CBIE
Canadian Bureau for International Education

BCEI
Bureau canadien de l'éducation internationale

CBIE PhD RESEARCH

Ethical Considerations for Internationalization: Perspectives from Global Citizenship Education

Kyra Garson

Introduction

A variety of globalizing influences have dramatically shifted the environment of Canadian institutions of higher education in the past few decades. Increased global student mobility has quite literally brought the world to our campuses. The presence of over 200,000 international students (Roslyn Kunin & Associates, 2012) is only one factor contributing to increased cultural diversity on Canadian campuses. Greater cultural diversity derives from steady growth in the presence of Indigenous students (AUCC, 2010; Malatest & Associates, 2004) and new Canadian students (Statistics Canada, 2009). Judging by the numbers, it would appear that higher education is poised to become a site of intercultural and global exchange. However, numerous scholars (Abdi, 2011; Banks, 2009; Camicia & Franklin, 2010; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008; Kuokkanen, 2008; Otten, 2010) warn that looking at quantitative factors alone may mask the continuation of potentially hegemonic or assimilative traditions inherent in the academy. As Apple states, higher education frequently continues to embrace "an entire set of historical assumptions about 'tradition,' about the existence of a social consensus over what should count as legitimate knowledge, and about cultural superiority" (Apple, 2000, p. 68).

Although higher education has always valued the mobility of scholars and ideas, the recent emphasis on international activities has evolved to encompass much more than scholarly exchange. Although many argue that the rhetoric around internationalization is designed to divert attention from competitive, market motivations (Stromquist, 2007; Harris, 2008), others believe that the internationalization of higher education offers potential opportunities for real change in terms of curriculum and learning outcomes in the form of global citizenship education (Gacel-Avila, 2005; Pike, 2008; Shultz, 2011; Swanson, 2011; Tarc, 2011).

This paper explores the links between international education and global citizenship education in order to understand the inherent convergences and divergences, and to consider how they can be connected to achieve ethical approaches in institutional policy and practice, and in teaching. The common themes in the internationalization and global citizenship education literature will be examined in order to investigate the potential future trajectory of this area of scholarship. Beginning with a brief discussion of terms, the paper discusses the ethical dilemmas posed for Canadian higher education in a globalized context where the mobility of educational resources, paradigms and students have become commonplace strategies for many institutions. The final sections will discuss the challenges of embedding global citizenship perspectives within internationalization in higher education and suggest future possibilities.

Discussion of Terms

Globalization has become an accepted paradigm influencing lives and interactions around the world. However it continues to generate a variety of contested understandings often operating simultaneously (Burbules & Torres, 2000; Conversi, 2010; Gaudelli, 2009; Popkewitz & Rizvi, 2009; Santos, 2006; Stomquist & Monkman, 2000). Furthermore, globalization is generally framed through Western scholarship (Abdi, 2011; Bourdieu, 2003; Santos, 2006) and therefore may not be inclusive of many voices directly or indirectly impacted. Conversi (2010) regards part of the lexical confusion as due to the "failure to distinguish globalization as an ideology and globalization as a practice" (p.48). Santos (2006) conceptualizes globalizations in the plural, some of which may be more or less benign; however, he suggests, it is the growing set of prescriptions framed by hegemonic, monocultural, neoliberal consensus that are threatening. Burbules and Torres (2000) warn that if education does not begin to seriously address the prevalent neoliberal framing of globalization in tangible ways it runs serious risks. The prevalence of globalization taken as an inevitable truth for which no one is accountable presents real danger for many (Burbules & Torres, 2000; Popkewitz & Rizvi, 2009; Santos, 2006). For Altbach and Teichler (2001) "Internationalization... is an inevitable result of the globalized and knowledge-based economy" (p. 5). Yet we are reminded that "the global dimension of higher education is not a sphere of nature" (p.10) but represents the actions and decisions of real people in real time. This is what Santos (2007) refers to as the "determinist fallacy" which he suggests "consists in transforming the causes of globalization into its effects, obscuring the fact that globalization results from a set of political decisions which are identifiable in time and space" (p. 395). Burbules and Torres (2000) also urge educators not to succumb to the rhetoric of inevitability and suggest that they frame the discussion going forward in a manner that positions the global "in more equitable, and more just ways" (p. 61).

