Critical Internationalization: Moving from Theory to Practice

Frances Vavrus
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, vavru003@umn.edu

Amy Pekol
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, pekol@umn.edu

Critical Internationalization: Moving from Theory to Practice

Abstract

This article utilizes critical social theory to illuminate structures of inequality that undergird certain practices of internationalization in higher education institutions, particularly in U.S. institutions. We demonstrate how such theory can be productively employed to analyze three key dimensions of contemporary internationalization: 1) a representational dimension, 2) a political-economic dimension, and 3) a symbolic capital dimension. We argue that these three elements are central to any critical conceptualization of internationalization that has at its core a consideration of equity, ethics, and social justice. The overarching goal of this article is to illustrate how critical social theory can foster more extensive debate regarding the material and ideological systems of exclusion in international education and contribute to the task of reimagining internationalization.

CRITICAL INTERNATIONALIZATION: MOVING FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

Frances Vavrus[1]
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, USA

Amy Pekol
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, USA

Introduction

Higher education institutions (HEIs) around the world are facing increasing pressure to internationalize their campuses, curriculum, and activities to the extent that nearly all HEIs today have embraced some form of internationalization (Green & Schoenberg, 2006). However, internationalization strategies and activities vary greatly across HEIs due to the different opportunities and pressures they face as research and teaching institutions. Internationalization may be limited to informal activities between institutions in two or more countries, or it might include exchanges among students and faculty as well as more extensive curricular changes to include scholarship from more regions of the world.

Most internationalization activities are driven by a combination of economic and social imperatives. For example, from a financial perspective, institutions in host countries stand to benefit from the presence of full fee-paying students from abroad and from joint international ventures with wealthy governments, organizations, and alumni. From the perspective of the university's social mission, HEIs are expected to develop greater international awareness among students and faculty as well as produce graduates with sufficient intercultural competence to compete in the global economy (OECD, 1999). Both the economic and social imperatives for internationalization can be explained by global economic pressures for universities and graduates to remain competitive in the global market (Torres & Schugurensky, 2002).

The growing importance of internationalization in higher education coincides with the decline of public funding for higher education in many parts of the world. As neoliberal policies took root in the 1980s and early 1990s, many governments drastically reduced public funding for higher education, causing universities to compete for private funding and student tuition (Heyneman, 1994; Torres & Schugurensky, 2002). This shift forced universities to adjust their financing and governance structures as well as their activities. Although universities around the world experienced similar restructuring pressures, universities adjusted to these policies in divergent ways.

Many universities and faculty in the Global North responded to these neoliberal pressures by adopting market-based strategies, such as competing for external funding, forming partnerships with private industries, increasing student fees, and selling educational

---

[1] *Correspondence*: University of Minnesota, Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, & Development, 430C Wulling Hall, 86 Pleasant St S E, Minneapolis, MN 55455; Email: vavru003@umn.edu

programs and services (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997, 2001; Stromquist, 2007). As a result, many well-established and privately supported universities in Europe and North America were able to position themselves as global education leaders—exporting their educational programs, services, and ideas abroad and importing full fee-paying students.

The situation for institutions in the Global South has generally been quite different. For the vast majority of these universities, which did not have the same global reputation or access to private resources as their Northern counterparts, they struggled to carry out the most basic teaching and research functions as public support dwindled. Many of them continue to rely on international development assistance to help fill the funding gap. This may take the form of direct donor assistance or university 'partnerships' with institutions in the Global North, and, to a lesser extent, South-South partnerships (Bradley 2007; Chisholm & Steiner-Khamsi, 2009; Samoff & Carrol, 2003).

The uneven flows of students and capital are an indication of the markedly different ways that the global political economy affects HEIs around the world. This special issue of FIRE is an invitation to engage in an analysis of these flows as part of a critical dialogue about the internationalization of higher education. This article contributes to the dialogue by utilizing critical theory to explain three key dimensions of contemporary internationalization: 1) a representational dimension, 2) a political-economic dimension, and 3) a symbolic capital dimension. We argue that these three elements are central to any critical conceptualization of internationalization that has at its core a consideration of equity, ethics, and social justice. The goal of this article, therefore, is to illustrate how a broader use of critical theory can illuminate the enduring structures of inequality that undergird internationalization in many contexts in an effort to redress them.

Conceptualizing Higher Education Internationalization

Internationalization of higher education is broadly defined as a "process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (Knight, 2008, p. 11). A common approach to internationalization is for universities to add a global dimension to their existing teaching, scholarship, and service components. In the case of the U.S., this may mean providing support to faculty to revise syllabi by incorporating case studies and texts from Africa, Asia, and South America; it may also include putting university resources into the establishment of programs to ensure that most undergraduate students have a study abroad experience or that more faculty engage in research with colleagues from outside North America. Integrating these dimensions into higher education is intended to help students to be more competitive in the global economy, faculty to develop a broader perspective on their disciplines, and the universities themselves to have an international presence, which is increasingly deemed necessary to remain prominent and financially solvent (Sanderson, 2008; Stromquist, 2007).

In response to this trend, a wealth of scholarship has emerged to guide and analyze the process of internationalization (Bartell, 2003; de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2008; Rudzki, 1995). Most of these studies, however, take a functionalist or instrumentalist approach to understanding the internationalization efforts of universities as a whole. That is, the studies focus attention on the specific inputs (activities), processes (arrangements), and outcomes (goals) of higher education internationalization rather than the broader context that shapes it. A major limitation of this scholarship is that it tends to accept dominant neoliberal discourses about the role of higher education as a means of ensuring economic competitiveness as its point of departure. As a result, it often uncritically supports the status quo regarding the division between higher- and lower-status institutions in the Global North and South, respectively, and fails to account for the broader historical and sociopolitical forces that influence opportunities for students and faculty to participate in international programs and to develop internationalization policies.

Critical scholars of internationalization have made important contributions to the field by drawing attention to, and analyzing the ways in which, Global North and South institutions occupy different positions within the global political economy. While the global political economy is an important component of any critical understanding of internationalization, we argue for a more comprehensive critical perspective on internationalization where the political economy of internationalization is complemented by attention to representation and symbolic capital (defined below). We do so by drawing attention to the ideological systems that bolster the unequal political-economic relations evident in internationalization today.

