

April 2014

A Critical Policy Analysis of Internationalization in Postsecondary Education : An Ontario Case Study

Ali Khorsandi Taskoh

The University of Western Ontario

Supervisor

Dr. Marianne A. Larsen

The University of Western Ontario

Graduate Program in Education

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree in Doctor of Philosophy

© Ali Khorsandi Taskoh 2014

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd>

 Part of the [International and Comparative Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Khorsandi, Ali Taskoh, "A Critical Policy Analysis of Internationalization in Postsecondary Education : An Ontario Case Study" (2014). *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. 1933.
<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/1933>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact tadam@uwo.ca.

A Critical Policy Analysis of Internationalization in Postsecondary Education: An Ontario Case Study

Thesis format: Monograph

by

Ali Khorsandi Taskoh

Graduate Program in Education

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

© Ali Khorsandi Taskoh 2014

ABSTRACT

Using a case study approach, I investigate a very timely and significant policy issue regarding postsecondary education. While internationalization seems to be ubiquitous in universities' policy rhetoric and statements in the Canadian context, specifically in Ontario, it is unclear what values drive internationalization and how they influence policies and initiatives at a public university in Ontario. Relying on Easton's approach of policy as the 'authoritative allocation of values' and drawing on critical policy analysis, I perceive policy as 'the practice of values'. The critical policy approach and the centrality of values in analysis require a consideration be given not only to what values are represented, but to understanding whose values are represented and whose voices are missing in internationalization activities and related policy statements.

By interrogating policy perceptions conveyed through interviews with university administrators and faculty, and reflected in policy statements and administration rhetoric, this study found the emergence and presence of two major discourses of values driving internationalization policies: liberal-academic and neoliberal-instrumental. The liberal-academic discourse is constituted by two sets of values: educational/academic and multicultural/humanitarian. The neoliberal-instrumental discourse is also comprised of two other sets: market-based and competition-based values. Moreover, the findings support there is a significant gap between the meaning of internationalization in theory and its perception in practice. From a critical point of view, internationalization is rhetorically (in theory) acknowledged as ideological components, and literally (in practice) recognized as different realistic components with some pragmatic rationales. Additionally, although participants from different administrative positions and faculties share the same values regarding the necessity of

internationalization, there are significant differences between their perceptions and attitudes about the meanings, rationales, and agendas of internationalization.

The study shows the gradual extension of commercial logic and market values that historically have been absent from traditional university policies in Ontario to educational initiatives and academic values. The study recommends internationalization initiatives require harmony and a dynamic balance between the two identified discourses of values. There is, therefore, an imperative need to maintain balance in the global market of internationalization and to protect academic and humanitarian values and rationales of postsecondary education.

Keywords: Internationalization, Higher Education, Values, Critical Policy Analysis, Case Study, Ontario.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I began my PhD journey as an uncertain yet excited adventurer searching for the gold of knowledge in North America, and experiencing the Canadian postsecondary education. As an international student from an unfairly misunderstood world, studying in a secular country engendered feelings of fear and hope because I was going to a place where everything was different, yet the same. I expected to face socio-cultural adaptations while studying in a large Canadian university. They included understanding against values and beliefs of my home country, faith and religious metamorphosis, epistemological paradigm shift, stress about the severe weather, and from accent-based attitudes toward negative, mediatized views about my national identity. I faced great fear as to how I was going to adapt to my new cultural- academic surroundings because of the expectations and challenges of adjusting to the culture and educational environment.

Another impending concern was about leaving behind what I had established in my home country – like an academic career with an administrative position in a highly prestigious and reputable institution affiliated to the ministry of higher education. Within this institution, it was nearly unheard of to hold this position since I only held a certificate in Master of Education; therefore, leaving and sacrificing such a position was difficult. The decision to leave this position took immense courage but I subconsciously felt I had the ability, desire, passion, and drive to pursue a new journey. I know and knew that Canada is home to some of the best universities, and has well-educated and kind citizens, many of whom are culturally diverse people. Living and studying in a multicultural environment and an immigrant/life-changing province can be (and has been) one of the most culturally interesting and educationally stimulating experiences for a Muslim international student. This greatly helped drive my decision to embrace this journey and

be thankful for the opportunity on which I was about to embark. Now that my PhD journey has come to an end and I reflect on this journey, I would not change these experiences even though I now face a new journey (along with new fear and hope) of establishing a new life once again.

In every step of this journey I am indebted to many wonderful individuals for their intellectual contribution, financial support, and emotional inspirations that have made this journey end. My first and foremost sincere appreciation goes to my kind, dedicated, and knowledgeable supervisor, Dr. Marianne A. Larsen; for her scholarly guidance and kindly encouragement. My next special thanks goes to my supervisory committee members, especially to Dr. Paul Tarc, for his academic insights and knowledge to responsively share with me for my dissertation and academic courses.

I am also indebted to many other beautiful people from the beginning to the end of this journey. My most heartfelt appreciation goes to my family, especially my mother and my father. I would also like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to all of my professors who I have learned from. I thank Professor Goli Rezai-Rashti, for her academic and emotional support and inspiration. I am also grateful to: Dr. Fred Ellet, Dr. Wayne Martino, Dr. Shelly Taylor, and Dr. Allen Edmonds from Western University; Professor Maroussia Hajdukowski-Ahmed from McMaster University; and Professor Linda Muzzin from OISE at the University of Toronto.

I am impressed by the cheerful willingness of many peers to volunteer their visions and to share a lot of original thoughts in our social and intellectual get-togethers and conversations during this journey; to all my friends at the Althouse College, especially to Karen, Adriane, Joel, Jan, Peggy, Mike, Katharine, Mark, Chris, Alireza, Jenny, and others. Among them, my very special appreciation goes to Sarah Elyse for all her emotional support and giving me hope when all seemed hopeless, and helping me during my revisions. I would also like to thank the great

staff of Faculty of Education, especially Linda Kulak, and people who work in the Education Library and the Graduate Office; they supported me constantly. I would also like to extend my thanks to staff working in International and Exchange Student Centre; especially Sandra Pehilj, for her kind and efficient support of international students. In addition, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my research participants for openly and willingly sharing their perceptions, perspectives, and experiences.

In the end, I would like to remember the support, guidance, and magnanimity of Dr. Robert McMillan; my first supervisor who I worked to by the middle of my comprehensive examination. Bob will always be remembered fondly by me and so many students, scholars, and colleagues. I echo my current supervisor's memo about him: we "have yet to meet any scholar who believed in the potential of his students more than Bob did." May he rest in peace!

DEDICATED TO

**THOSE WHO WORK TOO HARD AND SLEEP
LESS, DO NOT EAT ENOUGH, AND WEAR
TATTERED CLOTHES TO SAVE MONEY AND
TO SEND THEIR CHILDREN OVERSEAS TO
LEARN AND EXPERIENCE A NEW WORLD!**

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
DEDICATED TO	vii
List of Tables	x
List of Figures.....	xi
CHAPTER I: THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction: Context of the Problem	1
Problem Statement.....	3
Purpose Statement.....	8
Research Questions.....	8
Significance of the Study	10
Overview of Conceptual Approach and Methodology	11
Positionality	12
The Key Concepts.....	14
<i>The Concept of Value</i>	14
<i>The Concept of Policy</i>	17
Organization of the Study	19
Summary	19
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	21
Introduction.....	21
Internationalization as a Phenomenon: A Developing Concept	22
Rationales, Initiatives and Strategies	27
Benefits and Potential Challenges.....	34
Policy Research on Internationalization: With a Focus on Values	37
Canadian Experiences and Studies of Internationalization	42
Summary	47
CHAPTER III: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND APPROACHES	48
Introduction.....	48
Analysis <i>of-for</i> Policy	49
Critical Policy Analysis (CPA).....	52
Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).....	57
Globalization.....	60
Globalization and Internationalization.....	67

Neoliberalism and Higher Education.....	71
Summary	74
CHAPTER IV: METHODOLOGY	75
Qualitative Research Tradition	75
Case Study Research.....	76
Research Site.....	77
Research Site and the Context	78
Data Sources	81
Demography of Participants	83
Data Analysis	84
Methodological and Voice Triangulations.....	86
Ethical Considerations	87
Limitations	88
Summary	88
CHAPTER V: FINDINGS.....	90
Introduction.....	90
Meaning of Internationalization.....	91
Leading Policy Rationales	103
Internationalization Initiatives	116
Whose Agenda?	124
Whose Voices?.....	132
Who Benefits?.....	139
Diversity.....	148
Summary	155
CHAPTER VI: DISCUSSION- FOCUS ON VALUES	157
What Is Internationalization?	157
Why Is the University Internationalizing?	162
Whose Agenda Is It?	165
Driving Discourses of Values	171
Neoliberal- instrumental discourse	172
<i>Material-based values</i>	172
<i>Competition-based values</i>	176
Liberal-academic discourse.....	182
<i>Educational and academic-based values</i>	182

<i>Multicultural and humanitarian-based values</i>	184
A Cross (sub) Case Analysis.....	187
Summary	193
CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSION	194
Introduction.....	194
Conclusions.....	195
A Final Argument: Toward a Dynamic Balance	199
Further Recommendations	204
Concluding Remarks.....	206
REFERENCES	208
Appendix A: Interview Questions.....	243
Appendix B: Human Subject Ethics Approval	244
VITA.....	245

List of Tables

Table 2.1. The Rationales of Internationalization of Higher Education	29
Table 2.2. Value-driven Models of Internationalization.....	39
Table 2.3. Values of International Education Services by Top Ten Countries.....	44
Table 2.4: Comparison of International Education Services	44
Table 3.1. Conceptualizing Globalization: Three Tendencies.....	62
Table 3.2. Distribution of Views about the Impacts of Globalization	66
Table 4.1. Demography of Participants	84
Table 5.1. Meaning of Internationalization: Administrators' Perceptions	94
Table 5.2. Meaning of Internationalization: Faculty Perceptions.....	99
Table 5.3. Examples of Rationales: Administrators' Perceptions	107
Table 5.4. Examples of Rationales: Faculty Perceptions.....	113
Table 5.5. The Components and Main Initiatives of Internationalization: Official Policy	118

Table 5.6. Represented and Missing Voices: Administrators' Perceptions.....	134
Table 5.7. Represented and Missing Voices: Faculty Perceptions	135
Table 5.8. Who Benefits? Administrators' Perceptions.....	142
Table 5.9. Who Benefit: Faculty Perceptions	145

List of Figures

Figure 1.1. The word map of the term value.....	16
Figure 4.1. Primary data sources	82
Figure 5.1. Rationales of internationalization at Public University.....	115
Figure 5.2. Hierarchy of internationalization drivers.....	130
Figure 5.3. Two opposite perceptions about the beneficiaries of internationalization	147
Figure 6-1. The components of internationalization in theory	158
Figure 6-2. The components of internationalization in practice	160
Figure 6.3. Two discourses of policy values.....	185

CHAPTER I: THE PROBLEM

Introduction: Context of the Problem

The higher education sector has traditionally been affected by circumstances beyond and above campus missions and national borders. Universities have almost universally been associated with an international mission and cross-border dimension. They are presently being compared internationally, whether they want to or not, as if they are competing with each other in tough and tight international markets. Over the past three decades international initiatives of higher education have developed significantly worldwide. Internationalization has come a long way over this time and, in both theory and practice, occupied much attention of policy makers influencing strategic plans of most higher education institutions across the world (Altbach, 2002; de Wit, 2006; Enders, 2004; Jones, 2009; Knight, 2004; Ninnes & Hellstin, 2005; Rinne & Koivula, 2005; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Scott, 2000).

One criticism about internationalization is that institutions are increasingly commercializing their international initiatives and activities (Marginson & Sawir, 2011; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). There has recently been a global shift toward neoliberal principles and values in today's institutions, and the higher education sector is accordingly seen as a crucial factor in ensuring economic productivity and competitiveness in this context (Bok, 2003; Giroux, 2007; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Currently institutions are funded more by private sources than public, which was not the case two or three decades ago (Altbach, 2012; de Wit, 2011; Jones & Oleksiyenko, 2011; Maringe, et al 2013). Many higher education leaders are, accordingly, more known for being, what Giroux (2007) calls 'successful fundraisers' rather than intellectual leaders. In such a situation 'market efficiency' (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010) and 'productivity'

(Henkel, 1997) are central and postsecondary education is seen as a ‘multi-billion dollar business’ (Altbach, 2012). Institutions have hence increasingly been recognized as an ‘export industry’ or what David Ward (2008) calls ‘oil wells of the new economy’. This perspective is also associated with “promoting the instrumental values of competition” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 31). Under such circumstances, democratic public and intellectual values are, as Giroux (2010) observes, scorned in higher education settings.

Postsecondary education missions are, therefore, losing ground in favour of market and commercial goals. As de Wit (2011) argues, increasing “competition in higher education and the commercialization and cross-border delivery of higher education have challenged the value traditionally attached to cooperation, such as exchanges and partnerships” (p. 242). Within the ideological framework of neoliberalism, higher education institutions have, as Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) observed, become international drivers for revenue generation, since profit has become prioritized over the core educational activities of institutions. Therefore internationalization appears to be a key component for branding institutions to sell their products- normally credentials and certifications- to potential buyers, most of them being students from the developing world.

The commercial model of higher education has been criticized by many scholars, especially those who believe that postsecondary education is a public good that should be accessible to all based on their merit. Higher education has, in addition, traditionally been regarded for its contributions to intellectual and scholarly values, for its capacity to develop critical thinking in the community, and for its power to examine dominant assumptions and institutional norms (Axelrod, 2002; Bok, 2003; Childress, 2010; Clark, 1998; Giroux, 2007, 2011; Guld, 2003; Readings, 1996; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2009). The

academy is supposed to be a citadel of democratic learning, as Giroux (2011) argues, but many of its contemporary leaders are now eager to define themselves largely by economic terms and market considerations. Higher education has been a place and space in which public academic values and democratic modes of governing have traditionally been valued. And many scholars argue that higher education should still play a leading role in attaining equity, freedom and justice, fostering the values of democracy, educating and creating critical citizens, as well as shaping new democratic generations of thinkers and actors (Altbach, 2002; Giroux, 2007; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010).

Problem Statement

Internationalization, in both theory and practice, has occupied much of the attention of policy makers and has influenced policy statements of higher education institutions across Canada and internationally. Currently the vast majority of higher education institutions are increasingly interested in internationalization as a strategic activity for reinventing, restructuring and extending themselves. Even if lines have become blurred between the rationales behind internationalization (Knight, 2003; Tarc, 2013), many critical researchers claim that internationalization of higher education appears to be a part of a top-down-for-profit agenda rather than a global educational initiative to prepare students to live and work in a globalized world and equip them to be responsible global citizens (Altbach, 2012; de Wit, 2011; 2005; Giroux, 2007; Maringe, et al., 2013; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010).

Internationalization, like international education, has, as Tarc (2013) argues, “become an expedient in a neoliberal zeitgeist where the lines between ‘making a difference’ and ‘making profits,’ and international engagement and resume building, have become blurred if not erased” (p. 2). So we see at the same time university administrators making claims about how students

can 'make a difference in the world', build their resumes and become global citizens; these processes occur alongside new pressures for universities to commercialize, make profits and compete. Some higher education researchers and policy analysts have been warning policy makers, university administrations and practitioners about the likelihood of risks of internationalization. Internationalization has also been critiqued for other reasons. A few critical scholars ask whether internationalization is losing its way and becoming more corporate and less enlightened and about academic goals. Some others question whether the world of higher education may have reached the end of internationalization in the sense that academic initiatives and priorities are more oriented toward economic goals and returns (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; de Wit, 2006; Giroux, 2007; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Scott, 2000). It seems that two factors are more influential than others in this shift in vision and rationale. Affected by a growing interest, demand and marketplace for cross-border higher education and increasing competition, the value of postsecondary education exports from most developed countries has grown exponentially during the last three decades. Second, influenced by neoliberal global principles and values, the direction of internationalization has changed, with the introduction of a set of market principles to guide its processes and practices (Altbach, 2012; de Wit, 2011; IAU, 2005, 2010; Rizvi, et al., 2005).

The global market of higher education has, as a result, presented contrasting models of internationalization over the last two decades. Consequently, and as studies support, internationalization has consistently been identified as a major trend of trade policy of higher education in most universities in developed countries, and also as a priceless and irreplaceable source of brain gain (Giroux, 2007; Maringe, et al., 2013; Rizvi, et al., 2005; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). In other words, internationalization appears to be a matter of a for-profit global trade

agenda rather than a [democratic and] global public policy based on values such as public enlightenment, responsiveness and critical awareness. While internationalization is supposed to be a policy for the strengthening of local and global research networks and knowledge exchanges, and the improvement of academic quality and providing equitable educational opportunities to students to accomplish their needs and interests across the world, in reality it is viewed by some scholars as “a contribution to the financial bottom line in an era of financial cutbacks” (Altbach, 2012, p. 2).

As today’s knowledge-driven economy becomes increasingly globalized, the commercial benefits and contributions of internationalization are substantial. The economic contribution from the direct export of education and services abroad and international students’ fees is the main financial aspect of internationalization. The annual monetary benefit of international student tuition fees is estimated to generate about US\$100 billion in revenues for host countries. (King-Head, 2012). In other words, while internationalization should incorporate a range of values and programs that include openness, tolerance and cosmopolitanism (Rizvi, n.d) in order to prepare students for an increasingly globalized and multicultural world (Green, 2004, 2007) under the hegemony of the current market-driven regime, its main objective has become to provide a primary source of income for most institutions engaging in this policy.

This study underscores that internationalization as an [alternative] source of profit in a public university is problematic. In other words, this study is concerned with the extent to which internationalization is guided by economic and market-driven rationales, motivations and tradable commercial values, which may further marginalize academic and intellectual values and principles in the higher education sector. What is problematic is not institutional strategies in

diversifying the sources of income,¹ but the vision and practice of internationalization as a matter of global trade agendas rather than a global academic and educational strategy. While the main institutional rationales and strategies of internationalization are about economic and commercial activities such as marketing, export of programs, rankings and institutional international branding and profile and income generation (Knight, 2004; Kehm & Teichler), the problem is that this policy may perpetuate the erosion of intellectual values and culture that have served the academy in its modern sense for nearly three centuries.

These issues are important to explore given that most universities today are engaged in internationalization strategies. Longitudinal surveys by the International Association of Universities (IAU) in 2003, 2005, and 2010, for example, report that internationalization has been the first policy priority and the most important agent of change in higher education policy processes and practices over the last decade. And closer to home, internationalization of higher education has “become a significant feature of the Canadian educational landscape” (Beck, 2012, p. 133). Over 200 higher education institutions in Canada engage in some form of international activity (AUCC, n.d). As a common component of institutional mission statements, Canadian higher education policy makers and administrations have, as Jones and Oleksiyenko (2011) argue, made internationalization as a key priority and key aspect of their strategic plans. The significant point for local universities, according to The Minister of International Trade (2012), is that becoming the 21st century leader in internationalization in order to attract top talent foreign students and prepare citizens for the global marketplace seems the focal vision and landscape of the Canadian higher education. Canada is, accordingly, going to be a leading destination for many undergraduate and graduate international students.

¹ From international students’ mobility, research contracts and collaborations, program transfer, knowledge exchange, etc.

Ontario is one of the provinces that have embraced internationalization of higher education in Canada. Indeed, in 2010, the government of Ontario made a public announcement to double the population of international students in the coming years (Coates & Morrison, 2011), leading two scholars to state that universities in Ontario “are chasing applicants from around the world” (Coates & Morrison, 2011, p. 216). While internationalization seems to be ubiquitous in higher education policy rhetoric in Canadian higher education institutions, it is not particularly clear what values drive internationalization policies and initiatives in provinces such as Ontario. In other words, while the export of postsecondary education to different areas of the world is one of the main objectives of Canadian institutions (Lessard & Brassard, 2009), we need to identify the embedded values driving internationalization initiatives. While “many Canadians worry that the newcomers such as international students are displacing Canadian students seeking to get into the best programs” (Coates & Morrison, 2011, p. 217), whose priorities are represented in various internationalization programs and whose voices are possibly missing need to be investigated. Whereas most Canadian universities are struggling and competing to find new sources of revenue through attracting more international students (Coates & Morrison, 2011; McNeil, 2013), the main rationales behind internationalization need to be critically examined.

Evidence demonstrates that Canadian universities design and market their programs to appeal to an international audience (CMEC, 2011). This study is an attempt to provide a critical policy analysis of why and how a public university in Ontario does engage in internationalization. In a context where competition in an aggressive market of higher education has been one of the main characters of Canadian universities over the last two decades (Beck, 2012; CMEC, 2011; Fisher, et al., 2009; Jones & Oleksiyyenko, 2011), this study represents an endeavour to understand the ways and processes in which rationales are positioned in the

internationalization agenda. Most importantly, if as stated by the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC, 2011) ‘bringing education in Canada to the world, bringing the world to Canada’ is the objective of internationalization, we are particularly interested in comprehending *how* internationalization’s values become manifest in a public university in Ontario. Accordingly, policy perceptions obtained through interviews and official policy statements found in policy documents and materials constitute two main sources that are interrogated and conceptualized in this study.

Purpose Statement

This study aims to illuminate the values that drive policies and initiatives associated with internationalization in a public university in Ontario and underpin its administrators and faculty views and perceptions. In other words, drawing on critical policy analysis, this study questions the perspectives of university administration and faculty regarding internationalization as it is used and conveyed in university policies and initiatives. It critically examines how policy values are embedded in their perspectives and understandings about internationalization. The analysis further considers how official policy documents reflect ‘the practice of values’ in relationship to internationalization. More specifically, the study is undertaken with the following objectives:

- To develop a better understanding of meaning and rationales of internationalization in a public university in Ontario.
- To uncover whose priorities are represented in various internationalization programs as well as whose voices are missing.

Research Questions

The central question of the study is:

What values drive internationalization and how do they influence policies and initiatives at a public university in Ontario?

In addition, the study is guided by the following three research questions:

- 1- What does internationalization mean for administrators and faculty members?
- 2- Why does a public university in Ontario engage in internationalization?
- 3- Whose policy (agenda) does internationalization of higher education represent?

Policy in the area of higher education, whether intended as an instrumental outcome, based on the functional and rational tradition, or as a potential for emancipation based on the critical tradition, encounters diverging stances on the nature and importance of values. Values are often embedded within a broader context of policy discourses. The central question of the study critically examines values that influence policy makers of a public university to internationalize their institutional activities. It identifies values represented and disseminated through policy statements and administration rhetoric. It addresses the question of how different stakeholders [research participants] differentiate values presented in internationalization policies and initiatives.

Furthermore, the main intent of the first research question is to examine how participants perceive and interpret their experience of internationalization activities. Specifically it aims to examine the meaning of internationalization of higher education and attitudes of administrators and faculty about different initiatives. The intent of the second question is to interrogate the main rationales for internationalization at a public university. The objectives of the third question are to understand whose priorities and preferences are represented in internationalization activities and whose voices and opinions are absent from its agenda. Specifically the third question asks how and by whom are the internationalization policies and strategies written and developed.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant for a number of reasons. Firstly it attempts to provide a persuasive and innovative conceptual tool to investigate higher education policy in order to conceptualize policy rationales and values in contemporary higher education. Drawing upon different critical perspectives developed by scholars and leading figures in the areas of public policy and education, this study uses various directions and concepts of policy analysis approaches and critical policy analysis to critically conceptualize internationalization in the context of Ontario/Canada.

Secondly, almost all prestigious and non-prestigious, or top-ranking and low-ranking institutions' administrations refer to either their international profiles and international dimension in initiatives and mission statements or their current and forthcoming strategic policies for internationalization. However there is little effort by those institutions to conduct serious critical policy analysis in order to produce some new knowledge, insights and literature on internationalization of higher education. In consequence, as Beck (2012) suggests, there is an urgent need to examine the internationalization of higher education. And "if knowledge about internationalization is to be advanced" (Beck, 2012, p. 136) particularly in the Canadian context of higher education, this study is an attempt to fill the existing gaps of the literature, scholarship and knowledge in this area of policy and knowledge.

Thirdly, in terms of contribution, the findings and analyses of the study are intended to be of interest and value to scholars and also to various stakeholders in the area of internationalization, specifically in Ontario and Canada. Furthermore, as a case study in policy-oriented research, the most important policy contribution of this study is, as Merriam (1998)

argues, that it can directly influence policy, practice, and future research in the field of internationalization.

Overview of Conceptual Approach and Methodology

This study relies on critical policy analysis (CPA) as its theoretical perspective. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is also used as a complementary conceptual approach. Knowing that policy studies in the field of internationalization of higher education suffer from a kind of conceptual and theoretical ambiguity and vagueness (Ball, 1994, Taylor, et al., 1997), I have turned to globalization (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010) as an additional conceptual frame to better understand higher education policy in an era of a dominant neo-liberal agenda.

This study uses qualitative and case study research methodology. A public university in Ontario that had/has actively adopted and implemented internationalization as a policy and had/has a respective strategic plan, was chosen as the research site for the study. Data collection for this research relied on several primary sources: one-on-one key-informant interviews, policy documents, and published archival materials. In order to enhance the credibility and authenticity of findings, the study used two types of triangulation: methodological (Denzin, 2005) and voice triangulation (perceptions). *Participants* were selected from two groups of administrators and faculty members that had wide engagement, knowledge and information about internationalization activities and have been involved in this policy. The study used two types of sampling; *purposeful* sampling (criterion-based sampling) and *snowball* sampling. The collected data were analyzed in two stages; single case analysis (Yin, 2006; Merriam, 1998) and cross-[sub-] case analysis (Borman et al., 2006; Yin, 2006). Further details about the methodology of this study are found in Chapter IV.

Positionality

Positionality is a way of describing and disclosing the background, experience, values, and bias of the *self* to highlight the position of the policy researcher on an issue (Bourdieu, 1999; Prunty, 1985; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Disclosing the positionality of researcher means dealing with “the questions of who is doing the policy analysis and for what purpose, and within what context” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 46). Critical policy analysis includes taking into account the positionality of the researcher for the interpretation of information and phenomena for the purpose of determining the approach toward policy analysis. A critical policy analyst is not an impartial observer; s/he needs to be open about his/her position and to be transparent about his/her background that may affect the findings of the analysis.

In the initial phase of thinking and articulating my ideas to design this study I became acutely aware of being an *insider* in terms of “actual location of policy researcher in respect of the focus of analysis; [as] a doctoral student” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, 46). I believe myself to be an insider because I am an *international* student working on *internationalization* of higher education. Being an insider offers an exclusive opportunity for conducting critical policy analysis. As an insider who has researched a project to which I can relate, according to Lughod (1988) and Hill-Collins (1990), I have an advantage in terms of using my knowledge and experience to gain a deeper insight into my interpretation and analysis. Over the last decade I have witnessed institutions engaging with internationalization initiatives in both developed and developing contexts. My background in higher education¹, my familiarity with theory and practice highly influenced the design of this study prior to its initiation. My lived experience in

¹ My academic background and curriculum vitae are attached at the end of this dissertation.

higher education as a policy researcher and my experience as an expert in an international non-profit association inform another aspect of my positionality regarding this study.

Alongside being an insider, I am also an *outsider* as I am neither a faculty member nor an administrator at the research site. An outsider does not, as Mullings (1999) argues, belong to the context of group or subject under study. From this position and from the perspective of academic-cultural outsider (Phillips & Schweisfurth, 2008) there is a greater degree of objectivity; ability to observe the study site; and collect data without distorting, and misrepresenting the meanings, perceptions and attitudes of participants (Mullings, 1999). My dual positionality of insider/outsider, my professional background and experience in the area of higher education gave me the confidence to think that I must forge my own path in making a contribution to the field of internationalization in higher education. Also, it is my hope that I can make both a local and global impact in this area of knowledge, policy and practice.

With internationalization being so important to the fabric of higher education institutions, it has already given me much to think about and ultimately establish my own position. In my opinion as a critical idealist, internationalization is supposed to be relevant to all facets of university policies and practices, particularly in terms of the trinity of teaching, research and service. Through the vantage point of an insider/outsider with an extensive experience in the field of higher education, I believe that internationalization initiatives and programs should aim at supporting the goal of educating critically active and informed global citizens who will be motivated to stand up for their values, while promoting their reasoning skills by becoming critical thinkers. As such, internationalization can [and should] theoretically and practically provide significant possibilities and opportunities for engendering intellectual life, education, and experiences within and around academic settings. Amongst like-minded researchers in critical

policy tradition, I have been concerned with the risks and challenges of internationalization policy in terms of increased commodification of higher education policies and programs. This happens at the expense of the intellectual life and academic values that have traditionally underpinned postsecondary education, that include academic freedom, collegiality, social responsibility, scholarly excellence, intellectual pluralism and diversity, scholars mobility, knowledge exchanges and institutional autonomy: values which I am firmly committed to.

The Key Concepts

The Concept of Value

The concept of value is central to this study. Value (and valuing), as it is commonly understood and proclaimed in philosophy and social science, is quite a basic, but ambiguous concept. The term value and “value-expressions such as good, bad, right, wrong” (Dewey, 1939, p. 7) are used in a variety of philosophical, sociological, economic, psychological, linguistic, ethical, and educational contexts with a wide range of meanings and different approaches (Elliot, 1997; Pal, 2010; Perry, 1926). Just as many different answers are and could be given to the question *what is value*, the definition and question of ‘value’ cannot, in an obvious sense, be easily answered and developed. Because offering a precise definition of the term/concept(s) in qualitative and critical policy research may overly limit the scope of conceptualization and analysis, this study will attempt to develop a comprehensive understanding of the definition of values and policy.

Although the term value seems to be a buzzword and “attempts at defining value are rarely adequate for general use” (Elliot, 1997, p. 69), there is a range of different definitions of the concept. What follows is a brief synopsis of definition of value coming from a number of major English language dictionaries. In the Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2013), value is divided into two main meanings; ‘a numerical quantity that is assigned or is determined by calculation or

measurement’, and ‘something (as a principle or quality) that intrinsically is valuable or desirable’. The Oxford English Dictionary (2013) defines the verb “to value” as: to estimate the monetary worth of something; and to consider (someone or something) to be important or beneficial; and as a noun value is a) the regard that something is held to deserve; and the importance, worth, or usefulness of something, b) the material or monetary worth of something, c) principles or standards of behavior, and e) the numerical amount denoted by an algebraic term; a magnitude, quantity, or number). In the Macmillan dictionary, value is defined a) the amount that something is worth, and measured; and b) the principles and beliefs that influence the behaviour and way of life of a particular group or community. The online dictionary of thefreedictionary (2013) represents five different definitions of value as follows: a) *an amount, as of goods, services, or money, considered to be a fair and suitable equivalent for something else; a fair price or return;* b) *monetary or material worth;* c) *worth in usefulness or importance to the possessor; utility or merit;* d) *precise meaning or import, as of a word;* and e) *a principle, standard, or quality considered worthwhile or desirable.*

From a different angle the Visual Thesaurus reveals the ways that different concepts from different definitions are related to value and their diverse meaning. As shown in Figure 1.1, the word map of value includes 7 nouns (such as numerical quantity, worth, economic value, color property, note value, time value and ideal) and 14 verbs such as rate, determine, prize, respect, measure, assess, evaluate, etc.




Figure 1.1. The word map of term value

Besides terminological definitions, value has been defined and redefined in different ways and in different disciplines and theoretical contexts. From the ancient time by philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle to the present, whether it is called axiology or ethics, value has widely been the subject matter of philosophy. While values - both those relating to means and those relating to ends- are clearly an important concept and phenomenon in policy studies, it almost impossible to give an all-embracing definition (Elliot, 1997); simply because it is “difficult to detect and almost impossible to measure’ (Stewart, 2009, p. 16).

In accordance with different philosophical approaches and dictionary definitions, the concept value, however, could be defined in two ways: quantitative-objective and qualitative-subjective approaches. From a quantitative perspective, value is defined as a numerical quantity measured, assigned or computed aspect of things. In this approach the objectivity of things is basic, and the market, monetary or material worth of things are valued. In other words, the worth of something

is evaluated in terms of the amount of other things for which it can be exchanged or in terms of some medium of exchange. The quantitative logic of exchange value appears as the basic principle. The qualitative approach of value focuses on the relative worth, merit, or importance of things, whether the thing is an idea, event, person, policy, or object. From the qualitative perspective, the subjectivity of concept is fundamental; values are beliefs expressed in judgment statements rather than in fact statements; “the judgments that implicitly express an assumption about benefit or harm” (Elliot, 1997, p. 70). The qualitative-ethical-subjective approach and its definition as “*a principle, standard, or quality considered worthwhile or desirable*” is the only one that is epistemologically more congruent with and more relevant to the theoretical perspective of this study.

The Concept of Policy

Many, but not all, initially consider policy no more than a ‘text’. From the expert point of view, policy could be considered a ‘text’, a ‘discourse’ (Ball, 1993, 1994), or simply a document, a process, as well as a product (Taylor et al., 2010). Depending on the intent and position of the person who is defining or analyzing it, policy can be viewed in many different ways., This section will review and discuss different definitions of and approaches to policy definition, from the middle of last century to the present, which have been advanced in the literature in order to illustrate what policy means in this research and how this discussion illuminates my understanding of educational policy [-making] in the context of higher education.

According to Taylor et al (1994) policy involves the production of the text, the text itself, ongoing modifications to the text and the processes of implementation into practice. According to Dye (2002) policy is whatever governments choose to do or not to do. Policy is a decision, made by a publicly elected or designated body, which is deemed to be in the public interest

(Torjman, 2005). Policy is a field of activity, a specific proposal, government legislation, a general program or ‘desired state of affairs’, and what governments achieve (Wedel et al., 2005). Policy refers to the actions and positions taken by the state, which consists of a range of institutions that share the essential characteristics of authority and collectivity (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). From Ball’s perspective, “policy is both text and action or words and deeds; it is what is enacted as well as what is intended” (Ball, 1994, p.10).

Besides the above mentioned definitions there is a range of policy definitions in different systems by different experts. Different definitions of policy reflect different values, priorities, and actions that are exhibited during the work toward implementing the policy. While every definition tends to refer to policy in terms of its theoretical or philosophical construct, most definitions explicitly or implicitly present a constant emphasis on the terms “values” and “action”. Although there is, in other words, no single definition that encapsulates all of them, the most common element for the policy definition is ‘value statement’ and ‘validated and approved (authoritative) action’. Thus, one of the most fitting definitions of policy for this study belongs to Easton (1953) who defines policy as *the authoritative allocation of values*. This definition addresses the issue of *who* has the power to make policy and *what* is important for implementation. This definition of policy describes which values are important to an institution. In other words, policy is associated with values because it is an attempt to stimulate and bring about specific interests. Specifically, policy values in this study refer to different typologies of values in the area of public policy; such as *private or public*, developed by Jacobs in 1965, *instrumental or intrinsic*, developed by Wright in 1971, *procedural or substantive*, developed by Scott in 2000, *political or policy*, developed by Stewart in 2009, among others.

Organization of the Study

This study consists of seven chapters, which are organized as follows. The first chapter introduced the study, and described background, problem statement, purpose of the study, researcher positionality, and research questions that the researcher intended to address. Chapter II begins with a general review on the literature and scholarship of internationalization of higher education both internationally and in the Canadian context. This chapter also addresses a few significant gaps in the existing research literature. Chapter III focuses on the main theoretical framework and also conceptual approaches of the study which contains critical policy analysis (CPA), critical discourse analysis (CDA), conceptual grounding of globalization, and neoliberalism. Chapter IV starts with an introductory discussion on qualitative and case study research, and develops the research method that this study is based on. In Chapter V, the researcher summarizes the key findings of the study. This chapter has seven sections; in each section first the data gathered from the official policy documents and administration rhetoric is summarized; and findings from individual interviews are then presented, and finally each section ends with a few conclusions. Chapter VI begins with developing a critical discussion on the findings regarding the central question and three other guiding research questions of the study. Chapter VII concludes the dissertation with a summary and discussion that interweave the findings of the study based on research questions, and ends with a final argument and some recommendations.

Summary

This first chapter started with discussing the context and developing the problem of the study based on different resources, evidences, perspectives by different scholars, and with the researcher's experience and positionality. The chapter continued with a purpose statement and

research questions and then with an overview of the study's conceptual approach and methodology. The chapter ended with a definition and description of two basic concepts that inform the study, namely 'value' and 'policy.' I now turn to reviewing the literature that informed this study.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Early research in the field of internationalization of higher education was occasional, coincidental, and episodic (Teichler, 1996). By the beginning of 1990s, internationalization was faced with a lack of academic recognition of the field (de Wit, 1997) and comprehensive documentation (Teichler, 1996). There has been little theoretically and methodologically ambitious studies in the area of internationalization over the 1980s and 1990s, and there was not much research done until the beginning of the new century (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

While the available related research and study regarding internationalization can be considered ‘large-scale’ (ex. IAU’s surveys), ‘middle-scale’ (example: regional and inter-institutional projects) and ‘small-scale’ (example: all dissertations and single papers in journals), overall there is limited literature about internationalization of higher education (Altbach & Knight, 2007; de Wit, 2011; Knight, 2008; Kehm and Teichler, 2007; Marginson & van der Wende, 2009). According to Larsen (2013), the existing literature can, however, be categorized in three main frameworks: ‘strategies’ (types of strategies, activities and initiatives); ‘locations’ (where internationalization takes place, home or abroad); and ‘motivations’ (rationales for internationalization in higher education). Different studies in the area of internationalization of higher education, in addition, suggest, at least, three other streams that could be added to Larsen’s frameworks. The first one is ‘conceptual’ framework of internationalization and its relation with some relevant and superior concepts such as globalization, intercultural and multicultural education, and international education, among others. For example, in her study “Internationalisation of HE in the UK: Where are we now and where might we go”, Caruana (2007) argues that the conceptual debate on internationalization of higher education is very much

alive in UK universities. The second framework is ‘critical’ literature dealing with all studies and discussions on internationalization such as benefits, opportunities, challenges, among others. And the third one is ‘students’ framework such as research and studies on both international and domestic students’ experiences and perceptions (Altbach & Knight, 2007; de Wit, 1997, 2011; Caruana, 2007; Knight, 2003, 2008; Kehm and Teichler, 2007; Marginson & van der Wende, 2009; Powell, 2004; Teichler, 1996).

The content and literature reviewed in this chapter is aligned with the research questions of the study and reflects some of the areas of research on internationalization in higher education outlined above. It contains five sections: research literature on internationalization as a phenomenon [notion and definition]; literature about the rationales, initiatives and strategies associated with internationalization; benefits and potential challenges; policy research on internationalization with a focus on values, and finally Canadian experiences of internationalization.

Internationalization as a Phenomenon: A Developing Concept

The popularity of internationalization as a policy priority has soared since the early 1980s (Knight, 2003). The 1990s, however, mark “an important phase in the evolution of the internationalization of higher education” (Knight, 2008, p. 27). From 1990s, the definition of internationalization of higher education has been the subject of many related studies, policy statements and administrative rhetoric and is still evolving (Knight, 2008; Powell, 2004).

However, concepts like internationalization may have very different meanings depending on who is defining it and in what context it is applied.

Many define internationalization as a process of integrating international education into the curriculum in order to increase international cooperation, enhance national security and

improve economic competitiveness (Harari, 1992; Klasek, 1992; Mestenhauser & Ellingboe, 1998; Powell, 2004). For IAU (2013), internationalization is also a dynamic process and a means to multiple ends that can bring numerous benefits (Egron-Polak, 2013). According to Soderqvist (2002) it is a “change process from a national higher education institution to an international institution leading to the inclusion of an international dimension in all aspects of its holistic management in order to enhance the quality of teaching and learning and to achieve the desired competences” (p. 29). Internationalization is also defined as a process of strengthening the international character of campuses with the support of a leading institution (Hanson & Meyerson, 1995; Harari, 1992; Pickert & Turlington, 1992). Knight in 1994 defined internationalization as “a sustainable process of “integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (p. 7). The meaning of internationalization, therefore, varies from its traditional campus-based international initiatives, study abroad programs, stand-alone travel experiences, student and faculty exchanges, and collaborative research to processes of integrating international or intercultural perspectives into the teaching, research, and service functions institutionally (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Bogotch & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2010; Knight, 2003).

De Wit (2011) critiques different misconceptions and misunderstandings of internationalization policy. He argues that the reality about internationalization is less promising than its conceptual definitions. de Wit points out that for many, internationalization in practice is still similar to teaching in English, or studying abroad or teaching an international subject to international students. According to de Wit’s (2011) argument, the worst misconception regarding the internationalization of higher education is that it means having many international students on campus.

Another point is that although the concept has been defined from different perspectives in academia and has become a main research topic, the term has not yet reached its conceptual limits and there is no universally accepted definition of this phenomenon (Kehm & Teichler, 2007; Marginson & van der Wende, 2009). Because of this Stier (2004) argues about divergent conceptualizations of internationalization and points out that today's "universities are guided by divergent understandings of the term 'internationalization' as well as by diverging or even contradictory ideologies (p. 83). Therefore, internationalization of higher education over the years has been experimenting, theorizing and evolving. Until recently, it was, for example, used to refer to student mobility and curriculum for international students and later referred also to domestic students. It is evolving and developing "from a reactive to a pro-active strategic issue, from added value to mainstream, and also has seen its focus, scope and content evolve substantially" (de Wit, 2011, p. 242). Even though for many internationalization still means mobility and the presence of international fee-paying students (Stier, 2004) and, at most, the expansion of university campuses and branches abroad, the process of internationalization of higher education has, as Knight (2003) points out, been manifesting itself in a variety of ways and policies. New components were added to its multidimensional body in the past two decades, "moving from simple exchange of students to the big business of recruitment, and from activities impacting on an incredibly small elite group to a mass phenomenon" (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011, p. 15).

According to available literature and studies, there are six major components of internationalization: a) international students recruitment b) student and scholar mobility c) research and knowledge exchange and technical assistance; d) marketing and expansion of university campuses and branches abroad; e) internationalization of campus curricula; and f)

virtual transnational internationalization (like MOOCs¹). Therefore, it is clear that internationalization is not supposed to be only about the curriculum needs of students or even crossing borders and promoting student mobility; it is a multiple strategic policy that engages, incorporates and affects higher education institutions in different national/international dimensions (Altbach & Knight, 2007; de Wit, 2011; Knight, 2008; Kehm & Teichler, 2007; Marginson & van der Wende, 2009; Maringe et al., 2013).