Internationalization is the most overt impact of globalization on higher education. Here we meet with another highly contested and variously interpreted term. According to Knight (2004), the debate around what internationalization means has been ongoing since the mid-1980s. Thirty years later many scholars still acknowledge confusion with the term among stakeholders in higher education (Bond, 2006; Enders, 2004; Harris, 2008; Knight, 2004; Oka, 2007; Stromquist, 2007). Internationalization viewed as a response to globalization frames internationalization initiatives as a means to "cope with or exploit globalization" (Altbach, 2004). These choices of response form the basis of the divisions in the internationalization literature: whether internationalization is framed as a competitive, neoliberal educational market mechanism for institutional revenue (Stromquist, 2007; Harris, 2008), or as a vehicle for changes in curriculum relevant to new global contexts (Gacel-Avila, 2005; Shultz, 2011; Swanson, 2011; Tarc, 2011) or to intercultural education (Bond, 2006; Deardorff, 2006; Leask, 2010; Paige & Mestenhauser, 1999).

Although internationalization in higher education refers to a number of activities including the mobility of students, institutional partnerships and programs, and the transnational marketing and delivery of programs, the present discussion explores how the processes of globalization and internationalization impact the learning and teaching environment of Canadian campuses. Therefore, the paper will use Knight's (2004) definition of internationalization as "the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (p.11).

Internationalization has spurred a revival of interest in global citizenship (Gacel-Avila, 2005; Shultz, 2011; Swanson, 2011; Tarc, 2011; Wright, 2011); yet, a review of the global citizenship education (GCE) literature reveals similar challenges in providing a singular definition for the field (Abdi, 2008; 2011, Davies, 2006; Dower, 2008; Pike, 2008; Shultz, 2011; Swanson, 2011). Tarc (2011) points out that if any one of the three words: global, citizen or education is removed the meaning becomes entirely different. Shultz (2008; 2011) admits that the wide and varied use of the term may render it meaningless but believes that it is these varied discourses that potential for meaningful scholarship may emerge. Davies (2006) also comments that concepts of global citizenship have become too fragmented to be accepted and embedded. Weber (2011) simplifies the fragments to two competing discourses: one in which a social justice paradigm prevails, the other where GCE becomes a means to prepare learners for the global market economy. This dichotomy is reminiscent of similar divides in the internationalization literature (Knight, 2004; Stromquist, 2007).

A review of the GCE literature reveals a number of shifts which align with both the challenges and opportunities offered by the internationalization of higher education. These include a heightened emphasis on the ethical dilemmas presented by globalization and internationalization, a wider disciplinary distribution of interest in global citizenship in relation to fields beyond social sciences, and a particular focus on pedagogy, curriculum development and the learning outcomes potentially associated with global education. The literature of GCE and that of internationalization share some of the same concerns in terms of issues to consider and barriers to overcome. However, despite superficial alignment, they may be at odds in the present education climate (Andreotti, 2011).

Ethical Dilemmas

> Ethical enquiry does not yield a single way of life or scheme of values for all — not even for a single individual. Different ways of life embody incompatible aspects of the human good. So, in different contexts, may a single human life. Yet no life can reconcile fully the rival values that a human good contains (Gray, 2000).

In reviewing the literature of global citizenship education (GCE) and that of internationalization, it is possible to identify common and related themes that either implicitly or explicitly raise ethical questions for higher education as a direct result of globalization processes. As this discussion will reveal, perspective plays a large part in whether these issues are viewed as moral imperatives for humanity or the responsibility of higher education toward more immediate stakeholders. The main overlapping issues involve the increasing influence of neoliberal agendas on the conscience, capability and context of higher education in addressing global education. Many within the academy have resigned themselves to internationalization being aligned with market outputs while at the same time individual faculty members and faculty groups manage to work innovatively within that structure to provide experiential and even transformative learning outcomes for students.

