CARL E. JAMES, CRIS CLIFFORD CULLINAN, ANA CRUCERU

9. INTERNATIONALIZING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION:

Opportunities, Possibilities and Challenges

> Those campuses that exhibit consistent caution or visible fear about engaging their community in the critical discourse on diversity and globalism contradict the very mission statement that underscores their existence (Anderson, 2008, p.5).

A scan of university web pages will reveal the growing trend in the internationalization of postsecondary education as if to suggest that our educational challenges to date have been addressed, and we are now ready to take the next step: changing our student population, curricular practices, and approaches to education so that we will become global enterprises. Taking a small selection of the website language, we read that these international programs are intended to: 'prepare students for life in a rapidly changing global society;' 'build understanding of integral relationships among the people of the world;' 'create an international milieu on campus;' 'inculcate internationalism throughout the curriculum'; 'create an international outlook among faculty and staff'; and 'transform every graduate into a world citizen." Universities also reason that "global perspectives are critical to solving contemporary problems, ensuring academic excellence and preparing a world-class workforce." These assertions suggest that embarking on international programs would help to produce students and faculty members who are not only conscious of issues outside their own societies, but willing and able to engage in an educational process in which universities, as we know them, will be transformed: they will become institutions with academic programs which are, as one website indicates, 'complemented by a campus culture of global awareness, sensitivity and engagement and the integration of international perspectives and experiences into learning and discovery.'

How a university internationalizes is related and influenced by economic and political circumstances around it (Knight, 2006; UNESCO, 2003; Schuetze, 2011). Four primary foci have been identified in literature (Knight, 2008). First, universities actively recruit 'international' students, and send domestic or home students and faculty abroad, both for economic competition and also for cultural diversity in their institution. Second, universities develop

programs, conferences and courses abroad to encourage student mobility and information sharing. Third, they build international partnerships for research and funding purposes, allowing some to argue that internationalization is less about education and more about markets and economy. Fourth, universities internationalize their local curriculum through the inclusion of cultural and global elements (Knight, 2008; Stensaker, 2008; UNESCO, 2003; Huang, 2006).

Obviously, structural changes and adjustments need to be made if institutions, and instructors, are to be responsive to the experiences, needs, interests, expectations and aspirations of international students, particularly if international students are to feel welcome, and not seen merely as a source of income, meeting the growing financial needs of 'Western institutions.' The learning environments, then, of these institutions must be accommodative of these students, and as Schmitt (2006) writes, "add diversity to university classrooms because they bring with them an assortment of previous learning experiences, diverse views of the world and, in many cases, experiences of communicating and studying in more than one language" (p. 63). We take 'international students' to be, as Ryan and Carroll (2005a) define them, "students who have chosen to travel to another country for tertiary study … [and whose] previous experience will have been of other educational systems, in cultural contexts and sometimes in language that is different (or very different) from the one in which they will study" (p. 3).

Our focus in this chapter is on international students who travel to western universities to study. According to Ryan and Carroll (2005a) with reference to the UNESCO (2003) report, *Global Education Digest* in 2000/2001, international students in higher education made up 11 percent of the students in the United Kingdom, 13 percent in Australia, 3 percent (or about "half a million students") in the United States, 3 percent in Canada, and 5 percent in New Zealand. And with reference to other reports, the authors indicate that in 2004, the number of full-time international students in the UK increased to 16 percent, and in Australia, it was 24 percent in 2005. It was also noted that in 2004, almost 195,000 international students in the UK were from outside of the European Union - an increase of about 45,000 over their number in 2001/2. Australia, too, has had a significant increase in the number of international students, and it is predicted that the number will grow from the 303,342 in 2003 to 810,000 by 2018 (Ryan &.Carroll, 2005a, p. 4). Citing 'Australian experts,' Altbach and Knight (2006) also notes that "perhaps 15 million students will study abroad by 2025 – up from the current 2 million" – a prediction, the authors claim "might be optimistic" (p. 303).