Underlying this framework is a belief in the need to focus far more on material and ideological systems of exclusion in international education than we have seen to date. While much has been written about the social, material, and psychological benefits for students who participate in study abroad programs, for example, we argue that individuals and institutions in the Global South experience internationalization differently, and sometimes only marginally. This critical view of internationalization signals a break from much of the research in international education with its roots in social psychology and intercultural communication (Bennett, 2009; Pedersen, 2009; Stemler, Imada, & Sorkin, 2014).

Critical Theory in Education

It is beyond the scope of this article to trace the lengthy genealogy of critical social thought, but there are two lines of theory that are particularly relevant to our critique of the internationalization of higher education. With their historical roots in Marx's analysis of capitalism, critical social theories have developed and diverged to account for different dimensions of economic and social life while still united by the goal of explaining how inequality is structured and reproduced. In the decades following World War II, one branch of Marxist scholarship emerged to explain how capitalism on a global scale produced economically developed and underdeveloped regions. The work of Immanuel Wallerstein has been particularly important because of his articulation of world-system theory to explain the operations of the capitalist world-economy from the 1500s to the present (Wallerstein, 1974, 2000). His work emerged as a group of Latin American scholars, known collectively as the *dependentistas,* were articulating the view that it was the very nature of global capitalism to generate economic development in some regions and underdevelopment elsewhere (Connell, 2007; Robinson, 2011). Dependency theory, as it became known, was used extensively to explain underdevelopment in other regions, such as sub-Saharan Africa by scholars like Walter Rodney (1981) and Samir Amin (1974).

This branch of critical social theory, with its distinctly Marxist and macro-sociological orientation, provides a useful explanatory framework for analyzing the political economy of internationalization, as illustrated below. However, it is the second branch, with its focus on ideology, which helps to explain the representational and symbolic dimensions of internationalization. Antonio Gramsci's (1971) concept of cultural hegemony helped to establish this line of neo-Marxist thought in that it identifies the process by which the worldviews of dominant social classes come to be viewed as 'commonsense' throughout society even when this state of affairs perpetuates the economic and political marginalization of the working class. Louis Althusser (2001) added considerably to this work in his insistence on "ideological practices" as essential to the production and reproduction of ideology as carried out through "ideological state apparatuses" constituted by schools, media, political parties, and the like. These systems of representation form an ideological field in which social actors are "interpellated" or "hailed," meaning they come to recognize themselves as members of a population classified in particular ways, such as 'black' or 'foreign' or 'underdeveloped' (Hall, 1985). Cultural studies scholar Stuart Hall (1997a) built on the work of Gramsci and Althusser but focused more explicitly on media and representation, and how language as a symbolic system shapes our conceptualization of people and objects, a useful framework for

examining how populations and countries are represented in media produced by study abroad offices, as explored below.

Whereas Hall directed much, though not all, of his attention to media, race, and inequality, sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1977; 1984) and colleagues (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) are best known for their work on the ways that privilege and power are reproduced through social institutions, especially through the family and the educational system. Bourdieu's work, like other critical theorists, addresses the economic structures that perpetuate inequality, but he shows how these structures articulate with other forms of capital, such as social capital (in the form of relationships that have 'value'), cultural capital (in terms of education and the dispositions associated with social advancement), and symbolic capital (as reflected in the resources that accrue to people with honor and prestige). In addition to his complex notion of capital, Bourdieu is well known for the concepts of field and habitus. Field denotes a break for Bourdieu with Marxist scholarship on social class, which he feels is too rigid and, instead, offers field to capture the "relations of force that obtain between the social positions" of different social actors given their varying degrees of capital and their "struggles over the monopoly of power, of which struggles over the definition of the legitimate form of power are a crucial dimension" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, pp. 229-230). Habitus links this macro-level concept of field to the micro-level embodiment of certain forms of capital in that it is "the systems of dispositions ... characteristic of the different classes and class fractions" (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 6). Emirbayer and Johnson (2008) explain the connection among these three concepts more clearly:

> By habitus, Bourdieu means the relatively durable principles of judgment and practice generated by an actor's early life experiences and modified (to a greater or a lesser degree) later in life. Shaped above all by economic and cultural conditions – that is, specific fields with their specific distributions of capital(s) – within which it is acquired and carried forth as a guide to practice in future situations, the habitus is a mechanism linking individual action and the macro-structural settings within which future action is taken. (p. 4)

The authors go on to argue that these three concepts are so integral to organizational analysis that they should not be studied separately. However, we seek to foreground the notion of symbolic capital in our analysis below while recognizing international higher education as a field in the Bourdieuian sense.

Numerous scholars in the field of education have drawn on these critical social theorists, particularly Bourdieu, to examine how inequality operates in educational institutions in the U.S. and abroad (Demerath, 2009; Laureau, 2011/2003; Willis, 1981). Bradley Levinson (2011) provides a particularly useful way of understanding what we mean by critical social theory in education, explaining that they are *those conceptual accounts of the social world that attempt to understand and explain the causes of structural domination and inequality in order to facilitate human emancipation and equity"* (2011, p. 2; emphasis in original). He goes on to assert:

> One of the enduring insights of critical social theory is that all social practice, including the practice of education or educational research, is deeply informed by interests and value commitments that have political consequences. Another way of putting this is to say that no social practice is innocent and all social practice is 'interested.' (Levinson, 2011, p. 14)

If one considers social practice to have political and economic consequences, then the practices of internationalization in higher education cannot be viewed as inherently positive and politically benign. In contrast to much of the theory that has informed the field of international education in general, and the design of study abroad programs in particular, critical social theory insists on attention to relations of power that shape the encounter between self and the cultural Other, and between institutions with different degrees of prestige and financial resources.

For example, one of the most foundational theories in the field of international education is Gordon Allport's (1954) intergroup contact theory. Dating back to the 1950s, Allport argued that under conditions of sufficient contact between disparate groups who are working toward shared goals in a non-threatening situation, contact between the groups is an effective way to reduce prejudice and minimize the risk of violence between them (Pettigrew, 1998). Thus, when applying this theory to practice, study abroad programs would seek to minimize differences in privilege and status between group members, engage them in cooperative activities, and cultivate friendships during the contact period that may last well beyond (Eller, Abrams, & Zimmermann, 2011). Intergroup contact theory and its many refinements over the years have generated a productive line of scholarship in international education. However, it provides no political-economic analysis of conflict and, instead, sets out to explain prejudice from a psychological perspective that does not engage with histories of colonialism and imperialism that put prejudice into motion in many parts of the world.