Much of the alignment of GCE educators to internationalization is similar, both in optimizing opportunities provided and recognizing systemic barriers that block their larger efforts. As mentioned above, many GCE scholars see internationalization as a vehicle to move their agendas forward, as do "interculturalists" and those interested in transformative, experiential and, in some cases, service learning. Yet a great deal of internationalization rhetoric and mission is immersed in market frameworks (AUCC, 2007; Abdi & Shultz, 2008; Stromquist, 2007; Harris, 2008, Marginson, 2007; Shultz, 2011) which favour institutional and domestic stability over global sustainability (Webber, 2011).

With the inclusion of education within the General Agreement on Trades and Services (GATS), education became a tradable commodity on the global market. The opportunities for individual institutions to generate revenue through internationalization initiatives without ethical parameters has resulted in some questionable enterprises motivated by aspirations for profit and prestige over educational outcomes. Although international education pursued commercial cross-border arrangements prior to the inclusion of education in the GATS, many scholars see GATS as the inevitable move to the full marketization of education with numerous potentially difficult or dangerous implications (Abdi, 2011; Altbach, 2004; Altbach & Knight, 2007; Knight, 2007; Giroux, 2002; Harris, 2007; Stromquist, 2007). The commodification of education also has implications

Many within the academy have resigned themselves to internationalization being aligned with market outputs while at the same time individual faculty members and faculty groups manage to work innovatively within that structure to provide experiential and even transformative learning outcomes for students.

for GCE. Swanson (2011) notes that the increase in institutional support for global citizenship initiatives hinges on the competitive approach now prevalent in internationalization, and that these initiatives are often used merely to legitimate mission statements and branding (for example, to indicate cutting-edge education). Furthermore, as sloganism is often used vaguely and not tied to learning outcomes, it can serve to endorse the very universalisms that global citizenship initiatives should seek to diminish (Swanson, 2011).

Several scholars note the often inequitable direction of international education initiatives, in particular the North's or West's advantage in these endeavours that may do little more than perpetuate inequities in terms of access and opportunity. Altbach (2004) and Webber (2011) both raise the issue of institutional access in the South or East to resources and to publication that has resulted in certain universities and locations dominating research and funding. The larger issue for many scholars is not the economic implications but the subtle imperialist positioning of certain epistemologies as superior. Although several scholars raise concerns that the present educational trajectory continues to elevate Northern and Western knowledge above others (Asgharzadeh, 2008; Banks, 2009; Bates, 2005; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008; Pidgeon, 2008; Santos, 2007; Schoorman & Bogotch, 2010), Abdi (2011) is perhaps the most outspoken in this regard. Abdi (2011) urges educators to interrogate inherent colonialist attitudes and assumptions about peoples of the South, reminding us that systemic and generational damage remains from previous imperialist approaches that have resulted in not only de-culturized and de-historized populations, but have been instrumental in "de-citizenizing" as well.

The internationalization literature does not explicitly attend to the question of epistemological superiority. The closest concern comes in the form of discussion regarding "brain drain" which raises questions regarding the flow of talent but not necessarily systemic

epistemological inequities. Altbach and Knight (2007) note uneven directional flows of students as a result of international student recruitment, which they concede presents potential benefit to the home countries of the students but not to their educational systems in terms of control of content or economic gain. Where we do find attention put to knowledge variations, or at least perspectives varied by cultural orientation, is through the work of interculturalists or those who value intercultural frameworks beyond their usefulness for preparing students to do business in the global economy (Knight, 2004; Deardorff, 2006; Bok, 2009; Otten, 2003; 2009).