International schemes and programs have experienced a tremendous increase in popularity in the last few years. It is estimated that half of the student population at popular universities such as Oxford will be composed of international students by 2020 (Goodman, 2007). Several factors are acting to

change the mix of students who might now participate in international programs. While access is still a major issue, more traditionally excluded students now have the possibility of participating in postsecondary education, and eventually the student body will no longer reflect its historically white, dominant societal group (Ichimoto, 2004). In addition, the shift from an 'elite-oriented' to a 'market-based' system, where internationalization is more commercialized and promoted, is making international experiences available to a wider range of students (Ichimoto, 2004). More students have access to postsecondary education, which by necessity makes admissions more permeable, and there are more scholarships and sources of funding available (Stensaker, 2008).

Given this context, many of the students taking advantage of international programs tend to be linguistic and religious minorities, and people of color (or racial minority/racialized students) coming from developing countries and/or former colonies. As well, some are children and grandchildren of immigrant parents residing in societies such as Canada, the United States, Australia, Britain and other European countries. So today's 'international students' are not the traditional white middle class students; and while, as in past years, a number of international students are traveling to western countries to study on scholarship, some of them are the new middle class and elites of their societies. It seems to us that the racial, ethnic, linguistic and religious diversity of today's international students, combined with a similarly diverse 'domestic' (or home) student population in many metropolitan universities, should propel today's institutions into providing academic programs that enable marginalized (or racialized) students – both international and domestic (or home) – to fully participate and realize their educational goals. But such outcomes are not possible in the absence of institutional changes that address the inequity, colonialism and racism that operate as barriers to marginalized students' full participation and successful outcomes.

In this chapter, we contend that internationalization can benefit all students – international and domestic alike – if it is an institutional program that takes an approach to education that is inclusive of the diverse social, cultural and educational experiences of all students in our classrooms, our curricula, and on campus. Such a program must demonstrate a serious commitment to transforming postsecondary education into an interactive process among faculty and students, where differing worldviews and life experiences could be brought to bear in both interrogating and developing knowledge. If internationalization, indeed follows the rhetoric as presented on university websites (cited above), then it will serve all our students well, and ultimately create a new role and usefulness for postsecondary education.

The fact is, much of the challenge of bringing the 'world' to our campuses and our campuses to the world rests in our historic practice of fitting those who come to our institutions into our existing intellectual and political space, as

opposed to opening new territories in the lives and minds of all those participating in the academy. This tendency, which shows itself in our continuing problem of retention of students, and indeed of faculty and staff, who bring other than dominant culture experience to campus, is nothing new. What may be new is the confluence of two major shifts in our academic world: the necessity to succeed in providing viable education for international students, for both fiscal and academic business reasons; and, the increasing demographic changes in home countries, resulting in potential pools of "home" students who are less likely to be from the historically dominant groups, more likely to be multilingual, have a variety of first languages, and more diverse lower school educational experiences.

In what follows, using Canada, and to a lesser extent, the United States as reference, we discuss: a) the impetus for western universities and colleges to initiate internationalization programs in which they seek to recruit students to build up their student population, b) how the presence of 'international students' on university campuses can help to address the needs, issues and concerns of marginalized 'home' students, and c) the possibilities and limitations of internationalization moving us toward a more inclusive and equitable postsecondary education system.

THE IMPETUS TO INTERNATIONALIZE

It is difficult to untangle the reasons and process of any particular institution's desire to internationalize. UNESCO's (2003) survey of members of the International Association of Universities found that the most important reason cited for making internationalization a priority was the mobility of students and faculty, and this was also identified as the fastest growing aspect of internationalization. The preliminary findings of the 2005 International Association of Universities (IAU) indicate that there is a high level of consistency between the rationales driving internationalizations and the perceived benefits (Knight, 2006). According to Knight, Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) "see 'competitiveness' as the most important rationale driving internationalization at the national level and 'international development cooperation' ranked fourth in level of priority" – behind strategic alliances and human resource capacity. As Knight continues to point out, "yet, 'education exports' as a key motivator for internationalization ranks very low and still of lesser importance than 'cultural and mutual understanding' based rationales…. The number one ranking benefit is the increase in international knowledge and intercultural skills in university students, academics and staff members" (2006, p. 17).