In the following sections, we seek to provoke an alternative framing of internationalization in higher education that directs attention to the enduring representations, political-economic relations, and symbolic inequalities that need to be addressed if internationalization is to promote more equitable and just global relations.

Internationalization and Representation

The issue of representation is virtually absent in the literature on higher education internationalization. However, a number of scholars have drawn upon critical scholars like Stuart Hall in other fields to explore how language and visual images serve as ideological systems of representation. For example, critical communication scholar Paula Treichler begins her study of language, representation, and HIV/AIDS with a quote from Hall (1992), who wrote:

> The question of AIDS is an extremely important terrain of struggle and contestation. In addition to the people we know who are dying, or have died, or will, there are the many people dying who are never spoken of. How could we say that the question of AIDS is not also *a question of who gets represented and who does not*? (cited in Treichler, 2006, p. 4; emphasis added).

After a series of case studies looking at how the biomedical and the cultural dimensions of AIDS have become intertwined, Treichler (2006) concludes the volume with further insights drawn from Hall's (1992) work:

> These cultural chronicles of the AIDS epidemic help us know the ways in which we have come to understand AIDS, its interaction with culture and language, the intellectual debates and political initiatives that it has engendered, and its symbolic function as a staging ground for both ideological and material struggles. Like other linguistic constructions, AIDS and HIV are not simply labels, provided us by science....Language itself is 'real' and 'material,' a concrete vehicle that lays a trail of its existence in documents, policies, conversations, and other sites and routes of cultural circulation. We cannot, therefore, look 'through' language, as though it were a plate glass window, to see what AIDS really is. (pp. 328-329)

What Treichler and Hall suggest is that the grand challenges of our day—be they AIDS or poverty or education—cannot be addressed solely through empirical study. They must also be recognized as terrains of cultural and political contestation over who is included and excluded when any label is applied to a problem or a population.

Hall (1997b) himself makes this point in his discussion of globalization as a process of representation. He contends that global political and economic inequality has produced a privileged English identity and a marginalized identity for the rest of the world. He observes:

> English identity is strongly centered; knowing where it is, what it is, it places everything else. And the thing that is extraordinary about English identity is that it

didn't only place the colonized other—it placed *everybody* else. (p. 174, emphasis in original)

Critical scholars who focus more directly on globalization, global capital, and higher education have discussed this binary representation of the West. For instance, anthropologist and social theorist Arjun Appadurai (1999) argues, "globalization is inextricably linked to the current workings of capital on a global basis, that in this regard it extends the earlier logics of empire, trade and political dominion in many parts of the world" (p. 229). He goes on to assert, "But to say that globalization is about a world of things in motion somewhat understates the point. The various flows we see – of objects, persons, images and discourses – are not coeval, convergent, isomorphic or spatially consistent. They are in relations of disjuncture" (p. 231).

These relations of disjuncture can be seen in myriad ways in higher education, with one example being the ways in which different parts of the world are represented in marketing materials for study abroad programs. One only has to take a cursory look at the brochures produced by study abroad offices and the websites of companies that organize short- and long-term programs for U.S. university students to see that places and persons are not represented in the same way. There are certain visual tropes that return us to Hall's (1992) question of who gets represented and who does not, and how these representations vary by race and class. Although there are differences in the study abroad materials, from the layout of their websites to the design of their brochures, there is not a great deal of variation in the images used to depict study in the Global South. As one might expect, both U.S. students and the host country children they encounter appear cheerful in the pictures. One also notices that the 'typical' U.S. college student is white and the 'typical' residents of the Global South whom they encounter are children of color.

The image of the lone white U.S. college student assisting or playing with a group of African, Asian, or Latino children suggests a narrative of rescue not uncommon in U.S. education more broadly. An example is the Teach for America program in which predominantly young, white, middle-class teachers, most of whom are recent college graduates, are placed in schools with largely lower-income students of color (Popkewitz, 1998). The point here is that the marketing of study abroad programs is not immune to the reproduction of racial hierarchies and to the development narratives that place Europe and North America in distinctly different positions from Africa and parts of Asia and South America.

Development-focused academic partnerships between universities in the Global North and South also illustrate this hierarchical system of representation in higher education. North-South university partnerships have emerged over the past few decades as a popular means to build higher education 'capacity' in Africa, Asia, and South America (Bradley, 2007; Chapman, Pekol, & Wilson, 2014). In these partnerships, Global North universities typically partner with universities in the Global South to help the latter enhance their teaching, research, and outreach capacity. Yet this unidirectional view of capacity building ignores the learning that takes place for faculty from the Global North when they are working in new contexts with highly capable colleagues in Southern institutions (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2013). Moreover, as Gonzales Chavarría (2012) points out, the framing of these partnerships as a form of capacity building often requires universities in the South to conform to the norms, structures, and activities valued by the partners in the Northern universities. Moreover, the Northern universities' practices are commonly framed as the global gold standard in terms of quality and efficiency that Southern institutions should strive to emulate. In the process, however, many universities in the Global South have become primarily consumers of research and adopters of university systems produced for the conditions of higher education in the Global North rather than based on their own specific concerns and conditions (Samoff & Carrol, 2003). As a result, these types of university partnerships tend not to be reciprocal, as

students, faculty, institutional practices, intellectual paradigms, and ideologies about educational quality mostly flow from North to South (Zeleza, 2012).

Following Hall's (1997b) earlier observation about globalization, the central position of many Global North universities in the field of international higher education has effectively placed "everyone else," in this case most universities in the Global South, on the periphery. Indeed, some scholars describe the global higher education landscape in terms of academic centers and peripheries (Altbach, 2004; Altbach & Balán, 2007). According to this perspective, there are 'world-class' universities and then all the other universities. The world-class universities are those universities at the center of the global knowledge production network. They are typically the large research universities concentrated in the Global North that remain at the top of global academic rankings year after year.