Conversely, the GCE literature is rife with warnings to consider other epistemological orientations, particularly from scholars cognizant of the historical imposition of culture and norms, who argue that any genuine global education curriculum requires an inclusive discourse about what citizenship in a global context might look like (Abdi, 2011; Andreotti, 2011; Pike, 2008; Swanson, 2011). To discuss education for global citizenship and not consider alternative knowledge frameworks would be nothing less than perpetuating colonialist subjugation. Abdi (2011) frames his position within a historical context:

> The relationship between the West and the rest of the world has not been a mutual understanding of the certain commonalities of the global public good. It was, undoubtedly, the mono-directional ideological stampede that believes in itself and cannot ascertain other intentions and possibilities of life (p. 27).

GCE scholars go beyond observation of these problems and put their attention to pedagogy in ways that international education has not. GCE scholars have highlighted the numerous difficulties of teaching global citizenship in the face of complicated and misunderstood histories that often confound the present (Guimaraes-Iosif, 2011; Krogman & Foote, 2011; Pigozzi, 2006; Swanson, 2011). Complicity is a feature of the GCE discourse, in the sense that it urges educators to teach from historical contexts in order that students have the opportunity to come to terms with their own complicity in present and future issues (Abdi & Schultz, 2008; Abdi, 2011; Krogman & Foote, 2011; Shultz, 2011; Swanson, 2011; Wright, 2009).

Nonetheless, GCE scholars acknowledge the pedagogical challenges, either in the framing of its complexity (Abdi, 2011; Shultz; 2011), the necessity of interdisciplinary engagement (Pigozzi, 2006, Guimaraes-Iosif, 2011), the difficulty of questioning the status quo (Guimaraes-Iosif, 2011), and the risk of GCE "essentializing" human differences (Swanson, 2011, Tarc, 2011) or of reinforcing binaries and stereotypes if the structural foundations of such educational endeavours are not deeply questioned (Swanson, 2011). Andreotti (2011) acknowledges the necessity of carefully considered pedagogy for international exchange:

> They [exchanges] have the potential to provide an exciting and highly motivating opportunity to enable learners to engage productively with complex and interdependent processes that shape global/local contexts, identities and struggles for justice today. However, depending on the approach and methodology adopted, they can also reinforce stereotypes, promote a patronizing attitude towards the South and alienate students further in relation to global issues and perspectives (pp.145-146).

These warnings parallel recent scholarship indicating that domestic student mobility that lacks careful attention to learning outcomes may not result in substantive learning (Van Berg, Paige, & Lou, 2012).

The focus of GCE on critical pedagogy is a welcome contribution to the internationalization literature which for the most part has not focused on pedagogy. Notable exceptions are the work of Bond (2006) and emerging scholar Oka (2007) whose dissertation is entitled "Pedagogy of the Global" and provides a comprehensive interrogation of internationalization in light of history, subjugated knowledges and notions of difference in developing a responsible citizenry. In line with GCE scholars, Oka (2007) advocates for a critical approach and identifies the transformative qualities of a "global imaginary." Pedagogical considerations aside, distinct parallels are evident across the two bodies of literature in regard to the challenges presented by incorporating diversity of perspectives and difficult questions into the present educational structure. Both the internationalization literature and the GCE literature identify systemic barriers, mainly the neoliberal forces discussed above, but also institutional barriers in terms of governance, accountability and organizational culture.

Institutional Barriers

Barriers exist for any change initiative within established institutions. Institutions of higher education have notoriously slow processes through which to incorporate change. The limitations of these governance structures are noted by GCE scholars (Pike, 2008; Weber, 2011; Wright, 2009). The challenge can be illustrated through the change in attitude shown by Pike: his early optimism (2000) wanes to resolve, eight years later, when he wonders why GCE "it is not at the forefront of politicians' calls for additional funding or of parents' concerns" (Pike, 2008, p. 224).