Internationalization policies tend to be aimed at changing the traditional model of teaching and research into a progressive, innovative, inclusive and culturally aware education which caters to an increasing global market

(UNESCO, 2003). It is understood that such education would not only acknowledge the history, cultures and resources of a country and individual, but also shape the way interactions and learning takes place within institutions (Qiang, 2003). Further, internationalization places emphasis on problematizing assumptions and taken for granted beliefs with which individuals operate on a daily basis in educational and social contexts (McBurnie, 2000) with the expectation that through their intercultural experiences and exposure to other societies, ideally, individuals will become global citizens in their movements, ideas and values, with a sense of global empathy, and a desire for social change and equity. Further, it is hoped that through international dialogues and communications, as well as exposure to different languages and cultures, individuals will gain an understanding of their own culture in relation to others. And as Lincicome (1993) says, the education that international students receive is expected to prepare them for an international future (whether abroad or regional), teach them how to think and act independently, and make them more aware of globally acknowledged goals, values, social practices and relations. In relation to this point, Gurung and Prieto (2009) argue that nation-states – including the United States – can no longer isolate themselves from or "remain ignorant of others in the world" (p. xiii).

Among the often-stated aims of internationalization are the promotion of intercultural understanding, knowledge and language acquisition, international cooperation, and international solidarity (Altbach, 2007; Kirkwood & Fuss, 2001; Knight, 2006). The idea appears to be that to 'expose' students and faculty to cultural diversity is to foster an appreciation for this diversity. This will, the thinking goes, promote a smooth flow of information and knowledge between people and countries and more importantly, will help break cultural stereotypes (Gurung & Prieto, 2009; Kirkwood, 2001; UNESCO, 2003). Similar rationales have been used to promote the idea that bringing students from 'marginalized background' to campuses would result in growing understandings across racial, ethnic, gender and class lines among home country students, thereby transforming classroom as well as national environments (James, 2003).

The fact that these are largely unrealized outcomes, as evidenced by both low participation and retention rates among students from historically marginalized and racialized groups, as well as by few widespread and institutionalized changes in curricula, pedagogy, or faculty hiring criteria (Hernandez-Ramdwar, 2009; Ryan & Carroll, 2005b; Henry & Tator, 2009), does not make this sort of transformation impossible – just very unlikely if the actual work involved in doing so is not recognized, and if real changes are not expected or envisioned as part of the process. And if the implementation of multicultural programs on campuses, in countries such as the United States and Canada (Green & Olson, 2008; James, 2003), have not led to changes in curriculum and approaches to education for domestic students, then what will

be the impetus to bring about such changes for international students – their financial worth? According to Anderson (2008):

> A common assumption is that most institutions use a mission, vision or goal statement to endorse diversity, yet the reality is that such proclamations do not translate into real change, nor do they remove institutional barriers. In other words, diversity continues to be a difficult discussion if one assumes that broad university statements can have an impact in the absence of a commitment to more fundamental organizational change (p. 8).

The vision of a more integrated world work environment, where college and university graduates will be able to meet the demands of the new globalized market place, based on the need for international cooperation, is often advanced as a reason for internalization. In this regard, it is believed that, in addition to academic and professional knowledge, graduates will also need multilingual and intercultural skills (Ichimoto, 2004). By extension, therefore, qualifications obtained within an international setting, as well as with an international focus, are to be highly valued, for they demonstrate that graduates are equipped to function and work in a diverse and multicultural local and global environment (Knight, 2008). In addition, it is believed that international experience and knowledge have the potential for decreasing cultural isolation which can thwart career aspirations for those marginalized in a society (Ichimoto, 2004). Once again, we have the argument that just by being around people who are different from us – all other conditions in the classroom and on the campus remaining unchanged in any significant way – somehow individuals will learn to behave and interact knowledgeably, respectfully and effectively with difference or with a diverse group of people. That these skills, if they are honed in the classroom at all, will eventually translate into inclusive and effective practices in a diverse work environment is hardly guaranteed. In reality, we have yet to succeed in changing individuals' attitudes, thinking, beliefs and practices to allow for the meritocracy we seem to believe exists. The presence of difference does not change understanding or practice in the absence of acknowledgement that the status quo is ineffective.