Although internationalization has no universally agreed upon definition and represents different things to different people from the variety of positions in the area of higher education, there is, on the other hand, Jane Knight's widely-used definition. Despite different definitions, most current understandings of internationalization are influenced by Knight's definition (Beck, 2012; Maringe et al., 2013). As the most cited definition in the relevant literature and policy statements, internationalization of higher education is "the process of integrating an international, intercultural, and global dimension into the purpose, functions (teaching, research, service) and delivery of higher education" (Knight, 2004, p. 11). Because of promoting a simplistic understanding of the process of internationalization, this definition may, however, be part of the problem. Although Knight's new definition is a welcome start to the literature, "the depth dimension of internationalization is more dynamic and far reaching than portrayed by Knight" (Sanderson, 2008, p. 279). Knight's (2004) approach of internationalization is problematic because it does not reflect the realities of world of today postsecondary education properly. Moreover, there is no sufficient evidence for the prevalence of this definition amongst those who lead and manage modern-day universities in different parts of the world (Maringe et al., 2013).

¹ Massive Open Online Course

Although a “number of researchers and writers in higher education have made reference to Knight’s definition” (Sanderson, 2008, p. 277), this definition and approach remains problematic and questionable in the context of critical policy approach. As Franke and Russell (2012) argue “Knight’s address of internationalization is deserving of critical consideration” (p. 2). It seems to me that the above mentioned and well-cited definition fits into the policy approach which is known analysis *for* policy (Gordon *et al.*, 1977; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010) or what Ozga (2000) dubs research *for* policy. In other words, while the approach of analysis or research *for* policy lacks a critical orientation, and because this study is basically a critical policy analysis, the above mentioned institutional definition(s) may not be aligned with the theoretical and conceptual perspective of this study. The study has to adopt a definition of internationalization that aligns with the alternative and critical policy approach, namely analysis *of* policy, or research *into* policy¹. Since internationalization today is remarkably different from what it was one or two decades ago (IUA, 2012), redefining the contemporary institutional approach of internationalization of higher education is required. Because of this gap in the literature [particularly between visions and practices], one of the guiding questions of this study has been the notion and definition of internationalization in a specific context. As Brandenburg and de Wit (2011) argue, it is timely to critically reflect on the changing concept of internationalization. In other words, because of emerging different critical perspectives and remarkable changes in values, goals, strategies and initiatives in the area of higher education, re-definition of this concept and policy is needed and necessary. From a critical viewpoint, and based on the findings, this study, therefore, attempts to develop a discussion on definitions of internationalization of higher education in Chapters V and VI.

¹ These two approaches will be explained in Chapter III, under the section ‘Conceptual Framework.’

Rationales, Initiatives and Strategies

Internationalization is not merely a policy concern exclusively for the top-tier and prestigious universities in the developed world; it is significant for the majority of higher education institutions and their policy makers in different contexts (Egron-Polak, 2012; Knight, 2009; Stier, 2002). In most institutions' policy statements the central "rationales driving internationalization are becoming more explicit and are changing" (Knight, 2004, p. 19). Many institutions typically internationalize in order to recruit either for talent, and qualified or wealthy foreign students (Lipsett, 2009; McGowan & Potter, 2008). Some universities internationalize in order to attract top-quality faculty and professional researchers and research staff (Delgado-Márquez, 2011; Van der Wende, 2007). The dominant tendency, according to Knight (2008), is mostly toward economic rationales, branding and competition for recruiting talented international students.

From the perspectives of some scholars, internationalization is increasingly associated with commodification and commercialization of higher education (Altbach 2002; de Wit, 2011). As the goals and objectives of internationalization are multiple and somewhat conflicting (Tarc, 2013), there are different rationales for institutions acknowledging it as a policy priority. In the related literature there are a variety of goals and rationales underpinning internationalization ranging from educating global citizens, building capacity for research, to generating income from international student tuition fees, and the quest to enhance institutional prestige and reputation (Brown 2011; de Wit, 2011; Gibbs 2011; Knight, 2008; Maringe et al., 2013; Teferra 2008). Internationalization on one hand generates a competitive and commercialized drive for different initiatives like student enrolments, whereas on the other, it evokes notions of transnational connectivity and academic reciprocal flows of individuals (Matthews, 2002). According to

IAU's (2005) survey the main rationales of internationalizing are 'increasing national economic competitiveness, development of strategic alliances (political, cultural, trade, academic etc). (20%), building human resource capacity, promoting international solidarity and co-operation', among others. Furthermore, the IAU surveys (2003, 2005, 2010) shows that the key rationales of internationalizing vary from institution to institution and they include the preparation of students to live and work in a globalized world; the improvement of academic quality; the strengthening of research; attracting new students; generating revenues; and, increasingly, securing prestige and reputation.

Maringe and Gibbs (2006) classify all the rationales of internationalization in six wide-ranging streams: economic, political, sociocultural, technological, educational and pedagogical. Although the rationales of internationalization vary from different contexts and positions in practice, Knight (2004) discusses internationalization in terms of levels of emerging rationales; a) national human resources development, including strategic alliances, commercial trade, nation building, social/cultural development; b) institutional international branding and profile including income generation, student and staff development, strategic alliances, and knowledge production (p. 22-3). According to Knight (2004) the all the main rationales based on two national and institutional levels could be classified in four major rationales of a) *Social-cultural*; b) *Political*; c) *Economic growth*; and d) *Academic*. See Table 2.1.

Table 2.1

The Rationales of Internationalization of Higher Education

Rationales	Existing—National and Institutional Levels Combined
Social/cultural	National cultural identity Intercultural understanding Citizenship development Social and community development
Political	Foreign policy National security Technical assistance Peace and mutual understanding National identity Regional identity
Economic	Economic growth and competitiveness Labour market Financial incentives
Academic	International dimension to research and teaching Extension of academic horizon Institution building Profile and status Enhancement of quality International academic standards
Level	Of Emerging Importance— National and Institutional Levels Separated
National	Human resources development Strategic alliances Commercial trade Nation building Social/cultural development
Institutional	International branding and profile Income generation Student and staff development Strategic alliances Knowledge production

Note: Adapted from Knight, 2004, p. 23.

According to Stier (2004) there are three rationales or what he calls ‘normative motives’ embedded in internationalization policies which influence administrators, policy-makers and faculty in their understanding and approach to internationalization: idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. The idealist rationale of internationalization stems from the normative assumption that ‘internationalization is good *per se*’. According to this ideology, through internationalization initiatives, “higher education can contribute to the creation of a more democratic, fair and equal world. Hence, the task of universities is, among other things, to ‘foster’ citizens that adhere to an emancipatory outlook on the world” (p. 88). According to Instrumentalism, higher education is “to be one means to maximize profit, ensure economic growth and sustainable development, or to transmit desirable ideologies of governments, transnational corporations, interest groups or supranational regimes” (p. 89). From the standpoint of educationalists the purposes of internationalization extend beyond mere idealistic and

professional aspirations of policy-makers. Based on educationalists' arguments "internationalization may contribute to personal growth and self-actualization. ... The role of education is to assist him or her, not merely in detecting cultural differences and similarities, but in understanding, scrutinizing and respecting them" (92).

As higher education institutions in different parts of the world internationalize for a variety of reasons, there are different initiatives in internationalization processes. These initiatives vary from traditional internationalization initiatives such as student and staff mobility, curriculum change and international institutional linkages for teaching and research to new forms such as branch campuses abroad, distance learning programs with a global reach, and international educational hubs and networks. In their research, *Assessing the Internationalization of Degree Programs: Experiences from a Dutch-Flemish Pilot Certifying Internationalization*, Aerden et al (2013), for example, investigated the diversity of internationalization initiatives in the Netherlands and Flanders. They, like de Wit (2011), conclude that internationalization initiatives [and strategies] are filtered and contextualized by the specific internal context of the university, by the type of university and by how they are embedded nationally. Furthermore they are shaped at the program level by the different relationship these programs have to the market and society (Aerden et al., 2013, p. 57-8).

In their research, *A Comparative Study of Perceptions of Internationalization Strategies*, Warwick and Moogan (2013) compared the internationalization strategies of two groups of UK universities and the views of staff group at those institutions. They examined how UK universities are internationalizing and what approaches seem to be successful and unsuccessful. They conclude that approaches to implementing internationalization varied across the two sample groups of UK universities. Whilst nearly all UK universities have an internationalization

strategy, the perceived focus of many institutions remains on initiatives like recruiting international students and not on other internationalization initiatives. In other words, “the financial imperative of recruiting international students is generally a must do, prioritized ahead of nice to do softer issues, such as developing an international culture in the university” (Warwick & Moogan, 2013, p. 117).

Warwick and Moogan’s research also showed that whilst internationalization strategies existed at most universities, the content of these strategies is often not communicated throughout the university and there are significant variations in practice in the degree and understanding of internationalization between departments at the same university. Warwick and Moogan’s research indicates that there are many gaps between the stated intentions of the institutions, as laid out in their internationalization strategies, and the capabilities of the institutions to deliver their strategy. They argue that with the exception of a few institutions, most UK universities “have not developed staff and other resources in line with the increase in international student recruitment, the development of international teaching collaborations and the aspiration to create an international learning environment” (p. 118). Warwick and Moogan’s (2013) study also identifies that most universities have not attempted to internationalize their curriculum and there is only limited interest in the development of international experiences and student mobility.

There are, in addition, a number of strategies that higher education institutions have been using over the last three decades as they map and implement their strategic plans of internationalization. At the institutional level all strategies could, however, be categorized in two main strategies of organizational and program (Chan & Dimmok, 2008; Knight 2004; Knight & de Wit, 1999; Wächter, 2003). The organizational strategies relate to policies and infrastructure and include four main sub-strategies of governance, operations, services and human resources.

Program strategies relate to curriculum and include four main streams of academic programs, research and scholarly collaboration, and extracurricular (Knight & de Wit, 1999; Knight, 2004; deWit, 1995). Program strategies may be differentiated by type, as either internationalizing at-home or internationalizing abroad. Knight (2004) and Sanderson (2008) extend the program strategy in two main streams [sub-strategies] of *internationalization at home* and *cross-border education*. Internationalization at home applies to a 'campus-based activities' that happens within the border of a country. Cross-border education is a cross-border initiative and means internationalization happens abroad and technically supposed to be means of trade in postsecondary education. In other words, campus-based strategies are most often referred to as internationalization at home, and off campus initiatives are called cross-border. Cross-border education has significant implications for campus-based internationalization and vice-versa. Many of the new developments and unintended consequences are, however, associated with the cross-border aspects of internationalization (Knight & de Wit, 1999; Knight, 2004; Knight, 2009; Sanderson, 2008).

According to Maringe (2010) the main strategies to internationalize universities are commonly undertaken in four methods: (1) recruitment of international students, (2) students and staff exchange programs, (3) teaching collaboration and partnerships including joint programs and offshore teaching (4) development of international collaborative partnership for research, and (5) curriculum internationalization, ranging from minor changes in content to fundamental redesign of objectives, teaching methods and assessment with global aspects (Maringe, 2010). According to Beck (2012), strategies such as study abroad, the recruitment of international students, and exchange programs tend to promote fixed ideas of the global as 'going out there' and the local as being 'here,' particularly in relation to culture and the notion of intercultural

literacy (p. 138-9). Nevertheless the crux of the matter is that like rationales no one strategy fits all; they vary from context to context, institution to institution, position to position and are even “different by level: doctorate, master and bachelor” (de Wit, 2011, p. 243) in one single department. As the meaning and rationales of internationalization are evolving, the related initiatives and strategies are developing from branch campuses abroad and distance learning programs to a global reach to international educational hubs and networks (IAU, 2012; Knight, 2004).

In closing, it is worth mentioning that many of today’s universities have continued to produce reliable and relevant internationalization initiatives and strategies. However as Warwick and Moogan (2013) remark, the problem is that universities “remain weak at putting these strategies into action” (p. 118). In its *A Call for Action*, the IAU (2012, pp.3-4) suggests different principles and values which are expected to be embraced by higher education institutions in their design and implementation of internationalization initiatives and strategies. Commitment to promote academic freedom, institutional autonomy, and social responsibility is the first suggestion of IAU. Placement of academic goals such as student learning, the advancement of research, engagement with the community, and addressing global problems at the center of internationalization efforts is another important suggestion. Pursuit of socially responsible practices locally and internationally, such as equity in access and success, and non-discrimination is another important suggestion of the IAU’s ‘A Call for Action’. According to the IAU (2012) as institutions design and develop their initiatives and strategies, they should be clear and transparent about why they are undertaking a particular initiative and strategy, how it relates to their academic mission and values, and what mechanisms can be put in place to avoid possible negative consequences.

Benefits and Potential Challenges

Higher education policy makers in both institutional and governmental levels are increasingly interested in the variety of opportunities and benefits associated with internationalization.

According to the IAU's (2005) findings, 96% of responding higher education institutions from 95 countries in the world¹ believed that internationalization brings various benefits and opportunities to institutions. *The Minister of International Trade* (2012) lists the many benefits of internationalization that have been cited frequently over the years by university leaders.

According to this report, the five main benefits of internationalization are bringing an international dimension into the teaching, research and services; helping current and future generations to become citizens of the world who can contribute to the diplomacy of knowledge; the near-term impact on national and regional economies; immigration, demographic and labor market benefits; and finally economic growth, job creation, and increased exports and investment. The benefits of internationalization, however, may vary from institution to institution and from region to region. According to most critical researchers, the major benefit of internationalization of higher education for most Anglo-American institutions is economic profit (de Wit, 2011; IAU, 2012; Knight, 2007). Contrary to Anglo-American universities, institutions in developing countries, for example, put "less emphasis on revenue generation and more emphasis on the benefits of academic quality, research, and curriculum, which are fundamental elements of any higher education institution" (Knight, 2007, p. 61).

As internationalization fulfils different benefits and opportunities, it may privilege certain groups on and outside of campus more than others. From an idealistic viewpoint internationalization is good 'per se' because it enables students and scholars from different parts

¹ 58 were from developing and 37 from developed countries

of the world, particularly from the developing world, to access to new skills, information and knowledge in the developed world (Stier, 2002, 2006). In addition, internationalization is viewed as a policy that improves an institution's capabilities in relation to teaching and research, intercultural learning and cooperation, and enables a university to benchmark its courses against international norms (Ayoubi & Masoud, 2007; Elkin, Farnsworth & Templer, 2008).

Importantly, if international students, as Charbonneau (2012) remarks, choose to remain in host country after graduation they constitute a desirable source of qualified immigrants who are capable of integrating well into the host country economy.

Although a big gap between developing and developed countries exists in terms of the importance attributed to the benefits and challenges of internationalization, every single institution may face some degree of challenges of this policy (IAU, 2005, 2012; Knight, 2005; Stier, 2002). The IAU's (2005) global survey shows that 70% of responding institutions believe that there are substantial risks associated with internationalization. According to this report the top three risks are the commodification of postsecondary education programs, the increase in the number of foreign degree mills and low-quality providers, and brain drain a problem. According to Knight's (2007) and Maringe's (2013) observations, the loss of cultural and national identity, erosion of the quality of education, the homogenization of curriculum, dominance of western hegemony, commodification of education, and brain drain are the main risks and unintended consequences of internationalization.

Internationalization, in addition, may foster unjust and uneven academic and non-academic benefits globally among institutions and nations. Although internationalization initiatives and programs exist in almost every country, mostly developed countries, especially the large English-speaking nations "reap the main financial benefits and control most programs"

(Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 306). IAU (2012) reports that “uneven global flows of talent will remain an issue of consequence, in the long run, some of its worst impacts can be attenuated as a wider array of nations develop capacity and opportunity at home.” (p. 4). As Altbach and Knight (2007) and IAU (2005) remark, most buying countries are Asian and Latin American middle-income countries and, to a lesser extent, the poorer nations of the developing world that lack capacity to meet growing demand. The largest markets are therefore for ‘demand-absorbing’ programs that provide access to students who could not otherwise attend a postsecondary institution.

According to Green (2013), success in internationalization for many institutions is a bit of a numbers game. It is defined by the numbers of domestic students going abroad, the numbers of international students on campus, the amount of revenue foreign students generate, and also the number of campuses abroad or courses offered with an international focus. Thus, this numbers game, particularly an increase in the quantity of students in a classroom, can progressively lead to a decrease in the quality of teaching, learning and communication on campus. The over-concentration on international students’ tuition fees to generating income is one of the central challenges of internationalization which is constantly “being critiqued for having an economic orientation” (Beck, 2012, p. 133).

A number of other potential risks of internationalization have begun to appear (IAU, 2012). The prevalence of English is one of these adverse consequences as its widespread use may lead to cultural homogenization. Extending global competition in postsecondary education is another challenge that may diminish the diversity of institutional models of what constitutes quality of higher education. In addition, large-scale international student recruitment may result in the mistaken belief about decreased opportunities for local or domestic students or

inadvertently feed prejudice about foreigners. For instance, one of the most widely used indicators for internationalization is the ratio of international students versus domestic students. Taking this as the basis, a recent study has pointed out that leading universities such as Harvard, MIT, Yale or Cambridge have very high scores for this indicator (Horta, 2009). The other challenge is that it appears that the host governments [most of them from developed countries] are encouraging universities to convince foreign graduate students to stay in their new host countries. As IAU (2012) reports, this may foster the process of brain drain and even accelerate it globally. Furthermore, internationalization is providing substantial access in some countries and will be a 'niche market' in others (Altbach & Knight, 2007). However, as "the trends of commodification are seen to threaten the human development, research, and national capacity benefits of internationalization" (Knight, 2007, p. 620), the future of this policy may face more multifaceted challenges.

Policy Research on Internationalization: With a Focus on Values

Despite recent "ever increasing diversity, not only in themes and topics, but also in authors and the regions they come from and write about" (de Wit, 2011, p. 102), internationalization suffers from the lack of adequate robust sources with any particular epistemological and ontological positions and directions (de Wit, 2011; Kehm & Teichler, 2007; Maringe et al., 2013). To put the situation into context, it is important to remark that this status could be observed largely in the national and also local levels in Canadian research and scholarship on internationalization of higher education. One of the main reasons for such a situation appears to be the lack of skilled experts and researchers who professionally engage with the issue as their field of research interest and expertise. According to the IAU (2010) report, only a few studies have made a significant contribution to the theory and literature of internationalization in higher education

over the last two decades. de Wit (2011), however, provides a promising statement. According to his observation, there are emerging young researchers in different parts of the world, especially from Asia, Latin America and Africa and an increase in graduate and other types of professional research on internationalization by young scholars and practitioners around the world.

While there is an increasing number of policy-driven studies, there is, nonetheless, a dearth of literature regarding policy development and policy values associated with internationalization of higher education, particularly in the Canadian context (Altbach & Knight, 2007; de Wit, 2011; Kehm & Teichler, 2007). Policy values topics have been investigated for much of the second half of the past century (Evers, 1988; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010), but research and analysis on the area of internationalization remain clearly ignored. According to de Wit (2001) and Teichler's (2004) observations, and my investigation on the Internet and research databases, there is not much research on the subject of values and internationalization.

Although the issue of 'values' and related topics appears to be the most neglected research issue in the fields of higher education and internationalization (de Wit, 2001; Evers, 1988; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Teichler, 2004), some recent research has been conducted. In their research, Maringe and Fosket (2013) examined current values adopted in higher education settings regarding internationalization agendas. The data gathered from a global survey of internationalization in 200 universities undertaken at the University of Southampton (Maringe et al., 2013), suggest the emergence of three value-driven models of internationalization: commercial-value driven, cultural-value driven and curriculum-value driven. As Table 2.2 summarizes, the findings indicate that 'commercial' values appear to underpin the internationalization processes and activities in most institutions in rich-Northern countries of the West. Cultural values and imperatives are at the heart of the internationalization agenda in

Confucian and Middle East nations; and a curriculum-value driven process appears to support internationalization priorities and strategies of institutions in the poorer universities of the south.

Table 2.2

Value-driven Models of Internationalization

	Commercial-value driven international universities	Cultural-value driven international universities	Curriculum-value driven international universities
Representative world regions	Mainly Anglophone: North America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, UK and Western Europe	Mainly Confucian: China, Eastern Asia, Persian Gulf states, North Africa	Mainly developing nations: Sub-Saharan nations, South America
Dominant views about internationalization	Largely based on recruiting more international students and staff. Developing a visible international presence and identity	Largely based on recruiting more international staff (not so much students). Challenging the orthodoxy of western hegemony	Largely based on an academic rationale. Developing an appropriate international curriculum
Dominant institutional internationalization strategies	Talent identification and recruitment processes. Commercialization of international collaborative research. International student experience and league table strategies	Cultural exchange programs. Language training opportunities and International collaborative research and partnerships	Internationalization of university curricula. International research collaborative
Dominant challenges/ issues associated with internationalization	How to become more commercially efficient organizations in depressed economic environments. How to be more competitive in global markets	How to challenge the dominance of western ideology. How to promote the Confucian ideology more. Achieving greater cultural integration	How to stem talent migration to the west. How to promote more locally driven development. How to promote more equitable and sustainable partnerships and development programs

Note: Adapted from Maringe et al (2013, p.38-41).

While the emergence of above mentioned value-laden policies of internationalization is not a new phenomenon, with reference to the literature and align with Altbach (2002), Brown (2011), Gibbs (2011) and others, Maringe et al (2013) conclude that in the rich western nations, internationalization is increasingly becoming associated with the commodification and

commercialization of higher education with an “equally increasing trend toward aggressive marketing and privatization and preponderance for more direct student financial contribution toward their higher education experience” (p. 33). In this context, as Maringe argues, universities seek to be more commercially and economically efficient and cost-effective.

On the other hand, although financial incentives and income generating programs have become purposes of internationalization in many institutions in the West over the last two decades, commercial-driven values have not been driving internationalization policies and activities of all higher education institutions. In their research, *A Comparative Study of Perceptions of Internationalization Strategies*, Warwick and Moogan (2013) argue that the commercial values and imperatives might not be the dominant discourse of internationalization in all Western countries. According to Warwick and Moogan (2013) and with reference to the related literature, internationalization is not just seen for commercial purposes in many higher education systems in the West such as France, Australia, Scandinavian nations, among others.

In Scandinavian countries, internationalization has, for example, tended to focus on student mobility (Dobson & Holttta 2001; Tossavainen 2009). In France, internationalization of management schools is being driven partly by a desire to obtain international accreditation and also by students who wish to engage in international placements and study in English to improve their employment prospects (Perrin-Halot & Thomas, 2012). In Australia, a focus and efforts to internationalize the curriculum and graduate attributes has driven much of the recent work on internationalization to ensure that students leave university with a global perspective (Crossling, Edwards, & Schroder, 2008; Leask 2007; McNicholl, Burney, & Luff 2008; cited in Warwick & Moogan, 2013). At the end of their analysis, Warwick and Moogan conclude that whilst the focus on international student recruitment is not unique to the UK, the emphasis placed on this

one aspect of internationalization above all others is not something that is shared by other higher education systems.

In their research entitled “Internationalizing Educational Leadership: How a University Department Jumps the Curve From Local to International,” Bogotch and Maslin-Ostrowski (2010) found that the success of an internationalization policy across the three missions of research, teaching, and service in a university department rests not only with individual faculty champions, but also with collective actions. Their study shows that having willing and capable faculty members at departments are necessary to reach the more advanced stages of internationalization. This study also indicates that internationalization to faculty members means making connections in terms of both research agenda and partnership and connection with colleagues and students outside of the institution.

Furthermore, in 2012, IAU launched a call for action entitled *Affirming Academic Values in Internationalization of Higher Education*. Through this IAU aimed to call attention of institutions and policy makers to place academic purposes and values at centre of internationalization policies in order to improve the quality of learning, research, and enrich the postsecondary education experience (Egron-Polak, 2013). However, in recent years, although researchers have focused on “policy-related, academic and institutional research” (Maringe & Woodfield, 2013, p. 1), there are only a few truly robust critical policy research studies on the internationalization of higher education (de Wit, 2011; Enders, 2002; Kehm & Teichler, 2007). In default of some robust critical research and study, internationalization of higher education, in addition, suffers from misunderstanding and misinformation. There are number of different myths and misunderstandings about internationalization. According to Knight (2011) the first myth is that more foreign students on campus will produce more internationalized institutional

culture and curriculum (foreign students as internationalization agents). Myth two rests on a belief that the more international a university is the better its reputation is (international reputation as a proxy for quality). Myth three says the greater number of international agreements or network memberships, a university has the more prestigious and attractive it is (international institutional agreements). Myth four rests on the more international accreditation stars an institution has, the more internationalized it is and ergo the better it is (International accreditation); and myth five saying an international marketing scheme is the equivalent of an internationalization plan.

Canadian Experiences and Studies of Internationalization

In this section, I review the literature on Canadian experiences of internationalization in order to, but provide an overview of internationalization in Canadian higher education institutions. Almost all Canadian postsecondary institutions have identified internationalization as a policy priority (Beck, 2008; Jones, 2009). The Minister of International Trade (2012) reported in 2012 that internationalization in all its facets brings tremendous value to every community in Canada, whether urban or rural, eastern or western, francophone or Anglophone. The report emphasizes that the process of internationalization of Canada's higher education and research institutions through international partnerships and exchange of talent is thus of substantial importance to supporting Canada's science and technology (S & T) and innovation agendas.

Internationalization is viewed a force for change in Canadian postsecondary education and institutions (AUCC, 2007). According to the AUCC's (2009) report, not all universities in Canada are, however, at the same level of internationalization. "Many universities have an international reference in their strategic plan, several have internationalization strategies, but few

have a systematic or comprehensive approach to integrating an international dimension to the learning and teaching that take place on campus” (AUCC, 2009, p. 7).

Among the different components of internationalization, recruitment of international students are vitally important to Canadian institutions. According to the AUCC’s (2002), international students make an enormous contribution to the academic endeavour and bring a crucial global perspective to Canadian postsecondary education; furthermore, over the long term they become ambassadors for Canadian trade and political interests abroad (AUCC, 2002). As reported by the AUCC (2005, 2009), between 1996 and 2006, the number of international students studying in Canada increased from 25,000 to 70,000. In 2010, “international students represented approximately eight percent of full-time undergraduate students in Canada, approximately 18 percent of full-time master’s students and 23 percent of full-time PhD students” (AUCC, 2011, p. 15). Even if some critics believe that Canada is not ready to double international student recruitment (Usher, 2012), *The Minister of International Trade* (2012) recommends doubling the population of “quality international students” coming to Canada within 10 years (from the current number of 239,000 today to 450,000).

The AUCC’s (2007, 2009) survey shows that preparing internationally knowledgeable graduates and providing students with international and intercultural skills is the core rationales of internationalization at Canadian universities. According to this survey, building strategic alliances with institutions abroad, ‘promoting innovation in curriculum and diversity of programs’, ‘ensuring research and scholarship address international and national issues’, and ‘responding to Canada’s labour market needs’ are other main four rationales of internationalization at Canadian higher education institutions, respectively. Despite AUCC’s (2007, 2009) surveys, it is evident that like universities in other countries, socio-economic

rationales and revenue generating play a big role in developing internationalization initiatives in Canadian universities. For example, a recent report from the *Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Trade* shows international students contributed over \$8 billion to Canada's economy in 2010 through tuition, accommodation and discretionary spending. At the same time they created over 81,000 jobs; and generated more than \$445 million in government revenue. Additionally, short term students who pursued language training contributed an estimated \$788 million to the Canadian economy. This report also estimated that \$336 million per year can be attributed to additional tourism related activities, enjoyed by the international students and their family and friends. Out of this amount, about \$180.6 million was tax contribution to the federal government, and \$273.9 million contributed to provincial and territorial government tax revenue.

Table 2.3

Values of international Education Services by Top Ten Countries

Summary Table II Value of International Education Services by Top Ten Countries by Level of Study, 2010

Area/Country	Secondary or less	Trade	University	Other post-secondary	Other	All Long-Term Students
China	\$145,131,000	\$142,471,000	\$1,190,491,000	\$322,774,000	\$35,560,000	\$1,836,427,000
Korea	\$214,820,000	\$259,868,000	\$181,721,000	\$38,973,000	\$12,020,000	\$707,402,000
India	\$4,451,000	\$46,992,000	\$157,018,000	\$351,754,000	\$23,373,000	\$583,588,000
Saudi Arabia	\$14,546,000	\$31,550,000	\$222,160,000	\$82,442,000	\$76,964,000	\$427,662,000
USA	\$19,648,000	\$10,959,000	\$291,024,000	\$33,643,000	\$13,857,000	\$369,131,000
France	\$9,770,000	\$7,970,000	\$276,980,000	\$33,810,000	\$5,009,000	\$333,539,000
Japan	\$28,549,000	\$19,096,000	\$68,526,000	\$21,985,000	\$42,572,000	\$180,728,000
Mexico	\$37,884,000	\$11,624,000	\$46,699,000	\$18,321,000	\$10,852,000	\$125,380,000
Hong Kong	\$24,098,000	\$7,638,000	\$70,726,000	\$18,154,000	\$835,000	\$121,451,000
Taiwan	\$20,082,000	\$9,963,000	\$40,439,000	\$29,646,000	\$1,336,000	\$101,466,000
Top 10 Areas	\$518,979,000	\$548,131,000	\$2,545,784,000	\$951,502,000	\$222,378,000	\$4,786,774,000
All Area/Countries	\$762,889,000	\$672,170,000	\$3,955,558,000	\$1,229,139,000	\$302,013,000	\$6,921,769,000

Source: RKA estimates

The report adds that Canada's international education services for long-term students alone contribute to the equivalent of 1.7% of Canada's total export in goods to the world (Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc., 2012). Tables 2.3 and 2.4 represent the summary of financial and economic benefits of internationalization of higher education in Canada. The tables also provide

evidence showing that international students make a very significant contribution to the Canadian economy.

Table 2.4

Comparison of International Education Services

Summary Table III Comparison of International Education Services with Total Exports in Goods from Canada to the Top Ten International Student Source Countries and to All Countries, 2010

Area/Country	All Long-Term Students	All Exports in Goods	Educational Services as % of All Goods Exports
China	\$1,836,427,000	\$13,232,891,000	13.9%
Korea	\$707,402,000	\$3,709,307,000	19.1%
India	\$583,588,000	\$2,088,683,000	27.9%
Saudi Arabia	\$427,662,000	\$977,758,000	43.7%
USA	\$369,131,000	\$299,068,000,000	0.1%
France	\$333,539,000	\$2,349,565,000	14.2%
Japan	\$180,728,000	\$9,194,118,000	2.0%
Mexico	\$125,380,000	\$5,009,864,000	2.5%
Hong Kong	\$121,451,000	\$1,897,603,000	6.4%
Taiwan	\$101,466,000	\$1,289,112,000	7.9%
Top 10 Areas	\$4,786,774,000	\$338,816,901,000	1.4%
All Areas/Countries	\$6,921,769,000	\$399,434,000,000	1.7%

Source: RKA Estimates based on DFAIT data

Internationalization is a common component of institutional mission statements and a key aspect of their strategic plans in Canadian universities (Jones & Oleksiyenko, 2011). International activities, programs, and initiatives in universities and colleges across Canada have increased dramatically, both in numbers and diversity, over the past decade (Jones & Oleksiyenko, 2011). A majority of postsecondary institutions in Canada agree that internationalization is a high priority for their institutions (AUCC, 2007; Knight, 1997). These activities are sanctioned on the basis that academic rationales and objectives drive them. However, in the absence of more evidence that educational goals of promoting international and intercultural knowledge are being realized, and over-intensified activity in recruitment of international students, these claims are hardly substantiated (Beck, 2012).

Although competition in a global market of higher education has, however, been one of the main characteristics of Canadian universities over the last two decades (Beck, 2012; Jones &

Oleksiyenko, 2011; Knight 2008; Lessard & Brassard, 2009), according to Knight (2008) the components of internationalization in Canadian universities vary from institution to institution. Based on Knight's (2008) survey there are different rationales and initiatives associated with internationalization in Canadian universities. These include, for example, recruiting and supporting international students, the preparation of globally knowledgeable and interculturally competent graduates, marketing and export of education products and services; branding; teaching of foreign languages; exchanges programs; curriculum reform and cross-border delivery of programs; cooperation and partnerships with higher education institutions in different countries particularly developing countries; study abroad and work placement for Canadian students. According to Beck (2008) "internationalization in higher education in Canada is more closely connected to economic and political rationales of globalization than to students' educational concerns" (p. iii).

According to CMEC, the main strategy for Canadian universities should be having an increased share of the international student market and a greater number of international students studying in Canada for the near future. The two other strategies could be more opportunities for Canadian students to study abroad; and a greater number of international students choosing to remain in Canada as permanent residents after graduation. The Minister of International Trade (2012), moreover, proposes 14 recommendations to Canadian universities and institutions for the future prosperity. These recommendations can be categorized into Targets for Success, Policy Coordination and Ensuring sustainable quality, Promotion of Education in Canada, Investments, Infrastructure and support. Nevertheless, in considering the contemporary global forces and their influences on local and national trends in policy making, many scholars and experts have

observed that Canadian postsecondary education has recently been connected to marketization of higher education (Fisher, et al., 2009; Muzzin, 2008; Norrie & Lin, 2009; Rae, 2005).

The final point is that although different surveys (AUCC 2007; Frances, 1993; Knight, 1995, 2000; McKellin, 1998) show the increased attention of Canadian universities to internationalization as a policy mainstream and investment, as Beck (2012) and Jones and Oleksiyenko, (2011) remark, there is not substantial and considerable research in this area in the Canadian context of higher education. Some of the key gaps in this context mainly, according to Bond (2009), relate to a conceptual confusion in the field, the lack of understanding of the perspectives, practices, and experiences of the participants engaged in internationalization and the implications of this on how internationalization is conceptualized and practiced. One of the main contributions of this study is to fill those gaps in the existing literature.

Summary

This chapter started with a general review on the literature and scholarship of internationalization of higher education. Reviewing and discussing the literature about the different viewpoints and definitions of internationalization was the first section of the chapter. I, then, reviewed the existing literature about different related topics of rationales, initiatives, strategies, benefits and challenges of internationalization. The chapter concluded by describing and discussing the state of policy research and studies on internationalization and policy values and also by reviewing the Canadian experiences of internationalization. This study is addressing a few significant gaps in the existing research literature. These are: critical policy research on internationalization, research on values in internationalization policies, research that examines the views and perspectives of faculty and finally, empirical research about internationalization in Canadian higher education institutions.

CHAPTER III: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND APPROACHES

Introduction

This chapter discusses the conceptual framework and theoretical approaches of the study.

Although there is no single theory or clear-cut recipe for policy research (Ball, 1993; Lingard, 2009; Taylor et al. 1997), the intent of this chapter includes discussing and developing the theoretical grounding of the study. This study adopted a critical conceptual framework and approach. Among the two major traditions of policy analysis frameworks, the nature of the research problem and the purpose of the study determined that I choose an analysis '*of*' policy framework rather than analysis '*for*' policy framework.

Furthermore, this study is grounded in an interdisciplinary critical analysis informed by approaches from critical policy analysis, critical discourses analysis and globalization. Drawing upon different perspectives and perceptions of critical scholars and leading figures in the areas of public policy and education such as Ball, Rizvi, Lingard, Ozga, Taylor, Prunty, Giroux, Fairclough, among others, I first briefly review and discuss the main policy analysis framework. Based on the designated framework, critical policy analysis (CPA) and critical discourse analysis (CDA) as the main conceptual approaches of the study are, then, discussed. In the end part of the chapter, 'globalization' is utilized as the theoretical construct/conceptual frame of this study. The intent is to identify different concepts and perspectives of globalization to better understand higher education policy in the era of a dominant neo-liberal agenda (Rizvi & Lingard 2010). I also locate and express some of those conceptual groundings of neoliberal globalization as well as develop the relationship between globalization and internationalization to support my critical approach to the research problem.

Analysis *of-for* Policy

Policy analysis is defined by Pal (2010) as the disciplined application of intellect to policy problems. According to Tayler et al., (1997) policy analysis depends on the site of production of the policy as well as on the nature of the policy in question. Many policy authors have argued about the difficulty of conceptualizing policy analysis due to lack of strong conceptual and theoretical traditions and arguments, particularly in the area of [higher] education. Although most policy studies have been conducted based on ‘system approaches to policy’ (Ozga, 2000), there are other policy research and analysis approaches

Analysis ‘*of-for*’ policy is linked to two different traditions of policy analysis and research frameworks (Gordon et al., 1997; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). The framework of analysis ‘*for*’ policy refers to research conducted for actual policy development, often commissioned by policymakers inside the bureaucracy within which the policy is developed. Analysis ‘*of*’ policy is more of an academic exercise, conducted by academic researchers, seeking to understand why a particular policy was developed at a particular time and the effects, intended or otherwise, of that policy. In other words, analysis ‘*of*’ policy appears to be academically focused, whereas analysis ‘*for*’ policy appears to be practical and requires analysis for the sake of practice - policy development and implementation. There is a close convergence between the frameworks of *analysis ‘of-for’ policy* and Ozga’s (2000) approach of *research ‘for-into’ policy*. Research *for* policy limits research to the existing policy agenda and practice, while research ‘*into*’ policy is an independent critical analysis of the policy-making process. However, Ozga (2002) argues that distinction between research *for* policy and research *into* policy is problematic and most of the time they can be combined.

Analysis 'of' policy is, according to Rizvi and Lingard (2010) used and utilized in three major stages of policy analysis, namely: 'contextual', 'textual' and 'outcomes'. *Contextual* analysis is associated with historical and political origins of policy requiring questions such as where did the policy originate from; why was the policy adopted and why now; who were the players involved in establishing the policy agenda and the policy etc. *Textual* analysis, the second stage, is associated with policy discourse and discursive formation of policy and policy problems dealing with a set of different questions such as what discourses frame the policy text; are these globalized discourses; to which problem is the policy constructed as a solution; how is the policy problem conceptualized; how has the policy text been constructed linguistically; how does the policy work as a text; how has the policy been mediatized; how have any competing interests been sutured together in the text; what is the intertextuality of the policy; who has advanced and promoted the policy and why; how have competing interests been negotiated in relation to the policy agenda, etc. The third stage, *outcomes/implementation* analysis, is associated with strategies and policy outcomes of policy requiring questions such as what are the strategies for implementation; is this a material or symbolic policy; does the policy have unintended consequences; in whose interests does the policy actually work; and what are the social justice effects of the policy etc.

With an overview of different arguments and approaches, the basic concepts of analysis 'of' policy approach seem similar to Taylor et al's (1997) approach and framework of policy analysis including three stages and aspects of 'context', 'texts' and 'consequences' and Ball's (1993) framework of policy as 'text', 'discourse' and 'effects'. All the three concepts of effects (Ball, 1993), consequences (Taylor et al., 1997), and outcomes (Rizvi and Lingard, 2010) imply the same meanings and relevance. The concept context in Rizvi and Lingard's (2010) and

Taylor's (1997) framework entails discourse connotation in Ball's (1993) framework. In Taylor et al's analytical framework, context refers to the influences that lead to the creation of policies and an analysis of the different economic, social and political factors associated with the policy agenda. Related to these factors are "the influences of pressure groups and broader social movements which force governments to respond through the articulation of a policy statement" (Taylor et al. 1997, p. 45). All three frameworks use the concept of text (Ball, 1993; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Taylor, 1997) for the same meaning and the same sense and interpretation. Text as the wording and content of the policy provides direction and detail, and requires the questions of how the policy is articulated, what the aim of policy is; the values contained within the policy?, among others. Text can be comprehended in different ways by different people; but, in addition, "it is crucial to recognize that the policies themselves, the text, are not necessarily clear or closed or complete" (Ball, 1993, p. 2). Consequences/effects/outcomes are looked at as the effect or overall outcome of the policy by the end users. According to Rizvi and Lingard (2010) consequences/effects/outcomes studies mostly deal with policy practice, the context of policy practice, and policy evaluation specially commissioned by governments or state bureaucracies.

It is worth noting that the distinction between analysis '*for*' policy [functional framework] and analysis '*of*' policy [critical framework] refers to two different ways of addressing a policy problem. The nature of the research problem and the purpose of analysis determine what framework of analysis should be employed. Among the two major policy analysis frameworks mentioned above, analysis '*for*' policy and analysis '*of*' policy, the former framework lacks a critical orientation and perspective to policy issues and problems. In looking at the various policy analysis perspectives and arguments, the framework that mostly resonates with this study is the analysis '*of*' policy with mixed version of *textual-contextual* process. It is

preferred because of its centrality of critical deconstruction of the problem as well as its textual and contextual assumptions. All the arguments and discussions in the following conceptual and theoretical approaches particularly ‘critical policy analysis’ and ‘critical discourse analysis’ are, therefore, compatible with the critical conceptual grounds of analysis ‘of’ policy framework.

Critical Policy Analysis (CPA)

For about three decades or more, policy researchers and scholars have argued that policy analysis in education needs to move beyond rational/functional assumptions toward a more alternative and critical approach. The limitations of the traditional rationalist approach to policy analysis made critical policy analysis justified in policy research and studies. The rationalist approach did not, for example, reveal how the inequitable distribution of power and knowledge of stakeholders at an institution are implicated in the policy success or failure (Ball, 1990; Evers, 1988; Ozga, 2002; Prunty, 1985; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Taylor, 1997). There have, therefore, been remarkable changes toward that direction and approach to policy analysis during the last three decades. During this period, critical educational scholarship has attempted to place educational policy and practice within the wider theoretical context of critical theory in general, and critical policy analysis, in particular (Ball, 1990; Olssen *et al.*, 2004; Ozga, 2000). Although the critical approach to educational policy in the beginning emerged as a critique of social reproduction and political inequalities (Levinson, Sutton, & Winstead, 2012; Prunty, 1985), there are now a range of different conceptual directions and perspectives of critical policy analysis.

In the late 1980s, critical policy analysis had an emancipatory undertaking (Prunty, 1985). According to Prunty, in the context of policy determination, a policy analyst needed to search for establishing “procedural policy that would enable the inclusion of oppressed groups” (p. 135). These groups dominantly were the working class, the poor, ethnic and racial minorities,

and women. In this period, critical policy analysts attempted to show how the policy process contravened and “subverted the interests of the oppressed and how this is due, in part, to the ways in which such persons see themselves and others in society” (*Ibid*, p. 136). The concentration of Prunty’s perspective is on the political inequalities and the emphasis on the importance of moral guidance and advocacy in the policy process. Drawing on Prunty’s (1985) point of view, two main characteristics could be taken into account for critical policy analysis; commitment to praxis- the unity of thought and action, theory and practice’, and the personal values and political commitment of the analyst who is anchored in doing policy analysis, specifically when some basic values such as justice, equality and individual freedom are uncompromised. According to the Prunty (1985), a policy analyst must be aware of the different approaches and forms of policies in a given area in order to properly research and assess the appropriateness of the policy. According to Prunty’s perspective, critical policy analysis would strive to expose the sources of domination, repression, and exploitation that are entrenched in, and legitimated by educational policy. A critical policy analyst must, for instance, choose a stance which will best serve those whose ‘voices’ and ‘values’ have been subordinated by the desires of a dominant few.