Along with the rise of marketization and neoliberal politics came an increase in accountability systems for higher education. It is interesting to note that a search

in the Educational Resources Information Centre (ERIC) database for accountability in higher education produces hundreds of articles of which the vast majority are concerned with financial accountability and performance-based accountability that for the most part deals with quantitative outputs. The higher educational system has become an input-output model (Harris, 2009; Deardorff, 2006) in which outcomes are secondary and long-term outcomes are rarely considered. Teichler (2004) comments that the dialogue "focuses on marketization, competition and management in higher education.
Other terms, such as knowledge society, global village, global understanding or global learning, are hardly taken into consideration" (p. 23). In the present neoliberal market environment there are serious questions as to what higher education is accountable for.

Faculty Issues

Another area of overlap is discussions of unprepared or unwilling educators who may either feel discussions of citizenship or global issues are not part of their subject matter or that they are not sufficiently prepared to manage such content or approaches. For the most part, the internationalization literature focuses on faculty resistance (Bond, 2006; Childress, 2010; Sanderson, 2008) and faculty engagement (Childress, 2010; Stohl, 2007). Bond (2006) concludes that some faculty are making the necessary shifts in terms of content and delivery required by internationalization; however, she finds that these are pockets of motivated individuals who are not necessarily encouraged or supported within their organization. Sanderson (2008) concurs that educators need to be supported by the institutional culture to embrace international, intercultural and global aspects of both their content and delivery. Childress (2010) devotes an entire book to the institutional strategies and structures required for faculty to widely engage in internationalization but falls short of incorporating pedagogical frameworks.

From the perspective of GCE the emphasis is less on resistance or engagement, but more on the unpreparedness of educators to incorporate content they are not well grounded in (Davies, 2006; Abdi, 2011, Pigozzi, 2006; Tarc, 2011). Tarc (2011) suggests that in order to move GCE towards a more collaborative, inquiry-based practice, the required thinking is not "teaching for global mindedness" but "teaching to learn to teach for global mindedness" (p. 72). Guimaraes-Iosif (2011) claims that educators must begin to question the *type* of citizens that result from higher education. Others assert that the teaching of global citizenship frameworks is the responsibility of higher education to ensure sustainability for future generations (Wright, 2009) or even a "moral imperative" (Blades & Richardson, 2006, p. 116) for education.

Student Attitudes

Student attitudes are increasingly worrisome. Côté and Allahar (2011) describe this general malaise as "unengaged entitlement." Wright (2009) claims that higher education produces "blind contributors" to sustainability issues, through the approach, programming and facilities of institutions. She exemplifies the point with personal experiences in which she was teaching a mandatory course in sustainability issues; she was repeatedly challenged by students questioning the relevance of the content to their particular program. Increasingly higher education caters to – and in fact competes with other institutions to attract – the "consumer student" who is uniquely focused on obtaining the required certification to get a job or to compete in the marketplace. More unsettling still is Tarc's (2011) discussion of an insidious "making a difference" ethos that underlies many global education initiatives intended to engage students.

> Indeed, in the social imaginary of the privileged West, there is a heightened demand to 'do good' and 'be empowered' as circumscribed by an individualist 'making a difference' paradigm. Many 'transformative' acts of empowerment seem situated within a kind of market-oriented, individualist, consumer, charity mix (p.69).

For Tarc (2011) this ethos teaches that responsibility is not public and frames social action as a vehicle to gaining social capital. Andreotti (2011) also reveals similar findings through three case studies. Particularly unsettling was a Make Poverty History campaign prior to the Gleneagles Summit where students were recruited to volunteer. The website led off with a set of "provocative" questions:

> Are you amazing?
>
> Do you want to be part of making poverty history?
>
> If so, [NGO A] wants to hear from you! (p. 149)

Andreotti's (2011) analysis found the campaign's recruiting material promised that participation would increase respect and boost one's CV which "suggests a narcissistic approach to activism" (p. 151). Dower (2008) insists that those who have the privilege to consider themselves global citizens represent the global elite and in this, may reflect the imbalances and inequities they claim to challenge.