The idea that through internationalization needed changes in curricula and pedagogical practices will come about is based on an assumption that, driven by the broadening global reach of our student bodies, the appearance of increased numbers of international students on campus will necessitate the university to rethink, or at least adapt, their educational processes to include these groups (Qiang, 2003). Bringing individuals with different worldviews together, the argument goes, will mean that traditional models of local education will need to be rethought in order to meet the diverse needs and demands of students, to empower minority students, and provide inclusive

education (Nukaga, 2003). On this basis, critical pedagogies are seen as providing educators with innovative ways to view learning and knowledge production as educators interact with international students and the diverse experiences, beliefs and values they bring to the classroom. Porfilio and Carr (2010) assert that critical analyses of social and political structures combined with social activism are important to the counter-hegemonic social movement of young people through which they come to challenge the 'bootstrap capitalism' that is responsible for their inadequate education – an education which does not provide them the essential building blocks "to become critical, caring, engaged citizens" (p. 3).

Exactly how we move from curricula and pedagogies that have supported traditional structures and educational practices into those that recognize the voices and experiences of students, and marginalized students in particular, is certainly not clear from our past adventures with diversifying the campuses and changing educational practices. If the experiences and learning needs of international students, indeed of all students, are to be effectively addressed, then college and university classrooms must be ones in which educators work with students to question and challenge cultural domination, develop the critical thinking skills that will enable them to go beneath surface meaning and dominant myths and understand the deep meaning, root causes, social context, and ideology of events, actions, texts and discourses (Skubikowski, Wright & Graf, 2009; Lund & Carr, 2008). Doing so necessarily involves recognition of the power dynamics in the classroom between educators and students, and among students with one another, noting that the rules that govern these power relations are a reflection of the rules of the dominant ethno-racial group of the society (Lund & Carr, 2008; Delpit, 1995). And, as Delpit also explains, meaningful engagements that can result in understanding the worldview of another can be a challenge to our identities. She writes: "To put our beliefs on hold is to cease to exist as ourselves for a moment –and that is not easy. It is painful as well, because it means turning yourself inside out, giving up your sense of who you are, and being willing to see yourself in the unflattering light of another's angry gaze" (Delpit, 1995, pp. 46–47).

Were educators to actually use critical pedagogical approaches in our teaching/ learning situations with our culturally diverse student bodies of both domestic and international students, we would need to consider the curriculum in ways that would allow us to see it in the sometimes unflattering light of those whose worldviews, life experiences, and identities differ from those of dominant group members. To truly internationalize, humanize or broaden the curriculum, colleges and universities would need to do more than rely on the single or few faculty members within institutions who take seriously their role as facilitators of learning or as teacher/learners, and who consistently use interactive learning approaches that consider the identities, knowledge and

social and cultural capital of students. In this regard, the academic cultures of these institutions will have to become ones in which meaningful attention is given to the cultural contexts, histories and paradigms inherent in both their existing and developing approaches to knowledge, to research and to teaching.

The political and economic dimensions of globalization are more compelling drivers for internationalization than are socio-cultural and academic rationales, according to Stensaker (2008). And as Knight (2008) contends, this global demand increases the potential for internationalization to become commodified and commercialized, in effect creating profit aspirations, which can trump the focus on experiential learning and cultural education. Therefore, insofar as internationalization becomes a priority for postsecondary educational institutions whereby they involve themselves in global economic market demands for international knowledge and economic competitiveness, they set themselves up to be viewed as multinational companies participating in the global market (Knight , 2006; UNESCO, 2003). As such, when international knowledge is seen as important for economic, and less so for societal and cultural reasons, there is pressure on universities to produce globally literate graduates who are prepared to work in an economically driven international global context (Fischer, 2008).