For financial and ideological reasons, universities in low and middle-income countries that aspire to become world-class universities find it challenging to do so (Altbach, 2004; Altbach & Balán, 2007; Oleksiyenko & Sá, 2010). Moreover, some scholars contend that it can be counter-productive to direct efforts toward 'world-class' status at all. Zeleza (2012) argues that, in doing so, universities in the Global South "might end up sacrificing their role as catalysts of national development and intellectual leadership in their respective societies and regions, thereby foreclosing any possibilities of restructuring the global system of knowledge production itself" (2012, pp. 14-15).

The different representations of Global North and South universities—as academic centers and peripheries, or as world-class or not—affect their desirability as sites for study abroad and for research partnerships. These representations also tend to minimize and marginalize the contributions of scholars in the Global South in the production of 'world-class' knowledge and in international university partnerships. Viewing these two forms of internationalization—study abroad and international university partnerships—through the lens of representation highlights the very different positions that Global North and South universities occupy within the field of international higher education.

The Political Economy of Internationalization

Moving from the representational dimension of a critical theory of internationalization to the political-economic dimension, one finds very tangible "relations of disjuncture" (Appadurai, 1999, p. 230) in the flows of higher education students and knowledge dissemination around the world. Recent data on student mobility and the marketing of international education illustrate global patterns of inequality and exclusion, as well as the profit-making dimensions that rarely receive recognition in research focused on the social psychological benefits of studying abroad. In the past decade, the number of students studying abroad has more than doubled, from 2.1 million in 2001 to 4.3 million globally-mobile students today.

The top sending and receiving countries are overwhelmingly in Asia, with China at the top of the list with 694,400 students studying abroad followed by India (189,500) and the Republic of Korea (123,700) (Institute for International Education, 2013). This increase is not happening because students from Beijing to Bangalore suddenly realized the benefits of study abroad. Rather, as *The Economist* (2003) notes, we are witnessing the rise of an "international education industry" worth more than $100 billion (cited in Waters, 2006, p. 1047). This industry includes language institutes (especially English language institutes), e-learning programs, offshore programs or branch campuses (e.g. Global North universities set up satellite programs or campuses in Global South countries so that students can obtain a degree from a 'world-class' university without leaving the region), and the creation of "national education brands" (Waters, 2006, p. 1047).

In some countries, there is a single entity that coordinates national public and private international education efforts. In New Zealand, this organization is Education New Zealand, which promotes "advocacy on behalf of New Zealand's education export industry" and the

"promotion of the 'Educated in New Zealand' brand" (cited in Waters, 2006, p. 1055). The British Council serves a similar function in the UK, with its branding effort, 'Education UK,' promoting different types of educational products to potential students, including English-language courses, degree courses, and MBAs (Waters, 2006).

Our selection of these examples of the marketization of higher education by English-speaking countries is not random: The US and UK are the two top host destination countries in the world with about 30% of globally-mobile students opting to study in one of these two countries (Institute for International Education, 2013). Along with Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, these five English-speaking countries host about 50% of globally-mobile students (Waters, 2006). Thus, returning to Wallerstein (2000) and Appadurai's (1999) arguments that globalization today reflects historical patterns of inequality in the flow of capital, the countries that dominate the international education industry and have gained the greatest 'market share' of these students' dollars or pounds are countries that continue to benefit from their English-speaking empires.

In addition to this trend toward English-speaking host countries being the most popular sites for study abroad, there is another development worth noting that also parallels patterns of inequality in the global political economy. Cultural geographer Johanna Waters calls this pattern a "rescaling of social reproduction" (2006, p. 1048), meaning that the reproduction of social inequality due to unequal access to quality schooling is not only occurring at the scale of the state or nation but also increasingly on a global scale because only wealthier students can typically afford to study in more desirable host countries. One way to conceptualize such inequality is to compare study abroad to the U.S. by Chinese and African students. The population of China is approximately 1.3 billion people; the entire continent of Africa has about 1.1 billion people. Thus, one might expect China, *the country*, to send a slightly larger number of students to study abroad than *the continent* of Africa if one were to go by population numbers alone. Yet, as a continent, Africa has the largest number of youth between the ages of 15-24, the very ages when undergraduates are going abroad for studies (Ighobor, 2013). Its 200 million or so youth in this age group is actually slightly larger than the youth population (aged 15-24) in China, so perhaps one might expect roughly the same number of students studying abroad.

Yet the numbers are vastly different: in 2012, there were some 235,000 students from China studying in the U.S. and only 35,000 students from Africa (including North Africa and sub-Saharan Africa) (Institute for International Education, 2012; 2013). Moreover, there are roughly the same number of U.S. students studying abroad in China—a large but single country— as there are studying in the 54 countries that comprise the continent of Africa (approximately 14,000 U.S. students) (Institute for International Education, 2012; 2013). The story is more complicated because African students more frequently study abroad in other African countries compared to the U.S., but the point is that there are significant changes underway in how social inequality is reproduced through higher education, making it no longer solely a matter of which domestic university one attends but increasingly also whether one has studied abroad in a desirable host country. At present, this rescaling of social reproduction operates to the disadvantage of many African countries and others in the Global South.

The political economy of higher education internationalization and "relations of disjuncture" (Appadurai, 1999, p. 231) are also evident in the discourses of the global knowledge economy and practices of global knowledge production and dissemination. The very notion of a global knowledge economy reflects privileged assumptions about what the world's economy should look like and how individuals, institutions, and nations can participate in it. Michael Peters' research on global education policy discourses draws attention to this very issue. Through critical discourse analysis of education policies across different disciplines and nations, Peters (2001) finds that the knowledge economy is often

discussed in narrow and instrumental terms, and policies make overstated and untested claims about the significance of this dimension of the economy.

Such a narrow and uncritical framing of knowledge production has also resulted in the predominance of economic definitions of knowledge in education policies (Papadopoulos, 1994; Peters, 2001). This has led to what Peters (2003) describes as "a new kind of struggle over meaning and value of knowledge" (p. 153). The global imperatives of the knowledge economy now permeate education and development policies around the world. Peters concedes:

> It seems that the 'knowledge economy' is an idea whose time has come; nudged and patrolled by world policy institutions like the World Bank, OECD, International Monetary Fund, etc., national governments the world over have earnestly taken on the task of transforming their economies and societies in accordance with its implicit prescriptions. (2001, p. 6)

By shaping educational policy and the priorities embedded in it, international financial institutions and scholars in 'world class' universities have a profound influence on the internationalization of education. From this perspective, the 'inevitable' forces of the global knowledge economy are actually driven by the needs and interests of the global elites, in this case Western governments and universities.