Present and Future Trajectories

Consulting the GCE literature it is possible to discern shifts that may influence how internationalization is will be framed in the future. Considering traditional rationales for and approaches to internationalization, we see a change in emphasis within De Wit's (2002) and Knight's (2004) internationalization rationales, from primarily political and economic toward socio-cultural and academic rationales. This is evidenced by the number of academics in a variety of disciplines who combine internationalization and global education in their scholarship (Davies, 2006; Foote, 2011; Noddings, 2010; Shultz, 2011; Wright, 2009). In tandem with this trend is Knight's (2004) approaches model that has moved from activity and competence toward process and ethos. A second, related shift is that the GCE literature reveals more attention to pedagogy and curriculum in producing global citizens: whereas much of the internationalization literature assumes global learning outcomes simply by virtue of proximity or mobility, GCE scholars are seriously considering the impacts of such endeavours and the critical role of education in a globalized context (Abdi, 2011; Abdi & Shultz, 2008; 2011; Pike, 2008; Dower, 2008; Gacel- Avila, 2005; Swanson, 2011; Tarc, 2011; Wright, 2009).

The potential GCE scholarship to infuse ethical considerations into the internationalization process and ethos is substantial. At minimum, internationalization, as an established agenda for higher education, provides an environment "ripe for contestation" (Swanson, 2011, p. 124).

On the other hand, careful consideration of potential obstacles is in order. First, the concept of global citizens can be usurped to serve the neoliberal frameworks in which much of internationalization is firmly rooted. Furthermore, global citizenship is not a priority for neoliberal agendas, indeed "global thinking is not in the best interests of the global market" (Pike, 2008). Governance and operational issues will also hinder progress. In Canada in particular, they are highly complex due to provincial jurisdiction in education and federal roles in international relations and research. As a result, Canadian GCE has little policy support (Weber, 2011).

Another issue is that the terminology is unclear, and is enacted and advocated for through a variety of lenses for a variety of means (Davies, 2006, Shultz & Abdi, 2008, Tarc, 2011). The problematic of interpretive variation threatens to "reify difference as much as hide the dangerous universalisms they evoke, entrenching silences in the attempt to create a new platform for a set of global justices for all" (Swanson, 2011, p. 122). This is the danger that Abdi (2011) warns of in which GCE becomes yet another mechanism of subjugating the disenfranchised through frameworks imposed upon them.

Another possibility is that support for global citizenship may be dismissed as utopianism (Gumaraes-Iotif, 2011), for example by those in positions of privilege who tend to prefer the status quo.

internationalization, as an established agenda for higher education, provides an environment "ripe for contestation"

Recommendations

The calls to action in the GCE literature offer conceptual frameworks on how to proceed. Already noted was the necessity to critically frame all endeavours in sound pedagogy that allows spaces for collaboration and dialogue among all stakeholders, institutionally and internationally. Swanson (2011) urges a pedagogy of "glocalization" in which the concept of citizenship can be simultaneously informed as local and global. Other scholars recommend a framework that addresses local orientations and needs first and can be extended to the global sphere (Pike, 2008; Shultz, 2011). Krogman and Foote (2011) recommend finding ways to balance privilege with responsibility, while others urge reciprocity and balance (Noddings, 2006, Webber, 2011), and others urge holistic, historic thinking (Abdi, 2011; Pike, 2008; Wright, 2009).

The passion and purpose in the CGE literature strongly suggest that advocates will carry on despite adversity. Dower (2008) believes that global education provides optimism and that "things can improve through the efforts of those in a position to act" (p. 47). Although Pike (2008) concedes that the future of global citizenship education is uncertain, he insists on the imperative to resist complacency, stating that "what it might conceivably contribute to the Twenty-first century remains unknown, but the dangers of education without a global perspective are starkly evident in the history of the Twentieth" (p.219).

References

Abdi, A.A., & Shultz, L. (2008). Educating for human rights and global citizenship: An introduction. In A.A. Abdi & L. Shultz (Eds.). *Educating for human rights and global citizenship* (pp.1-11). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Abdi, A.A. (2011). De-Monoculturalizing global citizenship education: The need for multicentric intentions and practices. In L. Shultz, A.A. Abdi, & G.H. Richardson (Eds.). *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies* (pp. 25-39). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Altbach, P.G. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management* 10, 3-25.