In such a context, the experiences of students are viewed as secondary to the economic relevance of their presence in western universities and colleges. In this trend we can see echoes of past practices in which traditionally excluded, marginalized or racialized students are recruited on to university and colleges campuses as a primary indicator of a dedication to diversity – the equal opportunity approach, rather than focusing on attention to the particular interests and aspirations of these students, thereby ensuring successful matriculation – the equity approach. Students coming to a country learn to navigate an institution's educational system without making an impact on the curriculum and pedagogical practices. More often than not, 'successful studies' abroad necessitate mastering the educational system rather than creating new knowledge and modes of thinking (Knight, 1993). A more sustainable model of internationalization would be to not only attract international students and send domestic students abroad, but also to provide an academic and intellectual space for them to engage in their classes, taking into account the wide variety of experiences they bring to the classroom and postsecondary education (Qiang, 2003).

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

The presence of international students on western university campuses can play an important role in opening up cultural and global awareness, as well as insights into citizenship. If appropriate classroom discussions were to occur,

such exchanges among students and educators could allow students to recognize and contextualize cultural differences among all participants while at the same time providing more understanding of the role these differences play in knowledge production. If students take opportunities to move beyond familiar social encounters and discussions, exchanges among them can allow formal and informal spaces for associating with people whose opinions and worldviews are different. And as Kneale (2008) suggests, interactions or exchanges among students can also provide them with the necessary tension for learning and new understandings as they engage in daily problem solving and reflection.

In addition to bringing about global awareness, internationalization can help students and faculty work for changes in education and promote activism against ethnocentrism and racism in an effort to create a more fair and democratic world (Stier, 2004). Classrooms that include international students can be settings in which home students and faculty alike are exposed to unfamiliar social, cultural and educational resources and knowledge, which can be beneficial to their experiences in navigating unfamiliar settings within the home society. They can build skills in cultural understandings through the process of experiencing uneasiness, frustration and anxiety in their culturally diverse classroom, working these out and reflecting on them. In effect, such social, cultural and educational awareness and understanding can help to develop and routinely use skills in classroom and campus environments to interrogate, question and analyze learning. In this regard, both faculty and students could expand their beliefs, values, and cultural understanding; challenge their own stereotypes and prejudices; and increase their abilities to see and understand different perspectives. These experiences have the potential for increasing skills in critical thinking and making visible prejudices, ethnocentrism, racism and cultural stereotypes. Understanding the essence of different perspectives and how these can shape values can lay the groundwork for personal growth, self-actualization, independence, and self-esteem, as well as interest in other cultures (Stier, 2004). Such processes can also help individuals increase their abilities to learn self-direction and find inner drive and motivations (Wagenaar & Subedi, 1996). All of this can encourage both students and faculty to more critically examine taken for granted knowledge and pedagogical styles (Lund & Carr, 2008; Welch, 1997).

Evidently, the mere presence of more people of different types in the classroom does not, in itself, transform learning or even influence pedagogy. For internationalization to have any effect on curricula and the learning environment, faculties must be willing and able to negotiate a learning space with diverse participants. Conceptualizing how to internationalize the curriculum requires an understanding that education and learning are fluid, dynamic, contextual and contingent, as are teaching pedagogies. Transforming education is not an obvious process, and most faculty members have little

experience in opening up the intellectual space beyond traditional boundaries. Internationalizing the curriculum means building on what is already known, yet creating a new space for the students to insert the self into the classroom experience and knowledge production. Global perspectives on knowledge creation and critique can expand the thinking of all those involved. Starting with the local and expanding to the global context enables students negotiating the curriculum to adopt a relational view about how the development and existence of phenomena are interconnected, as well as help to them to see connections between local and global events as mutually dependent (Carroll & Ryan, 2005b).

Among the nine characteristics that Webb (2005) identifies as helping to define international curricula, and relevant to this discussion, are:

- curricula with international content;
- curricula that add a comparative dimension to traditional content;
- curricula addressing cross-cultural skills;
- curricula leading to internationally recognized professions; and
- special curricula designed exclusively for foreign students.