Returning to the issue of university partnerships, a political-economic analysis adds further insights into how they, too, contribute to the reproduction of social—and economic—inequality. Critical scholars have voiced concerns about who benefits most from such arrangements in intellectual and financial terms. Cornwall (2007), for one, tempers the widespread enthusiasm for such partnerships, observing that their popularity likely has "as much to do with their feel-good factor as with what they promised to deliver" (cited in Ginsburg, 2012, p. 68). Similarly, Miraftab (2004) calls for a more critical evaluation of university partnerships within the context of their social, economic, cultural, and political environment. Unless partnership programs are crafted with full attention to their historical and political environments, she contends that "the power-sharing scenario intended to serve the interests of all partners dwindles into a familiar charade" (p. 98). Ginsburg also questions the ability of partnerships to deliver equitable results on unequal playing fields. Like Miraftab, he emphasizes the unequal power relations that characterize international partnerships, which he believes are "informed by and organized through the use of financial/material and ideological resources" (2012, p. 67). Therefore, Ginsburg calls for a critical examination of the geopolitical location of the participating partners, their motives for participation, and the degree of power they exercise within the partnership.

In sum, the political economy of internationalization creates distinctions between those who can and cannot participate in international studies and research, and these patterns often reflect longer-standing inequalities in the global flow of capital. As international experience becomes more important for students to secure employment, the rescaling of inequality from the domestic to the global scale warrants further attention. Furthermore, as the incorporation of a global dimension into curricula and programs becomes a mark of world-class status for universities, those institutions that can do so more easily and thoroughly will likely benefit from attracting the best domestic and foreign students.

Symbolic Capital and Internationalization

The ideological and political-economic dimensions of internationalization converge in the concept of symbolic capital. As discussed above, three particularly important and interconnected dimensions of Bourdieu's scholarship are field, habitus, and capital (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008). Bourdieu's most accessible definition of symbolic capital comes at the end of one of his most influential books, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste* (1984), which draws upon his study of the "cultivated disposition[s] and cultural competence" of some 1,200 residents of France in the 1960s (p. 13). After documenting how educational

qualifications and family background correspond with patterns of cultural consumption, Bourdieu (1984) identifies symbolic capital as "the acquisition of a reputation for competence and an image of respectability and honourability that are easily converted into political positions" (p. 291). In his discussion earlier in the volume of the most prestigious schools in France, Bourdieu (1984) contends that such "symbolic imposition is most intense in the case of the diplomas consecrating the cultural elite. The qualifications awarded by the French *grandes ecoles* guarantee, without any other guarantee, a competence extending far beyond what they are supposed to guarantee" (p. 25). In other words, a diploma from an elite school certifies far more than mastery of a body of knowledge; it indicates that one has developed 'good taste' in art, food, music, and other cultural forms by which class distinctions are marked. Emirbayer and Johnson (2008) expand this understanding of symbolic capital to include "any type of capital (including but not limited to cultural capital) insofar as it is accorded honor or recognition by relevant actors" (p. 25).

With this understanding of symbolic capital in mind, we can consider how certain kinds of international educational experiences function as a form of symbolic capital, especially those forms that serve to consecrate a global cultural elite. Anthropologist Aihwa Ong (1999) argues that "Western" education is "the ultimate symbolic capital" (cited in Waters, 2006, p. 1047). She, among others, point out that the prestige accruing to someone with a diploma from a 'world-class' university results in numerous benefits, from higher status at home to greater employment options with domestic and international companies. Without a doubt, many of these universities have the best facilities in the world and offer educational opportunities unavailable to students at less-prestigious institutions. Moreover, the opportunity to refine one's linguistic skills by studying in an English-dominant country is understandably highly valued by many students around the world. However, a diploma from lesser institutions in the U.S., U.K., or Australia still serves as a form of symbolic capital because it is frequently assumed that institutions in the Global North are inherently superior to those in the South and will, therefore, bring economic and social benefits beyond what the degree is "supposed to guarantee" (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 25).

There are a number of examples that provide support for this proposition. For example, educational policy scholar Fazal Rizvi (2005) conducted research with Chinese and Indian students studying at Australian universities, and he found that these students could clearly articulate why they were studying abroad. They explained that they not only wanted to obtain what they believed would be a better education, but also sought an international credential because of the economic capital they hoped it would eventually generate for them. Rizvi (2005) concludes:

> This form of cosmopolitanism rests on the assumption that the world consists of a single economic market with free trade and minimal political involvement. Contemporary practices of international education occur within this ideological framework. We cannot ignore the fact that international students participate in an economic exchange, and are likely to be concerned less with moral and political dimensions of global inter-connectivity than with its strategic economic possibilities...ultimately, international education is used by international students to better position themselves within the changing structures of the global economy, which increasingly prizes the skills of inter-culturality and a cosmopolitan outlook. (no page)

A more recent study, published in August 2014 by HSBC, set out to explore the educational preferences of some 4,500 parents in 15 countries on five continents (with the gross omission of Africa). Nearly 75% of the parents across these countries were "enthusiastic" about sending their children abroad for university studies, and more than 50% ranked the U.S. as one of their top three choices for their children, with the UK in second place at 38% and Germany third with 27% (HSBC, 2014). The U.S. was the top destination for the children of parents from Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Singapore, Taiwan, and Turkey. The

diversity among these countries and their status as economic and/or political leaders makes these findings even more significant because it is middle and upper class families who can send their children to study abroad, and the majority of these families opt for the U.S.

It is important to recognize, however, that the status the U.S. and U.K. currently hold is not inherent but rather likely to change as other countries, most notably Brazil, Russia, India, and China—the so-called BRICs—invest more heavily in their higher education institutions. In a recent comparative study of these four countries, the researchers found that students were generally satisfied with the education they received, and this satisfaction, over the long term, may lead to fewer of them studying in the U.S. and UK, and these countries' HEIs are attracting more students from lower-income countries to their universities rather than those in the Global North. Nonetheless, this study also indicates that there is still a strong preference for higher education in certain high-income countries. The authors note that "there has been a marked increase during the last decade in the number of qualified individuals from the BRIC countries who seek to acquire Ph.D.s in the United States and other developed countries" (Carnoy et al., 2013, p. 234).