Altbach, P.G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 11(3/4), 290-305. doi: 10.1177/1028315307303542

Andreotti, V. (2011). The question of the "other" in global citizenship education: postcolonial analysis of telling case studies in England. In L. Shultz, A.A. Abdi & G.H. Richardson (Eds.). *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies* (pp.140-157). New York, N.Y.: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Apple, M. W. (2000). Between neoliberalism & neoconservatiosm: Education and conservativism in a global context. In Burbules N. C., Torres C. A. (Eds.), Globalization and education: Critical perspectives. New York: Routledge.

AUCC (2008). *Internationalization: A force for change in Canadian universities*. Retrieved from http://www.aucc.ca/_pdf/english/publications/internationalization_card_e.pdf

Blades, D.W., & Richardson, G.H. (2006). Restarting the interrupted discourse of the public good: Global citizenship education as moral imperative. In G.H. Richardson & D.W. Blades (Eds.). *Troubling the canon of citizenship education* (pp.115-123). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Bok, D. (2009). Foreword. In D.K. Deardorff, *The sage handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. ix-x). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Bond, S. (2006). Transforming the Culture of Learning: Evoking the International Dimension in Canadian University Curriculum. York University/Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations Symposium: "Internationalizing Canadian Universities: Practices,Challenges and Opportunities" Retrieved from http://international.yorku.ca/global/conference/canada/papers/

Bond, S. (2009). World of Learning: Canadian Post-Secondary Students and the Study Abroad Experience. Ottawa: CBIE.

Childress, L.K. (2010). *The twenty-first century university: Developing faculty engagement in internationalization*. New York, N.Y.: Peter Lang.

Côté, J. & Allahar, A. (2011). *The lowering of higher education: The rise of corporate universities and the fall of liberal education*. Toronto: University of Toronto

Deardorff, D.K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 10, 241-265. doi:10.1177/1028315306287002

Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action? *Educational review* 58 (1), 5-25. doi: 10.1080/00131910500352523

Dower, N. (2008). Are we all global citizens or are only some of us global citizens?: The relevance of this question to education. In A.A. Abdi & L. Shultz (Eds.). *Educating for human rights and global citizenship* (pp. 39-54). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gacel-Avila, J. (2005). The internationalization of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 9, 121-136. doi: 10.1177/1028315304263795

Giroux, H. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72 (4), 425-463.

Gray, J. (2000). *Two faces of liberalism*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Guimaraes-Iosif, R. (2011). Rethinking citizenship education in higher education institutions through the lens of critical pedagogy: educating the local and global emancipated citizen. In L. Shultz, A.A. Abdi & G.H. Richardson (Eds.). *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies* (pp. 76-93). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Harris, S. (2008). Internationalizing the university. *Educational Philosophy and Theory 40* (2), 346-357. doi:10.111/j.1469-5812.2007.00336.x

Kezar, A. (2004). Obtaining integrity? Reviewing and examining the charter between higher education and society. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(4), 429-45. doi:10.1353/rhe.2004.0013

Krogman, N. & Foote, L. (2011). Global citizenship and the environment: Embracing life in all its forms. In L. Shultz, A.A. Abdi & G.H. Richardson (Eds.). *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies* (pp.108-119). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Knight, J. (2007). Implications of cross-border education and GATS for the knowledge enterprise. *UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge*.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 8(5), doi: 10.1177/1028315303260832

Knight, J. (1994). Internationalization: Elements and Checkpoints. *CBIE Research Series Number 7*. Ottawa: CBIE

Knight, J. & de Wit, H. (1999). Quality and internationalization in higher education. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Marginson, S. (2007). Globalization, the "idea for a university" and its ethical regimes. *Higher Education management and Policy* 19(1), 31-45.