But the list does not include an institutional priority for having interactive, knowledge-generating environments in all classes. Yet one of the stated goals of internationalizing college and university campuses is the claim that all students are being prepared to work and live effectively in a global environment. Working with a paradigm that includes interrogating knowledge in all our learning environments so that students are routinely exposed to and expected to participate in the development of global perspectives, including those of 'home' students of differing identities and backgrounds, seems like a necessary key to meeting this goal.

As has been noted, initiatives to open up curricula and pedagogical practices to be inclusive of the diverse experiences, interests and aspirations of home country students have not been recognized as particularly successful. The model of learning that expects the student to tacitly accept and integrate without reservation the knowledge being offered ignores the complications implicit in working with learners whose worldviews, educational histories and societal experiences differ both from each other and from the traditional knowledge producers. Marginalized students perceive knowledge and truth as contextual as opposed to absolute. As diversity in ethnic, racial, linguistic, and religious backgrounds, skills levels, perspectives and worldviews become the norm and not the exception, the challenge for faculty, as Anderson (2008, p. 81) puts it, "is to recognize the needs and rights of contextual learners, and to create equitable learning environments that allow them to find their place in the academy."

Clearly, students' cultural backgrounds and experiences are important in how they engage in and experience academia and learning. The social and cultural knowledge students bring to the classroom has an impact not only in how they are responded to, but also how they interpret and understand information and their surroundings, as well as the access they have to learning and knowledge production (Carroll & Ryan, 2005b). Identity is not a blank slate, nor is it an inscribed stone tablet.

Indeed, human beings are complex: our behaviors, attitudes, values, and views of ourselves and others are related to the contexts, structures and circumstances in which we find ourselves and our interactions with others. Given this reality, getting to know and learn about the diversity of people with whom we live, learn, work and share our society is to become acquainted with the different ways in which the social, political, economic, educational, judicial and cultural structures have operated to inform and influence our lives in relationship to, among other factors, race, ethnicity, religion, gender, social class, age, language, sexuality and ability. It is also to know about the experiences of others, and in the process, know about ourselves (James, 2010, p. 3).

As such, students' participation in postsecondary education, whether at home or abroad, will be informed by their multiple identities interacting with their daily environments. The experiences they bring into the classroom and to education in general influence how they in turn respond to and incorporate the information and knowledge presented into their existing schemas used to understand the world (Carroll & Ryan, 2005b). Further, students' life experiences, as well as those of their teachers, family members and other mentors, play important roles in how and when these students obtain access into postsecondary education and knowledge production and ultimately the successes they experience within the classroom (Bramble, 2000; Fischer, 2008).

POSSIBILITIES AND CHALLENGES OF INTERNATIONALIZATION

While the benefits of the internationalization of postsecondary education can be numerous, the challenges to developing programs that could reap many of the potential benefits must be faced squarely. The fact is, the existence of a process called 'internationalization' on any campus does not necessarily mean that those participating are experiencing a two-way flow of education and learning, where both the home and international students learn from each other. Rather, the process sometimes is used as a vehicle to educate those considered less informed into Western norms and values (Stier, 2004), thereby creating a homogenized, rather than diverse dialogic culture among the student population. 'Internationalization' also sometimes works to impose one culture

as valid over that of the visiting international students. In such a context, for international students to succeed academically, they have to align their views and perspectives with those of the dominant group of the society (Knight, 2008). It is therefore understandable how postsecondary education institutions can and often have played a role in furthering the dominant Western culture, and in the process exacerbate the gap in North-South education which, as in turn, result in developing countries, from which many international students come, experiencing brain-drain as their 'knowledge' travels North and does not return (UNESCO, 2003). Conversely, the education that international students receive can also participate in 'brain-drain' or 'brain-circulation' whereby students return home having acquired skills and completed training to use their Western education in their new careers, raising questions the tendency of internationalization to reinforce cultural hegemony by transferring knowledge within an unquestioned and unexamined cultural 'capsule' and transferring it whole into other cultural contexts (Knight, 2008).