At the beginning of 1990s, critical policy analysis was, as Ball (1994) argues, mostly identified as an approach in which policy was historically and socially situated and replete with the values of its authors or policy researchers. Ball (1994) advocates an approach which emphasizes finding the appropriate theory and concepts for the task at hand, rather than narrowly applying a particular approach which may close off possibilities for interpretation. Accordingly, the task is to examine the moral order of reform and the relationship of reform to existing patterns of social inequality, bringing to bear those concepts and interpretive devices which offer

the best possibilities of insight and understanding. A critical policy analyst, therefore, should focus on the *task* rather than theoretical purism or conceptual niceties, and bear those concepts and interpretive devices in his or her work which offer the best possibilities of insight and understanding. Furthermore, Ball has used the metaphor of a pragmatic *tool box* to suggest that methodologies should not determine the approach to education policy analysis, but that methodology should be framed in terms of research purpose and researcher *positionality* (Ball, 2008).

In the last two decades, critical policy analysts and researchers have mostly attempted to contribute to understanding of *complexity* and *contextuality* of policy making through a focus on a broader discursive context (Taylor, 1997). Critical policy analysis, according to this perspective, allows policy researchers to address the contextual-historical issues of educational policy and is useful to those who are interested in discursive analyses in various subjects of policy research. In this framework, a policy analyst, according to Taylor (1997) needs to think about the dynamic linkage among three aspects of policy analysis; namely, ‘text’, ‘context’ and ‘consequence’. Referring to this broad conceptualization of policy analysis, as Taylor (1997) argues, policy text is analyzed within its context, specifically its historical one and also in relation to its impact on policy arenas in the broadest sense. Critical policy analysis, according to this approach, has a twofold function [and undertaking]: *reactivity* and *proactivity*. From Taylor *et al.*'s (1997) point of view, critical policy analysis cannot afford to ignore the technical issues of planning, but it must also be political and strategic. Being political and strategic help the analyst to expose the ways in which agendas are set and framed in favour of dominant interests and ideologies, and identify and overcome obstacles to a democratic process.

From the beginning of the new century, the central issue in much critical policy analysis has been to understand, criticize and conceptualize the global orientation of educational policy. According to Rizvi and Lingard (2010), the disposition of critical educational policy analysis in an era of globalization requires *relationality*- in response to new spatial politics- and *interconnectivity* –within and across nations- of policy developments. In order to develop an alternative discourse policy analysis, researchers and practitioners, according to Ozga (2000), should question and challenge the current discourse of policy making and policy implementation in the area of education. If this is achieved, critical policy analysis will contribute to a democratic project in education, and an overarching project to reform the education profession, which would lead to a significant development of engaged, informed professionals.

Critical policy analysis defines policy as the practice of power and governance (Levinson, Sutton, & Winstead, 2012; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). It employs the stance of critical theory in examining how instances of discourse reflect power dynamics in society (Kennedy-Lewis (2014; Wodak & Meyer 2009). Through this, it aims to illuminate the ways in which power operates through policy (Allan et al., 2010). Critical policy analysis also is not value-neutral (Marshall, 1997; Prunty, 1985) and acknowledges policy as a political and value-laden process (Allan et al., 2010). Critical policy analysis is used to elicit ‘truth’ about policy issues (Chesler & Crowfoot, 2000) and provides opportunity for policy researcher and analyst to “speak with authority against misguided, mistaken and unjust education policy” (Ozga, 2000, p. 2) in different local, national and global levels. Critical policy researchers are interested in how something comes to be thought of as being true, right, and correct. Rather than focusing policy analysis on how to create more effective policies, critical policy analysis asks questions such as ‘who benefits?’, ‘Who does not benefit?’, ‘Who loses?’, ‘Whose voices are heard?’, ‘Whose

voices are not heard', 'How do marginalized groups fare as a result of the policy?', among others (Bacchi, 2009; Chase, et al., 2012; Marshall, 1997; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Critical policy analysis, moreover, incorporates elements that aid in the discovery of values and goals critical to the formulation of policy objectives (Weimer, 1998)

Consequently a critical policy analyst must be able to critically envision why a policy is made in a specific period of time and how it is put into practice. In critical policy research, it is significant to know how policy values are directed and organized around a set of policy statements. Critical policy analysis, in this study aims to interrogate and critique in order to properly understand the implied and indirect values of policy text and discourse. Critical policy analysis is chosen as the preferred conceptual approach and the method of analysis because it helps to the kinds of critical questions outlined above that critical policy research attends to.

Critical policy analysis in this study is used to question the perspectives of university administration and faculty, and to critically examine their values about internationalization policies and initiatives. Critical policy analysis in this context in this respect exposes the values underlying policy issues and their proposed solutions (Fischer, 2003). This, according to Fischer (2003) and Yanow (2003), includes an analysis of, for instance, how values and policies are perceived and framed by the various policy actors, and understood and experienced by intended audiences in their daily lives and professions. These include groups of stakeholders, practitioners and clients from different government and private sectors, media, academia, students and parents who seek to influence, for instance, the course of higher education policy.

From Ball's (2008) point of view, a critical policy analyst must take risks and employ his/her imagination, but also be reflexive, and in my term, self-evaluative. Relying on Easton's definition of policy as the 'authoritative allocation of values', and drawing on critical policy

analysis approaches, in this study I see policy as the practice of values. This vision and the centrality of values requires me to consider not only what values are represented, but also to examine whose values are represented and whose voices are missing in internationalization initiatives and related policy statements. In other words, critical policy analysis requires me to interrogate and conceptualize “how some values are glossed over while others are highlighted, re-articulated or sutured together” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; p. 75). It helps to understand how internationalization policies and programs align with the intellectual values and professional needs of the university community. Last but not least, I choose critical policy analysis to analytically question university administration, and to critically debunk their policy assertions and values driving internationalization policies and initiatives.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

The term ‘discourse’ is defined and used in different ways. According to Fairclough (1993, 1995), discourse is manifested in language use or specific spoken/written statements as a form of social practice, which are ways of signifying experiences from a particular perspective. From Ball’s (1990) point of view, discourses are about “what can be said, and thought, but also about who can speak, when, where and with what authority” (p. 2). In accordance with Paechter (2001) a discourse is a way of speaking, thinking, and writing that presents particular relationships. Within a particular discourse everything cannot, however, be imagined; and only certain things can be said, thought, done and achieved. According to Ball (1993) policy texts are set within discursive frameworks which constrain but never determine all the possibilities for action. In other words, a discourse allows only certain voices to be included. This begs some open-ended questions; for example, as Ball (1994) remarks, who are the voices that get to be heard and how do they express themselves in the policy discourse.

A critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach to policy studies has recently been taken up by researchers in the area of higher education (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). CDA is an interdisciplinary approach and methodology in order to examine ideologies and power relations involved in spoken or written text(s) (Fairclough, 1995, Van Dijk, 1995). CDA is not, however, limited to specific structures of text and talk, and is open to various directions and interpretations. It is commonly used in two main containers of ‘approach’ and ‘lens’. As a lens, it provides a methodological perspective to describe, interpret, and critique the ‘social context’ reflected and embodied in written or spoken texts (Luke, 1997, Fairclough, 1995; Wood & Kroger, 2000). As an approach, it provides a conceptual framework for the study of discourses that view texts (written and spoken) as a form of ‘social practice’ and focuses on the ways social and political domination are visible in written text and spoken talk (Fairclough, 1995, 2010; Wood & Kroger, 2000). CDA does not, therefore, confine itself to the lens or method of analysis. It provides both an *analytic lens* and *conceptual approach* to critically and analytically examine and interpret discourse data (text and talk).

According to critical policy experts, since policy language frames problems in certain ways, a critical policy analyst seeks to uncover contradictions in policy statements and rhetoric. In other words, critical policy analysis seeks to identify conflicting ideologies in policy discourses and associated practices (Kennedy-Lewis, 2014; Simons, Olssen, and Peters 2009; Taylor 2004). Critical policy analysis, therefore, builds upon the foundation of critical discourse analysis (Taylor, 2004). The logic of using CDA in this study as a critical policy analysis is to explore how language *works* in policy statements, rhetoric, and talks (Fairclough, 1995; Taylor, 2004). It is to understand how values compete with each other to be represented in the policy statements in the context of higher education. I utilize CDA as both ‘conceptual framework’ and

‘analytic lens’ to reveal the policy actor’s use of policy terms and statements as a means to legitimize current values agendas regarding internationalization. CDA provides a lens to conduct a critical policy analysis of examining the values embedded in policy statements and rhetoric. Critical discourse analysis will help me to understand the dominant discourse that is employed in the policy making and processing system in higher education. In addition, critical discourse analysis will allow me to examine the policy language commonalities and differentiations among participants (administrators and faculty members) in the research site. Drawing on Fairclough (1995, 2010), critical discourse analysis provides me with a critical approach and a lens to understand how values in internationalization policy are constructed through language. It also helps me to understand the dominant discourse of values driving internationalization policies and initiatives.

Among the different perspectives of CDA, there are two approaches that are more employed in the area of education research; ‘Fairclough’s and ‘Foucault’s approaches. Foucault’s approach is associated to the historical and social context of [policy] texts (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Taylor, 2004); Fairclough’s (2003) approach focuses on the linguistic features of policy texts. There is a third approach that is rarely used in education research. It is Habermas’s approach that is an analysis of the different sorts of argumentative discourse in order to describe the normative validity of everyday social norms and practice (Simons, Olssen & Peters, 2009).

The CDA that this study employs is a textually oriented discourse analysis for policy text and primarily adopted from Fairclough’s work. Fairclough’s approach is an interdisciplinary approach to set up a kind of dialogue among disciplines and draws on “theories and techniques from a wide range of disciplines to bring together these different approaches and different levels of analysis” (Taylor, 2004, p. 435). CDA explores how texts construct representations of the

world, social relationships, and social identities, and there is an emphasis on highlighting how such practices and texts are ideologically shaped by relations of power (Fairclough, 1992, 1993, 2001a, 2001b, 2003; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; cited in Taylor, 2004).

Fairclough's point of view (1992, 1995, 2010) is that discourse analysis is analysis of how texts work within socio-cultural practices. By CDA, Fairclough means discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events, texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes. Fairclough (1995) proposes three dimensions of practice for combining the three level of analysis of micro (text), meso (discourse), and macro (socio-cultural) practices in a given policy research. According to Fairclough, in *text practice* (micro level) the analysis is on spoken or written language; in *discourse practice* (meso level) the analysis is on the production, distribution and consumption processes of a given text; and in *socio-cultural practice* (macro level) the analysis is on discursive events in order to understand the broad, societal currents that are affecting the texts. This thesis focuses on all three levels of discourse analysis.

Globalization

Globalization may appear to mean very different things to different people or groups in different contexts and disciplines, but whatever its meaning, there is widespread agreement that it is s, a phenomenon occurring all around us. The concept of globalization is typically used not only to describe a set of empirical events and conditions, but to prescribe desired interpretations of, and responses to economic, social, and cultural changes. One could have very different positions with respect to the processes of globalization, as a 'process' [or set of processes], it affects both policy content and production processes in education, and the ways in which educational institutions

choose and institutionalize values. As a social phenomenon, globalization is shaking every aspect of our public and private lives (Held & McGrew, 1999; Marginson & Rhoades, 2002; Giddens, 1999; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010).

Whether a process or a social phenomenon, there are three broad approaches (and tendencies) of globalization, according to Held and McGrew (2003). Each approach reflects a general set of arguments and views. The *hyperglobalist* thesis is the first approach of globalization. This approach “generally privileges an economic logic and, in its neoliberal variant, celebrates the emergence of a single global market and the principle of global competition as the harbingers of human progress” (Held & McGrew, 2003, p. 3). The second approach is called *skeptical*. The skeptics “rely on a wholly economistic conception of globalization, equating it primarily with a perfectly integrated global market” (p. 5). They are free to conclude that the extent of contemporary ‘globalization’ is wholly exaggerated (Hirst, 1997, cited in Held & McGrew, 2003). The *transformationalist* approach is the third approach of globalization. According to the proponents of this view “globalization is conceived as a powerful transformative force which is responsible for a ‘massive shake-out’ of societies, economies, institutions of governance and world order (Giddens, 1996, cited in Held & McGrew, 2003, p. 7).

Table 3.1

Conceptualizing Globalization: Three Approaches

	Hyperglobalists	Sceptics	Transformationalists
What's new?	A global age	Trading blocs, weaker geogovernance than in earlier periods	Historically unprecedented levels of global interconnectedness
Dominant features	Global capitalism, global governance, global civil society	World less interdependent than in 1890s	'Thick' (intensive and extensive) globalization
Power of national governments	Declining or eroding	Reinforced or enhanced	Reconstituted, restructured
Driving forces of globalization	Capitalism and technology	States and markets	Combined forces of modernity
Pattern of stratification	Erosion of old hierarchies	Increased marginalization of South	New architecture of world order
Dominant motif	McDonalds, Madonna, etc.	National interest	Transformation of political community
Conceptualization of globalization	As a reordering of the framework of human action	As internationalization and regionalization	As the reordering of interregional relations and action at a distance
Historical trajectory	Global civilization	Regional blocs/clash of civilizations	Indeterminate: global integration and fragmentation
Summary argument	The end of the nation-state	Internationalization depends on state acquiescence and support	Globalization transforming state power and world politics

Note: Adapted from Held & McGrew (2003, p.5)

In this study, globalization is seen as a phenomenon that may influence higher education policies like internationalization and bring various advantages and disadvantages. Globalization provides an international dimension to all aspects of our societies, communities, and educational policies (IAU, 2012; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Some argue that it has the positive effect of exposing people to other communities and helping them to define problems by articulating "what should be" (Pal, 2010, p. 110), as well as enabling them to gather support from around the world and not just their immediate communities. It could be a disadvantage because in the context of 'globality' it is exposed to "a constant barrage of crises and problems" (Pal, 2010, p. 109), which makes getting on the public policy agenda, particularly in the area of education, increasingly competitive. Global and cross-cultural awareness might be one of other main advantages of this phenomenon. As Rizvi and Lingard (2010) remark, it has had the phenomenological effect of

enhancing awareness amongst people across the globe of the world as one place, evidenced in, for example, talk of the world economy, world policy, global educational indicators, and global higher education market. Globalization has also increased public awareness of issues worldwide through a post-materialist approach promoting diversity, which includes environmental sustainability, gender aspects, and sexual preferences. Through globalization, people have learned the value of becoming tolerant and accepting of others who are different from themselves.

Globalization has increased the transparency of countries worldwide and countries now need to uphold values consistent with what ideals are respected worldwide. With globalization impacting public awareness and socio-political attitudes, people want their say and ideas about what public policies are formed. In this respect globalization has opened some spaces for citizens and all stakeholders to be engaged and actively participating in what happens locally and globally around public policy spheres. In addition, the development of globalization has impacted the values that policy makers hold within educational settings by now focusing on what is stressed developing an appreciation for a multicultural campus. With the advancement of globalization, the barriers between countries across the world have become more transparent and have allowed for the integration of policy design to local communities from an international level (Pal, 2010). All this represents the tremendous impact of globalization on the cultures and values of societies and people across the world, and also the importance placed upon globalization in order to benefit both local communities as well as global society.

At the same time and under the same conditions, globalization has challenged the socio-cultural and economic-political identities of society over the past two decades. Pal (2010) discusses various forms of globalization and their impact on socio-cultural policies including

cultural globalization. As the world becomes more interconnected it can be seen that globalization can, as Pal (2010) points out, annihilate local cultural traditions in favor of some homogenous global standards that can destabilize cultural norms and understandings and thereby weaken national bonds. He notes that while some argue that globalization is synonymous with sameness, “local cultures have resilience and carve out niches for themselves” (*Ibid*, p. 65). While the idea of the McWorld (Barber, 1995) and cultural globalization (Pal, 2010) are spreading their hegemony into the world of institutions, local identities are losing their sense of community as nation-states are bending under the weight of globalization. From a critical point of view this is somehow threatening to witness how some cultures, traditions, languages and values are day by day losing their identities and functions. There is, however, a question of local versus global identity and while “many people will welcome increased access to global culture, many resist fiercely and even violently” (Pal, 2010, p. 67).

Concerning the question of what higher education is going to look like due to economic globalization, a new global policy paradigm seems to have emerged and the traditional concept of educational policy, in general, and higher education policy, in particular, has been challenged by globalization. According to Beach et al., (2005) globalization has had two major types of impact on postsecondary education. First it has caused increased emphasis on the economic contribution of education relative to its other objectives. The other way in which globalization has impacted postsecondary education is through marketization, and what some refer to as the commodification of education. Within the context of globalization, higher education policy, according to Rizvi and Lingard (2010), currently works in different ways and spaces, and is more about having effects beyond nations. The processes that now frame education policy are often constituted globally and beyond the nation-state, even if they are still articulated in nationally

specific terms. When it comes to current trends of higher education, globalization is, in other words, often taken as a starting point and process beyond the scope of administrators and policy players in control of higher education institutions.

Globalization is affecting education policy values more than anything else. Indeed, “the values underpinning education policy are now often situated within globalized education policy discourses” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 51). While some of the older approaches of research in education policy might still hold, to some extent, at least, the policy values in the area of higher education are often constituted globally and beyond the nation-state’s specific boundaries. In educational settings, values are, in other words, negotiated through a range of political contexts and processes. These “negotiations no longer take place only within the national political context, but also in an emerging transnational space” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 72).

In this global context, the marketization of higher education is, therefore, seen as the primary value and work of higher education institutions (Giroux, 2010; Marginson, 1995; Readings, 1996; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Educational values are now replaced by the principles of the ‘market economy’ and an increasing number of students are now viewed as consumers of higher education. The commercialization and commodification of policy initiatives are the main and dominant discourse of agenda settings and policy making in higher education institutions. In this context, democratic public and academic values traditionally associated to universities are replaced by an absolute ‘market-driven paradigm’ (Giroux, 2010; Marginson, 1995; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). In this context, the major global educational discourses are about the market and knowledge economy.

The significant issue for this study is that globalization shapes many aspects of the philosophy and mission of higher education institutions including values, policies, processes,

teaching, research, and services. In a global survey (Maringe et al., 2013), university senior administrators were asked to indicate the impact of globalization in order to understand how this phenomenon is considered to be impacting societies and institutions across the world. As shown in Table 3.2, it seems that there is a strong global consensus about globalization exerting uneven world development, and high degree of agreement about the impact of globalization on ‘brain-

Table 3.2

Distribution of Views About the Impact of Globalization

Globalisation impact	Anglophone (N. America, Canada, Aus/NZ, EU and UK) (%)	Latin America (Brazil, Argentina, Chile and Mexico) (%)	Confucian (China, Japan, Singapore and Malaysia) (%)	Arabic (Egypt, Kuwait, Pakistan and Turkey) (%)	Sub-Saharan Africa (Zimbabwe, South Africa, Botswana and Mozambique) (%)
Accelerated uneven world development	80	90	80	80	85
Accelerated ‘brain drain’	75	80	65	75	100
Net migration from poorer nations	75	80	80	80	100
Improvement of access to resources	100	60	60	50	50
Raised quality of people’s lives	60	40	30	30	20

Note: Adapted from Maringe et al., 2013, p. 29-30.

drain’ and net migration of students to richer nations. Agreement around whether or not globalization contributes to issues improving access to resources and raising the quality of people’s lives is weaker in Southern African universities. As Maringe et al (2013) write, while “all (100%) senior university staff in Anglophone universities believe that globalization has resulted in widening people’s access to knowledge resources, only 40% believe the same to be true amongst senior staff in universities in sub-Saharan Africa” (p. 26).

Globalization has, on the other hand, continuously challenged the context of interpretations and the imaginations of educational policy researchers and agencies, and affected theory and methodology within ‘critical social science’ (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Although higher education is now very much woven into the market and business world, it helps an educational policy researcher to understand how the processes of globalization reconfigures the education policy terrain, and how he/she might critically conceptualize policy values across global-national-local contexts. The multidimensional character of globalization helps a policy analyst comprehend that educational policy has become more fluid, complex, and multiple (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002). Policy analysis in the higher education terrain requires an understanding of “how multiple, sometimes competing, values are brought together, organized and configured in a policy statement allocated in an authoritative manner” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 74). Higher education policy agenda cannot, therefore, simply be inferred from a particular theoretical or values position.

Globalization and Internationalization

As Altbach (2004) and Knight (2004) remark, internationalization is often confused with globalization and there is still a frequent misunderstanding regarding the relationship between these two phenomena. The common perspective on the distinction and relation between internationalization and globalization positions institutions in a situation in which internationalization is the response to the force of globalization. From Turpin & *et al.*'s (2002) point of view, today's higher education institutions have to respond to globalized challenges by “adopting business principles and strategies, and by aggressively pursuing international markets” (p. 329). This perspective emphasizes that internationalization is not identical to globalization; rather, it is both a product and a contributing factor to globalization. There are, however, a

couple of perspectives and arguments regarding the link and relation between these two topics and processes.

The linkage between these two phenomena is, in a way, seen as a two way road in which internationalization is simultaneously, “a cause, consequence and symptom of globalization” (OECD, 2004, p. 144). Brandenburg and de Wit (2011) argue that both terms act like “two connected universes, making it impossible to draw a distinctive line between them” (p. 16). Internationalization can best be viewed both as an expression of and a response to the general processes of globalization (Knight, 2003; Rizvi, n. d). While the internationalization of higher education has long been connected to foreign-policy aims, study abroad today is articulated as a necessary national response to a new cultural, political and economic threat called globalization (Zemach-Bersin, 2012, p. 91). Although some experts argue that globalization has arguably been the main force behind the acceleration of the processes of internationalization in the higher education sectors (Maringe & Woodfield, 2013), some scholars, however, assert that internationalization, as a key strategic top-down agenda is the legacy of neoliberal globalization and neoconservative ideology, which emphasizes a new academic-colonial and ideological values and processes for higher education institutions (Edwards & Usher, 2000; Jones, 2009; Ninnes & Hellstin, 2005; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010).

Some interpret internationalization as a relatively benign and a positive process in contrast to globalization, and especially the unfettered global competition of institutions (Knight & de Wit, 1995; Weltch, 2002). Edwards and Usher (2000), in contrast, view internationalization less benignly, arguing that “it comprises the spread of western institutions, culture and practices, while globalization is concerned with issues such as hybridity, space and the global-local nexus” (p. 20). In terms of both practice and perceptions, internationalization is closer to the well-

established tradition of international cooperation and mobility and to the core values of quality and excellence, whereas globalization refers more to competition, pushing the concept of higher education as a tradable commodity and challenging the concept of higher education as a public good (Van Vught *et al.*, 2002). Globalization provides the “initial pressure for institutions to internationalize. To use a scientific illustration, globalization provides the potential energy for institutional transformation, while internationalization illustrates the kinetic energy generated by the variety of activities aimed at creating more international/global value within the institution” (Maringe *et al.*, 2013, p. 13). Globalization tends to seek cultural, social, political and technological homogeneity as a model for integration (see, for example, Caruana & Spurling 2007), internationalization seeks to understand the differences and to find ways to exploit these differences for the greater good (Maringe *et al.*, 2013).

Globalization refers to the larger trends occurring with cross-border reverberations including trans-national movement of students, faculty, and programs, and the world interconnectedness via the web (Altbach, 2002). Globalization is, in other words, positioned as part of the environment in which “the international dimension of higher education is becoming more important and significantly changing” (Knight, 2004, p. 8). Globalization is now the most important contextual factor shaping the internationalization of higher education and has also introduced new aims, rationales, values, activities and actors engaged in internationalization. In higher education, globalization has, according to IAU (2012), led to intensified mobility of ideas, students and academic staff and to expanded possibilities for collaboration and global dissemination of knowledge.

Internationalization and globalization are complex phenomena with many strands and the distinction between them, although suggestive, cannot be regarded as categorical because they

overlap, and are intertwined, in all kinds of ways (de Wit, 2011; Scott, 2006; Teichler, 2004). Although globalization is presented as a process impacting internationalization, substantial efforts have been made during the past decade to maintain focus on the internationalization of higher education and to avoid using the term globalization of higher education. This has had mixed outcomes but some success has been achieved in ensuring that the relationship between these two terms is recognized, but that they are not seen to be synonymous and are not used interchangeably (Knight, 2003). In this sense, the relationship between internationalization and globalization could, therefore, be viewed in the Knight's (2008) quote "internationalization is changing the world of higher education, and globalization is changing the world of internationalization" (p.1).

Concluding the above perspectives and arguments, these phenomena are convergent and mutually reinforcing; as globalization is changing the world of internationalization, as a response to globalization, internationalization is increasingly influencing the world of university culture, values, policies and processes. In other words, it is important to point out that globalization and internationalization are not the same phenomena, but are related processes and have what Scott (2000) dubs a 'dialectical relationship.' This study employs the perspective in which internationalization and globalization are seen as different, but related and entangled phenomena, rather than distinct from each other. Internationalization (of higher education), in another sense, seems to be one of the major components of globalization (of higher education). Thus, in the context of globalization, internationalization of higher education can provide some significant opportunities for creating new kinds of academic life and reproducing a new style of experiences within and around academic settings. In such circumstances, it seems that internationalization can be a key site for global opportunities and cross-national-cultural cooperation and exchanges.

Neoliberalism and Higher Education

Neoliberalism is defined as a philosophy and theory of political-economic practices of free markets and set of market-based liberal economic policies which construes profit making as the essence of democracy and consuming as the main [only] operable form of citizenship (Giroux, 2012, Harvey, 2005; Sen, 1999). In Giroux's (2012) point of view, neoliberalism combines free market ideology with the privatization of public wealth, the elimination of the social state and social protections, and the deregulation of economic activity. Neoliberalism as a market-driven approach to economic and social policy welcomes the potential gains and benefits of globalization and emphasizes the efficiency of private enterprise and open markets. The opponents of neoliberalism argue that neo-liberal policies shape the basic conditions of daily life and produce inequality in society by increasing the power of corporations and large business (Moore, 2011; Peck & Tickell, 2002).

The dominant critique of current higher education policy mainly is associated with the neoliberal and neoconservative components (or elements) of globalization (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Its corporate ideology may have an attempt to frame higher education institutions as the scene and source of competence and fund-problem-solving and cooperation possibilities based on client focuses, market logic and accountability. From the neoliberal perspective, the university administration is influenced more by economic and capitalistic rationales and desires. Thus in today's academy and in the face of neoliberalism, the value of post-secondary education has taken on the value of a money. Neoliberalism has redefined educational values in largely economic terms, linked to the concerns of social and market efficiency. According to Rizvi and Lingard (2010) public and educational values have been interpreted through neoliberalism and the neoliberal perspective of education values has privileged processes of acquisition and

production rather than the need to build community and social lives that are characterized by human dignity. This perspective is also associated with “a preference for the minimalist state, concerned to promote the instrumental values of competition” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 31).

Different studies in the area of higher education affirm that today’s higher education institutions are responding to current pressures of neoliberal globalization in transforming into corporation and corporate enterprises (Marginson, 1995; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). In the context of current dominant paradigm of neoliberalism, higher education policy is often considered a form of “diplomatic investment for future political and economic relations” (Knight, 1997, p. 9), which Marginson (1995) refers to as a new version of “marketization of higher education” (p. 17), and Slaughter and Leslie (1997) dub ‘academic capitalism’. In the present situation of neoliberal globalization, higher education, in consequence, appears to be a contradiction. It is going through a process of fundamental change, divide and challenge. In the context of the idea of free marketing and corporate values and culture, higher education increasingly became a privilege rather than a right. References to higher education as a valuable commodity or for-profit business have become all too common (Clark, 1998; Giroux, 2007, Henkel, 1997; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Under the increasing hegemony of corporatization and commodification of public education policy, academy and higher education institutions are, as Giroux (2011) argues, defined not as critical enterprises and intellectuals but as state workers.

Influenced by neoliberal academic globalization, education can be produced anywhere and sold everywhere (Pal, 2010; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). As a result of neoliberal academic globalization, students are used to choice, and institutions try to convince students [as consumers] why they should choose a particular service from their institution. Due to this, institutions attempt to establish their unique value in the post-secondary marketplace. In other

words, the marketization of higher education is a focal component of neoliberal academic globalization. Marketization treats higher education as a consumer commodity with market principles “emphasizing greater choice and the certainty of return on the education consumer’s investment” (Kirby, 2007, p. 12).

Central to an influential and meaningful academic globalization are the increased mobility of students and faculty, exchange of information and knowledge, and partnership and communication among institutions in terms of policy initiatives. In the context of what Giroux (2010) calls ‘free-market fundamentalism’, higher education institutions are, furthermore, striving to respond to the needs of the rapidly globalizing economy by internationalizing the policies and processes of the trinity of teaching, research and services.

In closing, in the context of the hegemony of neoliberalism, economic logic and political pressures are redefining academic missions and values in higher education institutions. Top-notch institutions’ administrations and policy players do not endorse internationalization policy as a means to promote academic values and culture, as a process that celebrates the academic traditions and values that exist among academies and academicians in different contexts. In other words, many contemporary credible institutions follow anything and everything in their strategic plan and programs but academic values and excellence (Axelrod, 2002, 1997; Readings, 1998; Rinne & Koivula, 2005). Drawing on Nixon (2011) argument, institutions now have to be re-imagined as a social, civic and cosmopolitan good that is central to the well-being of civil society and its citizens. I think the time is, then, ripe to critically rethink and challenge the current central values and purposes of internationalization of higher education.

Summary

This chapter started with an introductory discussion on the conceptual frameworks of policy studies. Based on the designated framework i.e. analysis *'of'* policy, it continued with developing discussion on the two conceptual approaches of the study; namely critical policy analysis (CPA) and critical discourse analysis (CDA). Critical policy analysis approaches help to exposes the values underlying policy issues and their proposed solutions. Particularly, critical policy analysis provides a richer understanding of not only what values are represented, but also to examine whose values are represented and whose voices are missing in internationalization initiatives and related policy statements. The chapter ended with a discussion on the conceptual grounding of globalization and neoliberal globalization in the area of higher education, and an analytical review and argument on the relationship between globalization and internationalization of higher education.

CHAPTER IV: METHODOLOGY

Qualitative Research Tradition

In the recent decades, there has been a significant shift and increase in interest in ‘qualitative’ methodology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Creswell 1998; Merriam, 1998) in designing and conducting educational research. Qualitative research is a ‘situated activity’ and “consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 3). The goal of qualitative research is “eliciting understanding and meaning in which the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis” (Merriam, 1998, p. 11). Qualitative research methodology uses “multiple sources of information and data collection to develop a holistic account of the subject under study” (Creswell, 1998, p. 39).

Much recent research conducted with a policy analysis focus has been qualitative (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). According to Denzin and Lincoln (2005), qualitative researchers study things in their real and natural settings and locations, attempting “to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (p. 3). Qualitative research methodology is commonly used in research with critical approaches (Smith, 2006). It is a complex research tradition of inquiry based on exploration, description, analysis and interpretation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Merriam, 1998). Grounded theory, ethnography, phenomenology, and case study are, however, the main methodological strategies for conducting qualitative research in social sciences and education area of studies (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998). Because one of the main intentions of this study is to explore the perceptions of particular group of people in the area of higher education policy, I situate my study within qualitative research.

Case Study Research

As a site of multiple interpretive practices, qualitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Merriam, 1998) is best used to discover themes and relationships at the ‘case’ level (Gall *et al.*, 2003, p. 24). A ‘case’ as an object of study in qualitative research can be defined in a number of ways including as a person, a program, a policy, a group, an organization, an event, a concept, or a project (Merriam, 1998; Borman *et al.*, 2006; Yin, 2006; Stake, 2006). Case studies are a common way to conduct qualitative inquiry (Stake, 2006, p. 443) and are likely to continue to be the most commonly used approach to studying education-society relations (Arnové & Torres, 1999, p. 14). Case study draws attention to the question of what specifically can be learned about a case (Stake, 2005). It is best applied “when research aims to produce a firsthand understanding of a case” (Yin, 2006, p. 112). Case study research enables a researcher to explore the underlying factors and influential mechanisms that regulate the course of events, values and policies in the area of given study.

According to Guba and Lincoln (2005) and Stake (2005), theoretically, much case study is based on a view that social phenomena, human dilemmas and the nature of cases are situational. Case study research commonly concentrates on the influence of social, political, and other diverse contexts. In education research, as Yin (2006) points out, case study is employed when the researcher is interested in understanding complex social phenomena, and when s/he wants to focus on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context. Case study method is technically pertinent when research addresses either a descriptive question - what happened?- or an ‘explanatory’ question - how or why did something happen (Yin, 2006, p. 112). One of the main advantages of the case study method is that the researcher or investigator’s interest is focused on ‘process’ rather than outcomes, and ‘discovery’ rather than ‘confirmation’ (Merriam,

1998; Yin, 2006). The most important benefit of the case study method in policy-oriented research, however, is that it can “directly influence policy, practice, and future research (Merriam, 1998, p. 19). Nevertheless, case study in education research has, according to Merriam (1988) and Yin (2009), two main limitations; it is time-consuming to study one or more cases deeply; and the findings often cannot be generalized beyond the case(s). For this study, I, therefore, employ case study method to collect in-depth data and discussion about internationalization policies and initiatives.

Research Site

This study was conducted at an institutional level by focusing on a research-intensive and public university in Ontario. In order to maintain anonymity and privacy, the real name of institution is not revealed, and *Public University* is replaced. It had (and has) actively adopted and implemented internationalization as a policy and has now been experiencing its third strategic plan on internationalization. This university was chosen as the research site based on its adoption of internationalization as a case of goal-directed policy and a wide range of international policies and programs. Public University is a member of Canada’s G-13 institutions and one of the founding members of the Transborder Research University Network (TRUN.ca) which supports cooperation among research universities in the border region of Canada and United States. For the academic year of 2012-2013, the total student population of Public University was approximately 37 thousands, with about 8.4 percent being full-time international students. In this academic year at the undergraduate level, international students made up nearly 5.7 percent of the undergraduate student body. At the graduate level, Masters and PhDs was nearly 21 percent of the graduate students. The percentage of postdoctoral fellows at the institution in the same academic year from outside Canada was nearly 50 percent.

Faculty participants were recruited from the faculties of Arts and Humanities, Engineering, Science, and Social Science. These four faculties, located in the same research site, were selected among the *most* and *least* internationalized faculties. The criteria were based on international activities and components such as the population of international students and the international research collaborations in each faculty. The ranking of the most to the least internationalized faculty was the: Faculty of Engineering, Faculty of Science, Faculty of Social Science, and lastly, Faculty of Arts and Humanities. The logic of selecting participants from the most to least internationalized faculties was to collect different voices from different places.

Research Site and the Context

Canada is composed of 10 provinces and 3 territories. It does not have a national education policy, a federal department of education or an integrated national system of education. The education system in Canada is provided publicly and has two main divisions of K-12 (primary and secondary education) and postsecondary education. Although education in Canada is generally a provincial responsibility, it is funded by the federal, provincial and local levels. Education in Canada in terms of the structure and curriculum varies from school to school, province to province, and territory to territory. Each jurisdiction (province and territory) has its own department(s) or ministry of education. In addition to the provincial/territorial ministry of education, there are district school boards which administrate educational programs. Public funding for education comes either directly from the provincial or territorial governments or through a mix of provincial transfers and local taxes collected either by the local government or by the boards with taxing powers (CMEC, 2013).

The history of higher education in Canada dates back to the 17th century.¹ Like other institutions in North America [and Europe], Canadian universities had a strong connection to the church and religious orders and institutions. The primary academic trends and emphases of the institutions were liberal arts and pure sciences leading to professional training, - such as law, theology, and religious studies-, with some institutions offering practical training and disciplines like medicine, engineering and agriculture (Robin, 1976; Wilson, 1970). Although certain changes have been made to systems throughout Canada since the inception of the *British North America Act, 1867*, the most crucial developments of Canadian higher education occurred after World War II. The growth in the number of universities and colleges and educational facilities and programs has increased exponentially over the last five decades (Robin, 1976).

Postsecondary education is available in both government-supported and private institutions, which offer various degrees, diplomas, certificates, and attestations depending on the nature of the institution and the length of the program. Canada has 163 recognized public and private universities (including theological schools), and 183 recognized public colleges and institutes, including those granting applied and Bachelor's degrees. In addition to the recognized institutions, there are 68 university-level and 51 college-level institutions operating as authorized institutions, at which only selected programs are approved under provincially established quality assurance programs. Statistics Canada has reported that public expenditure on postsecondary education in 2005–06 was \$30.6 billion (in 2001 constant dollars). In 2004–05, federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal government funding, including funding for research, accounted for 54.2% of the revenue, although this ranged from 38.4% in Nova Scotia to 68.1% in Quebec. Student fees accounted for over 20% of the total. Donations, nongovernmental grants,

¹ Université Laval is the first and oldest higher education institution of Canada –and the 4th oldest in North America- established in 1663.

sales of products and services, and investments brought in another 25%. In 2005, there were 806,000 full-time university students (an increase of nearly 150,000 in the previous four years), as well as 273,000 part-time students. In 2005, Canadian universities awarded an estimated 175,700 bachelor's degrees, 33,000 master's degrees, and 4,200 doctoral degrees. Tuition costs at universities averaged \$4,524 in 2007–08, with international student fees for an undergraduate program averaging about \$14,000 annually. At colleges (in the nine provinces outside Quebec¹), the average tuition was about \$2,400. Education is also funded through the money that government transfers to individual students through loans, grants, and education tax credits (CMEC, 2013).

When it comes to higher education in Canada, Ontario is the flagship province of universities and colleges. The province of Ontario has the largest number of higher education institutions and students- local and international- as well as most highly ranked universities in international comparisons among the Canadian provinces. About 22% of the 96 public universities and 21% of the 127 colleges in Canada are located in Ontario (AUCC, 2012).

If one looks back in time, it was a fact that by the 1960s, the main function of higher education institutions in Ontario like other provinces and institutions in North America was teaching. It was since that decade that the universities' mission gradually transformed from teaching institutions to institutions focusing on teaching/research and then teaching, research and service. The increased focus on research arose from government expectations that research will be a key driver of the province's success in a globally competitive, knowledge based economy. Despite many changes in higher education sector over the five decades, most Ontario universities operate on a bicameral system. This includes a Board of Governors that tends to the administrative responsibilities and represents the public interest, and a Senate which is elected

¹ Quebec residents pay a very lower tuition rate at Quebec universities and colleges.

from within the university community and manages academic policy. Contemporary Ontario universities are, however, recognized commonly as self-governing, non-profit corporations (Jones, Shanahan & Goyan, 2001; MTCU, 2013; Norrie & Lin, 2009; Rae, 2005).

As universities in Ontario are given the freedom to create their own missions and functions statements, they have the legal freedom to set tuition fees at whatever level they wish and most of them raised tuition to the maximum allowable level over the last three decades. According to Boggs' (2009) report, Ontario average tuition fees for full-time undergraduate students have predominantly increased over the last two decades; for example it increased from \$1,785 in 1991/1992 to \$2,579 in 1995/1996 and \$4,492 in 2001/2002, representing an increase of 140% over this period.

Data Sources

Data collection for this research relies on several primary data sources. The first and main source was key-informant individual, one-on-one interviews. Most qualitative research is based on face-to-face interviews (Perakyla, 2006; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Individual interviews with two groups of key-informant participants were employed. The key informant conversations were useful in collecting firsthand information and knowledge from a wide range of participants about the research problems and questions. The semi-structured interviews were conducted in the English language.

In order to select participants who had sufficient and appropriate knowledge and experiences in internationalization policy, I employed 'purposeful sampling' (criterion-based sampling) to select participants who could provide rich information for the case and settings (Patton, 2002). The purposeful selection of participants as the archetypal method (Maxwell, 2005) is one of the main strategies that many researchers choose for case study research (Patton,

2002). Besides ‘purposeful sampling’ and based on my research experience in qualitative research, the study also employed ‘snowball sampling’ (Maxwell, 2005) method in order to take advantage of any useful suggestions some participants had. I accommodated each sub-site context(s) and also interviewee’s situations to start and finish my person-to-person interview. I planned on interviewing 22 participants; but the number increased to 27 as the need to collect more information and knowledge arose. Depending on the circumstances and interviewees’ situation, the length of interviews was flexible. It was between 30 to 60 minutes. In order to organize my final interview plans, assess the validity of the research questions, and make the interview questions most relevant, 6 pilot interviews similar to target interviews were conducted (four with faculty members and two with administrators). The pilot interviews showed that the original research questions were largely appropriate, though some minor changes were made based on pilot results and analysis.




Figure 4.1. Primary data sources

Official policy documents were the second source of data in this study. Documents are used for in-depth understanding of the research issue (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008) and “to augment evidence from other sources” (Yin, 2003, p. 86) to make findings and analysis more convincing

and persuasive. The policy document(s) in this study specifically refers to a four year strategic plan of internationalization (2009-2012) at Public University and each faculty's existing academic plans. The third source for data collection was *published archival materials* on internationalization related to the research site. They included university newspapers, the local and national press, and on-line reports which represented the formal administrators' rhetoric and speeches. These materials specifically included two main magazines based in Public University, as well as some national press such as the *Globe and Mail*.

Demography of Participants

Participants for this study were chosen among 'information-rich people' (Paton, 2002; Yin, 2006). To be selected to participate in this study, they had to have had wide knowledge and experience about internationalization or have been involved university's internationalization programs. The participants were selected from two main groups of (a) *administrators* including senior administrators, high-level policy makers (board of governors and the Senate), department chairs, and executive managers engaging in international programs and offices of the site; and (b) *faculty* including faculty members and international researchers who were engaged and interested in internationalization from the four faculties. Table 4.1 presents the demography of research participants.

In order to maintain the privacy of the participants and their affiliated department, pseudonyms are applied. Of the faculty member participants, there were three females and thirteen males. Seven were full professors, eight held positions as associate professors and one was assistant professor. Of the administrators, there were six females and five males. Four were full professors, three held positions as associate professors and 4 did not hold academic positions.