There are many reasons why a degree from a U.S. university might still be coveted by students and their parents in the Global South, with the dominance of English in the sciences and other fields being a prime reason. Yet the symbolic capital of English extends beyond the confines of universities in English-dominant countries. Many universities around the world are adopting English as the language of instruction and scholarship in order to participate in global knowledge networks such as international conferences and journals, even though participating in these networks often means adopting the norms and values of English-speaking university systems (Curry & Lillis, 2010; Hoffmann, 2000; Selvi, 2011). Curry and Lillis (2010) find that publishing in English-medium journals requires conforming to their methodologies and paradigms, which generally reflect Western traditions and values. Altbach and Salmi (2011) observe a similar pattern, leading them to conclude: "In some ways, English is also the language of academic neocolonialism in the sense that scholars everywhere are under pressure to conform to the norms and values of the metropolitan academic systems that use English" (p. 18).

English-speaking scholars at 'world-class' universities enjoy many advantages that are both symbolic and financial. In addition to being able to read, work, and publish in their native language, they have greater influence over global research and funding agendas that help to determine what counts as authoritative knowledge and legitimate ways to acquire it. Participation in academic research and policymaking networks requires funds to travel and research and reliable access to technologies to maintain those connections. As Altbach (2013) aptly concludes, "an international knowledge network—dependent on the Internet, increased use of English as the main scientific language, and growing linkages among academic institutions—is a central reality of academe" (p. x). The result is a convergence of disadvantages for scholars at universities in the Global South that have limited financial resources and limited opportunities for them to develop the level of proficiency in academic English necessary to publish in top-tier journals.

The symbolic capital associated with English and with a degree from a university in the Global North—particularly one that is highly ranked—is often converted into economic capital by virtue of the preferences of employers. In a qualitative study of students in Hong Kong and mainland China, Waters (2006) found that employers, especially multinational corporations, want employees who have studied abroad because they believe, *a priori*, that these employees will have stronger skills in English and a more cosmopolitan view of the world. As higher education has rapidly expanded in Hong Kong since the 1980s, wealthy families have found a way to preserve their class status by sending their children abroad for university and returning with a degree that is far more valuable in the eyes of employers than an equivalent B.A. or B.S. from a local university.

For high school students whose families cannot or do not want to send their children to Canada—a popular destination for university for Chinese students—they can send them to an 'offshore' Canadian high school located in China. This option, according to Waters, has had a significant impact on the local educational system because no Chinese school in the area of this Canadian school can confer the same symbolic distinction on its students, no matter how good a school it may be. Yet the annual tuition of $5,000 at the offshore high school makes it an option for only very wealthy Chinese families, but it is certainly worth it: Waters found that 96% of the school's graduates obtained visas to attend university in Canada compared to 55% of Chinese applicants overall. As she concludes, "This statistic alone is suggestive of the extent of 'exclusion' entrenched in the practices of international education" (2006, p. 1060).

Recommendations and Conclusions

The examples discussed throughout this article remind us of a central tenet of critical theory: social practice, including the practice of internationalization of higher education, is 'interested.' This does *not* mean it is intentionally malicious or nefarious; it *does* mean that social practice often serves the interests of states, institutions, and actors who benefit from the status quo. Yet one does not have to identify as a critical scholar to agree that there are distinctions in the ways host countries are marketed and differences in global mobility patterns that, at a minimum, ought to be re-examined on the basis of fairness alone. However, this special issue of FIRE is an invitation to a *critical* dialogue, so we end with a vision of a more critically informed set of practices for higher education internationalization.

There are a number of areas one might address, but we sought to put our commitment to equity and reciprocity into practice by highlighting the recommendations from the *Global Dialogue* on international education held in January 2014 in South Africa sponsored by the International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA). This meeting was attended by international education organizations from the U.S., Europe, and, most importantly, organizations from Africa, Central and South America, and the Middle East. In the rationale prepared for the meeting, the organizers proposed the following:

> A Global Dialogue should be arranged where those that were excluded from the debate in the past, mostly by default and not by design, play a real role as equals in the setting of the future agenda. The dialogue should enhance the debate relating to distributive justice. Without this, a double impoverishment occurs: Those in advantaged Higher Education systems with refined Internationalisation practices will merely reflect the negative aspect of global capitalism and affirm the widening economic gap instead of providing a constructive remedy. Where knowledge systems remain closed to outsiders, everybody is impoverished and ignorance sets in despite the guise of the information age. (IEASA, 2014, no page)

The Declaration that came out of the meeting identified the following issues as the most important for a reconsideration of international education globally:

- Enhancing the quality and diversity of programmes involving the mobility of students and academic and administrative staff.
- Increasing the focus on the internationalisation of the curriculum and of related learning outcomes.
- Gaining commitment on a global basis to equal and ethical higher education partnerships. (de Wit & Jooste, 2014, paragraph 11).

Each of these points is worthy of further exploration, but we will conclude with three additional recommendations following the final point, "equal and ethical higher education partnerships." This is hard work and work that will likely never be completed because equality is an aspiration and not an endpoint. Yet here are a few thoughts about how to turn aspiration into action.

First, as the organizers of the *Global Dialogue* recommend, there should be more opportunities for global conferences that set out to reimagine internationalization by: (a) holding conferences outside the U.S. and Europe; and (b) focusing on critical global concerns regarding internationalization rather than primarily national ones. Although the site of the conference may seem largely like a symbolic issue, it turns the table on those for whom travel in the U.S. or Europe is more convenient and less expensive. Video conferencing to make conferences more accessible to participants around the world should also be a priority for any organization that claims to be international, and this includes making it inexpensive or free and providing translation into multiple languages for keynote talks and panels.