It is the case that when they enter into their host education system, international students already possess sets of skills and experiences that have granted them success in academia in their own countries. These skills, however, do not always transfer or even match those needed or recognized by the educational systems of their host country. Culturally different modes of communication, interpretation, classroom routine, language use, personal interactions, writing and speaking, means that their actions may not match the educators' expectations and vice versa. To account for this difference in learning and knowledge production, educators sometimes tend to view these students' behaviors as problematic, and often set goals to correct such behaviors to match the local standards of the classroom and university (Carroll & Ryan, 2005b). While this is especially true when speaking about international students, home students often experience a similar hegemonic approach. They also possess life experiences which differ one from another and have developed skills that are often not recognized as "suitable" for the classroom. Distinctions made between international students as bearers of culture and home students as a homogenous, monocultural group are problematic, as the diversity among home students can be just as great as that between the international students and those most representative of the host culture (Smith, 2007).

Making space for internationalizing curricular and pedagogical practices demands disruption of dominant traditional ways of teaching and learning in universities (Carroll & Ryan, 2005a). As campuses become more diversified in their student body, educators need to re-think their pedagogy and ideas of education in general in order to include a wider variety of student experiences in the classroom. And insofar as postsecondary education instills, through its curriculum and pedagogy, a reading of the world through a Western lens that is predominantly white and upper middle class, then it does little else but mirror

the associated values and beliefs relating to race, ethnicity and gender (Magnusson, 2001). This educational practice inevitably creates an imbalance in power and intentions within the classroom between educator and students, and among various student populations, as traditional hegemony will silence the minority groups while creating tensions the majority group is ill-equipped and/or resistant to tackle.

CONCLUSION

While internationalization is directly associated with the purpose of the university, which is to teach, develop research and serve society, such overarching purposes do not come with templates for future directions or recommendations for strategic planning. In practice, then, internationalization on the ground often looks and is haphazard, with various components operating independently, and without integration of effort or learning. The knowledge of international and home students together should be used to devise new ways to operate in the classroom, developing new learning and teaching modalities that expand the spaces where students can make meanings together, sharing and building on these meanings to bring about changes that make for a more inclusive, relevant, socially conscious, and internationally aware education. The diversity that results from the presence of international students in today's western classrooms should not create educational struggles, but rather opportunities to engage and explore the differences in experiences and understanding made possible by the diversity.

And as Ryan and Carroll (2005a) write in their collection of essays, *Teaching International Students: Improving learning for all*, which draws on the experiences of scholars who have worked with international students in countries such as the United Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, the United States, Japan and Azerbaijan:

> The presence of international students, with their diverse paradigms and life experiences, provides us with an opportunity to ask who the university is there to serve and to what end. Are we as teachers in universities custodians of convention and a defined body of wisdom, or do we believe that we have a duty to forge new traditions and epistemologies? Is our role transformative or reproductive? (2005, p. 9)

As postsecondary educators, we have the opportunity to take part in helping create informed and educated 'world citizens' conscious of the world around them and our interdependency in the 21st century. In so doing, our role must be transformative. If, however, we do not rise to this challenge, learning will occur outside of the postsecondary system, and the system itself will become irrelevant in our emerging global society.

REFERENCES

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.

Anderson, J. A. (2008). *Driving Change through Diversity and Globalization.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Bramble, M. (2000). Being me in the academy. In C. E. James (Ed.), *Experiencing Difference* (pp. 271–282). Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Carroll, J., & Ryan, J. (2005a). Challenges and rewards: Bearers of culture, not bearers of problems. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Teaching International Students: Improving Learning for All.* New York: Routledge.

Carroll, J., & Ryan, J. (2005b). *Teaching International Students: Improving Learning for All.* New York: Routledge.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom.* New York: New Press.

Fischer, K. (2008). All aboard! Overseas study required. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*(41).

Goodman, R. (2007). The concept of Kokusaika and Japanese educational reform. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 5*(1), 71–87.

Green, M. F. & Olson, C. (Eds.). (2008). *Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide.* Washington, DC: The American Council on Education.