Table 4.1

Demography of Participants

Faculties	Rank/Position	Pseudonym	Gender
<i>Faculty of Arts and Humanities</i>	Full professor	Dr. Tracy	Male
	Associate professor	Dr. Levinson	Male
	Full professor	Dr. Robinson	Male
	Associate professor	Dr. Hinton	Female
<i>Faculty of Engineering</i>	Associate Professor	Dr. Sameti	Male
	Assistant Professor	Dr. O'Neill	Male
	Associate Professor	Dr. Vig	Male
	Full Professor	Dr. Beardslee	Male
<i>Faculty of Science</i>	Full professor	Dr. Boes	Male
	Associate professor	Dr. Brennon	Male
	Associate professor	Dr. Blatt	Male
	Associate professor	Dr. Barr	Female
<i>Faculty of Social Science</i>	Full professor	Dr. Adams	Male
	Associate professor	Dr. Boles	Female
	Full professor	Dr. Pierce	Male
	Full professor	Dr. Chao	Male
Administrators			
<i>Senior Administrators</i>	Full professor	Dr. Miller	Female
	No Rank	Dr. Smith	Male
	Full professor	Dr. Bryon	Female
<i>Governing Board members</i>	No Rank/Senate	Dr. Dishke	Male
	Full professor/ Board of Governor	Dr. Birdwell	Female
<i>Executive managers</i>	No Rank/Manager	Mrs. Selman	Female
	No Rank/Manager	Mrs. Layton	Female
<i>Deans/department chairs</i>	Department chair/Associate professor	Dr. Tishman	Male
	Department chair/ Associate professor	Dr. Saedi	Male
	Department chair/ Full professor	Dr. Santos	Male
	Associate dean/ Associate professor	Dr. James	Female

Data Analysis

Data analysis is the innovative, complex, time and energy-consuming part of a qualitative research. I define data analysis as a process of converting raw data into possessed information

and finally developing knowledge, insights and reporting. Based on this definition, my data analysis occurred concurrently with data collection and the interviews. I agree with experts such as Beach et al. (2009), Rizvi & Lingard (2010) and Taylor et al. (1997) that what make policy analysis critical are not the methods, tools and technique of analysis, but the framework and approach that is used to design and think through and beyond policy research which was discussed in the previous chapter.

Considering my own positionality, the text-contextual analysis that Rivzi and Lingard (2010) and Taylor et al.'s (1997) framework describe resonated with me and helped me to determine my personal preference with regard to policy analysis. The main analysis technique used in this research was, however, systematic/content analysis: transcribing, coding, categorizing, identifying major themes, conceptualization, and analysis. The collected data was, however, analyzed in two *stages* and through one specific *lens*. The first stage of data analysis was single case analysis (Yin, 2006; Merriam, 1998). Single case analysis sees each site as an exhaustive case of study and analysis. In this study [which reflects the main concerns and questions of research] single case analysis of policy documents and archival materials, the key themes and trends regarding notions, definitions, initiatives/activities, rationales, policy forces, priorities, voices, policy values, policy trends, and dominant procedures embodied in perceptions, attitudes, policy statements of site and the press were uncovered and discussed.

The supplementary stage of data analysis was cross-case analysis. Cross-case analysis applies to the analysis of data from at least two settings (Borman *et al.*, 2006; Yin, 2006). Although this research is a single case study research, cross case comparison was made for finding out possible convergence and divergence of data and findings from participants. It was used to achieve more complete understandings and interpretations of perceptions across the site

amongst administrators and faculty. The following techniques were pursued in applying the cross-case analysis: a) creating word tables of themes derived from transcriptions collected; b) combining the tables of the two groups of participants; c) and summarizing and analyzing the data for purpose of uncovering possible similarities and differences.

By cross analysis I did, however, not endeavor to synthesize and compare the four sub-settings of analysis (four faculties located in the same site) and individuals in the regular meaning of comparison in order to generalize my findings. Rather, understanding the complex configuration of meaning, rationales, policy forces, and values within two different sources of administrators and faculty perceptions is the main purpose in applying cross case analysis. The specific lens of data analysis for the above mentioned stages was critical ‘policy’ analysis.

Methodological and Voice Triangulations

Case study gains credibility by thoroughly triangulating the descriptions and interpretation (Stake, 2005, p. 443). Good case studies benefit from having multiple sources of evidence.

Triangulation is used to indicate that more than two methods or techniques are applied in a study in order to cross-check the consistency and credibility of data and information derived from different sources (Creswell, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). In collecting case study data, as Yin (2006) posits, the main idea is to triangulate or establish converging lines of evidence to make the findings as robust as possible (p. 115).

This study uses two types of triangulation to enhance the credibility and authenticity [and validity] of findings in order to produce richer critical analysis. The first is called *methodological* triangulation (Denzin, 2005). Methodological triangulation in this research involves using more than two methods and sources of information, such as one-on-one interviews (perception), policy document review (documentation), cross [sub-] case study analysis (validation) (Stake; 2006;

Denzin, 2006; Creswell, 1998; Yin, 2006). The second type of triangulation could be called *voice* triangulation. It refers to the all perceptions from two main groups of administrators (senior administrators, board of governors, senate, academic and executive managers) and faculty members.

Ethical Considerations

Education, by its very nature, is aimed at the improvement of individual lives, institutions and societies. I believe that research in [higher] education primarily and largely involve truth and values, on the basis of ‘qualitative’ priorities and ‘moral’ reasoning. Thus, education, in general, and higher education, in particular is, essentially, a value, and schooling is, unavoidably, a moral enterprise. I absolutely agree with Prunty’s (1985) argument that educational policy analysis, as a subcategory of policy analysis itself, “must be conducted from within a moral and ethical stance” (p. 135). What this comment points to is that educational policy analysis like education should be based on moral and ethical grounds; because research in education deals with subject(s) with diverse values which belong to human beings. I basically see schooling as the moral enterprise and higher education as a *value-laden* institution. In a sense, research in higher education is ethical because schooling, and teaching and learning processes are moral actions. Being concerned with ethical issues (Strike, 2006; Patton, 2002) has been one of the most important issues that I have considered in different stages of designing and doing my research, particularly in my personal involvement with participants and person-to-person interviewing. This study also has received human subject approval by Public University’s Institutional Review Board to ensure the protection of the identity of research site and participants. Pseudonyms were, therefore, assigned to university and individuals to ensure that no identifying data and information will be disclosed.

Limitations

A qualitative case study research has a lot of strengths. For example, conducting face-to-face interviews with a wide range of key-informant people, using two *stages* of data analysis and employing two types of triangulation are the strengths of this research for collecting firsthand information and in-depth knowledge. Like any other research methodology case study research is, however, not free from limitation(s), from both theoretical perspective and practical processes. There are a couple of limitations in this case study research. Due to the case study nature, the first and the greatest limitation belongs to the generalizability of information and findings. The findings, analysis and conclusions would, however, be partly applicable and helpful for institutions especially public universities in Ontario and Canada. The second main limitation belongs to the lack of sufficient literature, robust knowledge and scholarship on internationalization of higher education. There were a few useful journals, databases, and resources on this area and even more than half of research and publications are not in English. The lack of a persuasive theoretical framework and conceptual perspectives on the area of policy studies in the field of higher education is another limitation of the study. The last but not least, the limitation belongs to the lack of access to some senior administrators and high-level policy makers such as the President of the site and his/her perception and attitude; even though his/her written perspective was noticed and used in this study.

Summary

This chapter started with an introductory discussion on qualitative and case study research methodology. Discussion was continued by focusing on research site of the study, different sources of data collection, demography of research participants and data analysis techniques. The

chapter ended by focusing on, ethical considerations and research limitations. Next, I turn my attention to describing the key findings of the study.

CHAPTER V: FINDINGS

Introduction

In this chapter, I summarize and discuss the findings of the current study. Using a case study approach, this study examined and analyzed what values drive internationalization and how they influence initiatives and activities. Moreover, the study aimed at developing a better understanding of notions and rationales of internationalization of higher education at a public university in Ontario in Canada. This chapter is organized into various sections, based on the four research questions of the study stated in Chapter I, as follows: “what does internationalization mean for the Public University’s administrators and faculty?”; “Why does Public University engage in internationalization?”; and “Whose policy (agenda) does internationalization of higher education represent?”

In this chapter, in each section, I first summarize what the official policy says, as it exists in policy documents and archival materials which reflect the university administration’s rhetoric. I then summarize and discuss the findings from individual interviews and key-informant perceptions regarding the topic of each section. Consequently, I provide a conclusion and discussion based on different perceptions and reflections of the study participants, namely, administrators and faculty members. This process enhances my understanding of the discrepancy and inconsistency between official policy and participants’ perceptions in order to generate an in-depth discussion and analysis in Chapter VI, which focuses specifically on the issue of values in policy discourse.

Meaning of Internationalization

For over the last three decades, as outlined in the literature review chapter above, the definition of internationalization has been the subject of much related research, strategic policy texts and rhetoric in higher education, and is constantly developing and evolving (Knight, 2008; Powell, 2004). Although the concept has been frequently defined from different perspectives in academia and represented the main topic for various articles and research projects, the term has not reached yet its conceptual limits and there is no universally accepted definition of this phenomenon (Kehm & Teichler, 2007; Marginson & van der Wende, 2009). In this section, the findings regarding the research question “*What does internationalization mean for Public University’s faculty and administration?*” are summarized and discussed. The main intent of this question was to understand how participants perceive what they do or how they engage with internationalization. The questions that were asked can be found in Appendix A.

Official Policy

Internationalization of higher education appears to be a very important policy at Public University. Over much of the last decade, the university’s administration promoted internationalization as a strategic policy in the form of policy texts and practices. The current President who began his term in 2010, has a particular emphasis on internationalization both in speech and practice and initiated the development of a Strategic Plan. In addition, the new President of the University developed a new top-scale managerial position related to internationalization, the vice-provost of internationalization. During this period [2009-2012], the institution has expanded different campus-based initiatives and inaugurated several international research projects.¹

¹ Some examples of internationalization initiatives and activities are discussed in the next section.

For the university and its administration, internationalization has been “less an option than an imperative given the increasing importance of collaborative effort in the research process, and given the context of globalized cultures and economic and political structures” (Public University, 2009, p. 10). According to the university’s Strategic Plan (2009-2012), internationalization of higher education has three main components: 1) research and knowledge exchanges; 2) campus-based curriculum programs; and 3) student mobility. Within this Plan, internationalization has come to mean “[conducting] research and advanced training in collaboration with colleagues and institutions in other countries,” and “teaching in all disciplines, [...] in a global context, in an environment welcoming of students, postdoctoral fellows and trainees from other countries who enrich the learning experience” (Public University, 2009, p. 1).

For Dr. Chatman, the President of the University, internationalization means forming partnerships and having impact on local, national and international stages. In an interview published in the university website, he stated his way of looking at internationalization is forming partnerships, and impact in the broadest possible sense. According to him Public University start locally and gos to the province and make it national, and then international (Chatman, 2009). This definition is a footnote to the university’s past President’s approach to internationalization of higher education. Dr. Dawes, the past President, claimed that internationalization was about establishing partnerships with outstanding universities in key academic and geographic areas (Dawes, 2003).

International students and their impact on campus culture and the country has, in addition, been central to the official policy approach, both in the Strategic Plan and the administration’s public rhetoric with regards to internationalization. According to the Strategic Plan, “international students at the [Public] university culturally enrich the life of [...] the

community, and provide unique opportunities for learning about the world beyond borders” (Public University, 2009, p. 8). In an editorial for the *Globe and Mail* (August 30, 2012), Dr. Chatman, the university’s President, emphasized that international students’ contribution is so ingrained in the university culture, classrooms and economy. According to him, students’ contributions go well beyond their spending power. Because studying and engaging with the best young minds from around the world enriches the lives of Canadian students and increases their comfort with different cultures, something they will increasingly need if they are to excel in the global economy.

Administration’s Perception

According to administrators, internationalization of higher education is, as shown in Table 5.1, typically about ‘opportunity’ and ‘impact’. Dr. Smith, a senior administrator, for instance commented: “to me, internationalization is about connection and impact.” Dr. Saeedi, a department chair in the Faculty of Engineering, commented that “internationalization [initiatives] provide different opportunities to know about other systems of learning and knowledge production and people of the world that have better facilities, better access and better methods and techniques of doing research and instruction.” According to Dr. James, an Associate Dean from the Faculty of Science, internationalization is a big opportunity and advantage that Canadian universities should actively engage in. Dr. Santos, another Department Chair from the Faculty of Social Science believed that internationalization provides opportunity for universities, faculty members and students to have international communication and collaboration.

Administrators, particularly senior administrators, typically had a resource-based definition instead of reflecting their own first-hand and lived experience perception of

Table 5.1

Meaning of Internationalization: Administrators' Perceptions

Position	Internationalization in General	Internationalization at Public University
<i>Senior Administrators</i>	<p>Process by which the activities and operations of the institutions take into account a global and international focus.</p> <p>Struggling with global issues through higher education and research.</p> <p>To provide international opportunity and extending global impact</p>	<p>To make Public University globally aware and internationally relevant.</p> <p>To ensure Public University education and research is put into to the context of international stage with maximum international impact.</p> <p>To develop international agreements and academic collaboration with international institutions.</p>
<i>Governing Board member</i>	<p>A response to international competition and a reduction of barriers for cross-cultural communication.</p> <p>To increase the number of international students and recruiting the best international students at undergraduate and graduate level.</p>	<p>To expand international partnerships with foreign research institutes.</p> <p>To provide more opportunities for Public University students and getting them out into the world in order to get international exposure.</p>
<i>Managers</i>	<p>To look beyond Public University local and national borders and a process where universities bring in more international students.</p> <p>To recruit international researchers and scholars to share their knowledge with faculty, students and staff.</p>	<p>To provide more opportunities on campus and encourage local students and faculty to engage globally.</p> <p>Process of becoming more prominent in global market in order to bring more international students to campus.</p>
<i>Deans/department chairs</i>	<p>Process of applying and transferring academic knowledge and cultural experiences.</p> <p>Collaboration with other institutions around the world; but more cynically it means money.</p> <p>Collective efforts against global challenges and problems.</p> <p>Process of learning different cultures, different people and different languages at home country.</p>	<p>Process of recruiting international students to be trained in the labs and do research for departments.</p> <p>To recruit talented foreign students and bringing top-notch people [faculty and post-docs] on campus to work with local researchers.</p> <p>Process of bringing international perspective into Public University.</p> <p>To encourage people within Public University community to imagine themselves what they could do in relation to the world and other countries.</p>

internationalization. Dr. Miller, a VP of the University, for example, stated: “the definition that we have been working on is one given by Jane Knight, as the most common definition of internationalization. I think, it is the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education. This definition of internationalization seems to be the postscript of the definition that Knight (1999) developed about two decades ago. Even if Knight’s definition is a well-known one among policy makers and some scholars, as Dr. Miller mentioned above, there is not, as the findings of this study show, much concrete evidence that the university administration has fully been pursuing integrating the international dimensions of internationalization into its main purposes, functions, and priorities in practice.

Administrators also saw internationalization as an agenda associated with global citizenship education. Dr. Miller, for example, commented that, “the ultimate goal is creating the community of scholars at the [Public] university that are globally aware, cross culturally sensitive, and have high cross cultural literacy.” Dr. Miller, however, added that “these things have not been focused on so far and we will be doing them in our new strategic plan for internationalization.”

According to a few department chairs, the meaning of internationalization is associated with the current global problems that affect all in the world. They thought that international collaboration with different universities and researchers from different areas of research and knowledge based in different geographical locations is enormously needed. Dr. Saeedi, a Department Chair at the Faculty of Engineering, for example, commented:

So why do we not share our knowledge with each other. Together we can come up with some solutions that benefit everybody. If you need to find better solutions for current global challenges you should engage with researchers internationally. Collectively we can find better solutions for global issues.

Compared to the other three groups of administrators, university managers had a slightly different opinion and view of internationalization. Selman, for example, believed that “internationalization meaning is often used in a much narrower way to justify more recruitment of students from other countries. This is the instrumental logic of developing internationalization policies.” According to Layton, another executive manager, the existing institutional definition and direction of internationalization has to be changed to offer more services to students regarding their learning and cultural experiences. For comparison, Table 5.1 provides a summary of perceptions of internationalization by the four groups of administrators at Public University.

Faculty Perceptions

From the faculty point of view, the story of internationalization differs from what the official policy and administrators express. Internationalization from the perspective of some faculty members is a movement related to industry and business. Dr. Blatt, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Science, for example, commented: “I can say internationalization is an industry today; worldwide everybody’s focus is on it; on increasing partnerships, on increasing collaboration. So because of that I am saying it is an industry and a global trend of business.” To some other faculty members, internationalization represents neocolonial practices of higher education. According to Dr. Levinson, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, it “is a new colonial practice and embodies a colonial tendency.” She commented:

If I would think about what the internationalization [strategic plan] would look like, I might first ask our partners that visit us rather than our colleagues here. I should ask them what do you think of your visit, how do you think your visit is of value to you. Those kind of questions I will be taking into account in the internationalization [plan]. ... I am also concerned about students who come back. There are certain places that students go. They say ‘I go to learn’, and other places that they go, they say ‘I want to help.’ I find that a little bit troubling, something imperial about that for me. Who do you learn from and who do you help.

For some faculty members, internationalization of higher education is not a new idea, and has nothing to do with some innovative initiatives in practice. Dr. Tracy, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, for example, stated: “most departments based in our university have been international longer than before the present administration decided to make up a plan to describe it.” Dr. Boles, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science stated that “in the academic level all the plans miss so much of what we are already teaching our students or doing with our foreign colleagues.” Faculty reflections such as these show that in spite of the Strategic Plan and the university administration rhetoric and assertion, the idea of internationalization is neither new, nor original. Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for instance, commented: “I have been here for thirty seven years; we have always experienced some degree of international dimension in our teaching, [and in] our research in this university.”

In some cases, there was not even a clear understanding of the meaning of internationalization amongst them. Dr. Boes, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Science, for example, commented: “I do not really know what internationalization exactly means in this institution. From the administrative perspective, I only guess that internationalization means to be more visible and valued in the international educational and research communities.” Most of the faculty members supposed that internationalization means nothing more than recruiting more foreign students. Dr. Blatt, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Science, for instance, commented: “for me talking about internationalism is not so much interaction per se; it is more like bringing a lot of students outside of Canada to this country.” Dr. Boles, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science stated: “when we talk about internationalization it practically means recruiting more international students outside of Canada”. According to Dr.

Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, internationalization is “a trendy term [...], a means to attract more foreign students, [...], and financially a big move for more profit.”

A point worth noting is that not every faculty member on campus was interested in being engaged in the existing university internationalization plans and programs. Dr. Hinton, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities was interested in internationalization initiatives “as long as it does have a role when it is connected to academic goals of the university.”

Critical perceptions on existing internationalization initiatives and programs mainly came from the three faculties of Social Science, Arts and Humanities, Science, and also from the Managers’ side. Dr. Pierce, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for example, commented: “I have no interest in being involved in this top-down agenda. If I have foreign students in my classes, I am happy to teach them, but they get no special breaks so the [Public] university can get their money.” For some faculty members there are no tangible influences and important impacts of existing internationalization initiatives and programs on their academic lives and programs. Dr. Robinson, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, for example, commented: “I have no idea if any programs are affecting me or my colleagues’ academic life. I have had international students at the graduate level for long time ago; and I do not do anything differently.”

Internationalization even can happen naturally and often unconsciously every day, according to a few faculty members. Dr. Boes, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Science, for instance, commented: “to me it just happens because it happens; so even if there was not any initiatives from the President through the writing anything -strategic plan- I would probably still be doing same thing in practice.” According to a few participants, internationalization is an

important policy and process, but the issue is that Public University does not enjoy all its potential benefits and advantages. Both faculty members and directors reflected that the university administration would like to promote internationalization, but sometimes they do not know what that exactly entails. Dr. Tracy, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and

Table 5.2

Meaning of Internationalization: Faculty Perceptions

Faculty members	Internationalization in General	Internationalization at Public University
<i>Faculty of Arts and Humanities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process of creating more international and global intellectual climate on campus. - Global academic mobility and learning from others. - The process of marketization of postsecondary education. - Internationalization of campus through bringing more foreign students on campus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To recruit students around the world to get some reputation outside Canada. - To increase visibility abroad in order to attract the best students, the best faculty, and the best post-docs and so forth to Public University. - More partnered agreement and collaboration with other universities. - To sell more certificates to foreign students.
<i>Faculty of Engineering</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The value of internationalization is giving opportunities for students. - To have more students in campus coming from other countries. - The recruitment of international students, international mobility of post-docs and faculty. - It is communication; communication for learning [through] and internationalization of curriculum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To offer learning opportunities for local and foreign students. - To recruit international students, mainly at graduate level, for doing Public University research projects. - To have more students from outside of Canada, specifically in China and other East Asian countries. - To do high level research collaboration with different parts of the world.
<i>Faculty of Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To open universities to citizens from anywhere of the world. - To work either with international colleagues on campus or in overseas institutions. - Marketing higher education; sort of marketing students' recruitment. - Diversity of thinking and recruitment both at the undergrad and graduate levels and also faculty level. - To have free flow of ideas as well as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To build international collaboration chiefly in research level with other institutions outside of Canada. - To recruit and bring the brightest minds from abroad into Public University. - The process of bringing money to campus through recruiting more international undergrad students. - Access to talented students who have specific interest and knowledge

	people in both directions.	matched with faculty's interests and needs in the departments.
<i>Faculty of Social Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recruitment of international students, injecting more money into university, and diversity. - To build relationship with institutions from other parts of the world. - Bringing in more tuition dollars from foreign students to support local programs. - Internationalization of curriculum and knowledge exchange. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Competition to bring resources to Public University. - A push to make university more of commercial and business place than strict educational institution. - Being an internationally recognized university, in terms of branding through business and competition. - Recruitment of top foreign students, international mobility of post-docs and faculty.

Humanities thought that most of the University administrators did not have a clear perception and definition of internationalization. He said “If you ask our [university] administrators what is internationalization, it will take so long to get an answer. When it takes too long to get the answer, it means that nobody is totally clear what the answer really is.” A few faculty members believed that their international work and accomplishments were undervalued. Dr. Brennon, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Science, for example, said: “every time we publish a paper in a journal there is a degree of impact internationally somewhere in the globe; but nobody rewards this kind of accomplishment at the framework of this [existing] internationalization regime.”

According to some faculty members, the direction and programs of internationalization, at its basic level, must be to help people gain more critical perspectives about themselves, their educational lives and their real needs and expectations. According to Dr. Chao, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, because of a lack of critical engagement, the related policy plans and activities are losing their capacity to make sense of the real world of students. He continued by saying: “the [Public] university policy plans on internationalization are public

relations documents that bear little correspondence with reality ‘on the ground’.” A few other faculty members informed me that internationalization means all those good things that university administrators like to talk about, but the problem is that when it comes to actual implementation, often it falls by the wayside. Dr. Hinton, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, for example, commented: “I have not seen any attempt to actually grab the term internationalization. It is already assumed about marketing movement.... I see a huge gap in this sense between university strategic plan and what we try to do in terms of research and education.” Table 5.2 presents a summary of the perceptions of faculty members about the meaning of internationalization at Public University.

Conclusion

According to the official policy and participants’ perceptions, internationalization is an increasingly significant strategy of Public University. The data collected for this section, however, show that internationalization has different meanings that reflect divergent perceptions depending on who defines it and in what position it is used. In terms of the perceptions and attitudes of participants, internationalization of higher education is perceived in two different ways by administrators and faculty members. In terms of the official policy and for senior administrators, there is nothing negative about the internationalization policy. The common terms used by senior administrators regarding the meaning of internationalization varied from ‘access’, ‘impact’, ‘opportunity’ and ‘connection’ to ‘diversity’, ‘mobility’, ‘international awareness’, ‘partnership’, ‘collaboration’, among others. For this group of participants, internationalization is, in addition, a policy in progress and they hope to reach a better one in the near future.

In contrast, the meaning of internationalization for most faculty members is associated with a business-driven approach to higher education. This group of participants, especially those from the faculties of Social Science, Arts and Humanities, and Science believed that making ‘profit’, ‘business’, ‘competition’, ‘marketization’, ‘branding’, ‘industry’, ‘commercialization’, and ‘corporatization’ are the main agenda of internationalization. However, it is necessary to point out that not every single faculty member in this study was against the direction and existing agenda of Public University’s internationalization. For example, according to Dr. Sameti, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Engineering, internationalization “gives opportunity to Canadian students to work with people from other countries; it is enriching! It provides knowledge about other cultures; they learn the ways that other people work.” According to Dr. Chao, a full professor from the Faculty of Social Science, internationalization could be defined in two different ways; objective and subjective. He stated: “From the subjective side it is about diversity and from the objective side it means recruitment of international students and injecting more money into the system.”

There are, however, three points that I believe are worth considering regarding the findings in this section. First, despite different views and definitions, the majority of people from two groups of participants see internationalization as a ‘big deal’, a ‘timely strategy’ and a very significant ‘policy priority’ for Public University. In this sense, there is no discrepancy and gap between what the official policy and administrators say and what faculty members perceive about the significance of internationalization. They all agree that internationalization is a significant university policy, and should be a policy priority.

Second, internationalization, as it is shown in Tables 5.1 and 5.2, in its simplest form, and as a whole, is seen as the recruitment of foreign students, and not in terms of sending more

Canadian students abroad for short or middle-term exchange programs. Under such a situation, internationalization of higher education, to some degree, means bringing ‘others’ and ‘outsiders’ to Public University but not sending ‘insiders’ [the university faculty and students] abroad.

Third, because of an over-concentration on the recruitment of international students, faculty members perceive that not enough attention is paid to other aspects of internationalization at Public University. Particularly, the existing Plan ignores the critical engagement of educational and learning components. In other words, particularly from the perspectives of most faculty members, the existing connotation of internationalization lacks sufficient attention to some other important components such as international collaboration, international partnership, critical thinking and learning, staff and curriculum development, student exchanges and faculty mobility. This finding and conclusion is consistent with Warwick and Moogan’s (2013) finding indicating that most universities have not developed different internationalization activities equally compared to international student recruitment.

Leading Policy Rationales

Institutions internationalize their policies and processes for different reasons. The official policy statements and rhetoric at both national and institutional level are increasingly beginning “to be more explicit about *why* there are efforts to internationalize where before there was more emphasis on *what* needed to be done” (Knight, 2004, p. 19). Policy rationales are motives and reasons which rationalize why a certain policy is preferred and chosen over another alternative(s). While some rationales of internationalization of higher education are common among different universities, each institution may have its own particular rationales (Delgado-Márquez, 2011; Lipsett, 2009; McGowan & Potter, 2008; Van der Wende, 2007). This section focuses on understanding the main rationales for internationalization at Public University. The

summarized findings and discussion in this section are associated with the question “*Why does Public University engage in internationalization?*”

Official Policy

Enhancing, enriching, and making more comprehensive the university involvement in international activities in an increasingly globalized context is one of the main objectives of internationalization (Public University, 2009). According to the university’s Strategic Plan of internationalization, this objective is achieved “through partnership” and “closer interaction with institutions abroad, especially those located beyond the frontiers of North America.” (Public University, 2009, p. 1). Enhancing international relations and research collaboration with overseas institutions is a significant motive for the university. In other words, developing “strong collaborative research initiatives” (Public University, 2009, p.3) in order to benefit the institution and the country appears to be another main rationale of internationalization. Based on the report cited in the Plan of Engaging the Future (2010), Public University has established an International Research Fund for research collaborations with institutions with similar research interests and capacity in countries such as France, India, Mexico, China, the Caribbean and Africa.

Developing international teaching and learning experiences and attracting foreign students of the highest calibre have been the other central rationale of internationalization. According to the Strategic Plan, the university is committed to developing teaching and learning experience in both undergraduate and graduate studies (Public University, 2009, p. 1-4). Educating global citizens, in particular, appears to be another central rationale of internationalization. Through the Plan of Engaging the Future [on internationalization] the university is committed to supporting and giving its students “an education that will prepare

them to live, work and actively contribute within the global economy and society” (Public University, 2009, p. 18). Dr. Millan, a vice-provost, for example, stated that by internationalization, the university wants to educate global-ready citizens (Millan, 2012). Through the Plan, the university has been committed to offering different educational opportunities to local and international students. The university has also been committed to preparing students to participate in educational or career opportunities abroad. Through the International Curriculum Fund program, for example, the university has committed to develop programs with international foci at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Economic motives and incentives have, in addition, been a basic rationale of internationalization, based on the administration rhetoric. According to Dr. Chatman, the university’s President, internationalization, in all its forms, will create economic prosperity for the benefit of Canadians. Furthermore, internationalization will enable institutions to continually build on the knowledge and talent Canada needs to succeed on a global scale (Chatman, 2012). For the President, focusing only on educational and research aspects of internationalization cannot be a proper policy for Public University. According to him, only focusing on education (and teaching), conducting research, and doing some community service are not sufficient for a modern university (Chatman, 2009). The President supposes that the university can be a positive force in ensuring that the economic future of the city in which the university is located within can be as good as it can. According to him, if the city [economically] suffers, sooner or later the institution will suffer. What is interesting about these quotes is that the economic incentive is not for the university, but for the city and for the country in which the university is located. For example, Dr. Chatman who is the President of Public University, avoids talking about the economic benefits of internationalization for the university itself.

Administrators' perceptions

From the administrators' points of view, this study shows that collaboration and partnerships with international partners in global research projects is the main [and foremost] rationale of internationalization. According to Dr. Birdwell, a Governing Board member, the university cannot be competitive at any level "if it does not have meaningful collaboration and engagement beyond local and national borders." Dr. Dishke, a Senate member, supposed that having international research collaboration with top tier institutions of the world would provide great opportunities for Public University. According to him, "universities that draw only from local talent pools may be missing out on opportunities to share knowledge and learn from a broader set of life and cultural experiences." Dr. Smith, another senior administrator, verified Dr. Dishke's perception. He supposed that "the expansion of international partnerships with foreign research institutes and hiring senior university officials with a dedicated internationalization mandate" makes big opportunities for the community. According to Dr. Miller, another senior administrator, Public University needs an international partnership plan that develops more collaboration with the overseas partners and enables the university researchers and students to be connected with them internationally. According to her, research collaboration is an inevitable part of the University's past, current and future component of internationalization. "It is years and maybe decades that this university has been doing international research, and collaborating with the people around the globe on matters that have been important", said Dr. Miller. She added that, "We have been translating our research and mobilizing our knowledge, republishing in international journals through representing our research in conferences; now we have an international technology transfer organization through our world discovery office; so we are taking intellectual property and commercializing it in Asia."

In spite of the administration's rhetoric, especially the President's perspective mentioned above, some administrators supposed that although the higher education market is currently very international and Public University cannot ignore that fact, the economic aspect is not the core rationale of internationalization. According to Dr. Bryon, a senior administrator, the university is not run by international students' tuitions. By way of illustration, she commented "if you think about a big picture it is a seven hundred fifty million dollars a year enterprise, nearly a billion dollars a year to run this university; the fees that we get from international students are not going to change significantly the financial underpinning of the university."

Table 5.3

Examples of Rationales: Administrators' Perceptions

Administrators	Example of Rationales
<i>Senior Administrators</i>	To have an institution globally aware and internationally relevant with cross cultural sensitivity and global citizens. To provide opportunity for international learning and research, both at home and abroad. To teach students to be global citizens in the context of multicultural discourse.
<i>Governing Board members</i>	To extend deep and meaningful research collaboration and engagement beyond local and national borders. To promote Public University reputation internationally. To educate students and make more better citizens for Canada.
<i>Managers</i>	Visibility of Public University's name across the world and trying to get more attention. Providing opportunities for students to engage in global discussions to gain intercultural competencies.
<i>Deans/department chairs</i>	To be globally leader in terms of research and innovation. Recognition throughout the world; and getting national and international reputation. To come up with better understanding of current global challenges and problems in order to find better solutions. To have close communication and research collaboration with universities and scholars internationally.

According to administrators, it is true that international students contribute significantly to the Canadian economy, but in most departments such as Engineering and Science all graduate

students are funded by their departments. Dr. Saeedi, a Department Chair from the Faculty of Engineering thought that making money is not the main motivation for the graduate program. According to him, they have to be recruiting talented people to do their work. He commented “we want top international students in our labs; because our labs need them.” According to Dr. James, an Associate Dean from the Faculty of Science, there is a possibility of the institution trying to make money through international students’ tuition, but there is not any pressure by the university on departments to take more international students in order to increase the university finances. Dr. Santos, a department chair from the Faculty of Social Science observed that: “probably we are making some money from the undergraduate side, but, we got only five percent of our undergraduate population from overseas.” In contrast to the other department chairs, Dr. Tishman, a department chair from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities believed that economic incentives are the central part of internationalization rationales. He commented: “The university recruits more international students because they bring more money to us.” Table 5.3 summarizes the reflections of administrators concerning the rationales of internationalization at Public University.

Faculty Perceptions

From the faculty’ perspective, the story of internationalization rationales seems much different and more complex. Economic and financial incentives appear to be one of, if not the only major rationales of internationalization at Public University. According to faculty members, except for a few from the Faculty of Engineering, generating revenue is the first and foremost rationale of the university adopting internationalization. Faculty supposed that the recruitment of more international students, particularly in the undergraduate level, is a basic policy to bring more financial resources to the institution. The university tends to think of the classrooms as places

that need to be filled with what can be called ‘bums-in-seats’ model. Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for example, stated: “my students are increasingly becoming my customers; and that is what business transaction is; the bums in seats; we put as many bums in seats as possible. According to Dr. Hilton, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, “a push to internationalization logic has been linked to broader set of transformation and change the institution’s culture and commitment.” She continued that “internationalization has been a part of broader agenda to monetizing the university’s research, teaching and intellectual assets.”

Although a few faculty believed that departments do not recruit international students at graduate level for financial motivations, at the undergraduate level, the central objective is making money. Dr. Brennon, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Science, for example, commented: “[the] undergraduate program in our department is like an open market and foreign students are the actual customers. [...] The administration see international students like a rich source of consumers.” For most faculty members, it is obvious that the financial factor is the first and foremost rationale for internationalization, specifically the recruitment of more international undergraduate students. Dr. Blatt, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Science also commented, “from the business point of view, it is tempting to charge fifteen thousand dollars instead of five thousand and get more people who pay the fifteen thousand dollars.” According to Boes, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Science, the central rationale of the university in recruiting more international students at the undergraduate level is that the administration has to find some external resources to inject more money to the system to run the institution. He said:

The provincial funding for Ontario universities is declining; they have been on a decline for 20 years at least. So, in the environment where the provincial share of funding is going down and will continue to go down and where there is not a lot of flexibility to raise tuition for domestic students- because that ultimately is controlled by the provincial

government, and there is a political reason why the administration cannot raise domestic tuition-, the [Public] university is seeking more external non-provincial government founding; so if you talk to the administration, they hope to have more fund raising; so they would be more aggressive for fund raising; and they go after more billionaires and name more facilities as far as they can. So the fund raising is big part of it.

Faculty also believed that building a high profile brand name internationally in order to attract the best people is a significant goal for Public University. From the viewpoint of faculty, visibility and profile status appear to be another major motivation for internationalization. They believed that internationalization provides a rationale for going beyond local vision and regional approach of higher education. For this purpose Public University needs a significant population of international students, and international researchers and faculty who have an international mindset. Dr. Boes, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Science, for example, commented: “the other side which I think is maybe a little hidden agenda, perhaps, of the President, I am not sure, is that we really need to break out of the regional university mindset. And the really big successful universities in the world have done this already.” Dr. Chao, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science commented: “it is important in a sense that the university wants to be widely recognized at the global level. I do not think any institution wants to be exclusively a provincial or regional sort of institution; we need to have a high profile; insofar as it deserves recognition, I like it, internationally.” According to Dr. Pierce, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, rebranding Public University and making its professional image visible outside of Canada is central amongst the internationalization rationales. He commented: “the [Public] university has rebranded to provide a more consistent and professional image to the outside world.”

The fact, however, is that even though some faculty accepted that Public University has to be concerned about its visibility internationally, some of them were, more and less, unhappy about that. Dr. Robinson, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, for example,

commented: “to the extent that internationalization is being done as a form of brand extension, to the extent that it is not being done for scholarly or pedagogical reasons I cannot be part of that.”

According to Dr. Levinson, an Associate Professor from the same faculty, the current imperatives to internationalization at Public University seems to be not necessarily the cosmopolitan international nature of scholarship; instead, it is more about attracting more foreign students. He continued by saying that “the university administration are having to expand the brand internationally to get more international students from Asia and elsewhere.”

For some faculty, socio-political factors and intentions are another rationale of internationalization. Immigration policy and attraction of educated young people is an example of this rationale. According to faculty members, the federal government’s changes to immigration policy now focus more on highly educated and skilled young immigrants, and results in demands for higher specific standards in education. Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, supposed: although at the undergraduate level the [Public] university sees students as a revenue-generating activity, at the graduate level international students are a very good source of brain gain to replace increasing level of brain drain of Canadian talents to the other western countries, particularly the USA.” Dr. O’Neill, an Assistant Professor from the Faculty of Engineering believed that internationalization at the graduate level has a different story. According to him, international graduate students have different contributions for the Canadian academy and Canadian society. Their main contribution to universities is carrying out departments’ research projects. They also meet the Canadian immigration needs. According to Dr. Boes, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Science, internationalization is a way to attract talented people for the future of the country. He said: “internationalization for Canada is a political project in order to bring bright people in as

potential immigrants and residents”. Dr. Robinson, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities also supposed that internationalization is somehow a political agenda. He commented: “my assumption is that both brain drain and brain gain can happen at the same time. What I am now thinking about internationalization is that definitely it has a political slant; I think from the point of view of Canada it is a good thing.” According to Dr. Sameti, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Engineering, recruiting and training graduate students and making them top engineers for the future of Canada is an important rationale for engineering departments.

Research and academic purposes appear to be another important rationale of internationalization at Public University, according to faculty. In the graduate programs, particularly in Engineering and Science departments, international students are recruited to assist faculty to do their research projects. Dr. Vig, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Engineering, believed that international graduate students do not bring extra money to his department but they are a major source of influencing faculty research. He commented “many of our research projects and publications would not have happened if my colleagues and I did not have graduate students accompanying us in our research projects.” Dr. Beardslee, a Full Professor from the same faculty echoed Dr. Vig’s views, by stating that: “International graduate students conduct most of the data collection in our research programs. So, any faculty member in engineering who is successful, he is successful largely because he has a team of graduate students who are working either in his lab or on individual thesis projects that fit in his overall research program.” According to Dr. Barr, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Science, most of his and his colleagues’ publications are co-authored with graduate students and post-doctoral fellows. He commented “they [international students and fellows] are a good source of

trainees and workers that we can use in our research labs, research groups, and courses.” Dr. Sameti, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Engineering believed that his “department recruits international students simply because they have strong academic promise and because of mutual interests.”

Table 5.4

Examples of Rationales: Faculty Perceptions

Faculty Members	Example of Rationales
<i>Faculty of Arts and Humanities</i>	To expand Public University reputation and brand internationally. To increase visibility in order to attract the best people. To bring more money to the institution. International collaboration and relations with overseas institutions.
<i>Faculty of Engineering</i>	To recruit and train graduate students and make them top engineers for the future of Canada. To do research projects internationally. To compete to get the best and most talented students from the world. To be more visible and valued in international educational and research communities.
<i>Faculty of Science</i>	To collaborate with colleagues elsewhere in the world To promote academic quality and diversity on campus and classrooms. To get academic prestige internationally and become a top university in the global ranking and profile. To recruit graduate students to do faculty’s and departments’ projects.
Faculty of Social Science	To recruit more international students in order to bring more money to the university. To Create profile for the institution through recruitment of international students. To enrich experience of faculty to think about different ways of doing what we do. To fulfill some financial and economic objectives.

According to Dr. O’Neill, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Engineering, the university’s President has made and pushed to increase the international student population on campus for research and academic reasons and rationales. He said: “I am sure, and you may be aware, that I do not think our President is pushing that [internationalization] from a money making point of view. I think the President is pushing that because of the academic values added

of having international students here.” At the same time, a few faculty members, however, believed that it would partly be a self-concerned mode of internationalization if some departments hire international students for doing faculty’s research projects. Dr. Boes, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Science summed up this situation by stating that “the selfish mode is that if we can recruit top quality research graduate students or fellows then the research productivity of department goes on. The “selfish mode” that Dr. Boes refers to implies that the university does not accept any responsibility after graduation for international students.” Table 5.4 represents some key points of responses and reactions by the faculty regarding the rationales of internationalization at Public University.

Conclusion

The dominant trend and tendency concerning internationalization in higher education institutions in the developed world is typically toward economic rationales (de Wit, 2011; Knight, 2008; Maringe et al., 2013). The data gathered for this study supports the view that Public University has various motives for internationalizing. The four main rationales are summarized in Figure 5.1, including Economic-financial, Visibility-profile, Socio-political, and Research-academic.

The second point is that based on faculty members the economic and financial resources are the central rationale of internationalization, but although the administrators implicitly accept that the existing discourse of internationalization may engage with economic rationales, essential academic and scholarly rationales are not fully ignored. In other words, the administrators claim that internationalization at Public University is not really about doing business at all. Dr. Miller, a VP, for example, stated: “it would be terrible if we look at internationalization as a business.” She continued by emphasizing that “we are not going to have any international students in for business. That would be terrible thing; that would be biased, prejudiced, and discrimination.”




Figure 5.1. Rationales of internationalization at Public University

The last point is that while most faculty members challenge the commercial and financial rationale of internationalization, particularly concerning the recruitment of international students, administrators do not accept the criticism. According to administrators “the truth is that it is not what it is”, as this quote was brought up by Dr. Smith, a senior administrator. The administrators, for instance, justify the fee differential between domestic and international students through three points. First, Public University receives government funding and money for domestic students, but not for international students. The second reason is that they suppose this situation is not only at Public University but in other institutions in Ontario, Canada, and many parts of the world. In other words, Public University is not the only institution to pursue a market-based internationalization agenda; other universities in and out of Canada have similar motivations.

The third justification is that at the undergraduate level, relative to other top 10 universities in the

country, Public University has a low population of international students and they bring insignificant funds to the system. In other words, the economic benefits do not seem considerable to the university at the moment due to the relatively low undergraduate international student population. Therefore, the administrators claim that having fee differential for international and local students was understandable given that it is a common practice everywhere in Canada and elsewhere. Dr. Bryon, a senior administrator, for example, stated: “if the cost to international students was different only here [Public University], it was not ‘normal practice’ for the institution to charge more money for people who are not local; this is in Europe, in United States, Canada, and even between states and provinces.”

Internationalization Initiatives

In accordance with the official policy, Public University has committed to develop and pursue various internationalization activities, as it is shown in Table 5.5. Based on three components of the Strategic Plan of internationalization i.e. 1) research and collaboration; 2) teaching and learning, and 3) student experience (Public University, 2009, p. 2), the university administration has been devoted to the implementation of different international activities. With regards to the *research and collaboration component*, the university has had some international activities and collaborations with international partners. Through the plan, the university aimed to develop international research collaboration with its partners at the local-regional and international levels. With regards to the *internationalizing teaching and learning (curriculum)*, the main objective of the administration has been offering more opportunities to students to experience more multicultural learning. With regards to *internationalizing the student experience*, Public University has been committed to taking seriously student exchange programs, mainly for local

students. Exchange programs allow students “to study full or part time for university credit while continuing to pay tuition fees” (Public University, 2009, p. 8).