Second, study abroad should be re-conceptualized in more instances as higher education partnership with more reciprocal programs. A great deal of work has been done by many institutions to prepare students to address ethical dimensions of residing in another country and to think critically about their experiences during and after they return to the U.S. Our recommendation, however, is a bit different, and it has to do with the discussion above about representation. We attempted to find university-based programs anywhere in the world where students from the host country and the receiving country not only studied, lived, and volunteered together in the host country—for example, U.S. and Rwandan students in Rwanda—but also in the receiving country, in this case Rwandan and U.S. students living and studying together in the U.S. and doing similar kinds of community-based work in this country. Staying with the example of Rwanda, our review of study abroad programs for U.S. students going to Rwanda found that almost all of them focus on the genocide and its aftermath, with a fair number offering students the chance to volunteer in orphanages and women's organizations. These are undoubtedly powerful learning experiences that we would not want to discourage. However, we could not find any programs for Rwandan students to come to the U.S. and study genocide by engaging with Native American communities that continue to live with its aftermath (Glaunder, 2002; Trafzer & Lorimer, 2014). Such opportunities for reciprocal study abroad experiences would not level the global international education playing field, but they would be a significant step toward the development of experiences that represent the U.S. and help to repair relations of disjuncture (Appadurai, 1999).

Third, and finally, a bit of reflexivity, a central element of any critical social theory: The imperative to 'equal and ethical higher education partnerships' is not something we have found ways to achieve in our own work with faculty partners in the Global South. Although this is a goal to which we aspire, in practice the 'equal' part is very difficult indeed. For example, in a recent book that Vavrus edited with Lesley Bartlett (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2013), we conclude the volume with a chapter in which those involved in an international 'team ethnography' reflected on their experiences. The researchers in this project on Tanzanian teachers' use of learner-centered pedagogy included U.S.-based graduate students and Tanzanian and U.S. faculty, all of whom strove to work ethically and to treat one another as equals. Yet, from the beginning, privilege and power came into play. Two of us—Vavrus and Bartlett—were the ones who got the grants to fund the project and had the responsibility to manage the budget. We also had more experience writing in academic English and more knowledge of how to write a book proposal that would appeal to editors. In addition, our Tanzanian colleagues came out of an educational system where professors are not normally challenged, at least not publicly, which made deliberation about the research design and data analysis rather challenging. This story is not meant to discourage international research partnerships, but it is a cautionary tale about the complexities of knowledge production across borders where multiple inequalities, from the dominant language of academic publishing to access to funding for research, still exist. "Relationships of reciprocity," which scholars like Yvonne Hebert and Ali Abdi (2013, p. 24) call for in international education, may be a more realistic goal than *equal* relationships given the unequal world in which we live.

The work of reimagining internationalization ought to begin with a field like International Education, and this work involves both reflexivity about our own social practices and those of our institutions—especially our schools and universities—in relation to the growing call for global dialogue on how to make education more equal and ethical. Fazal Rizvi (2005) calls for a "new cosmopolitanism" that, as he puts it, is "self-aware, critical of its own positioning, of its own potential collusion with global capitalism" (no page), and he calls on universities to play a key role in developing such sensibilities: "Higher education has an important role to play in this task. If universities are to profit from international education in ways that are not merely commercial, then they have a major responsibility to initiate and sustain this conversation" (no page). Critical conversations are beginning to take place at universities around the world and in publications such as this one; the challenge for critical scholars is to engage in these dialogues and take them a step further to propel action.

References

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* New York: Addison-Wesley.

Altbach, P. G. (2004). The costs and benefits of world-class universities. *Academe, 90*(1): 20–23.

Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (2013). *The international imperative in higher education.* Rotterdam: SensePublishers.

Altbach, P. G., & Balán, J. (2007). *World class worldwide: Transforming research universities in Asia and Latin America.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Altbach, P. G., & Salmi, J. (Eds.). (2011). *The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities.* Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Althusser, L. (2001). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Amin, S. (1974). *Accumulation on a world scale: A critique of the theory of underdevelopment.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Appadurai, A. (1999). Globalization and the research imagination. *International Social Science Journal, 51*(160): 229-238.

Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education, 45*(1), 43–70.

Bennett, M.J. (2009). Defining, measuring, and facilitating intercultural learning: A conceptual introduction to the *Intercultural Education* double supplement. *Intercultural Education, 20*(1), S1-S13.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J-C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bradley, M. (2007). *North-South research partnerships: Challenges, responses and trends—A literature review and annotated bibliography.* Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

Carnoy, M., Loyalka, P., Dobryakova, M., Dossani, R., Froumin, I., Kuhns, K., Tilak, J., & Wang, R. (2013). *University expansion in a changing global economy: Triumph of the BRICs?* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Chapman, D. W., Pekol, A., & Wilson, E. (2014). Cross-border university networks as a development strategy: Lessons from three university networks focused on emerging pandemic threats. *International Review of Education, 60*(5), 619-637.

Chisholm, L., & Steiner-Khamsi, G. (Eds.) (2009). *South-South cooperation in education and development.* New York: Teachers College Press; Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Cornwall, A. (2007). Buzzwords and fuzzwords: deconstructing development discourse. *Development in Practice, 17*(4-5), 471-484.

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. M. (2010). Academic research networks: Accessing resources for English-medium publishing. *English for Specific Purposes, 29*(4), 281-295.

Demerath, P. (2009). *Producing success: The culture of personal advancement in an American high school.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative and conceptual analysis.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

de Wit, H. & Jooste, N. (2014). Can international education be truly equal and global? *University World News Global Edition* [online]. Available at:
http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20140218131715855)

Eller, A., Abrams, D., & Zimmermann, A. (2011). Two degrees of separation: A longitudinal study of actual and perceived extended international contact. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 14,* 175-191.

Emirbayer, M., & Johnson, V. (2008). Bourdieu and organizational analysis. *Theory and Society, 37*(1), 1-44.

Ginsburg, M. (2012). Public private partnerships, neoliberal globalization and democratization. In S. Robertson, K. Mundy, & A. Verger (Eds.). *Public private partnerships in education: New actors and modes of governance in a globalizing world* (pp. 63-78). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Glaunder, L. (2002). The need for accountability and reparations: 1830-1976: The United States government's role in the promotion, implementation, and execution of the crime of genocide against Native Americans. *DePaul Law Review, 51*(3), 911-961.

Gonzalez Chavarría, A. (2012). Multi-scalar globalization and political governance: Lessons from negotiations over Colombia's Poverty and Inequality Reduction Strategy, 2006-2015. *International Sociology, 27*(1), 120-135.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks.* (Ed. and trans. by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith.) New York: International Publishers.