Otten, M. (2003). Intercultural learning and diversity in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7 (1), 12-36. doi: 10.1177/1028315302250177

Otten, M. (2009). *Academicus interculturalis?* Negotiating interculturality in academic communities of practice. Intercultural Education, 20(5), 407-417. doi: 10.1080/14675980903371266

Pike, G. (2000). A tapestry in the making: The strands of global education. In T. Goldstien & D.

Selby (Eds.), *Weaving Connections: Educating for Peace, Social and Environmental Justice*. Pp 218-241

Pike, G. (2008). Reconstructing the legend: Educating for global citizenship. In A.A. Abdi & L. Shultz (Eds.). *Educating for human rights and global citizenship* (pp.223-238). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Pigozzi, M.J. (2006). A UNESCO view of global citizenship education. *Educational Review*, 58(1) pp. 1-4. doi: 10.1080/00131910500352473

Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc. (2009). The economic impact of international education in Canada. Retrieved from http://www.international.gc.ca/education/assets/pdfs/RKA_IntEd_Report_eng.pdf

Sanderson, G. (2008). A foundation for the internationalization of the academic self. *Journal of Studies in International Education 12*. Sage. Doi: 10.1177/1028315307299420

Schuerholz-Lehr, S. (2007). Teaching for global literacy in higher education: How prepared are the educators? In *Journal of Studies in International Education*, Vol.11:2, 180-204.

Shultz, L., Abdi, A.A., & Richardson, G.H. (2011). Global citizenship education and the role of the academy: A critical introduction. In L. Shultz, A.A. Abdi, & G.H. Richardson (Eds.). *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies* (pp.1-12). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, Vol. 11 No. 3/4, Fall/Winter 2007 359-372 DOI: 10.1177/1028315307303923

Stromquist, N. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education* 53, 81-105 doi:10.1007/s10734-005-1975-5

Swanson, D. (2011). Parallaxes and paradoxes of global citizenship: Critical reflection and possibilities of praxis in/through an international online course. In L. Shultz, A.A. Abdi, & G.H. Richardson (Eds.). *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies* (pp. 120-139). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Tarc, P. (2011). Bridging(representations of) the "global present" with the life-world of the classroom: Researching toward "learning to teach" global citizenship education. In L. Shultz, A.A. Abdi, & G.H. Richardson (Eds.). *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies* (pp. 64-75). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education. 48*, pp. 5-26.

Vande Berg, M., Paige, R.M., & Lou, K.H. (2012). (Eds). *Student learning abroad: What are students are learning abroad, what they're not, and what we can do about it*. Sterling, VA: Sylus.

Weber, N. (2011). Global education in higher education institutions in Ireland, the United Kingdom and Canada: Complemtarity and conflict in the global university. In L. Shultz, A.A. Abdi, & G.H. Richardson (Eds.). *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies* (pp.249-259). New York, N.Y.: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Wright, T.S.A. (2009). Sustainability, internationalization, and higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* (118), pp. 105-115. doi: 10.1002/tl.357

About the Author

Kyra Garson is a doctoral candidate in the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University. Her research interests include intercultural and global learning outcomes of undergraduate students through internationalization, internationalization at home initiatives, and interculturalizing curriculum through faculty development. In her professional role as the Interculturalization Coordinator for The Centre for Student Engagement and Learning Innovation at Thompson Rivers University, she works to enhance intercultural and global perspectives across campus. Kyra is an instructor for Queen's University's International Educators Training Program (IETP) and has developed and delivered workshops across Canada. Kyra is the 2011 recipient of the Internationalization Service Award, a CBIE Excellence Award recognizing outstanding service to international education.

CBIE PhD RESEARCH SERIES

A series for new researchers in the field of international education

ISBN: 978-1-894129-75-6
ISSN: 1183-4404

© 2012 Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE)

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author.

Canadian Bureau for International Education

220 Laurier Avenue West, Suite 1550
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5Z9

613-237-4820
research-recherche@cbie.ca

www.cbie.ca