Attracting more international students on campus is a key initiative of internationalization. According to the official policy, the presence of international students on campus not only benefits the university’s faculty, staff, and local students, according to the official policy, but also profits the country’s economy. “The presence of international students on campus culturally enriches the life of the community, and provides unique opportunities for learning about the world beyond university borders” (Public University, 2009, p. 8). The Plan, in addition, insists that “the [Public] University must be seen as an academically attractive and socially welcoming destination for international students considering study outside their home countries” (Public University, 2009, p. 8). According to the individual faculties’ academic plans, the faculty have been committed to be a strong proponent of the value of internationalization of higher education and international students. The main goal of the Academic Plan in the Faculty of Engineering, for example, is to recruit the best students and academics from around the globe and promote more faculty visits by prominent international academics and industry leaders. According to the Academic Plan of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, recruiting more international undergraduate students from different countries is one of two main components of internationalization similarly. Increasing the proportion of international undergraduate students to over 10% is the main objective of the Faculty of Science’s student recruitment agenda.

According to administration rhetoric, Public University is a welcome home to international students. For President Chatman, international students are an opportunity, not a cost (Chatman, 2012). According to him, public is wrong in looking at international students as a drain on the system, or as foreigners taking places in universities and colleges that rightfully

belong to their sons and daughters (Chatman, 2012). In a report commissioned by the government in 2011, titled *International Education, a Key Driver of Canada's Future Prosperity*, the President of the university stated that attracting the best and brightest international students will ensure the world sees Canada as the place to be for top talent, global partnerships and business opportunities (Chatman, 2012).

Table 5.5

The Components and Main Initiatives of Internationalization: Official Policy

Components	Initiatives (Key Examples)
Research and knowledge exchanges	Working with overseas institutions and doing research with international partners outside of Public University and the country. Conducting national/international projects such as University Heads East project, The Wind Engineering, Energy and Environment project, etc. Giving more mobility opportunity to the university and international researchers.
Campus-based curriculum programs	Developing joint undergraduate-graduate degree programs with overseas institutions. International Curriculum Fund. Presence of international faculty and postdoctoral fellows in order to enrich the campus teaching and learning processes and programs.
Student Experience	Recruitment of international students on campus. Extending traditional exchange opportunity and student mobility outside of the North American from 3 months to 2 years. Engaging in international exchange programs and hosting international graduate students. Participation of local students in organized study abroad activities and taking courses at overseas institutions. Offering <i>Go Global Certificate Program</i> which help students in terms of widening their visions of the world.

Based on the President reflection in an editorial written for the *Globe and Mail*, the Public University administration thinks that international students enrich the learning experience for all local and foreign students in campus (Chatman, 2010). According to Dr. Miller, a senior administrator, international students and researchers, as the central component of internationalization, can bring broader perspectives and visions to the institution. She

commented that: “international students’ attitudes and perspectives can challenge the norms that [Public] University as a local institution historically used to them.”

In addition to attracting international students as the first and foremost activity, Public University has, as Table 5.5 represents, conducted and experienced different initiatives and international activities. Different departments may have, furthermore, had their own initiatives and activities. For example, the Department of Civil Engineering has the ‘Civil Engineering with International Program’. Students who take this program have the opportunity to go to work on a development project three months in Africa between the end of the third year and beginning of the fourth year. Another department in the Faculty of Engineering offers global courses and issue certificates for undergraduate students.

Faculty members had, however, rather different perceptions about the policy and procedures of international student recruitment. According to them, the recruitment of international students is more than a simple component of internationalization. Dr. Boles, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for example, stated that “bringing international students to campus not only is the dominant component but also is the only component in some departments.” Some faculty members were not thrilled concerning the over-recruitment of international students and believed that foreign students are recruited for non-academic motives. Dr. Barr, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Science, for instance, commented that the university administration “are not concerned about the top and brilliant foreign students across the world; they are interested in their wealthy backgrounds.” Dr. Robinson, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities did not feel good teaching international students who are on campus only because of their wealthy backgrounds. In other words, as a professor he would rather teach students who are qualified based on the merit of their

skill and educational qualification, not students who can afford to be at Public University because of their well-off backgrounds. By way of illustration, he commented:

I would like to teach the best students who want to come, not just students who can afford to pay tuition fees. Internationalization to the extent that involves bright international students I value; but to the extent that it involves only foreign students from wealthy families who bring money in, I do not value that agenda; because my intellectual position as a professor who must teach is dramatically undermined.

Faculty maintain that marketing and making more financial resources are the main logic behind recruiting more international students. Dr. Boles, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for example, commented: “it is important to the administration to attract more foreign students. More foreign students on campus means that the University has more resources to generate revenue to achieve its objectives.” Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the same faculty had a similar attitude about international students. He warmly welcomes international students as long as they are not regarded as mere revenue generation for the government or Public University budget. Because he believed that viewing international students as a source of budget means transforming postsecondary education into a commodity. He commented: “I welcome undergrad students to Canada and to my classes. But if they are here only as a revenue source to the [Public] university and Ontario Government, that would be unwelcome to me.” Dr. Brennon, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Science supposed that any form of university admission that makes it possible for the rich students to come in but not the poor ones is regrettable and undesirable. He also commented: “I am not against the university budget benefit; and I am strongly with that; but that is not a good funding model to recruit wealthy international students. ... I am against the transformation of postsecondary education into business and training.”

The other finding to consider is that although the official policy and administration support student exchanges as major component of internationalization, in practice, it is not viewed as

being sufficient or satisfying for the faculty. Despite administration rhetoric, the University is not viewed as doing well when it comes to international exchange and mobility programs. According to Layton, an executive manager, only a small percent [less than 3%] of domestic students can use these programs. Dr. Boes, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Science, had the same perception and stated: “most of our local students are from Ontario; I think it is important for them to have some experiences internationally. But this opportunity is not available for most of them right now.” According to Dr. Santos, a department chair from the faculty of Social Science, the students’ exchange program is weak at the department because it is quite low in the university, and in Canada as a whole.” The important point is that even executive managers were not hopeful in providing more opportunity for local students to experience international exchange programs due to the existing political-financial climate. Selman, an executive manager, for example, said: “I am a little less optimistic that those kinds of goals that were set up by the panel will be reached because of financial problems.” According to Layton, another executive manager, the major reason for this problem is the lack of sufficient funding and dedicated resources for the exchange and mobility programs, and not local student’s choice or desire. By way of illustration, she commented:

I spoke with my colleague at the University of Western Australia in which we are setting up an exchange agreement; he told me that every single one of their students that goes abroad gets study scholarship of 5 to 6 thousand dollars; every single one; it is like a four million dollars cost to that; but our commitment is two hundred thousand dollars to fund to our domestic students.

Conclusion

I end this section on internationalization initiatives and activities with several points and conclusions. According to the data gathered for this study, there are some gaps between what the official policy says and what actually happens in the name of internationalization at Public University. According to the Strategic and Academic Plans, there have been different initiatives

that the university was committed to pursue, but the main focus of the administration has mostly been on one component. In other words, while international research collaboration and partnership, knowledge exchange, international teaching and learning programs, and extending students exchange and experience have been among the major official components of internationalization, recruiting more international students has been viewed (by faculty and managers) as the first and foremost activity and priority. In place of such a situation, faculty members wanted to see internationalization meaning more than merely recruiting students from foreign countries.

The other point is that according to both the official policy and participants' perceptions, international students enrich the community and campus. The issue, nevertheless, is that the existing policies and procedures of internationalization typically privilege foreign students from wealthy families, according to the faculty. In addition, according to faculty one of the serious negative issues that over-recruitment of wealthy international students may cause is the fear among residents of Ontario students and parents about their possible displacement by international students. This issue was rejected outright by senior administrators. Dr. Bryon, a senior administrator, for example, commented "there is not any displacement or replacement of our local students by international students; maybe some other kind of government policies can displace Canadian citizens and students; like immigrant policies; immigrant people whose children potentially may displace Canadian students."

The third point is related to the sense that there is insufficient faculty mobility at Public University. In other words, most departments suffer from a lack of enough visiting faculty and well-recognized international researchers on campus. Some faculty members were somewhat disappointed when they did not see any well-known international faculty in their departments for

short or long term periods. Dr. Pierce, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for example, said: “we do not have a large number of outsiders [international faculty] to come in. We do not have many distinguished people around the world who are taking their sabbatical in our university.” Dr. Beardslee, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Engineering, in spite of having good facilities, claimed that they do not have any reputable and prominent visiting researchers and scholars in their department. He commented: “I would make sure we have money and facilities to bring in well-known faculty from international institutions but we do not have enough of those people on our campus and in our labs and projects.” In the meantime, even though faculty members are well aware of the university plight and difficulties in building and maintaining appropriate facilities and securing financial resources to get distinguished researchers and faculty on campus, they see it as a necessity. Dr. Blatt, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Science, for example, noted that “bringing visiting and international faculty maybe is not the official goal of the [Public] university’s international priority but I hope that they have it in their agenda soon.” Consequently, the issue of faculty mobility was not only a matter of great importance to all participants, but also should be one of the main goals of the faculties’ Academic Plans. According to the different Faculties’ Plans, promoting more faculty visits by prominent international academics and industry leaders is a very important objective. Therefore, increasing faculty mobility programs, particularly through hiring well-organized people from international institutions and people who have international backgrounds is a matter of great interest.

The fourth point is that although a few faculties such as the School of Business have already started having overseas branches outside of the campus, specifically in China and India, it is neither highly recommended in the Strategic Plan nor mentioned by administration.

According to the University's official reports, Canadian universities' share of international branch campuses is less than 2% (Alphonso, 2012). The final point is that Public University has not been engaged in virtual transnational internationalization, like MOOCs or any other types of widespread online cross-border curricular initiatives

Whose Agenda?

Universities in Ontario have a unique blend of hierarchical and democratic decision-making structures. They are supposed to be run by 'governing boards' and 'academic administrators.' In the absence of reliable and robust critical research and comprehensive national-provincial surveys (Jones & Oleksiyenko, 2011), the question of who and what forces are truly the key driver(s) of internationalization is still unanswered and remains to be examined critically. In this section, I summarize and conceptualize the findings of the study in relation to the third research question: "Whose policy (agenda) does internationalization of higher education represent at Public University?" The findings are illuminated through individual interviews, documents and materials reviews. The focus is on three key policy forces of internationalization, the most and least benefited and privileged groups, and represented and marginalized voices. In this section, I discuss the process of policy development of internationalization mainly based on perceptions and reflections of faculty and administrators at Public University. The main intent of developing this discussion is to understand what forces drive internationalization. It focuses on the critical policy question of who leads internationalization, and how and by whom the policies and initiatives are created or developed at the University. The discussion concludes by addressing how the academic community, as the main implementer and stakeholder, have and have not been involved in developing the related plan(s) and program(s).

Administrators Perceptions

According to administrators, industry has a big role in internationalization policies and processes. Dr. Smith, a senior administrator, for example, believed that internationalization provides a connection between the business sector [especially big companies] and the institution. He stated: “the big connection for me is with industry; all industries are now international global companies; right, no matter if you are small company here in Ontario or you are a big one like General Motors, IBM, they are opportunity for us.” According to Dr. Dishke, a Senate member, the international market is forceful and the administration has to listen to what is happening in that market. He also added that: “the university is listening and adapting to the realities of the international market.” According to Dr. Smith, internationalization might be interpreted as a means of connecting the university to the business sector to fulfill different corporate objectives. Dr. Smith supposed that a big part of internationalization is about cooperation with industry. By way of illustration, he commented:

Companies act internationally now. So when they come to us and ask us to do industry research, whatever, that is a global issue for the companies. So our research on battery technology that informs General Motors (GM) has a global international connection, whatever; GM makes that decision from a corporation, headquarters based on the US or their Chinese branch or whatever, you know, if you do \$240 million on the campus with corporate powers and industry, that makes sense for everybody involved, right.

For some administrators, although internationalization is strictly an institutional responsibility, provincial and the federal governments have both a visible and invisible hand in its agenda. According to Dr. Dishke, a Senate member, a big part of policies regarding internationalization, particularly at its middle stage is directly or indirectly the policy of federal and provincial governments. He added: “policies like tuition are not totally a decision at the institution level. It is the Ontario Government’s decision in terms of their funding of educational institutions.” Dr. Dishke’s perspective was echoed by Layton, an executive manager. According to her, “internationalization is much more than our President or vice provost’s priority. ... It is

like our government's agenda, for sure." In other words, the driver behind internationalization was not the President or even the university, but the provincial and federal governments. For some administrators, the whole education system is centrally run and poorly resourced, even if higher education institutions are supposedly decentralized and independent in Ontario. Dr. Birdwell, a Governing Board member, for instance, said: "when I look at the way Canadian higher education is supported by governments, I see the whole education system of this country is completely wrongly resourced."

According to some administrators, especially department chairs, internationalization is also a part of the portfolio of the Dean's office in each Faculty. Although they believed that departments at the University have no substantial power in developing the internationalization agenda, in terms of implementation, they are in the front line. Dr. Saeedi, a department chair from the Faculty of Engineering, for example, commented: "in our Faculty, internationalization is in the portfolio of the Dean's office. It could be any plans and programs that may be developed and implemented to increase international programs." Dr. James, an Associate Dean from the Faculty of Science believed that although internationalization is an administrative priority, and specifically the President's policy, at the lower level, the responsibility is with the Dean's office and the departments. She commented:

My impression is that internationalization is the priority of the [Public] University and also President; but the Dean's office and departments are the next level that some decisions and relevant programs are made. In my experience, departments are not at the forefront of developing or in the position of responding to that kind of policy.

Faculty Perceptions

The story from the Faculty's side differs greatly and most considered corporatization the main driver of internationalization at PU. Some faculty supposed that 'corporatization' plays a big role and impact on internationalization policies and directions and consequently, corporations, benefit

the most. Dr. Brennon, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Science stated: “you know, our university for many reasons is becoming more corporate; and the administration is having to sell itself to find source of money and see the institution as a factory to import material of students.” Dr. Boles, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, commented: “we live in a world where increasingly everything is being made subservient to [the] economy; that will always privilege the people who have, as opposed to people who have not; and so I think that unfortunately the only one who benefits is the corporation.” According to Dr. Hinton, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, the university is becoming a less welcoming place to anybody who does not agree with proficiency, market driven productivity procedures, and corporatization of research and thought. She commented: “so, you know what happens when you are not part of the corporatization process and efficiency game like, for example, the English department, you worry for your long term survival; you do that because you have to be part of the regime.” Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science criticized the administration because of the corporate entity of the university in trying to maximize the returns of investments. He said: “the language of internationalization is the economic language, and the language of corporatization; this is the logic of capital; it will go where it can get the best returns, and if it is in China, India, let’s do it!”

Faculty also thought that internationalization is the policy and priority of federal and then provincial governments. Dr. Pierce, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for example, commented: “I think the agenda [of internationalization] is about protecting the interests of the Canadian government, and Canadian companies on the world stage.” Dr. Tracy, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, believed that: “this institution, like others in Canada and the Canadian context, is so dependent upon the government dollars

coming in. So I think the key player is government. So to some degree, internationalization is performance for government dollars and government money.” According to Blatt, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Science, nobody in the community takes the internationalization plans seriously because it is not the University’s plan. He commented: “I do not take the strategic plan seriously; because all decisions on that plan depend on the provincial government.”

At the same time, some faculty considered internationalization to be a top-down agenda and specifically to be the university President’s policy. Dr. Boes, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Science, for example, commented: “internationalization, my impression of it, is a top-down policy that is driven by our President’s interests and beliefs that internationalization is the benefit to [Public] University, to the community and to everybody on the campus.” According to a few faculty members, the existing internationalization policy is non-democratic. An Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for example, noted that the internationalization “is a non-democratic process and a very interesting paradox; because its policies, its programs are made centrally but ultimately they get implemented by individuals who do not feel they belong to the priorities; it appears very conflicted to me.”

Unlike the perceptions of most faculty members, a few, however, believed that the university’s President has a leadership role and he could have his own vision of policy and priority. Dr. Vig, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Engineering, for instance, said: “it is his [President] right to prioritize policies. If we want to make this University a globally recognized institution, we should follow our internationalization programs. Internationalization directions and vision should basically come from [the] leader’s and leadership’s point of view. And then it goes to faculties for implementation.” Dr. Boes, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Science believed that although internationalization is the policy of the President, they care about

it and look at it as the University's policy and priority as a whole. By the way of illustration, he commented:

I know it is a top-down agenda, but we care about internationalization because we care about what we do and if we care about higher education, the quality of education and the values that the motto of the university represents and the combination of those values; we care about the past, we care about the future; and because we care about ourselves and our intellectual identity.

Conclusion

The data gathered for this section supports the view that even if internationalization policies and initiatives are driven at the institutional level and by the university administration, there are also other forces that play a role. The governance of internationalization at Public University is, in other words, influenced by different forces. Based on data and the discussion above, three key forces appear to influence internationalization policies at three different levels. At the *macro* level (global/international), as it is shown in Figure 5.2, the international regime and corporate world play a huge role in Public University's internationalization agenda. In other words, industry, corporate, and international actors with international norms and decision-making procedures along with particular business ethics and laws appears to be the first force that is driving internationalization. At the *meso* level (national/provincial), internationalization at Public University appears to be driven by various levels of governments. According to some participants, internationalization is the policy and priority of federal and then provincial governments. At the *micro* level (institutional/local), internationalization is an administration's agenda, and particularly the President's priority. None of the participants believed that individual faculties, faculty members or students were key drivers in the internationalization policies at the university.




Figure 5.2. Hierarchy of internationalization drivers

There is, however, an important point that needs to be clarified. The policy of internationalization at Public University, like many other higher education institutions is shaped by different local and international forces. They include institutional leaders and policy players, local politics, national resources, political culture and governance/public management, and corporate and economic globalization. But what is more important is that at the heart of policy making and policy processes are all stakeholders' involvement and public engagement (Berliner, 1990; Howlett & Ramesh, 2003; McLaughlin, 1987; Pal, 2010). As is shown above, Figure 5.2, according to the most faculty, the main stakeholders of the university, namely, the community of academics and students, have little power in internationalization agenda setting. From the critical policy analysis stance, this approach is more compatible with a rationalist approach of policy making which lacks equitable distribution of power and knowledge of stakeholders in agenda setting and policy making (Prunty, 1985; Evers, 1988; Ball, 1990; Ozga, 2002; Taylor, 1997; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). If so, the key point and question to ask would be how

internationalization initiatives can be implemented by people who have no power or say in the development of the policy.

As McLaughlin (1987) argues, it is obvious that policy success falls on the will of the people and it relies on how the individuals interpret the policy as well as their values toward the end objective(s). From this perspective, a quote by Dr. Boles, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science was illuminating. According to him, “As I am interpreting your question in my way, there are so many ways that I could interpret the policy that I have not been taken seriously to develop.” The questions of who develops the policy, who interprets it, and who implements it are very important questions in terms of agenda setting and policy development. It is evident that stakeholders and campus citizens can provide a unique and strong vision into the use and the overall effectiveness of the policy through their- first hand perspective. The implementation of the internationalization policy, like any other policies at the University needs the support of all members of the university and contribution of direct and indirect stakeholders. It is no wonder that a large percentage of faculty members and individuals do not share fully their ideas and abilities in the implementation of policy initiatives if they think that the administration is not going to pay attention to their priorities and interests. If internationalization initiatives and international activities of the university are not fully aligned with professional and intellectual motivations of faculty members or students’ needs, preferences and choices, the official policy would be problematic, and would not be accepted and successfully implemented. Whilst studies show that faculty members and instructors have a serious role and impact on internationalizing campus, curriculum and classroom (Bond, et al., 2003). Therefore, if faculty and students and other concerned individuals are going to take an important role on implementation of internationalization initiatives and programs, they must be

motivated by the administration, and the goals of the policy, and involved in the policy making process.

Whose Voices?

Critical policy analysis predominantly defines policy as the practice of power. From this point of view, policy statements and practices are shaped by relations of power and the ability to change others, their behaviors, interests, and voices (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Levinson, Sutton, & Winstead, 2012; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Fairclough, 2001; Taylor, 2004). On the other hand, Easton's (1953) well-known definition of policy as *the authoritative allocation of values* essentially addresses the issue of the legitimate ability of some to influence others' values. In this sense, *who* has the power to make decisions and whose voices are heard are important concerns in critical policy analysis. This section, therefore, focuses on the subject of who has the power for her/his voice to be heard and whose voices are missing in the internationalization policy processes and procedures. The findings are summarized and developed primarily based on perspectives of faculty and administrators.

Administrators' Perceptions

According to senior administrators, the voices of all groups in the university community are heard. Dr. James, an Associate Dean, for example, stated: "I do not see that voices are missing. We ask faculty, undergraduate and graduate students to participate in planning. We always have graduate students and undergraduate students as representatives." Participants from the administrators' side believed that faculty members' voices are actually heard significantly. Dr. Birdwell, a Governing Board member, for example, said: "our faculty is quite powerful and their priorities are dominant across the institution; so I think their voices are heard." Dr. Dishke, a Senate member, supposed that almost all faculty know that there is a new position of the VP of

internationalization who is ready to hear voices of faculty and students. He believed that some faculty members choose to be silent rather than to be involved in plans and initiatives. He commented: “the voices that are not heard are the voices that are not saying anything anyway. But maybe research like your study identifies opportunities that silent individuals have overlooked and they will become more involved and the program will move in a direction that would reflect their interests more.” Dr. Miller, a senior administrator, for example, commented that: “it is a pity if voices of all groups of the community are not heard well. We are here to hear all the voices.”

Some senior administrators and Governing Board members complained about the lack of engagement and commitment of faculty to internationalization initiatives. They thought that faculty engagement in different university policies and programs of internationalization was not satisfactory, and they need to engage more appropriately and effectively. According to Dr. Dishke, a Senate member, faculty should identify the most promising avenues for internationalization. He believed that “the University policy should complement and facilitate this process and its outcomes. Faculty members should continue to have meaningful engagement in university governance processes.” Senior administrators believed that if some faculty are not heard, it is because they are so selfish, always complain about everything, and view university policies in an insular way. By way of illustration, Dr. Smith, a senior administrator, commented:

I think sometimes professors are not being heard because of their own fault. I think they see internationalization just based on their own little world and their friends’ world; right. They are not heard because they are very selfish; this is my criticism of them. They look after their own little world; sometimes they do not care about the university reputation; a few of them care about. A few of them do understand that the increasing university reputation increases their reputation; which is more money, better students, and better everything.

According to the executive managers, the process and method of policy development, implementation and information dissemination at Public University need to be changed. They

Table 5.6

Represented and Missing Voices: Administrators' Perceptions

Administrators	Represented Voices	Missing Voices
<i>Senior Administrators</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - My job is to make sure that all voices are heard and responded to. - Faculty, administration and students. - Everybody in the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maybe sometimes some professors are not heard, but we try to ensure that everyone are well heard. - I do not get a sense that there is a group that its voices are not heard. - Maybe staff.
<i>Governing Board member</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The voices that are heard loudest, I think are people [administration] who made the decision to do this policy. - Faculty's voices are being heard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I cannot comment on whose priorities are absent. - Honestly I do not know whose voices are not heard.
<i>Managers</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The university President; he certainly has an agenda behind that. - Certainly it is not mine! More likely it is administration priority. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am not sure to what extent students have been consulted in any of that; my guess is probably very little, in terms of having their voices heard in initial stages. - Students. I do not even know domestic students necessarily are consulted around.
<i>Deans/department chairs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The President; he has leadership role. - Departments and people who do international research get heard I guess. - Students' voices are heard. - the administration and our international researchers and faculty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some faculty's voices are heard the least. - I would guess 99% of the university that is not involved with development or providing international programs are not heard. - Most faculty and all students are not heard. - Staff and undergraduate students.

believed that the internationalization policy was developed without any meaningful input into existing policies and programs from stakeholders such as faculty and students. Selman, a Manager, for example, said: "I think there was not or a very limited research or survey to develop the recent plan of internationalization. They [the administration] need to take us [people who directly connected to international students] seriously." According to Layton, another executive manager, the voices of students, domestic and international, are not represented in the internationalization policies. She commented: "my sense is that international students' voices

probably are not heard; I think their voices are relatively small.” Here in Table 5.6 are some reflections by administrators on represented and marginalized voices concerning the university’s internationalization agenda and initiatives.

Faculty Perceptions

According to faculty, students are the main group that is not heard properly. Dr. Blatt, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Science supposed that “students are definitely one of the groups whose their voices are missing.” According to faculty, not only are students’ voices not heard but also faculty members’ voices. Dr. Hinton, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities reckoned that faculty members are the top forgotten group. She said: “in some departments, you barely can find an international student; in some other units, you have just international students there; it seems to me faculty are not heard totally. That seems really strange to me. And, you know, the problem is that the voices of those who are missing are never going to be heard, because they are not there to be heard.” Dr. Levinson, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, commented: “I think faculty members could influence how the policies get developed. I do not know if it was possible to engage faculty in that process; I do not know if it came down just to a small group of people saying this is the vision that I have for this university and so this is where we need to go.” According to Dr. Pierce, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, faculty members are and should be the voice of academy, but their voices are missing. He added:

Table 5.7

Represented and Missing Voices: Faculty Perceptions

Faculty members	Represented Voices	Missing Voices
<i>Faculty of Arts</i>	- The university administration and	- Definitely international students are

<i>and Humanities</i>	<p>Governments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Priorities and voices of the university's President. - Undoubtedly the administration priorities. - Canadian companies and priorities of governments. 	<p>missing in a very large extent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - International and domestic students both. - Faculty and students both; their voices do not get heard. - Canadian undergraduate students are missing obviously.
<i>Faculty of Engineering</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Certainly the voices of administration are heard more than anyone else. - Our President' priorities are heard most. - Faculty's voices are heard. - Everyone (but staff). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our undergrad and grad students' voices and concerns should be heard more. - The voices of students' parents are not heard. - With regard to faculty, I do not think their voices are heard properly and enough! - Staff and those faculty who do not care.
<i>Faculty of Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is certainly a top-down agenda at the moment; it is our President's policy. - I do not think the individual researchers or individual faculty members priorities are incorporated into the vision of internationalization. So they are not heard. - The administration and government, certainly. - Internationalization is an administrative priority. They are heard completely. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I do not think students are heard at all.! Both, domestic and international! - International students; that is not really part of the upper people concern or discussion. - The voices of most faculty who do not have relationship with the administration. - In general, students, more undergraduate students. Secondly staff and contract-instructors.
<i>Faculty of Social Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In that respect unfortunately the answer is clear: corporation and administration. - People who make decisions and write policies. They reflect their interests, priorities and those kinds of things. - Certainly it is not my or my close colleagues' priority. - People in power, provincial and federal government priority. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local and international Students and faculty. - I do not think international students are heard. - Undergraduate students, most of the time they are not heard. - Staff and undergraduate students, both Canadian and foreign students.

I would say faculty should be the voice of university; but their voices are not heard appropriately. Faculty should be at the center of that; how does one articulate those voices? How does one organize those voices? Well, that is a challenge! The administration should ask itself; are faculty members being taken into consideration? Have they been invited to seriously participate in a bottom-up approach?

One of the main issues brought up by faculty during the interviews is that none of them was invited by the University authorities to consult in developing internationalization policy and its related initiatives. All faculty, except one from the Faculty of Science, believed that they have never been directly asked if they have any ideas and opinions about internationalization or possible suggestion in terms of recruitment of international students or international projects. Dr. Boles, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for instance, said: “I do not remember being consulted in developing our academic or strategic plan of internationalization.” Because of that, most of them have their own priorities and personal ideas about internationalization in carrying out their research or international collaboration. It implies that even though each faculty member tends to give priority to internationalization, they have varying degrees of [personal] internationalization activities in practice. This was a common comment of most faculty members. According to Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, every faculty in his department uses his/her own way and policy of collaboration with international colleagues. He said “in our department, [the] faculty internationalization profile is mostly relying on the activities of individual researchers; my priority is just my priority. And I do not think that it is driven by the strategic plan of internationalization or another plan of university.” Dr. Barr, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Science, commented: “I do not think our professors have internationalization consciously in their works or have some kind of objectives or specific goals of it; I do not think that they feel the need to know about internationalization plans. In our career, it happens naturally; as far as I have seen so far; specially in research areas.” In this way, we can see that although faculty members do not feel they have a voice in the agenda setting and official policies of the university, they have carried

out their own personal programs and activities in order to engage in internationalization teaching and research.

Conclusion

The data gathered shows that internationalization initiatives favour some voices and disadvantage others. The University administration and government(s) are the two groups of stakeholders that have the power to be fully heard. In contrast, students, both local and international, are one of the main stakeholders that have practically no significant power and voice to be heard properly in Public University's internationalization policies and practices. They are not invited to participate in policy making and agenda setting processes. There may be some formal or informal mechanisms of feedback, but seemingly, that feedback is rarely taken into consideration in the real world of policy making and implementation.

Faculty members are the second main stakeholders that have little power to be heard with regards to internationalization initiatives and activities. Based on the faculty perceptions, they are implementing the policy initiatives, while they do not have power to create them. It is obvious that all stakeholders, particularly faculty and students should have more voice and power in developing coming internationalization agenda and plans. According to the perceptions of administrators, the issue is not merely that students and faculty have no power to be heard properly, they do not want to be heard. However, the faculty community perceive that internationalization is a scenario that senior administrators and others in power advocate for others to follow. Because of this, some participants were really unenthusiastic and somewhat pessimist to do anything about it. Dr. Pierce, from the Faculty of Social Science, for instance, said: "I have brought an international approach to my classrooms and into every single lecture. But I am a little wary on the other side; I do not listen what they [administration] push down; I

do not listen what they push down.” Due to the perception that no one listens to them, and the inequitable distribution of power in university settings, each stakeholder feels like his/her own separate island of internationalization separate from Public University Strategic Plans.

Here is a place that Pal’s (2010) question is appropriate to take into consideration: If the university’s administration and policy makers have not really “been consulting when making and implementing [internationalization] policy, then what have they been doing?” (p. 281). This question addresses the influence and notion of power and voices to be heard in agenda setting and policy creation. The major gap is that administrators and people in power confidently and assertively thought they were optimally representing the voices of at least key stakeholders, ideally faculty, students, administration and staff. Moreover, almost all faculty are skeptical about their voices being heard. They feel that they do not have any or have very little influence on internationalization initiatives and its processes.

Who Benefits?

One of the most crucial questions in a democratic policy making environment in higher education is how policy makers can create a policy that adequately meets the needs and interests of all people on campus and the community involved. This question makes the duty and role of postsecondary education policy making not only serious and sensitive, but also moral and ethical. From a critical point of view, the key question could not, therefore, be simply what the anticipated benefits or possible risks of internationalization might be. Rather, the major critical policy question is who benefits the most and who does not. According to the university’s Strategic Plan, internationalization must “benefit the institution, the country [Canada] and the world in an increasingly competitive funding environment” (Public University, 2009, p.3). In addition, internationalization “helps meet the expressed needs of students, faculty and

administrators to understand their work within a global context, and helps ensure that teaching, learning, research and service are as current as possible, based upon existing realities and developments in Canada and well beyond” (Public University, 2009, p.1).

In this section I summarize the findings and develop a discussion concerning the question(s) of who and what group(s) benefit the most and who and what group(s) possibly do not benefit from internationalization initiatives and activities. The findings presented here are based on questions that I asked the research participants about which group(s) did and did not benefit from the internationalization initiatives at Public University.

Administrators’ Perceptions

For administrators, students, both local and international, are the first and foremost beneficiaries of internationalization at Public University. Dr. Saeedi, a department chair from the Faculty of Engineering, for example, stated “international students benefit working in our labs and using the facilities; as our Canadian students can benefit by going abroad to use other universities’ facilities and environments.” According to Dr. Santos, a department chair from the Faculty of Social Science, domestic students benefit because most of the university’s students are from Ontario and Southern Ontario and mainly from small towns and the perception is that they have never travelled outside of their towns and province. He also added: “I think local students have a very limited multicultural perspective; while they do not have international experience or vision enough they can learn how to interact with other people outside of Ontario, and Canada borders.” According to Layton, an executive manager, domestic students benefit “because international and exchange students always have some new things, new knowledge and new cultural experience for domestic and other international students as well.” At the same time, this assertion is challenged. Dr. Tishman, a department chair from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities,

commented: “they [administration] frequently say students benefit because there is a whole kind of desire to broaden their perspectives and horizon of experiences; really! How did you exactly figure out that? How did you examine that?” This reflection seems to be a provocative question for designing and conducting a national research/survey regarding internationalization of higher education in Canada and Ontario. Although this question has already been addressed in a study in terms of the impact of internationalization on students (Beck, 2008; Bond, 2009), there is not sufficient evidence in this case in the Canadian context.

According to a few administrators, however, some groups either benefit very little or do not benefit at all. Selman, an executive manager, for example, supposed that international students do not benefit from internationalization because the campus is not a very welcoming venue for them. She commented: “so there is not a welcoming environment on campus for international students. I think most of our international students either do not benefit or benefit very little.” Dr. Miller, a senior administrator, was disappointed in this regard. She said: “It is a pity if our international students don’t benefit; ... it is a pity if domestic students benefit little. [...] It is a pity if [local students] prefer to live in their homogenized groups.” According to Selman, even local students do not benefit much from internationalization because they are concerned about their positions. She said: “they [local students] feel like losing their spots in classrooms and university. I can remember, a couple of years ago when I was talking with our local students on campus, one of them was pretty angry to see more international students are recruited.” Dr. James, an Associate Dean from the Faculty of Science believed that people behind the scene like staff do not benefit at all. She commented: “The least beneficial group probably would be staff, people that should work behind the scene to help the department run; who do not have very much interaction with students.” According to Dr. Miller, a senior

administrator, “the groups that interact directly with international students and researchers are going to benefit the most.”

Table 5.8

Who Benefits? Administrators’ Perceptions

Administrators	Most Advantaged Group(s)	Least Advantaged Group(s)
<i>Senior Administrators</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Certainly international and domestic students and faculty benefit the most. - Everyone! Public University benefits too, but not commercial benefit. - International students and international researchers benefit the most. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administration, maybe, I think. No, I do not really know. - Undergrad community. Probably they benefit the least. - Most likely most staff does not benefit.
<i>Senate/Governing Board member</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would expect that international students and faculty who come here benefit the most. - The academics and domestic students, but ultimately university benefit as a whole. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perhaps the home countries of international students who get status here in Canada. - Staff and administrators.
<i>Managers</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is an opportunity for everyone to benefit. But our university brand benefits the most. - Some outgoing students [domestic] and some of our incoming students [international]. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People [stakeholders] who are skeptical about it [internationalization] and are not interested in that. - Most undergraduate students, maybe benefit less.
<i>Deans/department chairs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People who come here to study. - Canadian students, the university, and in general Canadian society benefit. - Faculty; because it benefits their research program. - Research that we do here, it benefits everybody in every society in the globe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I cannot see someone in down side of it. But I cannot assure you that all benefit the same. - Maybe some faculty who are not interested to engage in international academic and research activities. - Our staff and maybe some students. - Students! And mostly international students.

Although there are not any comprehensive assessments of how and to what degree domestic and international students benefit from the internationalization, the majority of administrators reckoned and hoped that ultimately, it must be everybody in the community who benefits from

internationalization activities. Dr. Santos, a department chair from the Faculty of Social Science, for instance, commented: “it is not a zero benefit game or something; I am sure that all benefit; but they possibly benefit unfairly and in different ways; because the initiatives are distributed unequally in different areas.” Dr. Dishke, a Senate member, had the same approach. By way of illustration, he commented:

My sincere hope is that we all benefit to some extent and that university processes continue to be meritocratic. I do not see a zero-sum proposition. I know that it will be important to continue to build capacity with respect to student services to ensure that international students are properly supported when they arrive at the [Public] University. I know that the University administration is aware and engaged in this issue.

Table 5.8 summarizes a summary of various reflections by administrators about the groups who benefit the most and least from internationalization initiatives and activities at Public University.

Faculty Perceptions

According to faculty, the university administration benefits the most from internationalization at Public University. Dr. Robinson, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, for example, commented: “I think that internationalization is largely beneficial for the [Public] university and its administration.” Internationalization could, however, benefit both international and domestic students. In other words, some faculty members believed that the internationalization policy benefited both domestic and international students as they interacted with one another. Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, commented: “Canadian students benefit a great deal from having students next to them in class who are not Canadian. It broadens their horizon. And by the same token the foreign students next to Canadian students benefit also.” According to Dr. Sameti, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Engineering, international students benefit because the education system of the university, particularly in the post-graduate level is very strong in Canada. Dr. O’Neill, another

Associate Professor from the Faculty of Engineering, supposed that international students greatly benefit because the university research profile and activity is very good.

According to some faculty, everybody benefits from internationalization activities at the university, but the staff is the only group that benefits the least or not at all. According to Dr. O'Neill, an Assistant Professor from the Faculty of Engineering, for instance, "it is supposed everybody benefits from one way to another but I do not think that staff or secretary people do benefit." Dr. Vig, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Engineering, noted that "students who have not had a chance to be university students" benefitted the least from the policy. Dr. Blatt, an Associate Professor and Canadian research chair from the Faculty of Science had the same impression. He stated:

It is hard to identify anyone who does not benefit from internationalization. The only people who may be perceived as not to benefit, may be students who are not able to get in the [Public] university or students who have lost their places or eligibilities because of the presence of more international students on campus. At this point, I do not think that that is a problem. I do not think that Canadian students cannot go to the university because international students are taking their places. That is not the case; not here, at this time, at least.

Although according to some faculty, both foreign and domestic students can benefit from internationalization reciprocally, some of them were not convinced that students benefit much as it is claimed by the university administration. Dr. Boles, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for example, said: "I think that often, the benefit stops at the tuition, the business that students bring to Public University, not students themselves. And that is really unfortunate." The second approach, which was commonly reflected by most faculty members from the Faculties of Social Science, Science and Arts and Humanities, supposed that students,-

Table 5.9

Who Benefits: Faculty Perceptions

Faculty members	Most Advantaged Group(s)	Least Advantaged Group(s)
<i>Faculty of Arts and Humanities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is the benefit of the [Public] university budget. - Certainly Canadian Government. - The administration of institution through making money; and the university through international profile. - Faculty who do international research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I do not think international students benefit largely; because they are not well-prepared to benefit the most. - Students! Whether graduate or undergraduate students. - Those who pay money benefit less; whether it is individual or institution! - I cannot see anybody with having adverse effect of it [internationalization].
<i>Faculty of Engineering</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administration, faculty, and students benefit. - International students do, because they get a lot of attention. - Domestic students benefit very much. - I guess all of us do; one way or another. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I do not think there are any risks of it for anybody. - If someone [international students and researchers] comes to Canada and stays, then home country loses. - People who teach restrictive courses do not benefit; like economics, it is local. - Staff and other employees do not benefit much.
<i>Faculty of Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Faculty members because we do our research mostly through our grad students. - Administration benefit from getting people's money. - Students; but domestic students benefit more than international students. - Researchers and their labs benefit from the presence of brilliant students across the world. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students benefit the least. - I do not know if there is anyone who truly doesn't benefit within the intellectual community. - Maybe people like staff who do not care about policies like this [internationalization]. - The least beneficial group probably would be staff.
<i>Faculty of Social Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It has always been the institution administration that benefits the most. - Students benefit but Canadian local students benefit more. - The [Public] university benefit because there is some funding there. - I really do not know; I am honest, but maybe some faculty benefit more than others, in the academic level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The wider society is losing. - Students, both domestic and international. - Certainly students who do not have chance to go abroad and use exchange programs. - I assume some of our faculty and most students.

especially at the undergraduate level, do not benefit from internationalization programs so much. According to Dr. Tracy, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, nobody actually knows if domestic or international students on campus benefit from the present internationalization policies and programs. He added: “despite the fact that theory says domestic students should benefit from internationalization, maybe they really do not benefit as much as the University administration expects.” Dr. Pierce, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, thought that domestic students benefit the least because they do not connect or interact with international students very well. He commented:

Our local students do not benefit because they do not connect with our foreign students; they are afraid of them because foreign students are hardworking and get better marks. They do not connect with them because after graduation, they leave the campus, the city and maybe the country. This is not just about students; if domestic faculty members do not interact with colleagues outside of Canada they will lose.

A couple of faculty members were, however, pessimistic about the benefits of existing internationalization activities. According to this group of participants, because internationalization ultimately leads to market-oriented advantage, they did not see any benefit even for the university administration. Dr. Pierce, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for example, commented:

Internationalization for me means pluralization of our voices and our theoretical perspectives in our knowledge production, teaching and research. You ask me who benefits from this, I really do not know, because I do not see the benefit of this, I see it as huge risk; I see it a problem; I see it as a threat; I do not see the benefit; I see it as threat even for administration.

Table 5.9 provides the summary of reflections by faculty about the groups who benefit the most and least from internationalization initiatives and activities at Public University.

Conclusion

As it shown in the Figure 5.3, there is a big gap in perceptions between administrators and Faculty about which groups benefit and which do not from the internationalization activities at

PU. According to the most faculty members, the university administration benefits the most, while the administrators suppose that international students and then faculty benefit the most from internationalization programs. According to the administrators and participants from the Faculty of Engineering, all students, particularly international students, benefit enormously from the current university's internationalization. Although there are not any comprehensive-




Figure 5.3. Two opposite perceptions about beneficiaries of internationalization

evaluation or studies in the context of Canada indicating the higher quality of learning and educational experience for international students (Jones & Oleksiyenko, 2011; Weber, 2011), it is consistent with the idea of students are the main stakeholders who are supposed to benefit from internationalization (IAU, 2005, 2010). What is interesting is that amongst the faculty participants, some from the Faculty of Engineering had the same perceptions as administrators regarding the groups that benefited the most and least. The host province and country of international students are other groups that may benefit the most. Even if international students

who do not stay and go back home country, they become potential allies with host countries by fostering successful commercial and political relations, given their understanding of the host countries values, cultures and society. Finally, all participants thought that all groups and stakeholders, particularly faculty and students, both domestic and international, must benefit from internationalization one way or another.

Diversity

Internationalization and diversity have commonly shared aims of enhancing cultural awareness and understanding in higher education (Davis, 2013). Some argue that one of the main educational undertakings of today's universities is "to produce graduates who are sensitive to social diversity and attuned to the contemporary realities of globalisation" (Donland, 2007, p. 289). A real diversity makes campus life rich and educational experience richer for students. Diversity is presumed to be the major part and component of internationalization in Ontario higher education institutions because of intercultural and multicultural environment of the province. In other words, diversity is assumed to be a core feature of internationalization initiatives at Public University because of multicultural context of the University.

Based on the official internationalization policy, diversity in all parts of the university campus is valued at Public University. According to Dr. Millan, a vice-provost, diversity is one reason why Public University has put a priority on internationalization and its different initiatives and strategies (Millan, 2009). Based on an official report (Public University, 2007), the policy makers asserted that the university is "enriched by the cultural and personal diversity provided by an international faculty, student, and staff community." Diversity, for the university administration, seems to be a basic objective for internationalization because it enriches the campus. According to the university's President, Dr. Chatman (2010), diversity and diverse

cultural perspectives enrich the educational experience for all students in the classroom. Diversity is respected in the university because it brings to the university a rich variety of heritages, traditions, cultures, knowledges and perspectives, according to the official policy.