Green, M. F., & Shoenberg, R. (2006). *Where faculty live: Internationalizing the disciplines.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Hall, S. (1985). Signification, representation, ideology: Althusser and the post-structuralist debates. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 2*(2), 91-114.

Hall, S. (1992). Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural studies* (pp. 277-294). New York and London: Routledge.

Hall, S. (Ed.) (1997a). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices.* Milton Keynes, UK: The Open University Press.

Hall, S. (1997b). The local and the global: Globalization and ethnicity. In A. McClintock, A. Mufti, & E. Shohat (Eds.), *Dangerous liaisons: Gender, nation, and postcolonial perspectives* (pp. 173-187). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hebert, Y., & Abdi, A.A. (Eds.) (2013). *Critical perspectives on international education.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Heyneman, S.P. (1994). *Education in the Europe and Central Asia Region: Policies of adjustment and excellence.* Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Hoffmann, C. (2000). The spread of English and the growth of multilingualism with English in Europe. *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third language.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

HSBC Holdings. (2014). *The value of education: Springboard for success.* London: HSBC Holdings.

IEASA. (2014). *Global dialogue: A global dialogue on the future of higher education internationalisation.* Retrieved from http://www.cbie-

bcei.ca/wpcontent/uploads/2014/01/Global_Dialoge_2014_Rationale_Document_We
b.pdf

Ighobor, K. (2013). Africa's youth: A 'ticking time bomb' or an opportunity? *African Renewal* [online]. Available at: http://www.un.org/africarenewal/magazine/may-2013/africa%E2%80%99s-youth-%E2%80%9Cticking-time-bomb%E2%80%9D-or-opportunity.

Institute for International Education. (2012). *Open Doors 2012 regional fact sheet: Africa*. New York: Institute for International Education.

Institute for International Education. (2013). *Project Atlas: Trends and global data 2013*. New York: Institute for International Education.

Knight, J. (2008). The internationalization of higher education: Complexities and realities. In D. Teferra & J. Knight (Eds.), *Higher education in Africa: The international dimension* (pp. 1-43). Boston: Boston College Center for International Higher Education.

Laureau, A. (2011/2003). *Unequal childhoods: Race, class, and family life* (2nd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Levinson, B.A.U. (2011). *Beyond critique: Exploring critical social theories and education.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Miraftab, F. (2004). Public-private partnerships: The Trojan horse of neoliberal development? *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 24*(1), 89–101.

OECD (1999). *Quality and internationalisation in higher education: Institutional management in higher education.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

Oleksiyenko, A., & Sá, C. M. (2010). Resource asymmetries and cumulative advantages: Canadian and US research universities and the field of global health. *Higher Education, 59*(3), 367–385.

Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Papadopoulos, G. (1994). *Education 1960-1990: The OECD perspective*. Paris: OECD.

Pedersen, P. (2009). Teaching toward an ethnorelative worldview through psychology study abroad. *Intercultural Education, 20*(1), S73-S86.

Peters, M. (2001). National education policy constructions of the "knowledge economy": Towards a critique. *The Journal of Educational Enquiry, 2*(1), 1-22.

Peters, M. A. (2003). Classical political economy and the role of universities in the new knowledge economy. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 1*(2), 153-168.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-85.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1998). *Struggling for the soul: The politics of schooling and the construction of the teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Rizvi, F. (2005). International education and the production of cosmopolitan identities. *RIHE International Publication Series, 9* (no page). Urbana-Champaign, IL.

Robinson, W. I (2011). Globalization and the sociology of Immanuel Wallerstein: A critical appraisal. *International Sociology, 26*(6), 723–745.

Rodney, W. (1981). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

Rudzki, R. E. (1995). The application of a strategic management model to the internationalization of higher education institutions. *Higher Education, 29*(4), 421-441.

Samoff, J., & Carrol, B. (2003). The promise of partnership and continuities of dependence: External support to higher education in Africa. *African Studies Review, 47*(1), 67-199.

Sanderson, G. (2008). A foundation for the internationalization of the academic self. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 12*(3), 276–307.

Selvi, A. F. (2011). World Englishes in the Turkish sociolinguistic context. *World Englishes, 30*(2), 182-199.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Stemler, S.E., Imada, T., & Sorkin, C. (2014). Development and validation of the Wesleyan Intercultural Competence Scale (WICS): A tool for measuring the impact of study abroad experiences. *Frontiers: the Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, XXIV, 25-47.

Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education, 53*(1), 81–105.

The Economist. (2003). Beware students, 23 August, 37–38.

Torres, C.A., & Schugurensky, D. (2002). The political economy of higher education in the era of neoliberal globalization: Latin America in comparative perspective. *Higher Education, 43*(4), 429-455.

Trafzer, C.E., & Lorimer, M. (2014). Silencing California Indian genocide in social studies texts. *American Behavioral Scientist, 58*(1), 64–82.

Treichler, P.A. (2006). *How to have theory in an epidemic: Cultural chronicles of AIDS*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Vavrus, F., & Bartlett, L. (Eds.) (2013). *Teaching in tension: International pedagogies, national policies, and teachers' practices in Tanzania*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The modern world-system I: Capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. New York: Academic Press.

Wallerstein, I. (2000). Globalization or the age of transition? A long-term view of the trajectory of the world system. *International Sociology, 15*(2), 251-267.

Waters, J.L. (2006). Emergent geographies of international education and social exclusion. *Antipode, 38*(5), 1046-1068.

Willis, P. (1981). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Zeleza, P. T. (2012). Internationalization in higher education: Opportunities and challenges for the Knowledge Project in the Global South. *Internationalisation of Higher Education: Perspectives from the South. SARUA Leadership Dialogue Series, 2*(2), 6-18.

About the Authors

Frances Vavrus is Professor in the Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development at the University of Minnesota and Co-Director of the University's Interdisciplinary Center for the Study of Global Change. Her research interests include comparative pedagogies, critical development studies, and postcolonial theory in teacher education with a focus on sub-Saharan Africa. She teaches courses in comparative education, international development education, and research methodology.

Amy Pekol is a doctoral student in the Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development at the University of Minnesota. She is a researcher and evaluator in the area of international development education. She has studied and worked in Latin America, Europe, Asia, and Central and Eastern Africa, and has experience in the non-profit, education, and public sectors. Her current research examines faculty engagement within North-South university partnerships for development.