Gurung, R. A. R. & Prieto, L. R. (Eds.). (2009). *Getting Culture: Incorporating Diversity across the Curriculum.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Henry, F. & Tator, C. (Eds.). (2009). *Racism in the Canadian University: Demanding Social Justice, Inclusion, and Equity.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hernandez-Ramdwar, C. (2009). Caribbean students in the Canadian academy: We've come a long way? In F. Henry & C. Tator (Eds.), *Racism in the Canadian University: Demanding Social Justice, Inclusion, and Equity* (pp. 106–127). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Huang, F. (2006). Internationalization of curricula in higher education institutions in comparative perspective: Case studies of China, Japan and the Netherlands. *Higher Education, 51*(4), 521–539.

Ichimoto, T. (2004). Ambivalent 'selves' in transition: A case study of Japanese women studying in Australian universities. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 25*(3), 247–269.

James, C. E. (2003). Becoming insiders: Racialized students in the academe. In K. Brathwaite (Ed.), *Access and Equity in the University* (pp. 139–164). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

James, C. E. (2010). *Seeing Ourselves: Exploring Race, Ethnicity and Culture.* Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Kirkwood, T. (2001). Building bridges: Miami 'ambassadors' visit Russia. *Social Education, 65*(4), 236.

Knight, J. (2008, October-November). The internationalization of higher education: Are we on the right track? *Academic Matters.*

Knight, J. (2006). *IAU 2005 Internationalization Survey: Preliminary Findings Report.* International Association of Universities.

Lincicome, M. (1993). Internationalization, and the dilemma of educational reform in Japan. *Comparative Education Review, 37*(2), 123–151.

Lund, D. E. & Carr, P. R. (Ed.). (2008). *Doing Democracy: Striving for Political Literacy and Social Justice.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Magnusson, J.-L. (2001). Higher education and citizenship in a global context. In R. Bruno-Jofre & N. Aponiuk (Eds.), *Educating Citizens for a Pluralistic Society.* Calgary: Canadian Ethnic Studies.

McBurnie, G. (2000). Pursuing internationalization as a means to advance the academic mission of the University: An Australian case study. *Higher Education in Europe*, *15*(1).

Nakuga, M. (2003). Japanese education in an era of internationalization: A case study of an emerging multicultural coexistence model. *International Journal of Japanese Sociology*, *12*, 79–94.

Portfilio, B. J., & Carr, P. R. (2010). The neo-liberal social order, youth and resistance. In B. J. Porfilio & P. R. Carr (Eds.), *Youth Culture, Education and Resistance: Subverting the Commercial Ordering of Life* (pp. 1–18). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education*, *1*(2), 248–270.

Schmitt, D. (2005). Writing in the international classroom. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Teaching International Students: Improving Learning for All*. New York: Routledge.

Schuetze, C. F. (2011, June 19). Report estimates cost to U.K. of fewer student visas. *The New York Times*.

Skubikowski, K., Wright, C., & Graf, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Social Justice Education: Inviting Faculty to Transform their Institutions*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Smith, H. (2007). Playing a different game: The contextualized decision-making processes of minority ethnic students in choosing a higher education institution. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *10*(4), 415–437.

Stensaker, B., Frolich, N., Gornitzka, A., & Maassen, P. (2008). Internationalization of higher education: The gap between national policy-making and institutional needs. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *6*(1), 1–11.

Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *2*(1), 1–28.

UNESCO. (2003). Internalisation of higher education: Trends and developments since 1998. *The International Association of Universities*, 1–42.

Wagenaar, T. C., & Subedi, J. (1996). Internationalizing the curriculum. *Teaching Sociology*, *24*(3), 272–283.

Webb, G. (2005). Internationalisation of curriculum: An institutional approach. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Teaching International Students: Improving Learning for All*. New York: Routledge.

Welch, A. R. (1997). The internationalisation of the academic profession. *Higher Education*, *34*(3), 323–345.

Younes, M. N., & Asay, S. M. (2003). The world as a classroom: The impact of international study experiences on college students. *College Teaching*, *51*(4).

Carl E. James
Centre for Education and Community,
York University, Canada

Cris Clifford Cullinan
Organization Development and Training,
University of Oregon, USA

Ana Cruceru
Faculty of Education,
York University, Canada