Administrators' Perceptions

For the university administrators, diversity appears to be a very important component of internationalization. For most of them, however, diversity means the presence of more international students on campus with diverse cultures and backgrounds. According to Dr. Bryon, a senior administrator, the university recruits more international students because they can help to enhance the diversity of campus cultures and the quality of academic programs. She commented: “we spend money to get international people [students and faculty] in because we value diversity. ... If departments mix people together, then [they] can get much more interesting result than if they only work with local people with narrow education and experiences, and with no different vision.” Accordingly, admitting international students is not only due to financial incentives; the diversity, as we saw in the discussion above, seems another rationale of why the University recruits international students.

Some of the administrators had critical thoughts on the current policy and form of diversity. Dr. Tishman, a Department Chair from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, for example, challenged the university administration for imbalanced attention and the admission of foreign students from particular nations. He commented: “What the administration has trying to do with diversity is to find those students mostly in Asia but not exclusively to be willing to come our university... And the Asian students and families are going to give us money to things that they want to do.” It was inspiring to me to hear that Dr. Miller, a senior administrator at the age of 55-60 has started to learn Chinese. She said “I want to learn to speak Mandarin. There are people in

China who want to have our experience and our knowledge. ... That makes our world a better place to study and live with others. So I am positive about these things; I am optimistic on these things.” Dr Miller’s assertions seem to be contradicted. On the one hand she is learning Chinese – and yet on the other she has almost neocolonial views about Canadian importance to the Chinese. Dr. Miller also believed that if the university’s administration wants to attract Chinese students “[they] need some sort of collaboration with Chinese government, Chinese families and Chinese society.” As a matter of fact, they criticize the fact that the international students who are recruited are from a very narrow set of countries and privileged backgrounds. So what participants are criticizing is that there is not enough diversity or ‘real diversity’ as one of the faculty participants noted above.

Faculty Perceptions

Diversity according to faculty members is also a key component of education, and the internationalization policy. Dr. Beardslee, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Engineering, for example, noted that the “university is a place where diversity and acceptance of diversity has a chance to flourish. [And] internationalization is a great way to foster and increase the diversity on campus and the institution.” According to Dr. Pierce, another Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, the value of diversity is significant in internationalization policies. He continued by saying that: “diversity is the most important objective of this policy ... If by internationalization, you mean the promotion of cultural, ethnic, racial and national diversity in our faculty, I will be much in favour of that. But that is not what I have seen happening at this institution.”

While most faculty members had a respectful vision for diversity as a genuine and inseparable component of internationalization, they, at the same time, challenged the current discourse of

inclusiveness associated with internationalization at Public University. According to Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, there are plenty of international students on the campus, but they are all nearly from the same social class background. He commented: “this internationalization does not strengthen the university diversity in terms of ‘social classes’ on campus and classrooms in its academic terms.” According to him, what is really missing is real diversity, and real differences on campus and the community. Dr. Robinson, another full professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities commented: “I think it would be important to me to get as diverse voices of possible. But when I say diverse, I do not mean ethnically or religiously diverse; I mean the great of diversity in social class, and in their backgrounds.”

The main issue is that the university’s current policy and procedures of internationalization have little to do with heterogenized diversity and inclusiveness. Dr. Boles, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for example, believed that the institution lacks a truly open and useful policy of internationalization in terms of diversity and inclusion. She said: “when you want to have different people from different walks of life in the same place you have to be an open minded one; so I always go on the side of heterogeneity over homogeneity; but we are not sure our university vision is open enough on the heterogeneity side of this policy.”

Recruitment of students from one or two specific Asian countries is an example of what I call homogenized diversity of internationalization. This homogenized diversity may exclude talented people from other parts of the world to get to good universities in North America. Dr. Chao, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for example, commented: “so what ends up happening is paying attention to those students and families in Asian countries that can pay big bucks to come here. And so what happens is that really good students from other parts of the world get shunted out.” Dr. Boles, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, in

addition, commented: The [Public] university wants everyone to be same. Where it counts? People can have differences but those should be differences that do not really affect the bottom-line. Regarding the homogenized diversity of campus internationalization, some faculty members were rather sensitive about dominant Asian students' sub-culture on campus and its effect on their learning and education achievements. By way of illustration, a Dr. Pierce, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, commented:

My fear is that some students, especially students coming from countries with very different cultures and languages, [...] for example, form a sort of sub-culture when they are here. And most of them do not really try to learn the language and some of the experiences that we have in this country. So they wind up with a sort of superficial education. I do not say they are deceiving but they are drawn in by the status of North America and I am not sure if they actually get a better education.

For some faculty, the issue is not merely the homogenized culture of international students in campus and classes; rather, it is also the dominant logic of homogenized discourse in off-campus internationalization activities. For example, according to Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, the internationally famous business school of the University has only one off-shore campus in China because of its students' market. He added: "having a branch in [...] was not by accident; [the university administration] does not have a campus in Trinidad or somewhere in Africa; just because they are probably not wealthy as [...]." Dr. Boles, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science commented: "we just know China is the second largest economy in the world; that is a big opportunity to the administration to acknowledge and collaborate in that big economy." Some faculty members were not pleased and excited to see the administration only concentrate on one specific place to develop collaboration. As stated earlier, they thought a higher education institution should not function like a business corporation. Dr. Tishman, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, for example, stated:

You know! Our President is rarely on campus; he is always in China; that is where he lives, primarily. I am giving you a cynical picture of this; but it is true! It is simple fact of our corporate university right for now. There is not enough money from traditional sources. So we have to go where the money is, right now in Asia, in China, India.

The issue here is the concern that the university like other top-tier institutions in Ontario has been recruiting students predominantly from privileged backgrounds and most of them tend to come from a few particular countries. The notion of homogenized diversity may, in addition, challenge the real diversity of the academy. By way of illustration, Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, stated:

If I bring the children of ambassadors or students from the wealthy and upper class families to this institution, that is not a real internationalization, to me. We do need and we want diversity; diversity in social class; the way we chose is not a good one. You get people who look and smell differently, but they are all from the same class with the same philosophical understanding of the world and the same aspiration. You go to our business school, you see what I mean. White, and blue and pink, green and gray are different, but the mentality of all are the same. And that is what I am talking about.

Conclusion

Even though a variety of initiatives and activities can be seen with regards to internationalization at Public University, in terms of diversity the existing policies and procedures, from recruiting international students to exchange programs and partnership is more aligned with homogenization rather heterogeneity. According to the Strategic Plan of internationalization, Public University is committed to “selectively target undergraduate and graduate students from particular areas of strategic importance to the [Public] University and develop partnership agreements with both universities and selected high schools of high academic quality in such areas to facilitate attraction and entry of these students” (Public University, 2009, p. 10). The term ‘selectively’ implies admission of international students from selective economic-booming countries and selective wealthy families. This is problematic in so many ways. The selective commitment of the internationalization plan may lead to a homogenized culture and discourse of

diversity and inclusiveness on campus. Selective commitment to diversity cannot properly support excellence, equal opportunity, and quality in community and campus. The selective student recruitment practices do not support real diversity. In other words, this trend of selective admissions policies may lead internationalization initiatives to privilege certain groups of students over others.

The other effect of this selective strategy of internationalization is that post-secondary education in some parts of the world has been glorified the expense of other parts. Those privileged areas either could be sellers [predominantly developed and industrialized countries] or buyers [predominantly developing but rich countries places commonly in East Asia]. This trend has mostly privileged citizens of one or two specific countries. The recently emerged market of higher education in a few countries in East Asia, and high flow of East Asian students has led to a homogenized diversity on campus, departments, and classes. Accordingly, a kind of diversity that directs a department at Public University to recruit 60% of its international students from the same country and culture is not realistic, and cannot simply be convincing for most of the faculty.

The issue is not just focusing on a few specific nations to recruit more foreign students, but that student exchange programs are only limited to some developed and privileged countries. Among the two hundred and twenty North-South countries, the university student exchange program is limited to about 20 developed and privileged countries (e.g. USA, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, England, etc.) (Public University, 2011). Beside these fortunate countries, the institution also needs to target students and faculty exchange program to institutions in developing and less developed countries. This implies that the University's exchange program needs to reflect more heterogenized form of diversity.

Another example of the homogenized discourse of diversity is that Public University, like almost every institution in Canada, has many collaborations and associations with institutions in a handful of countries that are doing very well economically. As Dr. Dishke, a Senate member stated, “the university is engaged in dialogue with peers at institutions with a particular focus on an Asian country.”

Perhaps the market logic and financial pressure drive the university’s administration to bring students in from one specific place or some particular parts of the world, but the argument is that it may prevent many qualified local and international students from middle and low income families from attending the university. The issue is not, therefore, the presence of many students from a certain part of the world on campus or their dominant sub-cultures in students’ communities; the criticism is about the economic-political tendency of existing internationalization to homogenize the university.

In brief, the findings suggest that the University has to be more open to inclusion and diversity through its different initiatives of internationalization, particularly recruiting international students and faculty. It is expected that internationalization, as an element of global public good, should reflect and support the diversity of greater society on campus and community. An actual academic internationalization plan may provide all groups, particularly faculty and students, an atmosphere conducive to a rich international learning experience.

Summary

In this chapter, I summarized and discussed the key findings of the study. In each of the seven sections, first the data gathered from the official policy documents and administration rhetoric was summarized. Findings from individual interviews were then summarized and discussed.

Finally, each section ended with some discussion and conclusions. Participants’ perceptions and

experiences with the internationalization policy spanned a broad spectrum. From the viewpoints of faculty members, the central agenda of internationalization is toward the commercialization of higher education. From the perspectives of administrators internationalization initiatives and activities are not essentially about doing business with postsecondary education. There is, in addition, a disconnect between what the community of faculty members wants the University administrators to do and what the administration actually do about internationalization in a real world. In the next chapter, the major findings, with a focus on the notion of values, will be discussed within a critical policy lens.

CHAPTER VI: DISCUSSION- FOCUS ON VALUES

The central question of the current study was what values drive internationalization of higher education and how they influence policies and initiatives at a public university in Ontario? The study was, in addition, guided by three other research questions: “*What does internationalization mean for the university’s administrators and faculty?*”, “*Why does a public university engage in internationalization?*”, and “*Whose policy does internationalization of higher education represent at a public university?*” In this chapter, first I discuss the findings associated with the three research questions, and then critically analyze and conceptualize the findings regarding embedded values influencing and driving internationalization policies and initiatives. Based on the findings discussed in Chapter V, the main focus of the discussion and analysis is based on possible divergence/convergence between perceptions and the official policy documents and the administration rhetoric and discrepancy between what is and what internationalization of higher education should be at a public university in Ontario. The chapter ends with a brief discussion of the major cross case analysis findings.

What Is Internationalization?

In this study, a number of different visions and perspectives informed the concept and meaning of internationalization by different participants. Based on the findings outlined in Chapter V, I present and develop two different definitions for internationalization of higher education at Public University. The perspectives summarized in Chapter V could be classified into two approaches of definition; internationalization in *theory* and internationalization in *practice*.

In terms of theory, internationalization of higher education is *the process of integrating international aspects and initiatives into postsecondary education in order to educate critical, responsible and engaged students and global citizens*. This definition is a formal-administrative

approach to internationalization and is linked to Knight’s definition of “a sustainable process of integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (Knight; 1997, p. 7). This definition is similar to “the prevalent understanding of internationalization, widely used by Canadian universities and colleges; that is; it is a process integrating an intercultural and international dimension into all areas of the university (Knight, 2003). As is shown in Figure 6.1, and based on different perceptions and discussions in Chapter V, the five main components of this approach are: diversity in the culture of campus and quality of teaching/learning; students and faculty mobility and knowledge exchange; research collaboration and academic partnership; global awareness and international impact; and equal opportunity and access.



Figure 6.1. Components of internationalization in theory

In terms of practice, the story of internationalization in the real world of higher education institutions differs. Based on the findings of this study, internationalization of higher education in practice could be defined as *the process of commercializing research and postsecondary*

education, and international competition for the recruitment of foreign students from wealthy and privileged countries in order to generate revenue, secure national profile, and build international reputation. This definition is a counter approach of the theoretical/ideal-form definition of internationalization presented above. This approach of internationalization reflects the realities of today (Knight, 2004, p. 10), and implies that internationalization in the real world is remarkably different from what it supposed to be in theory, based on policy statements, and administrations' rhetoric. This approach is consistent with Knight's (2007) argument that internationalization of higher education may seen as a profit- making enterprise for institutions.




Figure 6-2. The components of internationalization in practice

According to this approach, especially from the viewpoints of faculty members, the hidden agenda of the university administration is toward the commercialization of postsecondary education. Based on this approach, the other four major components of internationalization, as shown in Figure 6-2, are: recruiting privileged international students; marketization, competition and human capital flight; business and corporatization; and branding and profile building.

From the definition of internationalization in theory, educating critical and engaged students and citizens is at the centre of internationalization goals and missions. This is an ideal notion of internationalization and is consistent with an approach that most university policy makers speaking about the 'educating global citizens' as the main academic advantages of internationalization of higher education (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). However, as De Wit (2011) observed, the reality and current trends of internationalization of higher education are less promising than its conceptual definitions. While many universities cite producing global citizens as a goal, according to Green (2013) few have a clear set of learning outcomes associated with this label, a map of the learning experiences that will produce this learning, or an assessment plan in place to determine what students are actually learning and what that means for curricular improvement. Accordingly, although this is an idealized approach to the internationalization definition, it is, at the same time part of the problem (Beck, 2012; Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011). It is, in fact, a contemporary organizational and administrative approach to internationalization (Sanderson, 2008), and from a critical point of view, it rarely takes place in the real world of present-day postsecondary education, particularly in the Anglo-American context of higher education (de Wit, 2011, Knight, 2007; Maringe et al., 2013; Warwick & Moogan, 2013).

The argument however, is that there is a large gap and difference between the notion and meaning of internationalization in theory (rhetorically) and its perception in practice (literally). From a critical point of view, what is rhetorically (in theory) acknowledged as internationalization are ideological slogans and ideal components; slogans such as diversity of campus, quality of learning processes, improving campus life, students and faculty mobility and knowledge exchange opportunities for everyone inside and outside of campus, educational and intellectual values, enhancing academic values, global awareness and international impact, among others. This finding supports Stier's (2002) argument about policy makers' general tendency to focus on ideological aims and goals. According to Stier's observation, university administrators are concerned with formalities and practical issues of international co-operation.

What is literally (in practice) recognized as internationalization is some pragmatic components with different realistic objectives; such as recruiting international students from privileged families and countries; securing national profile and building international branding and reputation, selling the university credentials, competition, corporatization, among others. The big disconnect is, accordingly, between what internationalization theoretically means and what is practically required. This is consistent with the related literature signifying that there is a significant disconnect between what is rhetorically said and what is literally meant or done about internationalization in most institutions, particularly in Anglophone universities (Bennett & Kane, 2011; de Wit, 2011; Maringe et al., 2013; Warwick & Moogan, 2013).

The crux of the matter, in addition, is that the official version and approach of internationalization seems like an excellent policy, but in practice the story differs. As was discussed in Chapter II, the existing literature regarding the definition of internationalization commonly lacks a critical approach and orientation (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Sanderson,

2008). Because of emerging different critical perspectives and remarkable changes in values, goals, strategies and initiatives in the area of higher education (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010), re-definition of internationalization is needed and necessary.

Internationalization of higher education, accordingly, needs to be critically defined based on what/how it is perceived in practice. Therefore, as the findings suggest that internationalization of higher education in practice has a differing and opposing meaning, it is time to critically reflect on the contemporary concept of internationalization in a different way.

Why Is the University Internationalizing?

Internationalization of higher education is regarded as an effective strategy motivating most university administrators and policy players in different countries and regions today. Almost all university administrators refer to their international missions and dimensions in policy statements and rhetoric (de Wit, 2011; Knight, 2008; Kehm & Teichler (2007). Based on different contexts and missions, institutions have different motives to internationalize their policies, processes and programs. As the motives of internationalization are multiple, there are different rationales for institutions acknowledging it as a policy priority. Some institutions typically internationalize in order to attract talent and qualified foreign students. Attracting and hiring top-quality faculty and professional researchers and research staff are at the top of rationales for some other institutions. As the literature supports (de Wit, 2011; Knight, 2008; Kehm & Teichler, 2007), there, however, appear to exist different rationales for internationalization ranging from academic and educational rationales such as educating global citizens, building capacity for research, partnership, among others, to economic and administrative rationales, and the quest to enhance institutional prestige and reputation.

Although rhetorically, internationalization is associated with academic rationales and activities such as international research, partnership and collaboration, recruitment of top talented students, mobility programs, and educational quality and excellence (de Wit, 2011; Knight, 2008; Maringe et al., 2013), the dominant tendency at Public University is mostly toward visibility and profile developing, and related economic rationales such as recruiting undergraduate international students. This finding is not in agreement with the AUCC's (2007, 2009) surveys in 2006 and 2009 indicating that educating internationally knowledgeable graduates and providing local and international students with international and intercultural knowledge and skills is the core rationales of internationalization at Canadian institutions. As was summarized in Chapter V, there is a common sense understanding about the importance of the visibility-profile rationale of internationalization amongst the official policy and participants. In its update on the Strategic Plan – September 2010-, *Future Engaging* recommends that Public University must raise its international profile and visibility. It is important that the university work “to promote its international profile at home and abroad, [...] to ensure that internationalization maintains a high level of visibility within the institution”. (Public University, 2009, p. 9). The University administration has attempted to achieve this goal by different appropriate commitments like increasing the number of international undergraduate students, strengthening intellectual intensity at the institution and selectively expanding the number of active partnerships with preeminent international research and teaching institutions (e.g., joint degrees, dual degrees).

Furthermore, the findings support that there may be different motives behind a specific initiative of internationalization. For example, there is not only one simple-single rationale for keeping recruiting international students. While there is, as it was discussed in Chapter V,

material rationale and revenue generation behind the recruitment of international ‘undergraduate’ students, the best international ‘graduate’ and postdoctoral students, in particular in the fields of engineering and science, are recruited for scholarly and research reasons and partly for socio-political rationales like immigration policy. According to faculty members, socio-political rationales like immigration policy are not the University administration’s agenda; this is the federal government’s changes to immigration policy focusing on highly skilled young immigrants. This finding and discussion is consistent with the IAU’s (2012) finding showing that internationalization may foster the process of immigration, brain drain and even accelerate it globally.

In this study, while most participants challenged the economic and financial rationale of internationalization, particularly concerning the recruitment of international students, administrators did not accept the criticism. For example, from the perspective of administrators the fee differential between domestic and international students is justifiable given that Public University, like other institutions in Ontario, receives government funding and money for domestic students but not for international students. Based on the existing literature (Jones, Shanahan & Goyan, 2001; MTCU, 2013; Norrie & Lin, 2009; Rae, 2005), although the Ontario higher education system seems both open and accessible, the centralization of financing has allowed the government to make significant cuts in university budgets (Lessard & Brassard, 2007). Due to the recent declining level of public funding, Ontario universities, therefore, currently face significant financial shortages and dilemmas. According to reports (e.g., Boggs, 2009), while 90% of university costs were covered by federal and provincial governments through cost-sharing in 1970s, the cuts in government grants fell to 45% of total higher education

revenue in 2011. Therefore, universities have been forced to find alternative funding sources and new revenue streams.

The decision to acknowledge internationalization as a priority at Public University is, nevertheless, based on different policy rationales. As it was shown and discussed in Chapter V, this finding supports that policy rationales for internationalization range from commercial-economic-political to academic-educational-cultural, among others (IAU, 2003, 2005, 2010; Knight, 2004; Maringe et al., 2013). The argument is that based on the official policy and administrators' perceptions, internationalization initiatives rhetorically are about academic and educational rationales. In contrast, faculty members believe that the visibility-profile motive and financial resources are the first and foremost key rationale of internationalization for the university administration in practice. Nevertheless, although the existing discourse of internationalization may engage with economic rationales, essential academic and scholarly rationales are not fully ignored at Public University. In other words, internationalization is not only about doing business with postsecondary education at Public University.

Whose Agenda Is It?

Public University internationalization policies and plans received serious criticism and resistance from the most faculty participants. Faculty, as summarized in Chapter V, think that the existing internationalization of the University is a top-down agenda and the President's own policy and the University priority. This finding is consistent with Dewey's and Duff's (2009) observations indicating that internationalization is articulated as an institutional priority area. This situation has made the faculty tremendously cynical about most of the University's internationalization initiatives and activities. Such skepticism is clear in the reflection of Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science. He stated: "I am very skeptical about internationalization. I

am cynical about the creation of this plan [internationalization], because they are very top-down.” The top-down and non-democratic process may make the community to feel indifferent and apathetic about what is happening at the university in the name of internationalization. As summarized and discussed in the previous chapter, a part of the stakeholders feels excluded from the internationalization agenda settings and processes. Therefore, this group of faculty had to choose to do their international activities based on their own norms, interests and rules.

The University community is unenthusiastic about the Strategic Plan of internationalization, because faculty members think that the current one is not their policy, but the policy of the administration pushing faculty to pursue its agenda. For example, this assertion is evident from the perception of Dr. Pierce, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science; “it [internationalization] is not certainly mine. It is the administration’s policy. It is the policy of the President and people around him, not all other people in the University. ... Are they going to take me seriously after this, no, no, I do not think so!”

From a critical point of view, internationalization cannot be continued as the part of an individual agenda or as a President’s personal priority in a public institution with liberal standards and reputation. In terms of policy making, a real internationalization of higher education is supposed to have two main characters. First, it cannot happen only through an official top-down agenda; it must happen naturally and organically (de Wit, 2006; Enders, 2004). The second character is that genuine internationalization should be caused a collective mindset (Bogotch & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2010). A very top-down agenda setting and other non-democratic processes may lead the faculty to suppose that policy makers are out of touch with what is actually happening on campus and in the classrooms when they develop new policies of internationalization. Perhaps some participants were right in saying that the administration are

entitled and have the right role when it comes to setting internationalization agenda, but they are too far from what the university community, particularly faculty and students mainly think and actually do in the real world of the campus.

One question to ask is how many of the University policy makers are faculty members or academic professional researchers? According to faculty members, like many Canadian contemporary university administrations a significant part of the university policy makers are essentially the managers of the business sector and industry. This perception is consistent to Coates's and Morrison's (2011) observation indicating that a large part of today university policy makers in the Canadian context of higher education is from the business sector. Therefore, the main concern is that they, then, may not be the best people to develop proper initiatives for internationalization. This point is consistent with Giroux's (2007) argument saying that today higher education policy makers are more known for being successful 'fundraisers' rather than intellectual individuals and academic policy makers. In such a situation, and in a non-democratic and non-transparent context, as internationalization reflects the voices of administration and people in power, it may ignore the voices of the community. Therefore, what the administration consciously or subconsciously tends to overlook is the voices of the frontline stakeholders of internationalization including the faculty, staff, and students, among others. In a democratic policy context, recognizing the voices of all groups is substantially the duty of administration.

The other point is that some people on and off the campus might resent internationalization initiatives not because they are not aware of the original intention of this policy nor because they do not understand its intent or benefits, but because they feel they are not involved in its agenda. Public University needs provide a forum/environment in which every stakeholder has courage to speak up boldly about internationalization (Pal, 2010). It was very shocking to me in a few

interview sessions when, at the end of interviews after the recorder was off, participants were more critical about what they see happening in the institution regarding internationalization. At that moment, a question to me was why in a liberal institution of higher education professors feel insecure to speak up about policy issues. This is a very critical and provocative question for the administration to answer and accommodate the collective understanding of all stakeholders within their internationalization policy.

As is shown and discussed in Chapter V, the administration is the main group of stakeholders that has the power to be fully heard in Public University's internationalization policies and practices. In contrast, faculty and students are two main stakeholders that have practically had little power and voice to be heard with regards to internationalization activities. However, studies show that the success of internationalization in a department rests with both individual faculty and their collective actions (Bogotch & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2010). Therefore, participation of faculty members at policy making processes is necessary to reach the more advanced stages of internationalization. This study also indicates that internationalization to faculty members means making connections in terms of both research agenda and partnership and connection with colleagues and students outside of the institution.

The argument is that the main stakeholders' voices should be at the heart of the policy making process of internationalization. This point addresses the fundamental influence and notion of consultation, collective participation, and power to be heard in policy creation. The policy's success or failure in an institution depends on the nature and quality of power distribution, influence and voices of stakeholders (Ball, 1990; Evers, 1988; McLaughlin, 1987; Ozga, 2002; Pall, 2010; Prunty, 1985; Taylor, 1997). To facilitate this, the administration needs to know what the real expectations and common sense understandings of main stakeholders

entail. Instead of top-down and non-democratic procedures, Public University needs to move toward a bottom-up, democratic-based, and evidence-based policy making process in order to cover different voices. It is necessary to mention that Public University has been working on a new strategic plan of internationalization with some new visions and directions to fix current weaknesses. In this respect a Senior Governing Board member commented “I know that some of Public University’s leaders are conscious of this [weakness of Plan] and continue to democratize the strategic planning process. The upcoming strategic planning process looks quite promising.” Public University is, therefore, turning to a bottom-up policy making approach for developing its new strategic plan of internationalization. By way of illustration, Dr. Miller, VP internationalization a senior administrator, said:

In the new international plan I am going out to academics, to staff, to students and talking about our new ideas and components. So that I can get feedback about what is important to them what is not important to them, what is good, what is stupid, and then we formulate the plan together. So I have already selected 17 different groups on campus and presented accordingly and have received the feedback. So while the previous one did not have that kind of outreach components and did not engage the faculty and staff or students to the same extent, I am hoping that the new one will. We cannot have a top-down approach to internationalization; rather a kind of bottom-up approach.

Nevertheless, although the development of this new strategic plan seems like a bottom-up approach, it still needs a fully evidence-based studies and critical based policy analysis for decision making and agenda setting. For example, for writing a new strategic plan, the University administration has encouraged students to participate in an online survey, to call, email, or drop by to inform policy makers about their views/opinions about an agenda that the administration is already planning to develop. At first, this appears to be an all-encompassing approach, but it is not an evidenced-based approach for policy development that truly involves the voices of all stakeholders.

The argument is that internationalization initiatives have favored some voices and disadvantaged others. While the current policies and programs mostly favour voices of the administration and disadvantage others, the main issue should be how all faculty and students' voices and needs can be considered and integrated into the plan. The academy is a place in which people from many different social, economic, and ethnic groups gather together (Bok,2003; Giroux, 2010). It is a place where everybody has a right to play a role and have her/his voice heard. I am well aware of the fact that engaging the full breadth of internal and external stakeholders of internationalization with different perspectives might not be possible, but an internationalization policy and plan fully involving two core stakeholders, namely students and faculty, is extremely necessary and beneficial (Pal, 2010; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). The intent of taking, for example, students in policy circles or agenda setting for internationalization should not be interpreted as bringing policy down to the level of the students; it should, in its place, be assumed as bringing students (as coming engaged and global citizens) up to the level of policy makers and policy creators. A genuine internationalization policy, as Altbach and Knight (2007) argue, not only must ensure that international higher education benefits public and not simply be a profit center, but also reflects the voices of all the university community.

I believe that in a real internationalized campus, at both, individual and institutional levels, stakeholders must identify themselves as specific partners of policy making. This, consequently, may influence their commitment, particularly faculty, to the campus as an ideal type of community to live in. Although multiple challenges may appear if the administration relies solely on, for example faculty and students, to lead internationalization policies and initiatives (Dewey & Duff, 2009), it is important to consider the views and voices of all the community before jumping to a conclusion that it best suits all the stakeholders' needs. It is

necessary that every group's interests and voices to be heard in internationalization activities. In other words, the power to have a voice or an opinion to be heard and reflected is a key condition in a democratic policy agenda setting (McLaughlin, 1987). I argue that in an engaging-democratic context and process, a policy is made based on both majority and minority voices and the expectations of policy makers to meet them at the best. It is evident that if faculty members as first-hand stakeholders, for example, feel disgruntled by what is happening within the university and in the community as a whole, then they have an intellectual force and scholarly duty to act differently to ensure that their philosophy and academic mission are addressed.

Driving Discourses of Values

The term value from a qualitative/subjective approach, as shown in Chapter I, implies a quality considered worthwhile and desirable for a group of people (stakeholders). The concept value, as it is commonly understood and proclaimed in different texts and rhetoric is embedded within a broader context of policy discourses (Prunty, 1985; Evers, 1988; Stewart, 2009; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Pal, 2010). Policy values hypothetically reflect visions, voices, interests and priorities of people in power and different groups of stakeholders (Harvey, 1973; Pal, 2010; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Higher education policy is not value-free because it involves a myriad of participants and stakeholders including students, faculty, parents, interest groups, administration, board of governors, senate members, governments, industry and business sector, and professionals who can have widely divergent voices and views on what issues need to be addressed, the priorities and optimal solutions to problems.

In policy research, it is significant to comprehend what values drive a given policy and how policy values are directed and organized around a set of policy statements (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Stewart, 2009). This study aimed to illuminate the overt and covert values that influence

the policies and activities associated with internationalization in a public university in Ontario. Relying on the findings of this study, there have been a set of different policy values driving internationalization initiatives. Some of them seem more visible and tangible, and others are less observable and barely transparent. All these values could be categorized into two major discourses: *neoliberal- instrumental* and *liberal-academic discourse*. I will first discuss the neoliberal- instrumental discourse and its components, and then the liberal-academic discourse and the related values. At the end, a discussion and conclusion is developed.

Neoliberal- instrumental discourse

Drawing on the data gathered, internationalization policies and initiatives are influenced and directed by a neoliberal-instrumental discourse of values. This discourse of values is evidenced by different sources of perceptions, comments, policy statements and rhetoric. Neoliberal-instrumental discourse is comprised of material-based and competition based values.

Material-based values

Material-based values including different market-oriented and economic components are the first group of values that have been influencing and driving internationalization. Similar to most world-class public universities in the developed world (de Wit, 2011; Maringe, 2013), internationalization at Public University appears to be a great policy for the market activity of postsecondary education. For the administration, there is certainly some revenue which must be generated through internationalization activities. According to Dr. Chatman, the President of the University, for example, in Ontario, international students contribute an estimated \$1-billion annually to the provincial economy (Chatman, 2010a). In his editorial written for the *Globe and Mail*, the President wrote that not only does internationalization enhance the education experience for all students, but it also provides long-term economic benefits for Ontario and

Canada (Chatman, 2010b). According to the President, as the numbers of international students grow, they will have an increasing economic impact on the university and the city (Chatman, 2012).

Despite the President's rhetoric, there is no very concrete consistency between different resources of the administration rhetoric about the economic motives and influences of internationalization. For example, although the President speaks about the economic impact of internationalization, Dr. Millan, a vice-provost, believes that existing initiatives are not driven by economic objectives, specifically money and tuition that international students bring to the system. In her interview in a university journal, she commented that internationalization is not driven at all by the tuition fees that international students have to pay. According to her, the tuition that Public University charge international students equals the tuition levels that domestic students are charged plus the government grants funding that the university gets for domestic students (Millan, 2011).

The lack of consistency among senior administrators implies that either the related official policy statements like Strategic Plan are silent, or the administration are not honest with regards to their reflections about the economic motives and influences of internationalization. This strengthens a hypothesis that economic motives are an embedded and hidden agenda of internationalization policies and initiatives. If so, the community of faculty members, particularly participants from three faculties (i.e. Social Science, Science, and Arts and Humanities), are rightfully reflecting on the idea that financial incentives are the primary values driving internationalization initiatives.

As it shown in Chapter V, faculty believe that internationalization is a way of generating revenue. According to Dr. Boles, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for

example, international students pay money to the university for programs that already have been planned for domestic students' requirements and needs. According to Dr. Tracy, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, "internationalization is about money and nobody can see the liberal values of education in university anymore." Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, supposed that internationalization of campus is driven by an economic engine than an educational engine. He added: "the economic engine has to do with the fact that foreign students on our campus pay two or three times as much school [tuition] fees than the Canadian students." By way of illustration, he commented:

If I have a local student who pays seven thousand dollars a year to come to be in university, and we get somebody in from China, Iran, wherever as a foreign student who pays twenty thousand dollars a year, economic logic tells you I would rather have the foreign students; it makes more sense economically and financially; but it is a Canadian university, we have to reserve some seats and spots for locals and Canadians.

At the same time, faculty challenged the business attitudes of the university administration toward internationalization and international students. Dr. Boes, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Science, believed that the university has been selling postsecondary credentials to the world through internationalization like a commercial project. Dr. Hilton, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, commented: "I think our university administration sees international students as cash cows and of course, provincial government sees them in that way." She believed that this is the disappointing part of internationalization, viewing foreign students like revenue generators. She continued her criticism by saying that: "It is so sad if provincial and federal governments say universities have to raise their own money; it is so sad when universities charge international students three times or whatever more than our students." Dr. Levinson, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities was suspicious because he supposed that internationalization is a business project of the government. He said: "I try not to be an ideological driven faculty [member] but in terms of values promoted by

internationalization I am very skeptical and actually quite critical at the same time; that is a political-business agenda, not a real education plan.” Dr. Robinson, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities stated:

Let’s say Public University has to make some money, but if that money goes into classrooms, into, let’s say, hiring more tenured professors or creating better resources for students or creating better financial package for students, I have no problem with that money; let’s say international students pay higher fees but nobody knows where that money goes?

Therefore, the faculty perceptions are that the University administration’s first and primary concern is not recruiting the best and brightest international undergraduate students. Rather, they are interested in their wealthy backgrounds and the finances they can generate from them. Indeed, this is consistent with Coates’s and Morrison’s (2011) observations that “universities in Ontario are chasing foreign students from around the world” (p. 215). However, the administrators, as shown in Chapter V, do not accept the criticism that market values drive internationalization initiatives. The population of international undergraduate students is low at Public University compared to other top-tier public institutions in Canada and Ontario.¹ The senior administrators suppose that if internationalization was a replaceable source for declining public budget of the university, the presence of international undergraduate students on campus must have been the first university internationalization activity. It means that in contrast to faculty members, administrators do not believe that recruitment of international undergraduate students is the first priority of internationalization activities. In other words, the administrators may be right in their assertion, to a degree but having few international undergraduate students does not mean that the university is reluctant to have more. It may mean that the administration has been unsuccessful in attracting international students.

¹ Population of all international students at Public University is about 8.4%. The population of international undergraduate students is about 5.7%.

Competition-based values

Competition-based values appear to be second set of value driving internationalization at Public University. Securing and increasing national prestige and building international profile and reputation are the main components of this group of values. The international reputation and branding trend is, therefore, seen as an important category of rationale in this study. Like many institutions in developed countries (Bok, 2003; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010), ranking, branding and reputation in both the national and international stages have been fundamental for Public University's administration. According to the University official policy, 'reputation' along with 'economic' motivations appear to be the main components that are influencing internationalization initiatives. Within the university, the Strategic Plan places 'international reputation' as a key policy target. Promoting the profile and raising international reputation is, in other words, the main concern of the University administration. According to Millan, a voice-provost, the university wants to raise [its] profile by offering the best higher education in Ontario and Canada; and be the destination for the best students and best faculty and best staff (Millan, 2013).

According to the administrators, one of the central concerns of Public University to acknowledge internationalization as a policy priority is to compete for national-international prestige and reputation. Senior administration believed that it is the duty of the administration to hold and increase the university's reputation nationally and internationally. Dr. Bryon, a Board of Governor, for example, stated: "people are hungry for the education that we have in North America...; so the administration needs to be able to hold on and raise our reputation, and at the same time make the place attractive for foreigners, and people outside of the province to come in." According to Dr. Smith, a senior administrator, most of the time, unhealthy competition

drives internationalization. He commented: “each university fights each other; that is another thing that drives me crazy; ... [just] look at Southern Ontario; all universities compete with each other.” He added that “internationalization is being a commercial enterprise.” According to some administrators, the existing game of competition is not bad per se, rather, it is a big opportunity for Canada and Canadian institutions. Dr. Saeedi, a Department Chair from the Faculty of Engineering, for example, stated: I think it would be very unfortunate for Canadian universities if they ignore this competition. [...] just from a market point of view, [...] there is a large market there; this is a big opportunity for the institution, the departments, faculty, and whatever.”

According to the faculty, competition for branding [and ranking] is a major concern of the university administration. Dr. Boes, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Science, for instance, commented “[the] administration wants to win this competition of branding and ranking games.” Dr. Pierce, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, commented: “there is a game in the name of competition; we want to win it; this is happening everywhere.” Dr. Pierce continued by criticizing the competition: “I used to talk about this from an instrumental way of thinking that is pushing us to think in terms of competition; this is a narrow way; this is a Tsunami, it is a Tsunami because it is covering the entire world. Everyone is doing that.” According to Dr. Pierce, the university’s administration has internationalization as a first priority because they want to win the game of competition to attract the best and brightest people. He commented:

We want to get [up] a good piece of the global pie. And by that we mean as the President has stated very clearly, we want to get the best piece of this pie; the best students and the best people from the world; we want them to come here instead of going to Stanford, U of T, UBC, etc. That is the rational part of all this that everyone wants to get the best piece of the same pie.

The logic of competition is understandable for faculty. According to them, there is no way to flee from the notion of competition which is unhealthy but necessary for the best and brightest students. Some faculty also believed that the university can compete without losing their

fundamental and basic academic identity. Dr. Tracy, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, for instance, commented: “we are living in a moment that I don’t particularly like, but I cannot close my eyes and say it doesn’t exist. No! I see the pressures! Pressure to compete, pressure to bring money, pressure to attract more resources! I see that pressure.” Dr. Pierce, another Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science saw competition like a ‘good devil’. He stated: “we have to walk with this devil if needed.” He continued by saying:

Competition is like a devil; sometimes you have to walk with the devil; it is possible! I think because I see that in other universities are doing that. It is possible to bring those resources, to get more money; to enrich your bank account without losing your soul; without abandoning your basic values, the mission, the fundamental mission; ...the educational mission of this university; the need to enhance our critical capacity of our vision; I think that we could enrich our bank account precisely by enhancing our critical capacity by paying attention to the product by making it more real, more substantive, more responsible and critical; it can be done.

According to faculty, the values of learning and education are neglected by focus on the recruitment of students. Dr. Chao, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science believed that: “the traditional academic values of knowledge and opportunity for intellectual discussion and debate have moved mostly into career training.” The other issue based on Faculty perception is that because of the dominant neoliberal zeitgeist which generally privileges an economic logic of postsecondary education (Held & McGrew, 2003; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010), neither administrators nor international students value the educational values of internationalization enough. Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science commented: “I always ask my foreign students why you are here! Either they do not know [even though they are here] or they say the same thing, more or less: we are here to get a good job.” According to Dr. Adams’ perception, international students are looking for training rather than education. He stated: “So they want training not education. I think not only administrators, but also students accept that business model.” Because of this, Dr. Tracy, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts

and Humanities, supposed that the university's administration does everything to keep students on campus to get their tuition money by the end. This is, as a matter of fact, the impact of neoliberal ideology which has privileged the processes of training rather than education and the need to build lives characterized by human dignity. This perspective is also associated with a preference to promote the instrumental values of competition.

Dr. Hinton, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities had an unenthusiastic perspective about the current trend of internationalization. She commented: "internationalization is a sick plan because our university is sick." According to Dr. Hilton, the deep entrenchment of market values in faculty's intellectual life and departments' academic objectives and programs is the symptom of the university's and internationalization's sickness. This is truth from the position of many other critically minded faculty, as it is consistent with other critical scholars' (Axelrod, 2002; Giroux, 2007; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010) observations from outside of the University. In this sense, as much as I perceive, internationalization plan is not the problem per se; rather it is a symptom of the larger problem itself. This means the possible sickness of internationalization is caused by the neoliberal accountability regime which has surrounded the academy and has been diminishing academic values and standards. Based on researchers' (e.g., Giroux, 2007; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010) arguments, neoliberal globalization forces institutions and their administration to anticipate and profit labor market trends.¹

According to Dr. Hilton, the sickness of the university occurs when traditional academic-humanist values and public and citizenship interests are overtaken or displaced by market principles such as competition, profit and private-interest. She added: "the problem is that when you try to talk about alternative things like academic freedom, research freedom, self-

¹ As such, their consumers are prospective students and their parents, and institutions are interested in responding the current crucial question of students and parents if their investment is going to pay off.

governance, freedom from market, university autonomy, etc. you feel you are alone in this way.” This is consistent with Giroux’s (2002, 2007) and Rizvi’s and Lingard’s (2010) observations indicating that in the context of neoliberalism, higher education policies have shifted from democratic public values toward a market-driven mode of learning and education. In addition, Dr. Hinton’s reflection could be interpreted as a sign of the risks and challenges of internationalization in terms of increased trends of the university toward commodification of related policies and programs at the expense of values such as academic freedom; collegiality, social responsibility, institutional autonomy, research and scholarly excellence, intellectual pluralism and diversity, scholars mobility, knowledge exchanges and partnerships that have traditionally underpinned postsecondary education. What does not seem promising is that while Public University budgets and funding are impacted by the global economic crisis and intertwined with government financial policies, it is expected that the pressure on the administration will be to find more cost-efficient initiatives and programs for internationalization. The researcher’s perception is that the University President and policy makers have to be politically and institutionally correct to gain more financial resources. In other words, with a noticeable level of declining public funding and the economic-political realities surrounding the University, the administration will/have to continue pursuing policies [of internationalization] that demand efficiency of inputs/components and accountability of outputs/outcomes.

The other point is that under the situation of “promoting the instrumental values of competition” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 31), the logic of acknowledging competition for profile and branding by the administration is that if the University’s reputation is raised, not only can departments get more talented and top international researchers and graduate and postdoctoral

students, but also that they can get attention of wealthy students from overseas. Because the best international faculty and researchers desire to work in the top-tier institutions, foreign students and their families predominantly choose their schools/institutions based on their international recognitions. While Public University lacks such a great international reputation outside of the country, internationalization is a very important strategy for the administration to raise the institution profile. This assertion resonates with the reflection of a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science stating that the administration are well aware that Public University may be famous, well-known and well-established within the province and country, but people from outside of the country do not know this institution as it really is.

To sum up, the neoliberal- instrumental discourse which has been dominant in many institutions from the 1970s (Altbach & Knight, 2007; de Wit, 2011; Maringe et al., 2013; Warwick & Moogan, 2013), began to prevail over the last decade or so at Public University. There has recently been a shift toward neoliberal values orientation in internationalization of higher education. In the framework of this business-capital discourse, the university has been engaging with policies that may help to attract more foreign students and sell research products in an aggressive market of competition and profit building. This seems well-matched with the arguments of some scholars such as Giroux (2007), Rizvi and Lingard (2010), and Warwick and Moogan (2013) that today's higher education institutions are less likely to base organizational decisions on educational and scholarly values, and more likely to link them to management-efficiency ethos and strategy.

In addition, under the condition of neoliberal-instrumental discourse there is an increased concern about the focus on student numbers and financial bottom-line rather than the content and the quality of international learning and multicultural experiences. According to faculty, existing

internationalization initiatives do not align with academic and intellectual standards of the university and the community. For example, Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science thought that over-recruitment of wealthy international students happens for the advantage of non-academic criteria. He commented: “I have lamented in recent years that the quality of our education is declining that we are using criteria instead of standards; today we are not meeting standards but rather satisfying criteria.” The argument is that when internationalization initiatives do not align with the faculty expectations, they judge the agenda as detrimental, or at best, ineffective and unsuccessful. This trend of internationalization may perpetuate the erosion of intellectual life and academic freedom and equality. For faculty what is obvious is that postsecondary education should not be a business, and students should not be conceived as the university’s customers. Increasing the population of foreign students or research and knowledge exchange merely for economic purposes cannot be an ultimate academic goal for a public, liberal and research-intensive university in a developed, multicultural context.

Liberal-academic discourse

The liberal-academic discourse of values mostly exists in policy statements and administration rhetoric. This discourse implies that the mission of the university is to educate critical engaged students as global citizens. The liberal-academic discourse is constituted by educational/academic and multicultural/ humanitarian values. I first discuss these two sets of values, and then develop a discussion on the discourse.

Educational and academic-based values

Educational and academic-based values are the third group of values that appears to be driving internationalization activities. According to some administrators, educational values still drive internationalization initiatives. According to Dr. Miller, a senior administrator, the idea of

educating globally ready graduates and citizens is the important thing that the administration has been planning to do. She said: “As I tell people, if internationalization at this institution was all about business or all about bringing international students for resources and so on, I would not be taking this job. We want to educate global citizens and international researchers.” According to Dr. Bryon, another senior administrator, the real value driving internationalization certainly is learning and education. She believed that the funding of international graduate students is an instance of the claim that foreign students are recruited only because of educational and academic reasons at Public University.

Beside some curriculum and learning-based activities at the university level, different international teaching and educational programs have been implemented in different departments over the last decade. For example, the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering from the Faculty of Engineering has developed a joint undergraduate-graduate degree program with the Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) in Roorkee. Likewise, the Faculty of Law has developed a unique joint undergraduate/master’s program with The University Groningen in the Netherlands, and a joint masters-level program with the National Academy of Legal Scholarship, the top-ranked law school in India. The School of Business is offering a global Masters in International Management program in partnership with CEMS¹. All of these academic activities and research and education partnerships imply that although educational and academic values are partly submerged because of the university funding circumstance, they still exist and are not completely absent at Public University.

¹ The Global Alliance in Management Education or CEMS (formerly the Community of European Management Schools and International Companies).

Multicultural and humanitarian-based values

Multicultural and humanitarian-based values are the fourth driving set of values of internationalization. I found a few instances of this group of values in policy statements and reports. According to the Strategic Plan and other related reports, Public University has, for example, been working with educational and medical institutions in Belarus to improve dental care and the quality of cardiac treatment and surgery in that country. Rebuilding the health care system in Rwanda in collaboration with other Canadian partners and funding from the Canadian International Development Agency is another example of its international humanitarian activity and research collaboration. UHE's project— as the university commitment and response to the HIV/AIDS crisis in Africa in order to establish disease-fighting probiotic yoghurt businesses in Tanzania, Kenya and Rwanda- has been a cornerstone of Public University's internationalization strategy. Another example is a Faculty of Education researchers' work and contributions on a project to develop research material on "Global Citizenship" for Canadian schools.

Reviewing these activities indicate that despite the reflections of most critically minded participants, Public University has experienced different types of internationalization initiatives other than recruiting international students. The above mentioned initiatives could be viewed as proof that that the university internationalization plans are not only about recruiting international students as the first and foremost initiative for generating revenue. To some degree, it can be employed and interpreted as part of misconceptions and misunderstanding which exist among the participants about the internationalization programs (De Wit, 2011; Knight, 2011). As de Wit (2011) argues, the worst misconception regarding internationalization of higher education is that it means having many international students on campus. This also implies that although almost all faculty members mentioned were aware of the University's Strategic Plan of

internationalization, they were not well aware of the different components of internationalization and its activities at the university. This may be because although almost all faculty were, more or less, aware of Public University's strategic plan on internationalization, only one associate professor from the Faculty of Science stated that he had read the complete plan. If so, the university administration has the responsibility to approach a way that would address the faculty and other stakeholders' misconceptions and misunderstanding of internationalization policies.




Figure 6.3. Two main discourses of policy values

The liberal-academic values are traditionally included in the three main roles of the modern university, teaching/learning; research/knowledge and service/supports (Bok, 2003; Giroux, 2010). In this sense, internationalization can be valued as an agenda which aims to fulfill higher education's original missions in a broad way. According to this discourse, the end goal(s) and policy rationale(s) of internationalization is supposed to be associated with research, knowledge production and educating students to embrace all cultures, experiences, diversity and different walks of life. A real and academic internationalization with persuasive rationales may

lead to educate responsible citizens who are competitively self-motivated, civic-minded and productive, and eligible for taking social responsibilities in both foreign and domestic arenas. This is consistent with IAU's (2003, 2005, 2010) suggestion that the key rationales of internationalization are supposed to support the preparation of students to live and work in a globalized world, the improvement of academic quality, and the strengthening of research. Such persuasive rationales of internationalization should, in addition, lead faculty to feel more confident and connected to both global networks and their community-based activities.

To sum up, as shown in Figure 6.3, and discussed above and Chapter V, different sets of values have been influencing internationalization initiatives and activities at Public University. The two discourses of values (i.e. liberal-academic and neoliberal-instrumental values) are consistent with the findings and discussion on the two approaches of internationalization's definition, as discussed in section one. Both the liberal-academic values and the notion of internationalization *in theory* mostly exist in policy statements and administration rhetoric. The neoliberal-instrumental values and the notion of internationalization *in practice* are mostly observed during the implementation of routine internationalization on and off campus. This statement resonates with a comment from Dr. Boes, a research participant, indicating that, "you can find some intellectual and educational values on the paper [policy statements] but material values are basic in practice. I think it is materials that are valued more because then the infrastructure of the grant money than flows to the [Public] university." Accordingly, internationalization policies and initiatives are theoretically influenced by liberal-academic discourse of values and in practice, driven by neoliberal-instrumental discourse.

A Cross (sub) Case Analysis

Despite the fact that this is a single case study, in this section I briefly employ the technique of cross case analysis to identify the major similarities and differences in participants' perceptions in order to get rich information of the case. As it was shown in Chapter V, I used various tables and figures to compare the summary of findings (presented in a descriptive format) and discussion from two sources of participants -faculty and administrators. Here I briefly summarize and discuss the main cross-case findings.

Although administrators and participants in different faculties shared almost the same value on the necessity and need of internationalization, they defined it in different and somewhat contrasting ways. In other words, internationalization of higher education is perceived in two different ways by administrators and faculty members. For senior administrators, internationalization is an ideal policy and there is nothing negative about it. Terms such as 'access', 'impact', 'opportunity', 'connection', 'diversity', 'mobility', 'awareness', 'partnership', 'collaboration', etc. characterize common perceptions and descriptions by administrators regarding internationalization. In contrast, the meaning of internationalization for faculty members, except participants from the Faculty of Engineering, is associated with a business-driven approach to higher education. Terms such as 'profit', 'business', 'competition', 'marketization', 'branding', 'industry', 'commercialization', 'corporatization', etc. are the common descriptions of internationalization by faculty members. Despite the differences between two groups of participants in terms of how they view internationalization at Public University, most of them see internationalization as a timely and significant strategy. In this sense, there is no discrepancy between what administrators say and what faculty perceive about the significance of internationalization. In other words, while all participants, both the

administrators and faculty members, may have conflicting or differing values and priorities, they see internationalization as a necessary and essential policy for the present and future of the University. To some degree, this finding and discussion is in agreement with Stier's (2004) argument indicating that although "administrators and teachers [faculty] share a commitment to internationalization, they adhere to different ideologies and normative objectives" (p. 94).

According to administrators (except the managers) internationalization at Public University entails different initiatives such as international research collaboration and partnership, recruiting international students, knowledge exchange, international teaching and learning programs, and extending students exchange and experience. Moreover, based on the views of faculty members, except for participants from Faculty of Engineering, the university has only been committed to recruiting more international students as the first and foremost activity of internationalization.

In addition, there is a big gap between senior administrators' and executive managers' attitudes about internationalization programs and their impacts on the campus and the community. One of the main similarities in perceptions of participants is that both administrators and faculty believed that the presence of more international students enrich the university community and campus.

Faculty believe that regardless of the positive or negative impact of internationalization on the community, the first goal for the administration is generating financial resources. In contrast, administrators rationalize (and they were perhaps successful in doing so with the general public) that the international policies and programs are created for the good of the institution. Nevertheless, although faculty believe that existing initiatives and programs are held in accordance to the market-driven values and corporate-driven rationales, they understand

circumstances and financial logic of the university to find replaceable resources for declining public funding.

According to administrators, the existing policies of internationalization provide opportunities for all but the faculty believed that the current procedures commonly privilege international students from wealthy families. Prioritizing the recruitment of international fee-paying students from privileged backgrounds is considered an inappropriate way of enhancing diversity and quality of the community. Marketing and recruiting more international students would not be viewed as a detriment if they were admitted based on their academic merit, but this is not how faculty perceive the situation. According to faculty, the current policies of recruiting more wealthy international students is causing fear among local students and parents about their possible displacement. This issue was, however, rejected outright by senior administrators.

Another point is that although the university's Strategic Plan, Academic Plans of Faculties, and most of the administrators are rather silent about economic incentives and market-based motives of internationalization, according to faculty these economic motives and incentives are an obvious and basic rationale of internationalization. In other words, according to the official rhetoric internationalization initiatives are about academic and educational rationales. In contrast, faculty members believe that the economic and financial resources are the first and foremost key rationale of internationalization for the university.

Another major gap is that administrators confidently thought they were optimally representing the voices of the key stakeholders, including faculty, students, administration and staff. However, most faculty are skeptical about their voices being heard. They feel that they do not have or have very little influence on internationalization initiatives and its processes.

According to the administrators, all students, particularly international students, and faculty

benefit enormously from the current university's internationalization. Faculty members, however, believes that the university administration benefits the most.

Another cross-case finding is that faculty were either not involved in internationalization at all or become over involved in international activities. Researchers in the Faculties of Engineering and Science were the most involved with internationalization and participants from Social Science, and particularly Arts and Humanities have been the less-involved faculty. From this perspective, it is important to mention that faculties could be divided into two divisions of 'more' international and 'less' international. Additionally, even departments within a 'more' internationalized faculties could be divided in two 'more' and 'less' internationalized departments and so on. This finding is consistent with Warwick and Moogan's (2013) research showing that there are extensive variations in practice in the degree and implementation of internationalization initiatives between departments at the same university.

To sum up, in descending order from the most to least critical perceptions about internationalization initiatives and programs at Public University were the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Faculty of Social Science, Faculty of Science, and lastly, the Faculty of Engineering. This finding may provoke thoughts as to why participants from some faculties may be more critical about internationalization than others. From the researchers' perspective, there are two core reasons. The first reason is that faculties that have been more internationalized, in terms of international research partnerships and collaboration, and the population of international students, have faculty members with less critical perspectives about internationalization programs. On the contrary, faculties that have been less internationalized and rather marginalized in terms of different internationalization components, have faculty members with greater critical attitudes. The uneven engagement of departments and individuals with internationalization

activities appears to be the main reason for this. In other words, participants from the Faculty of Engineering are less critical because they have benefited and are privileged by different components and activities of internationalization, compared to scholars from other faculties at Public University. A couple of the research participants echoed this point. For instance, Dr. Boles, an Associate Professor from the Faculty of Social Science commented: “if you study or teach in the areas of, for example, humanities, sociology, and many social sciences, my sense as an insider is that you will not be at the first stage of internationalization priority now.” She continued to say that unequal attention to departments is a common threat on campus these days. She commented, “what we regularly see here is the situation which the natural sciences, engineering and, you know, those areas get far more money attention than the traditional humanistic areas like Arts and Humanities, visual arts, etc.” Next, Dr. Pierce, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science described internationalization as a one-way policy turning into a form of unequal agenda planned for scientists and engineers. Dr. Tracy, another Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities commented, “we worry in the Humanities and Social Sciences a lot, in general. To the extent that internationalization privileges and rewards certain areas of study and certain things, we [faculty] are worried that we are not on that list.” Following, a Full Professor, Dr. Robinson, from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities believed that the business approach and attitude of internationalization is the main reason for the existence of unequal attention to departments. He stated, “I think what I say, yes, I would like to engage in our international programs, but the problem is that when you privilege the commercialization of research as the kind of agenda then the problem becomes that not enough attention will be paid to some disciplines and some areas.” Hence, some participants, particularly more critically-minded faculty, were either not excited about or less interested in

internationalization - mostly because of the existing unequal treatment and engagement. These statements are consistent with the findings from other analyses (Altbach & Knight, 2007; IAU, 2010) whereby internationalization may foster unjust academic (and non-academic) practices among departments and institutions.

The second reason is that scholars from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences have held critical visions about their environment, in and out of the academy, based on the nature of their educational field and school of thought. In other words, they historically and professionally have analyzed policies with a critical lens and stance. In the meantime, it has historically been philosophers and scholars from the fields of humanities and social sciences that have been theorizing, developing, and maintaining intellectual values, educational principles, and academic standards of postsecondary education. Therefore, it is expected that they would protect their traditional-academic heritage, values, and principles from neoliberal encroachments and academic metamorphosis.

A second provocative question would be why executive managers are critical about existing internationalization programs and policies compared to the other three groups of participants from the administrator's side. One of the main reasons is that they hold greater awareness of the realities of internationalization initiatives in current practice. Executive managers who engage in international programs and work in the related offices are directly connected to international students, their conditions, and problems. Therefore, when executive managers reckon that students' voices, both local and international, are not heard, it should be duly noted to the university administration and policy makers to take students' voices seriously.

Summary

This chapter started with developing a discussion on the findings regarding the three research questions of the study. Then, it continued to develop a discussion and analysis on the central question and topic of the study, namely dominant discourses of values, at Public University. It was discussed that two major discourses of values appear to drive the initiatives and activities of internationalization: liberal-academic and neoliberal-instrumental. The findings indicate that the gradual extension of commercial logic and market values to current educational initiatives and academic values that historically have been absent from traditional university policies in Ontario. One of the main arguments of this chapter was that there is a significant gap between internationalization in theory and internationalization in practice.

CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSION

Introduction

To put this thesis and its findings into context, it is helpful to review some key points regarding the research framework and methodology of the study. A single case-study approach and critical framework were used for understanding what values drive internationalization and how they influence policies and initiatives at a public university in Ontario. Three other research questions were examined. These include: “*What does internationalization mean for the university’s administrators and faculty?*”; “*Why does the university engage in internationalization?*” and “*Whose policy (agenda) does internationalization of higher education represent?*”

The research site of the study was a public university in Ontario, Canada. The university has actively adopted and implemented internationalization as a policy and has a respective strategic plan. In order to maintain anonymity, Public University was chosen as the pseudonym of the research site. The main source of information and data collection was key-informant interviews. Research participants were selected from two groups of faculty and administrators that either had direct and first-hand engagement and experience or wide knowledge and information about internationalization. The group of administrators varied from senior administrators and policy makers to managers and departments chairs. Faculty members included scholars who were engaged and interested in internationalization from the four Faculties of Arts and Humanities, Engineering, Science, and Social Sciences. As per the ethics approval process for this research, I used pseudonyms for participants in order to maintain their anonymity and privacy.

The study also utilized data from other sources in order to “secure an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 7), and to facilitate a

better understanding the official position of the university on internationalization. In addition to key-informant individual interviews - as the main data source – official policy (including policy documents and archived materials published in the press and media sources) was acquired as supplementary source of information in this research. According to Yin (2003) the most important application of documents in policy analysis is to support and enhance evidence from other sources. The main policy document consulted was a four year Strategic Plan of Public University on internationalization between 2009 and 2012. For the administration’s rhetoric, published archival materials and reports were reviewed. These materials were chosen in order to understand Public University’s administration rhetoric toward internationalization from 2009 to 2012. The data was analyzed in a single case analysis (Yin, 2006; Merriam, 1998). The process and technique of single case analysis used in this study was transcribing, uncovering, coding, categorizing, and identifying key concepts, themes and major trends. This chapter concludes the thesis with a summary and discussion that interweave the findings of the study based on research questions. The chapter (and dissertation) ends with a final argument and some recommendations and concluding words.

Conclusions

Relying on Easton’s definition of policy as the ‘authoritative allocation of values’, and drawing on critical policy analysis approaches (Ball, 1990; Fairclough, 1995; Giroux, 2007; Prunty, 1985; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Taylor, 1997), I perceived policy as ‘the practice of values’. This vision and the centrality of values required that I consider not only what values are represented, but also understand whose values are represented and whose voices are missing in internationalization initiatives and related policy statements. Critical policy analysis required that I interrogate and conceptualize how and what values and voices are glossed over or misplaced. This approach

analytically questioned the University administration, and critically debunked their policy assertions about internationalization initiatives and activities.

Concerning the first research question, this study identified two major and different approaches of internationalization at Public University. What is common in the official policy and most definitions by administrators is that internationalization means international collaboration, international learning, and international partnerships with overseas institutions. For administrators in particular internationalization means ensuring that the education and research that the university engage in have maximum international impact. This includes addressing global issues such as HIV, climate change, food scarcity, among others. From this perspective, internationalization also is the process of integrating international and institutional initiatives of postsecondary education to educate engaged and responsible global citizens. For the faculty, however, internationalization at Public University means the process of recruiting more foreign students, specifically from wealthy families. From this perspective, internationalization is viewed as the process of international competition to commercialize postsecondary education and the recruitment of more wealthy international students to generate revenue and build the national-international profile and reputation of public University.

Regarding the second theme and research question, the study discovered four major rationales: commercial-financial; administrative-visibility; educational-academic, and international-collaborative relationship. In terms of cross-case findings, according to administrators, revenue does not play a central role in terms of the recruitment of international fee-paying students and other initiatives like research and collaboration constitute internationalization at Public University. Faculty members, however, supposed that income generation and selling the institutions' credentials play a crucial role in different

internationalization initiatives and activities. On the other hand, according to senior administrators, the broader and main rationale is the enrichment of the university community in terms of different aspects of educational and academic and cultural diversity. On the contrary, the faculty, furthermore, believed that the goal of internationalization is branding and extending the profile of the University. This shows that there are many contradictions and different perceptions about the rationales driving internationalization at Public University amongst the research participants in this study.

In terms of agenda setting and policy development, which the third research question set out to understand, this study identified that internationalization is influenced and run by three different forces at three different levels. At the *macro level* (global/international) the international regime and corporate world along with international agencies play a basic role. At the *meso level* (national/provincial), governments of Canada and Ontario have a considerable role related to internationalization initiatives. At the *micro level* (local/institutional), internationalization is viewed as the University's President's and administration's agenda. Faculties and departments directors feel they have a minor role in internationalization activities. The faculty, in addition, tend to focus on improving academic performance and learning experiences of international and domestic students, and sending out domestic students to experience the world, instead of recruiting more international students. Particularly, department chairs support developing initiatives and strategies that can improve students' learning and academic performance. What is important is that internationalization at Public University is viewed by faculty members being run by the University elites. From the perspective of faculty, this is not acceptable. The point is that the university community sees internationalization as a top-down policy with a non-democratic agenda at the University. Accordingly they believe that

there is not a substantive policy interaction between the administration and the university community.

Regarding the central research question about the embedded and core values influencing internationalization, the data gathered suggests an emergence and presence of two major discourses of values driving the related policies and initiatives, namely, an academic-liberal discourse and an instrumental-neoliberal discourse. Each discourse includes two subdivisions. The two main subdivisions of liberal- academic discourse are education-academic based values and multicultural-humanitarian based values. The two main subdivisions of neoliberal-instrumental discourse are material-based values and competition based values. For both administrators and faculty members, competition for reputation, international profile and admitting the best and brightest people are the important values driving internationalization initiatives. Nevertheless, from the vantage point of cross case findings, faculty suppose that *commercialization* of higher education is the dominant value paradigm that drives the University in internationalization initiatives. From this perspective, internationalization at Public University is recognized as a means to an end which is associated with market and budgetary objectives.

With the rise in student mobility around the world, and despite different goals and great diversity, this study identifies that Public University has, more and less, similar concerns with other universities in the developed world (Altbach & Knight, 2007; de Wit, 2011; Maringe et al., 2013). One, and probably the only and leading concern at Public University is making up declining public funding and developing replaceable resources for government funds. Despite the emergence and presence of some successful international academic and humanitarian-based initiatives such as UHE and WINDE, among others, internationalization is associated with an increasing tendency toward aggressive marketing and competition for more international

students, generating other financial resources and building the profile of the University. Taking all that into account, this study concludes that commercialization is the dominant trend of influencing and governing internationalization. From this perspective, as de Wit (2011) argues, internationalization is an objective in itself. Consequently, instrumental-market-driven rationales justify any kind of commercial-academic activities such as the recruitment of more international students and corporatization. In such a condition, the privilege of material-based values and market-driven rationales means that international opportunities of postsecondary education at Public University are becoming a luxury reserved for students from wealthy families, particularly from privileged countries.

A Final Argument: Toward a Dynamic Balance

The argument is that the liberal academic values of postsecondary education are gradually losing ground in favour of commercial goals and open-market values at the University. Liberal-academic values are, however, not completely absent at Public University. They exist, but are submerged in the contemporary dominant neoliberal-instrumental discourse of values. This finding is consistent with other scholars' observations indicating the shift of internationalization policies, particularly in Anglo-American institutions, from traditional values of academic and cooperative rationales to market-driven values and competitive and corporate rationales (Giroux, 2007; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; van der Wende, 2001).

The criticism is not merely because the value of money is driving internationalization; the argument is that the market and instrumental-based values are threatening and eroding the intrinsic values of post-secondary education. This is a symptom of our current university illness, according to Dr. Hinton, a research participant from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities. She added that "the erosion of traditional scholarly values is evidently one symptom of the illness of

our university.” This perception is consistent with Axelrod’s (2002) report indicating that decision-making autonomy that the university must have to provide cultural, intellectual, community-service, and training functions is being eroded in Canadian public universities (*Ibid*, p. 4-5). Under such circumstances, Public University like other peer institutions in Ontario and Canada has now become highly dependent on income generated from internationalization activities, and has developed a kind of marketing structures to sustain its different sources of revenue (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010).

The argument is that the economic-financial rationale as a dominant motive appears to be worrisome for the community. This is because they believe that the institution has been approaching postsecondary education with a business mindset, rather than from the perspective of intrinsic -educational rationales of schooling. It was clear to me that some participants got nervous during our interviews about their opinions and perspectives about the university’s inclination to see postsecondary education as a for-profit business. Dr. Adams, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for example reflected: “the current discourse of higher education goes too far away from the real reasons my colleagues and I have been recruited as professors to teach students or do research.” This is consistent with other scholars’ observations indicating that postsecondary education sector is seen as a factor in ensuring economic productivity (Bok, 2003; Giroux, 2007; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Within this commercial framework, higher education institutions have, as Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) observed, become international drivers for revenue generation, since profit has become prioritized over the core educational activities of institution. According to the findings and discussion, therefore, internationalization appears to be a key component of the global marketplace of postsecondary

education for branding institutions to sell their products - normally credentials and certifications- to potential buyers, most of whom are students from the developing world.

The argument, nevertheless, is that with the current unstable economic climate which means priorities for revenue generation and controlling expenditures, a tension between these two discourses of values has been emerging. This tension is connected to the recently emerging conflict in the relationship between university funding and government policies (Boggs, 2009). In other words, Public University like other institution in Canada and Ontario has been forced by government(s) policy to narrow its academic-educational mission (Axelrod, 2002). Under such a condition, neoliberal and instrumental values are privileged over liberal and academic-humanistic values. The argument is that even if it is justifiable for the administration to search for an agenda that promotes the branding and income generation, it cannot mean that they overlook the intrinsic basic academic values of postsecondary education. From the point of views of faculty members, the university administrators and policy makers need to approach their decision to internationalize from the perspective of the liberal-academic values rather than neoliberal-instrumental values. In other words, if the university administration approaches internationalization with a business or market perspective, then all key policy stakeholders - students, faculty and staff- are viewed from a financial/business standpoint, rather than from an academic and scholarly standpoint. Rather, the values behind the internationalization agenda need to be deeply redefined and reconsidered to include intellectual pluralism, critical thinking, scholarly excellence, and deliberative democracy where decisions are made on the basis of public discussion and collaboration.

For internationalization policy making, the administration needs an imaginary which recognizes that the university is an academic-socio-cultural enterprise aimed at educating new

generations of global citizens. Internationalization could, furthermore, instill the humanitarian-culturally and scholarly core values which are currently submerging in public institutions (Giroux, 2007; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). I am not suggesting that Public University should return to the values of origins of the university in the Renaissance period. Rather, I argue that although the zeitgeist of our time pushes the administration to have an internationalization agenda that reflects the economic realities of the time, it cannot inevitably mean that they have to overlook the basic-intrinsic liberal values of higher education. Without belittling the importance of financial aspect of internationalization, it is traditionally acknowledged that higher education serves the public good as the stronghold of public democratic and educational-academic values (Giroux & Searls Giroux, 2004). In the largest sense, internationalization must contribute to 'human flourishing' (Nixon, 2011). It is still expected that the university should take responsibility not only to search for truth regardless of where it may lead (Bok, 2003) but also to educate students to push power politically and morally to be responsible and accountable at the local, national and international levels.

The argument also is that the current policy making process regarding internationalization is flawed and needs to be profoundly rethought and changed. Internationalization initiatives need to be more accessible and useful for all. The existing internationalization processes and procedures are challenged because they are not fully and appropriately internationalized. The administration's hidden presupposition maybe is that internationalization activities cannot please everyone properly, nor can they meet all needs and demands according to each faculty's and students' priority and expectations. But based on the findings of this study an ideal agenda for internationalization must develop in a fully democratic engagement from all walks of life based on harmony between educational and market rationales. Under such a condition, the argument is

that there is a strategic need to combine the key components of the University's motto of 'usefulness' (knowledge for living) and 'truth' (search for knowledge). In other words, imbalanced concentration on a single component of the University motto is the issue of misleading internationalization policies. The lack of balance between two central parts of the university motto may lead the institution to lose ground. Internationalization requires harmony and a dynamic balance between different rationales and values discussed above. Having balance between the business and academic values seems to be the ideal type of internationalization initiatives for most participants. One of the researcher participants, Dr. Pierce, a Full Professor from the Faculty of Social Science, for example, well echoed this point. He stated: "internationalization has to be about some balance between the business aspect of internationalization and the cultural-educational aspect of internationalization." This reflection is similar to something that Dr. Tracy, another Full Professor from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities called: "balance between public values and market values."

The final argument, accordingly, is that with due attention to the necessity of making up for the declining public funding at Public University, there is a need to maintain balance in the global market of internationalization and to protect democratic public and academic values and principles of higher education. I argue that a persuasive and dynamic balance between '*Veritas*' et '*Utilitas*' or a value balance between search for knowledge (truth) and knowledge for living (usefulness), and accordingly harmony between two discourses of values would be an ideal type policy for the coming internationalization of the University. It is evident that striking the right and dynamic balance between two polar sides of internationalization is always a challenge but it is one that the University administration has to do extensively and transparently. The reality is that like administrators, we are aware of the contemporary fiscal shortages and constraints, but

higher education has traditionally been regarded for its contributions to intellectual and scholarly values (Axelrod, 2002; Bok, 2003; Childress, 2010; Clark, 1998; Giroux, 2007, 2011; Guld, 2003; Readings, 1996; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2009). I agree with scholars like Stier (2004) who believe that economic realities cannot be overlooked with regards to postsecondary education policies, but the Public University administration should be well aware of the potential risks and challenges of international market and business aspect of internationalization. Therefore, we agree upon the strategy of harmony and equilibrium, and it is important that the institution sets up a bridge between aspects of market rationales and educational-academic rationales in order to reach all its goals and objectives.

Further Recommendations

Policies should be revised and updated over time on the basis of ongoing research and investigation to ensure that existing agenda and processes are being incorporated into the needs and expectations of stakeholders. Research has shown that policy analysis, particularly critical policy analysis, has had relatively little influence on policy making circles and their procedures (Stewart, 2009; Taylor, et.al., 2007; Weiss, 1983). Unfortunately, critical policy research either does not influence higher education policies, or influences are little and unremarkable. In other words, the implications of critical studies and recommendations from policy-oriented research seem to have little effect on either the day-to-day operations of policy initiatives or the long-term directions of education policy (Berliner, 1990; Pal, 2010; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Without generalizing the findings and discussions, I am, however, confident about the impact that this study will have on the administration and policy makers in public universities in Ontario and Canada.

The other issue is that while globalization may have both positive and negative consequences to higher education, the existing policies and processes of internationalization may decrease the population of international students seeking further education in host universities like Public University and many other institutions in Ontario. In other words, in a “nationally uneven system of higher education in Canada” (Coates & Morrison, 2011, p. 178) and under the condition of aggressive competition for foreign students, there are two factors that may make Ontario universities much less attractive than they once were and, consequently, decrease international student enrollment. These are: ‘imbalanced procedures’ (such as increasing tuition rates, grant discriminatory policies) and dual valuation [with regards to graduate and undergraduate students]. If, consequently, the university administration’s goal is to increase the population of the best and brightest international students, making a policy of equivalence tuition for local and international students is a first and most important step. In other words, what is actually influential in increasing the number of international students on campus is to decrease international students’ tuition fees. Having a balance between the business and educational aspects of internationalization initiatives is, therefore, recommended.

As shown in Chapter V and discussed in Chapter VI, there is a reciprocal (and assumedly equal) lack of knowledge and understanding about each other’s values between administrators and faculty with regards to rationales and values behind internationalization initiatives. Therefore, a closer and mutual understanding between administrators and faculty is professionally and persuasively needed. In other words, Public University needs an approach/agenda that would address the gap between the current administration/faculty misunderstanding and somewhat conflict of attitudes and enable more sustainable running of development of internationalization programs on and outside of campus whilst still delivering on

the three core missions of contemporary higher education success, teaching-learning, research-knowledge/, and service-supports.

Areas for Future Research

In addition, there are a few key related topics for future and further policy research and analysis in the area of internationalization of higher education:

(1) How students, local and international, differentiate values, rationales and initiatives presented in internationalization policy statements, procedures and practices.

(2) Support systems for local and international students that would include both financial support and on-campus services networks for all new students.

(3) Potential benefits and challenges of internationalization of public institutions in Canada, including benefits and risks of internationalization initiatives for local and international students.

(4) A comparative critical policy analyses of internationalization of higher education in different provinces of Canada, in different Anglo-American countries, and different developing country settings.

(5) 'Postsecondary education for all' in privileged institutions in the developed world in which their administrations seek international students from wealthy families from rich developing countries.

Concluding Remarks

As the study comes to a close, I would like to present below a few thoughts. At the present time, if one walks through the centre spot of Public University (like any other public institution in Ontario and Canada), one sees and hears different languages spoken on campus. The cultural

composition of University has changed dramatically over the past 25 years. While global corporatization is rapidly accelerating in all areas, the existing boom of internationalization is going to occur amid the whispers of ‘hope’ and ‘fear’ in the coming decade(s). In an optimistic scenario, internationalization is supposed to be promising because of all its opportunities, benefits, and different ways of promoting and educating global citizens. In a pessimistic scenario, internationalization might become the major victim of its own success due to erosion of the quality of liberal humanitarian and academic values. The growing financial dependence of the public institutions on international students carries significant challenges. “International students are, in effect, propping up and improving universities for all in attendance. If they stop coming, the universities feel financial pain” (Coates & Morrison, 2011, p. 218). Although internationalization will remain a central force and priority in higher education institutions, its contours are unclear. Therefore, the University’s administration should be well aware of the potential challenges of internationalization initiatives, which includes wiping out the intrinsic values, academic standards and intellectual traditions of the university and in their place favouring corporate outcome, and market-driven values.

REFERENCES

- Aerden, A, Decker, F. D., Divis, J., Frederiks, M. & de Wit, H. (2013). Assessing the internationalization of degree programs: experiences from a Dutch-Flemish pilot certifying internationalization. *Compare*, 43 (1), 56-78.
- Agoston, S. & Dima, A. (2012). Trends and strategies within the process of academic internationalization. *Management & Marketing*, 7 (1), 43-56.
- Alexander, R.J. (1997) *Policy and Practice in primary education: local initiative, national agendas*, 2nd e. London: Routledge.
- Allan, E. J., Iverson, S. V., & Roper-Huilmsn, R. (Eds.). (2010). *Reconstructing policy in higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Alphonso, C. (2012). Where in the world are Canada's universities? The Globe and Mail, Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/time-to-lead/where-in-the-world-are-canadas-universities/article4614819/>
- Altbach, G. P. (2012). Taking on corruption in international higher education. *University World news*; Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20120717134058780>
- Altbach, P. & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 290-305.
- Altbach, P. G. (2002). Perspectives on international higher education. *Change*, 34 (3), 29–31.
- Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. In National Education Association (Ed.), *The EA 2005 almanac of higher education* (pp. 63-74). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

- Altbach, P. Reisberg, L. and Rumbley, L., (2009). *Trends in global higher education, tracking an academic revolution*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Arno, R.F. & Torres, C.A., Eds. (1999). *Comparative education: The dialectics of the global and the local*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (2002). *Trends in higher education*. Ottawa: AUCC.
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (2005). *Canadian universities: general information*. Retrieved from http://www.aucc.ca/can_uni/general_info/overview_e.html
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (2007). *Internationalizing Canadian campuses*. Report on findings of the 2006 Survey on Internationalization. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Retrieved from http://www.aucc.ca/_pdf/english/publications/aucc-scotia_web_e.pdf
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. (2009). *Universities Matter: How Canada's universities contribute to economic recovery and long-term prosperity* Ottawa: AUCC
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. (2011). *Trends in higher education*. Vol (1). Retrieved from: http://www.aucc.ca/_pdf/english/publications/trends-2011-vol1-enrolment-e.pdf
- Axelrod, P. D. (2002). *Values in conflict: the university, the marketplace and the trials of liberal education*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Bacchi, C. (2009). *Analysing policy: What's the problem represented to be?* Frenchs Forest: Pearson Education Australia.
- Ball, J. S. (2008). *The education debate*. Bristol: Polity Press.

- Ball, J.S. (1990). *Politics and policy making in education: Explorations in policy sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Ball, J.S. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse*, 13(2), 10–17.
- Ball, J.S. (1994). *Education Reform: A critical and post-structural approach*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Barr, N. (2003). *Financing higher education: Comparing the options*. London School of Economics and Political Science. Retrieved from http://econ.lse.ac.uk/staff/nb/barr_HE_option030610.pdf
- Bazerman, C. (2006). Analyzing the multidimensionality of texts in education. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. B. Elmore (Eds.), *Complementary methods in education research* (pp. 77–94). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Beach, C. M., Boadway, R. W., and McInnis, R. M. (2005). *Higher education in Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: John Deutsch Institute for the Study of Economic Policy, McGill-Queens University Press.
- Beach, R., Enciso, P., Harste, J., Jenkins, C., Raina, S., A., Rogers, R., Short, K. G., Sung, Y. K., Wilson, M., & Yenika-Agbaw, V. (2009). Exploring the "critical" in critical content analysis of children's literature. In K. M. Leaner, D. W. Rowe, D. K. Dickinson, M. K. Hundley, R. T. Jamenez & V. J. Risko (Eds.), *58th yearbook of the national reading conference* (pp. 129-143). Oak Creek, WI: National Reading Conference.
- Beck, K. (2008). *Being international: Learning in a Canadian university* (Doctoral dissertation). Unpublished manuscript, Department of Education, Simon Fraser University, British Columbia, Burnaby, Canada.

- Beck, K. (2012). Globalization/s: Reproduction and resistance in the internationalization of higher education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 35 (3), 133-148.
- Bedard, G.J. & Lawton, S.B. (2000). The struggle for power and control: shifting policy-making models and the Harris agenda for education in Ontario. *Canadian Public Administration*, 43 (3), 241-269.
- Bereday, J. Z. F. (1964). *Comparative research in education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Berliner, D.C.. (1990). Research on teaching and educational policy. In L.R. Marcus and BD Stickney (Eds) *Politics and policy in the age of education*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Boggs, A.M. (2009). Ontario's university tuition framework: A history and current policy issues. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 39(1). Retrieved from <http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/cjhe/article/view/495/532>
- Bogotch, I. & Maslin-Ostrowski, P. (2010). Internationalizing educational leadership: How a university department jumps the curve from local to international. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46 (2), 210-240.
- Bok, D. (1982). *Beyond the ivory tower: Social responsibilities of the modern university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bond, S. (2006). *Transforming the culture of learning: Evoking the international dimension in Canadian university curriculum*. Retrieved from: <http://www.yorku.ca/yorkint/global/archive/conference/canada/papers/Sheryl-Bond.pdf>
- Bond, S. (2009). *World of Learning: Canadian Post- Secondary Students and the Study Abroad Experience*. Ottawa: CBIE.

- Bond, S., Qian, J., & Huang, J. (2003). The role of faculty in internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum and classroom experience. *CBIE Research Millennium Series* No. 8). Ottawa, ON: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Borman, K.M., Clarke, C., Cotner, B., & Lee, R. (2006). Cross-case analysis. In J.L. Green, C. Camilli, & P.B. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (123-139). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999). The Social conditions of the international circulation of ideas. In R. Schusterman (ed). *Bourdieu: A critical reader*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Brameld, T. (1964). Values: Education's most neglected problem. In S. Elam & T. Brameld (Eds.) *Values in American education*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc.
- Brandenburg, U. & de Wit, H. (2011). The End of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 62, 15–16.
- Bray, M. & Thomas, R. M. (1995). Levels of comparison in educational studies: Different insights from different literatures and the value of multilevel analyses. *Harvard Educational Review*. 65 (3), 472-90.
- Brown, R. (2011). The march of the market. In M. Molesworth, R. Scullion & E. Nixon, *the marketization of higher education and the student as consumer*. (pp. 11–24). London: Routledge.
- Canadian Federation of Students (CFS). (2011). *Funding for post-secondary education*. Retrieved from <http://www.cfs-fcee.ca/html/english/research/factsheets/Fact%20Sheet-Funding-11%20x%2017-en-to%20print%20No%20BLEED.pdf>
- Carnoy, M. (1999). *Globalization and educational reform: what planners need to know*. Paris, France: UNESCO; International Institute for Educational Planning.

- Caruana, V. & Spurling, N. (2007). The internationalisation of UK higher education: A review of selected material. York: Higher Education Academy. Retrieved from www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/the_internationalisation_of_uk_he
- Caruana, V. (2007). Internationalisation of HE in the UK: 'Where are we now and where might we go?' Retrieved from http://www.ece.salford.ac.uk/proceedings/papers/01_07.pdf
- Chan, S.A., Fisher, D. & Rubenson, K. (2007). *The evolution of professionalism: Educational policy in the provinces and territories of Canada*. Vancouver, BC, Canada: Centre for Policy Studies in Higher Education and Training.
- Chan, W. & Dimmok, C. (2008). The internationalization of universities: globalist, internationalist and translocalist models, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7 (2), 184-204.
- Charbonneau, L. (2008). Commonwealth universities secretary general promotes common values. *University Affairs*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/commonwealth-universities-secretary-general-promotes-common-values.aspx>
- Charbonneau, L. (2012). A few doubt on internationalization. *University Affairs*: Retrieved from http://www.universityaffairs.ca/margin-notes/a-few-doubts-on-internationalization/?utm_source=rss&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=a-few-doubts-on-internationalization.
- Chase, M. M., Dowd, A. C., Bordoloi Pazich, L., & Bensimon, E. M. (2012). Transfer equity for "minoritized" students: A critical policy analysis of even states. *Educational Policy*. Retrieved from <http://epx.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/12/06/0895904812468227>

- Chatman, A. (2010a). Internationalizing Canada's student experience. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/internationalizing-canadas-student-experience/article4324212/>
- Chatman, A. (2010b). Why International Students scholarships are good for Canada. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/why-international-student-scholarships-are-good-for-canada/article1241333/>
- Chatman, A. (2012a). *Canada needs international talent*. Retrieved from <http://www.international.gc.ca/education/advisory-consultation.aspx?view=d>
- Chatman, A. (2012b). Foreign students a lucrative venture. *The Gazette*. Retrieved from http://www.westerngazette.ca/2012/08/22/story_internationalization/
- Chatman, A. (2009). *Planting the seeds for internationalization*. Retrieved from http://communications.uwo.ca/western_news/stories/2009/September/planting_the_seeds_for_internationalization.html
- Childress, L. K. (2010). *The twenty-first century university: developing faculty engagement in internationalization*. New York, NY : Peter Lang.
- Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating the entrepreneurial university: Organizational pathways of transformation*. Oxford, Pergammon Press for IAU.
- Clark, I. D., Moran, G., Skolnik, M. & Trick, D. (2009). *Academic transformation: the forces reshaping higher education in Ontario*. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Coates, K.S., & Morrison, B. (2011). *Campus confidential: 100 startling things you don't know about Canadian universities*. Toronto: Lorimer Press.

- Codd, J. A. (1988). The construction and deconstruction of educational policy documents. *Journal of Education Policy*, 3 (3), 235-247
- Constantinou, P. (2010). *Government relations in the postsecondary education sector in Ontario*. Retrieved from https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/24727/1/Constantinou_Peter_P_201006_PhD_ththth.pdf
- Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) (2011). *International education marketing plan*. Retrieved from http://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/Attachments/264/COF_Bringing_Ed_to_Canada_Eng_final.pdf
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Dale, R. (1989). *The state and education policy*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.
- Dale, R. (1991). Review symposium. *The British Journal of Sociology of Education* 12(2), 246–250.
- Datnow, A. & Park, V. (2008). Conceptualizing policy implementation: Large-Scale Reform in an Era of Complexity. In G. Sykes, B. Schneider & D. M. Plank (Eds.) *Handbook of education policy research*. (pp. 348-354). New York: Routledge.
- Davis, G. (2013). Diversity and internationalization: Collaborating, not just co-existing. NAFSA: *Trends and Insights for International Education Leaderships*. Retrieved from: http://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/ti_diversity.pdf

- Dawes, P. (2003). *Western signs partnership with Mexican universities*. Retrieved from http://communications.uwo.ca/western_news/stories/2003/September/western_signs_partnership_with_mexican_universities.html
- de Wit, H. (2000). Changing rationales for the internationalization of higher education. In L. C. Barrows (Ed.), *Internationalization of higher education: An institutional perspective* (pp. 9-21). Bucharest: UNESCO-CEPES.
- 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. (2011a). Globalization and internationalization of higher education. *Revista de Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento*, 3(2), 241-248. Retrieved from <http://rusc.uoc.edu/ojs/index.php/rusc/article/view/v8n2-dewit-eng>
- de Wit, H. (2011b). *Trends, issues and challenges in internationalization of higher education*. Amsterdam: Centre for Applied Research on Economics and Management, Hogeschool van Amsterdam.
- Delgado-Marquez, L. B., Hurtado-Torres, N. E. & Bondar, Y. (2011). Internationalization of higher education: Theoretical and empirical investigation of its influence on university institution rankings. *RUSC. Universities And Knowledge Society Journal*, 8(2), 101-122. Retrieved from <http://rusc.uoc.edu/ojs/index.php/rusc/article/view/v8n2-delgado-hurtado-bondar/v8n2-delgadohurtado-democracy>. London: Sage Publications Limited.
- Denzin, N. (2006). *Sociological methods: A sourcebook*. (5th edition). Aldine Transaction.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada (DFAIT) (2011). *Canada's capacity for international student enrollment*. Retrieved from http://www.international.gc.ca/education/capacity_reportrapport_sur_les_capacites.aspx?view=d

Dery, D. (2000). Agenda setting and problem definition. *Policy Studies*, 21(1), 37-47.

Dewey, J. (1922). *Human nature and conduct: An introduction to social psychology*. New York: Henry Holt.

Dewey, J. (1939). *Theory of valuation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, P. & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher Education*, 58, 491–504.

Dror, Y. (1983). *Public policy making reexamined*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Chandler Publishing Company.

Dye, T. R. (2002). *Understanding public policy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Earl, L. & Fullan, M. (2003). Using data in leadership for learning. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33 (3), 383-394.

Easton, D. (1953). *The Political System: An inquiry into the state of political science*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Edel, A. (1988). The concept of value and its travels in twentieth-century America. In M. Murphey & I. Berg, (eds.) *Values and value-theory in twentieth-century America: essays in Honor of Elizabeth Flower*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Edel, A. (2001). *Ethical theory & social change: The evolution of John Dewey's Ethics, 1908-1932*. New Brunswick, N.J. London: Transaction Publishers.
- Edwards, R. & Usher, R. (2000). *Globalization and pedagogy: Space, place and identity*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Edwards, R. (1970). The dimensions of comparison, and of comparative education. *Comparative Education Review*, 14(3), 239-254.
- Egron-Polak, E. & Hudson, R. (2010). *Internationalization of higher education: Global trends, regional perspectives – IAU 3rd Global Survey*. Paris: International Association of Universities.
- Egron-Polak, E. (2012). Internationalization of Higher education: An Introduction. *IAU Horizons*. 17(3), 1-18.
- Egron-Polak, E. (2013). *Re-thinking internationalization of higher education equality diversity and shared benefits*. Paper presented in Norwegian Internationalization Conference Bergen, March 6, 2013. Retrieved from:
http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:_s4BfSQbOh4J:siu.no/content/download/10318/101841/file/IK13%2520Eva%2520Egron-Polak.pdf+%&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca&client=firefox-a
- Elliott, D. (1997). Universal values and moral development theories. In C. Christians & M. Traber (Eds). *Communication ethics and universal values*. (pp. 68-83), Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Encyclopædia Britannica. (2013). *Axiology*. Encyclopædia Britannica Online Academic Edition. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., Retrieved from
<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/46184/axiology>

- Enders, J. (2004) Higher education, internationalization, and the nation-state: Recent developments and challenges to governance theory. *Higher Education*, 47: 361-382.
- Evers, C. W. (1988). Policy analysis, values and complexity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 3(3), 223-233.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the commodification of public discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 4 (2), 133-68.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. 2nd ed. Essex: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Pearson ESL.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fischer, F. (2003). Beyond empiricism: Policy analysis as deliberative practice. In A. Maarten, A. Hajer & H. Wagenaar (eds.): *Deliberative policy analysis; understanding governance in the network society*. (pp. 247–265). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fitz, J. (1994). Implementation research and education policy: Practice and prospects. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 42 (1), 53-69.
- Frances, A. (1993). *Facing the future: The internationalization of post-secondary institutions in British Columbia*. Vancouver: British Columbia Centre for International Education.
- Franke, M. & Russell, W. (2012). A statement on internationalisation. Unpublished manuscript. Ontario, London: Huron University College, Centre for Global Studies.

- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gee, J.P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Geller, H.A. and Johnson, A.P. (1990). Policy as linear and non-linear science. *Journal of Education Policy*, 5(1), 49-65.
- Gibbs, P. (2011). Adopting consumer time and the marketing of higher education. In M. Molesworth, R. Scullion, & E. Nixon (Eds). *The marketization of higher education and the student as consumer* (pp. 52–63). London: Routledge.
- Giddens, A. (1999). *Runaway world: How globalization is reshaping our lives*. London: Profile Books.
- Giroux, H. A. & Searls-Giroux, S. (2004). *Take back higher education: Race, youth, and the crisis of democracy in the post-civil rights era*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Giroux, H. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The University as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(4), 425-464.
- Giroux, H. A. (2008). *Against the terror of neoliberalism: Politics beyond the age of greed*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Giroux, H. A. (2010). The University debate: Public values, higher education and the scourge of neoliberalism: Politics at the limits of the social. *Cultural Machine*. Retrieved from <http://www.culturemachine.net/index.php/cm/article/viewFile/426/444>.

- Giroux, H. A. (2011). Beyond the swindle of the corporate university: Higher education in the service of democracy. *Truth Out*. Retrieved from <http://www.globalresearch.ca/PrintArticle.php?articleId=22851>
- Giroux, H. A. (2012a). *Education and the crisis of public values: Challenging the assault on teachers, students, and public education*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Giroux, H. A. (2012b). *The Age of neoliberal terrorism*. Retrieved from http://www.truthdig.com/report/page2/a_conversation_with_henry_a_giroux_20121202/
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of self in everyday life*. London: Penguin.
- Gordon, I., Lewis, J. & Young, J. (1977). Perspectives on policy analysis. *Public Administration Bulletin*, 25, 26-35.
- Grace, G. (1995). *School Leadership: beyond education management: an essay in policy scholarship*. London: Falmer Press.
- Green, M. (2013). Rethinking the bottom line for internationalization: What are students learning? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/worldwise/rethinking-the-bottom-line-for-internationalization-what-are-students-learning/31979>
- Green, M. F. (2007). Internationalization of community colleges: Barriers and strategies.
- Green, M. F., & Siaya, L. (Eds.). (2005). *Measuring internationalization at community colleges*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1986). *Discourse strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Harden-Davidson, A. (2004). Neoliberal elements of restructuring through the Ontario College of Teachers: An example of centralized marketization. *Canadian and International Education*. 33 (1), 31-44.
- Harvey, D. (1973). *Social justice and the city*. London: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heckathorn, D.D. (2002). Respondent-driven sampling II: Deriving valid estimates from chain-referral samples of hidden populations". *Social Problems*. 49, 11-34.
- Held, D & McGrew, A. (2003). *The global transformations reader: an introduction to the globalization debate*. (2nd ed). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Held, D. & McGrew, A. (2000). *Global transformations: politics, economics and culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Henkel, M. (1997). Academic values and the university as corporate enterprise. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 51(2), 134-143.
- Henry, M. (1993). What is policy? A response to Stephen Ball. *Discourse*, 14(1), 102–105.
- Hess, F. (2008). When education research matters. *Social Science and Public Policy*. 45, 534-539.
- Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) (2010). *Ontario's postsecondary education system: Sound but challenges ahead*. Retrieved from http://www.heqco.ca/en-CA/Stay_Informed/News%20Releases/Pages/NewsRelease-March18,2010.aspx
- Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) (2012). *Third Annual Review and Research Plan*. Retrieved from <http://www.heqco.ca/SiteCollectionDocuments/TARRP.pdf>

- Hill-Collins, P. (1990). Learning from the outsider within the sociological significance of black feminist thought. In: M. Fonow, J. Cook (Eds.). *Beyond methodology feminist scholarship as lived research* (pp. 35-59). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Howlett, M. & Ramesh, M. (2003). *Studying public policy: Policy cycles and policy subsystems*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- International Association of Universities (IAU) (2004). *Globalization and higher education: Transnational education*. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/iau/globalization/tne.html>.
- International Association of Universities (IAU) (2012). *Affirming Academic Values in Internationalization of Higher Education: A Call for Action*. Retrieved from <http://globalhighered.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/affirming-academic-values-in-internationalization-of-higher-education.pdf>
- Jones, G. (2009). Internationalization and higher education in Canada: Three challenges. In R. D. Trilokekar, G. A. Jones & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada universities go global* (pp. 355-369). Toronto: James Lorimer and Company (CAUT Series).
- Jones, G. A. (2010). Broadening accessibility to postsecondary education in Canada. *Academic Matters* (online version). Retrieved from <http://www.academicmatters.ca/2010/09/broadening-accessibility-to-postsecondaryeducation-in-canada/>
- Jones, G. A., Shanahan, T., & Goyan, P. (2001). University governance in Canadian higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7(2), 135-148.

- Jones, G. A., and Oleksiyenko, A. (2011). The internationalization of Canadian university research: A Global Higher Education Matrix Analysis of Multi-level Governance. *Higher Education*, 61(1), 41-57.
- Kamberelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (2005). *On qualitative inquiry*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Kehm, B.M. & Teichler, U. (2007). Research on Internationalization in Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 260-273.
- Kelly, G.J., Crawford, T., & Green, J. (2001). Common task and uncommon knowledge: Dissenting voices in the discursive construction of physics across small laboratory groups. *Linguistics & Education*, 12, 135 - 174.
- Kennedy-Lewis, B.L. (2014). Using critical policy analysis to examine competing discourses in zero tolerance legislation: do we really want to leave no child behind? *Journal of Education Policy*, 29 (2), 165-194.
- Kernaghan, K. (2003). Integrating values into public service: The values statement as centerpiece. *Public Administration Review*, 63(6), 711–719.
- Kerr, A. (2011). *Adult learners in postsecondary institutions*. Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario. Retrieved from http://www.heqco.ca/en-CA/Research/At_Issue_Papers/Pages/Summary.aspx?link=11
- King, S. (2013). CFS wants new tuition framework. *The gazette*. Retrieved from <http://www.westerngazette.ca/2013/02/27/cfs-wants-new-tuition-framework/>
- Kingdon, J.W. (1995). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies*. 2nd ed. New York: HarperCollins.

- King-Head, S. (2012). GLOBAL: International student choices changing. *University World News*, N. 203. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20120106164011851>
- Kirby, D. (2007). Reviewing Canadian postsecondary education: Postsecondary education policy in postindustrial Canada. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 65. Retrieved from <http://umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/kirby.html>
- Kirtman, L. (2002). Policy and practice: Restructuring teachers' work. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10(25), 1-26. Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/304/430>
- Knight, J. & de Wit, H. (eds) (1999). *Quality and internationalization of higher education*. Paris: OECD.
- Knight, J. (1993). Internationalization: Management strategies and issues. *International Education magazine*, 9(1), 6-22.
- Knight, J. (1997). A shared vision? Stakeholders' perspectives on internationalization of higher education in Canada, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 1(1), 27-44.
- Knight, J. (1999). Internationalization of higher education. In J. Knight & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Quality and internationalization in higher education* (pp. 13-28). Paris: OECD.
- Knight, J. (2003). *Internationalization of higher education practices and priorities: IAU Survey Report*; International Association of Universities (IAU). Retrieved from http://www.pucminas.br/imagedb/documento/DOC_DSC_NOME_ARQUI20060214115459.pdf
- Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2-3.

- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definitions, approaches and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8, 5-31.
- Knight, J. (2005). *Crossborder education: Programs and providers on the move*. Research Monograph. Ottawa, Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Knight, J. (2006). *Higher education crossing borders: A guide to the implications of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) for cross-border education*. Report prepared for the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) and UNESCO. Paris: COL/UNESCO.
- Knight, J. (2007). Internationalization brings important benefits as well as risks. *International Higher Education*. 46 (4), 8-10.
- Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalization of higher education: Historical and conceptual perspectives. In J. Knight & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Strategies for internationalization of higher education: A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America* (pp. 5-32). Amsterdam: the European Association for International Education.
- Knight, J. (2008). *Higher education in Turmoil: The changing world of internationalization*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Kogan, M. (1975). *Education policy making: A study of interest groups and parliament*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Kunin, R. & Associates Inc. (2009). *Economic impact of international education in Canada final report*. Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada. Retrieved from http://www.international.gc.ca/education/assets/pdfs/RKA_IntEd_Report_eng.pdf

- Kunin, R. & Associates Inc. (2011). *Economic impact of international education in Canada final report*. Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada. Retrieved from http://www.international.gc.ca/education/assets/pdfs/economic_impact_en.pdf
- Laing, R. D., Phillipson, H., & Lee, A. R. (1966). *Interpersonal perception: A theory and method of research*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Landsberg, M. (1997). Crackdown on education about power. *Toronto Star*. Oct. 18th.
- Larsen, M. A. (2013). *Internationalizing higher education: A case study of ethical internationalization?* Paper presented at the CIES Conference, New Orleans, March 2013.
- LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (2nd ed.). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Lee, J. S. (1990). *Jacques Lacan*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Levin, B. (2001). Conceptualizing the process of education reform from an international perspective. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*. 9 (14), 1-12.
- Levin, B. (2007). Sustainable, large-scale education renewal. *Journal of Educational Change*. 8, 323-336.
- Levin, B., Cooper, A., Arjomand, S. & Thompson, K. (2011). *Research use and its impact in secondary schools: Exploring knowledge mobilization in education*. Toronto, Canadian Education Association. Retrieved from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/rspe/UserFiles/File/CEA_Research_Use_in_SS_Final_Report.pdf
- Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2005). *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

- Lingard, B. (2009). Researching education policy in a globalized world: theoretical and methodological considerations. In T.Popkewitz & F.Rizvi (eds), *Education and globalism*, New York, Teachers College Press, pp.226-246.
- Lingard, C. C. (1957). *Canada 1957. The Official Handbook of Present Conditions and Recent Progress*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Lughod, L. (1988). Fieldwork of a dutiful daughter. In: S. Altorki, S., C. Fawzi El-Solh (Eds.), *Arab women in the field: Studying your own society* (pp.139-161). Syracuse University Press, Syracuse.
- Manzon, M. (2007). Comparing places. In M. Bray, B. Adamson, & M. Mason (Eds.), *Comparative education research: Approaches and methods*. (pp. 85-121). Hong Kong: CERC.
- Marginson, S. & M.C. van der Wende (2009). The New global landscape of nations and institutions. In: *Higher education to 2030, volume 2: Globalisation*. Paris: OECD. Pp. 17-57.
- Marginson, S. & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education*, 43 (3), 281-309.
- Marginson, S. & Sawir, E. (2011). *Ideas for intercultural education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marginson, S. (1995). Markets in higher education: Australia. In J. Smyth (ed.), *Academic work: The changing labour process in higher education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Marginson, S. (2011). Higher education and public good. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 65(4), 411-433.

- Marginson, S. (2013). The impossibility of capitalist markets in higher education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 28(3), 353-370.
- Maringe, F. (2010). The meanings of globalization and internationalization in HE: Findings from a world survey. In F. Maringe & N. Foskett (Eds.), *Globalization and internationalization in higher education: Theoretical, strategic and management perspectives* (pp. 17-34). London: Continuum International Publishing
- Maringe, N. Foskett & S. Woodfield (2013). *Emerging internationalization models in an uneven global terrain*. Retrieved from http://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/Attachments/264/COF_Bringing_Ed_to_Canada_Eng_final.pdf
- Maringe, F. & Gibbs, P. (2006). *Marketing higher education: Theory and practice*. London: Open University Press.
- Maringe, F. & Woodfield, S. (2013). Contemporary issues on the internationalization of higher education: critical and comparative perspectives, *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 43(1), 1-8.
- Maringe, F., Foskett, F. & Woodfield, S. (2013). Emerging internationalization models in an uneven global terrain: findings from a global survey. *Compare*. 43(1), 9-36.
- Marshall, C. (ed) (1997). *Feminist critical policy analysis: A perspective from primary and secondary schooling*. London, Falmer Press.
- Martin, T. J. (2003). Divergent ontologies with converging conclusions: A case study of comparison of comparative methodologies. *Comparative Education*, 39(1), 105-117.

- Matthews, J. (2002). International education and internationalization are not the same as globalisation: Emerging issues for secondary schools. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6 (4), 360–390.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- McKellin, K. (1998). *Maintaining the momentum: The internationalization of British Columbia's post-secondary institutions*. Victoria: British Columbia Centre for International Education.
- McLaughlin, M.W. (1987). Learning from experience: Lessons from policy implementation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 9(2), 171-178.
- McNess, E. (2004). Culture, context and the quality of education: evidence from a smallscale extended case study in England and Denmark. *Compare*, 34(3), 315-327.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Millan, A. (2012). *Targets help define what 'internationalization' means*. Retrieved from http://communications.uwo.ca/western_news/stories/2012/March/target_help_define_wh_at_internationalization_means.html
- Millan, J. (2009). Diversity lacking. *The Gazette*. Retrieved from <http://www.westerngazette.ca/2009/10/06/diversity-lacking/>
- Millan, J. (2011). The university focuses on internationalization. *The Gazette*. Retrieved from http://www.westerngazette.ca/2011/12/06/news_internationalization/

- Millan, J. (2013). Ambitious plan aims to boost Public University's profile at home and abroad. *The London Free Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.lfpress.com/2013/08/06/ambitious-plan-aims-to-boost-western-universitys-profile-at-home-and-abroad>.
- Ministry of Training, Colleges, and Universities Ontario (2011). *Find a university*. Retrieved from <http://www.ontario.ca/education-and-training/ontario-universities>
- Moore, J. W. (2011). Transcending the metabolic rift: A theory of crises in the capitalist world ecology. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38 (1)1-46.
- Mori, J., & Hayashi, M. (2006). The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: A study of interactions between first and second language speakers. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(2), 195–219.
- Mullings, B. (1999). Insider or outsider, both or neither: some dilemmas of interviewing in a cross-cultural setting. *Geoforum*, 30, 337–350.
- Muzzin, L. (2008). How fares equity in an era of academic capitalism? The role of contingent faculty. In A. Chan & D. Fisher (Eds.) *The exchange university: The corporatization of academic culture* (pp. 105-124). Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Nagel, T. (1979). The limits of objectivity. In S. McMurrin (ed.), *Tanner lectures on human values* (pp. 75–139). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ninnes, P. & Hellstin, M. (2005). *Internationalizing higher education*. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong.
- Nixon, J. (2011). *Higher education and the public good: Imagining the university*. London & New York: Continuum.

- Norrie, K. & Lin, S. (2009). *Postsecondary education attainment and participation in Ontario*. Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario. Retrieved from <http://www.heqco.ca/SiteCollectionDocuments>
- Olsen, M., Codd, J., & O'Neill, A. M. (2004). *Education policy: Globalization, citizenship and democracy*. London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage publications.
- Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges & Universities (OMTCU) (2012). *Strengthening Ontario's centres of creativity, innovation and knowledge*. Retrieved from <http://www.tcu.gov.on.ca/pepg/publications/DiscussionStrengtheningOntarioPSE.pdf>
- Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (OMTCU) (2010). *Governance and accountability framework*. Retrieved from http://www.tcu.gov.on.ca/pepg/publications/GovAccount_Directive2010.pdf
- Orsini, M. & Smith, M. (2007). *Critical policy studies*. Canada: BC, University of British Columbia Press.
- Overall, C. (2009). *Values of the times*. University Affairs. Retrieved from <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/values-for-the-times.aspx>
- Ozga, J. & Lingard, R. (2007). Globalization, education policy and politics. In R. Lingard & J.Ozga (eds), *The Routledge Falmer Reader in education policy and politics*. London, Routledge.
- Ozga, J. (2000). *Policy research in educational settings: Contested terrain*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ozga, J. (2002). Researching education policy: interpreting the evidence, in B.Davies and J.West-Burnam (eds). *Handbook of Educational Leadership and Management* (pp. 212-227). London, Pearson Collins.

- Pal, L. A. (1997). *Virtual policy networks: the internet as a model of contemporary governance?* Retrieved from http://www.isoc.org/inet97/proceedings/G7/G7_1.HTM (accessed 2 July 2011).
- Pal, L.A. (2010). *Beyond policy analysis: Public issue management in turbulent times* (4th ed). Toronto: Thomson Nelson.
- Paquette, J. (1999). Re-engineering Ontario education: The process and substance of the Harris Reforms in education in Ontario. *Education and Law Journal*. 9, 1-41.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Peck, J. & Tickell, A. (2002). Neoliberalizing space. *Antipode Journal*, 34(3), 380-404.
- Perakyla, A. (2005). Analysing talk and text. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 959-978). Newbury Park: Sage, pp. 869-886.
- Perry, R. B. (1916). Economic value and moral value. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 30(3), 443-485.
- Perry, R. B. (1926). *General theory of value*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Prunty, J.J. (1985). Signposts for a critical educational policy analysis. *Australian Journal of Education*, 24 (2), 133-140.
- Public University (2007). *Engaging the future*. Retrieved from Public University Website.
- Public University (2009). *Strategic Plan of Internationalization (2009-2012)*. Retrieved from Public University Website.
- Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of higher education toward a conceptual framework. *Policy future in Education*, 1(2), 248-70.

- Rae, B. (2005). *Ontario: A leader in learning - report and recommendations*. Toronto: Publications Ontario. Retrieved from www.tcu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/reports/postsec.pdf
- Ranson, S. (1995). Theorising education policy. *Journal of Education Policy*, 10(4), 427–448.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Rinne, R. & Koivula, J. (2005). The Changing place of the university and a clash of values; the entrepreneurial university in the European knowledge society. *Higher Education management and Policy*, 17(3), 91-123.
- Rist, R .C. (2000). Influencing the policy process with Qualitative Research. In: N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 1001-1017). Thousand Oaks, CA, London: Sage.
- Rizvi, F. (2007). Postcolonialism and globalization in education. *Cultural Studies, Critical Methodologies*, 7(3), 256-63.
- Rizvi, F. (n.d.). *Internationalization of curriculum*. Retrieved from <http://www.teaching.rmit.edu.au/resources/icpfr.PDF>
- Rizvi, F. & Engel, L. (2005). Globalization and recent shifts in education policy in the Asia Pacific: An Overview of Some Critical Issues. Bangkok; UNESCO Asia Pacific Regional Bureau for Education. *Critical Methodologies*, 9(5), 669-695.
- Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing educational policy*. UK: London. Routledge.
- Robin S. H. (1976). *A history of higher education in Canada, 1663-1960*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rokeach, M. (1970). *Beliefs, attitudes and values*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.

- Rosenbilt, S., Ebkov, H. & Teichler, U. (2007). Massification and diversity of higher education systems: Interplay of complex dimensions. *Higher Education Policy*, 20(4), 373-389.
- Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc. (RKA) (2012). *Economic impact of international education in Canada*. Retrieved from http://www.international.gc.ca/education/assets/pdfs/economic_impact_en.pdf
- Ryan, T.G. & Joong, P. (2005). Teachers' and students' perceptions of the nature and impact of large-scale reforms. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*. 38, 1-21.
- Sanderson, G. (2008). A foundation for the internationalization of the academic Self. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 12 (3), 276-307.
- Scheff, T. et al. (2006). *Goffman unbound: Toward a new paradigm in social science*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Schneider, A. & Ingram, H. (1990). Behavioral assumptions of policy tools. *Journal of Politics* 52, 510-529.
- Schoorman, D. (2000). What really do we mean by 'internationalization'?" *Contemporary Education*, 71(4), 5-11.
- Scott, P. (2005). The Global dimension: Internationalizing higher education. In B. Khem, H. de Wit (eds.), *Internationalization in higher education: European responses to the global perspective*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education and the European Higher Education Society.
- Sean, J. & Usher, A. (2005). Canada's two-market system: Universities, colleges cater to very different clienteles. *University Affairs*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/Article.aspx?id=1876>

- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York: Alfred A Knopf Inc.
- Shantz, D. (2002). Ontario educational reform: A tragedy of errors. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 29 (2), 105-107.
- Shearmur, J. (1992). In defense of neoliberalism. *Journal of Democracy* 3 (3), 75-81.
- Shulock, N. (1999). The paradox of policy analysis: If it is not used why do we produce so much of it? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 18(2), 226–244.
- Simons, M. & Masschelein, J. (2009). Toward the idea of a world university. *Interchange*, 40(1), 1–23.
- Simons, M., Olssen, M. & Peters, M. A. (2009). Re-reading education policies, part 1: The critical education policy orientation. In M. Simons, M. Olssen, and M. A. Peters (eds.). *Re-reading education policies: A handbook studying the policy agenda of the 21st century* (pp. 1–35). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Skovsmose, O. (2007). Mathematical literacy and globalization. Internationalization and globalization. In B. Atweh, et al (ed). *Mathematics and science education* (pp. 3-18). New York: IEEE Computer Society Press.
- Slaughter, S & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies and the entrepreneurial university*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, M. L. (2006). Multiple methodology in education research. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, P. B. Elmore, A. Skukauskaite, & E. Grace (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 457-475). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Smyth, J. (1994). A policy analysis of higher education reforms in Australia in the context of globalisation. *Melbourne Studies in Education*, 35(1), 39–72.

- Stake, S. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Steenhuisen, B. (April 2010). *Studying values in public policy: comparing five approaches*. Paper presented in 14th Annual Conference of the international Research Society for Public Management, Berne, Switzerland. Abstract retrieved from <http://repository.tudelft.nl/view/ir/uuid%3Ad3f36d00-f8d4-48d4-8f6b-21af3006b25b/>
- Stewart, J. (2006). Value conflict and policy change. *Review of Policy Research*, 23 (1), 183-96.
- Stewart, J. (2009). *Public policy values*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stier, J. (2002). *Internationalization in higher education: unexplored possibilities and unavoidable challenges*. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research. University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal. Abstract retrieved from www.academici.com/blog.aspx?bid=5249
- Stier, J. (2003). Internationalization, ethnic diversity and the acquisition of intercultural competencies. *Intercultural Education*, 14 (1), 77-91.
- Stier, J. (2006). Internationalization, intercultural communication and intercultural competence. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*. 11, 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.
- Strike, K. A. (2006). The ethics of educational research. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P.B. Moore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in educational research* (pp. 57-73). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Stronach, I. (2010). *Globalizing education, educating the local: how method made us mad*. London, Routledge.
- Sullivan, W. M. (1999). *The university as citizen: Institutional identity and social responsibility*. Washington, DC: The Council on Public Policy Education.
- Taylor, S. (1997). Critical policy analysis: Exploring contexts, texts, and consequences. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. 18 (19), 23-35.
- Taylor, S. (2004). Researching educational policy and change in “new times”: Using critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 19, 433-451.
- Taylor, S. Rivzi, F., Lingard, B. & Henry, M. (1997). *Educational policy and the politics of change*. London: Routledge.
- Teferra, D. (2008). The international dimension of higher education in Africa: Status, challenges and prospects. In D. Teferra & J. Knight (Eds). *Higher education in Africa: The international dimension* (pp. 44–79). Accra, Ghana/ Boston, MA: AAU/CIHE.
- Teichler, U. (1996). Research on academic mobility and international cooperation in higher education: An agenda for the future. In P. Blumenthal, C. Goodwin, A. Smith, & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Academic mobility in a changing world* (pp. 338-358). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Teichler, U. (1998). Massification a challenge for higher education references. *Tertiary Education and Management*. 4 (1), 17-27.
- Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education*, 48 (1), 5-26.
- The Minister of International Trade (MIT) (2012). *International education: A key driver of Canada's future prosperity*. Advisory Panel on Canada's International Education

- Strategy. Retrieved from
http://www.international.gc.ca/education/assets/pdfs/ies_report_rapport_sei-eng.pdf
- Torjman, S. (2005). "What is policy?" Ottawa: Caledon Institute of Social Policy. Available online at <http://www.caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/544ENG.pdf>
- Torres-Olave, B. M. (2011). There is a world out there: Spatial imagination, agency, and academic culture in a Mexican University Program. *Comparative Education Review*. 55(1), 30-55.
- Trowler, P. (1998). *Education policy: A policy sociology approach*. Eastbourne, East Sussex: The Gildridge Press Limited.
- Turpin, T., Iredale, R. & Crinnion, P. (2002). Internationalization of higher education: Implications for Australia and its Education Clients, *Minerva; Springer Netherlands*, 40 (4), 327-40.
- Usher, A. (2012). *Straight thinking about international education*. Retrieved from <http://higheredstrategy.com/straight-thinking-about-international-education-1/>
- van der Wende, M. (2001). Internationalization policies: about new trends and contrasting paradigms. *Higher Education Policy*, 14 (3), 249-259.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schaffner & A. L. Wenden (eds.), *Language and peace* (pp.17-33). Dartmouth: Aldershot.
- van Vught, F. A., van der Wende, M. C., & Westerheijden, D. F. (2002). Globalization and internationalization: Policy agendas compared. In O. Fulton & J. Enders (Eds.), *Higher education in a globalizing world. International trends and mutual observations* (pp. 103-120). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

- Vidovich, L. (2001). *A conceptual framework for analysis of education policy and practices*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education conference. Fremantle, Australia. Abstract retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/01pap/vid0127.htm>
- Viner, J. (1948). Power versus plenty as objectives of foreign policy in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. *World Politics*, 1(1), 1-29.
- Wächter, B. (2003). An introduction: Internationalization at home in context. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 7(1), 5–11.
- Warwick, P. & Moogan, Y. J. (2013). A comparative study of perceptions of internationalization strategies in UK universities. *Compare*, 43(1), 102-123.
- Weber, L. (2011). *International Chinese and Canadian students' experiences of internationalization at a Canadian university*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Education, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada.
- Wedel, J., Shore, C. Feldman, G. & Lathrop, S. (2005). Toward an anthropology of public policy. *The ANNALS* (of the American Academy of Political and Social Science), 600, 30–51.
- Weimer, D. L. (1998). Policy analysis and evidence: A craft perspective. *Policy Studies Journal*, 26(1), 114-128.
- Weiss, C.H. (1983). Ideology, interest, and information: The basis of policy positions. In D. Callahan and B. Jennings (Eds.), *Ethics, the social sciences, and policy analysis* (pp. 213-245). Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Welch, A. (2002). Going global? Internationalising Australian universities in a time of global crisis. *Comparative Education Review*, 46(4), 433-471.

- Wildavsky, A. (1979). *Speaking truth to power: The art and craft of policy analysis*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Wilson, J. D. (1970). *Canadian education: A history*. Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall of Canada, Ltd.
- Windham, D.M. (1996). *Internationalisation of higher education: Overview and main conclusions of the seminar*. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).
- Wodak, R., & Meyer. M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology.” In R. Wodak and M. Meyer. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.) (1–33). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wood, L., & Kroger, W. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Woods, N. (2006). *Describing discourse: A practical guide to discourse analysis*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Yanow, D. (2003). Accessing local knowledge. In A. Maarten, A. Hajer & H. Wagenaar (eds.), *Deliberative policy analysis; understanding governance in the network society*. (228-246). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Okas: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Yin, R. K. (2006). Case study methods. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli & P. B. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 111-122). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Young, J, Levin, B. & Wallin, D. (2008). *Understanding Canadian Schools: An Introduction to Educational Administration*. Scarborough: Thomson/Nelson.

Young, S.J. (2002). The use of market mechanisms in higher education finance and state control: Ontario considered [Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Funds] [Access to Opportunities Program]. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 32(2), 79-102.

Young, T.V. et al. (2010). Understanding agenda setting in state educational policy: An application of Kingdon's multiple streams model to the formation of state reading policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*. 18 (15), 1-18.

Zemach-Bersin, T. (2012). Entitled to the world. In V. Andreotti & L. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education* (pp. 87-104). New York: Routledge.

Appendix A: Interview Questions

- 1) What does it mean to internationalize higher education?
- 2) What do you think internationalization means to Public University?
- 3) Why do you think Public University should engage in internationalization activities?
- 4) Why do you think you should engage in the university/your department's programs of internationalization?
- 5) What are the main activities associated with internationalization? Could you give me some examples of related activities in the university/your department?
- 6) How and by whom are internationalization plans developed in the university/your department?
- 7) Were you involved in the writing of internationalization strategic plan(s)? If so, how you were involved? If not, why not?
- 8) Who benefits and who does not benefit in internationalization activities in your department/and university?
- 9) What those priorities are heard most and whose are absent the most in your department/and university's internationalization activities?
- 10) In what way do internationalization strategic plans impact on your scholarly values and professional needs?
- 11) What values influence/direct the policies and activities of internationalization in the university/your department?
- 12) To what degree is diversity as a core element of internationalization encouraged (and embedded) in different related initiatives in the university/your department?

Appendix B: Human Subject Ethics Approval

Western Education
WESTERN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS - ETHICS APPROVAL NOTICE

Review Number: 1208-2
Principal Investigator: Marianne Larsen
Student Name: Ali Khorsandi Taskoh
Title: *A Critical Policy Analysis of Internationalization in Higher Education: An Ontario Case Study*
Expiry Date: August 31, 2013
Type: PhD Thesis
Ethics Approval Date: August 27, 2012
Revision #:
Documents Reviewed &
Approved: Western Protocol, Letter of Information & Consent.

This is to notify you that the Faculty of Education Sub-Research Ethics Board (REB), which operates under the authority of the Western University Research Ethics Board for Non-Medical Research Involving Human Subjects, according to the Tri-Council Policy Statement and the applicable laws and regulations of Ontario has granted approval to the above named research study on the date noted above. The approval shall remain valid until the expiry date noted above assuming timely and acceptable responses to the REB's periodic requests for surveillance and monitoring information.

During the course of the research, no deviations from, or changes to, the study or information/consent documents may be initiated without prior written approval from the REB, except for minor administrative aspects. Participants must receive a copy of the signed information/consent documentation. Investigators must promptly report to the Chair of the Faculty Sub-REB any adverse or unexpected experiences or events that are both serious and unexpected, and any new information which may adversely affect the safety of the subjects or the conduct of the study. In the event that any changes require a change in the information/consent documentation and/or recruitment advertisement, newly revised documents must be submitted to the Sub-REB for approval.

Dr. Alan Edmunds (Chair)

2012-2013 Faculty of Education Sub-Research Ethics Board

Dr. Alan Edmunds	Faculty of Education (Chair)
Dr. John Barnett	Faculty of Education
Dr. Farahnaz Faez	Faculty of Education
Dr. Wayne Martino	Faculty of Education
Dr. George Gadanidis	Faculty of Education
Dr. Elizabeth Nowicki	Faculty of Education
Dr. Julie Byrd Clark	Faculty of Education
Dr. Kari Veblen	Faculty of Music
Dr. Jason Brown	Faculty of Education
Dr. Susan Rodger	Faculty of Education
	Faculty of Education, Associate Dean, Research (<i>ex officio</i>)
Dr. Shelley Taylor	Faculty of Education, Western Non-Medical Research Ethics Board (<i>ex officio</i>)
Dr. Ruth Wright	Faculty of Music, Western Non-Medical Research Ethics Board (<i>ex officio</i>)
Dr. Kevin Watson	Faculty of Music, Western Non-Medical Research Ethics Board (<i>ex officio</i>)

The Faculty of Education Research Officer

VITA

Name: Ali Khorsandi Taskoh

(A) Academic and Administrative Experience (Selected)

Department Chair (2005 - Aug. 2009). Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies.

Head of the Secretariat (2004-2006). Research Development of Cultural and Social Sciences.

Tehran: Ministry of Science, Research and Technology; Centre for Social and Cultural Studies.

International Affairs Manager (2007). Tehran: Ministry of Science, Research and Technology;

Farabi International Award.

Academic Assistant (2008 - 2009). Tehran: Ministry of Science, Research and Technology;

Farabi International Award.

Educational Expert (2002-2004). Tehran: Ministry of Science, Research and Technology;

Centre for Cultural and Social Planning.

Research Board Member (2006- 2009). Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies.

Journal Co-Founder (one of two). Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies. *The*

interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities (Quarterly Journal).

Deputy Editor-in chief (2007 - 2009). Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies. *The*

interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities (Quarterly Journal).

Member of Publication Board (2005- 2009). Tehran: The Institute for Social and cultural

Studies.

Reviewer (2002-2013). Journal papers and research projects (More than 70 research reports, papers and book chapters).

Teaching Assistant (2010-2013). Western University; Ontario, Canada:

- International Mathematics: Dr. Frank Leddy. Fall 2013.
- Power, Politics and Policy in Education: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives: Dr. Lucy Karanja; Fall 2012.
- International Education: Dr. Paul Tarc, Fall 2011.

Research Assistant (2010-2013). Western University; Ontario, Canada:

- International Education: Dr. Marianne A. Larsen, Winter 2013
- Professional Education: Dr. Robert McMillan 2010-2011
- International and Comparative Education: Dr. Paul Tarc, 2011-2012.

(B) Publication

(1) Book(s)¹

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2008). *Interdisciplinary discourse: With a focus on interdisciplinary higher education*. Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies (ISCS).

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2006). *A critical analysis of linkage system between secondary and postsecondary education*; Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies (ISCS).

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. & Davari-Ardakani, R. (2009). *Philosophy in today's university*. Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies (ISCS).

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2009). *The humanities and civilizing* (ed). Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies (ISCS).

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. & et al., (2011). *Research in the area of higher education (A Translation)*. Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies (ISCS).

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (in progress). *Re-thinking internationalization of higher education*.

(2) Papers (Refereed and Book Chapters)

¹ In Persian

- Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2011). A critical analysis of equal education rights and opportunities to all: THE CASE OF IRAN. Chapter in the book of “*Social Capital in Iran*”. Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural studies.
- Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2010). Typology in the interdisciplinary education. *Iranian Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities*. Quarterly: 1(4), 68-81.
- Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2009). Interdisciplinarity in higher education: Challenges and obstacles; *Iranian Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities*. 1(2), 85-101.
- Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2009). Entrepreneurship university and its functions; (2009); *Cultural journal*. Ministry of Science, Research and technology of Iran; Centre for Cultural and Social Planning. 1(5), 8-10.
- Khorsandi Taskoh, A. & Liaghatdar, M. J (2008). Inter-cultural and international interaction among universities (2008). *Iranian Journal of the Cultural Research*. 1(2), 111-135.
- Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2008). The humanities in Iran. Chapter in the Book of “*Strategies for Development of Human Sciences in Iran*”. Institute for the Humanities and Cultural Studies. 1(7), 1-28.
- Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2008). An introduction to social science and humanities in Iran; *Iranian Journal of Farabi International Award*. 1(2), 17-26.
- Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2008). The nature and philosophy of interdisciplinarity; *Iranian Journal of Farabi International Award*. 1(5), 19-27.
- Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2008). The motivations for being interdisciplinary and the critics; *Iranian Journal of Farabi International Award*. 2(6).15-22.
- Khorsandi Taskoh, A. & Liaghatdar, M. J. (2006). Academy and communication among cultures. *Iranian Encyclopaedia for Higher Education*. 1(1), 468-489.

Khorsandi Taskoh A. (2001). Educational challenges in the 21 century. Chapter in the book on the *Research Annual book in education*; Isfahan, the University of Isfahan, Faculty of Education.

(3) Conference Presentations (selected)

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (March, 2014). Internationalization of higher education: Power relations? Marginalized Voices? *58th Annual Conference of CIES*; Canada, Toronto: The University of Toronto.

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (April, 2013). An analysis of non-academic issues affecting the experiences of international students; an Ontario case study" (accepted paper). AERA Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California, USA.

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (May 27 – May 30, 2012). Internationalization of higher education: An agent of change or challenge? The XLth annual conference of Canadian society for the study of education (CSSE). Canada; Wilfrid Laurier University and University of Waterloo.

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (May 2011). Beyond academic factor of internationalization of higher education. *55th Annual Conference of CIES*; Canada, Montréal: The University of McGill.

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (April 2010). The typology of interdisciplinary education. Canada: UWO: The Annual Grad Student Symposium in The Faculty of Education.

Khorsandi Taskoh A. (May 2009). Iranian model of higher education; with an eye on the situation of Iranian universities in the international level. England, Durham: Durham University.

Khorsandi Taskoh A. (April 2009). The interdisciplinarity in higher education. *The Conference of Interdisciplinary Studies*. Iran, Tehran; University of Tehran.

Khorsandi Taskoh A. (July 2008). Social sciences in Iran: Privileges and main challenges. Italy: Florence: The University of Manash.

Khorsandi Taskoh A. (Jun 2007). The humanities in Iran: Problems, challenges and prospects. *International Conferences concerning "New Directions in The Humanities"*, France, Paris: American University of Paris.

Khorsandi Taskoh A. (April 2007). Education, The humanities and development. *National Congress for Development of the Humanities in Iran*. Tehran: Institute for the Humanities and Cultural Studies.

Khorsandi Taskoh A. (July 2006). Interdisciplinary education. Greece, Aegean: University of Aegean.

Khorsandi Taskoh A. (May 2002). Dialogue among universities. *International Conference in Dialogue among Civilizations by Higher Education*. Iran: Tehran, University of Tehran

Khorsandi Taskoh A. (March 2000). Educational challenges and educational planning in new century. Iran, Isfahan: University of Esfahan; Faculty of Education.

C) Research Grants and Awards

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2009). *Internationalization of higher education: Opportunities and obstacles*. Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies.

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2008). *The fate of philosophy in today's academy*. Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies.

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2007). *Interdisciplinary research and education: Theory, policy and practice*. Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies.

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2003). *A pathology of relationship between communicative problems between high school and university in Iran*. Tehran: The University of Tehran.

Khorsandi Taskoh, A. (2002). *Inter-university dialogue among cultures*. Tehran: The Academic Center for Education, Culture and Research (ACECR).

Dissertation National Award (2002). The Best Graduate Thesis of Year. Tehran: The Academic Center for Education, Culture and Research (ACECR).

SOGS Bursary Award (2013). Out of Ontario Province Program. Canada, Ontario: Western University.

UWO International Students Bursary (2013). International and Exchange Students Center. Canada, Ontario: Western University.

Selected Researcher for appreciation (2007). Tehran: Ministry of Science, Research and Technology; Institute for Social and Cultural Studies.

Selected Department Chair for appreciation (2008). Tehran: Ministry of Science, Research and Technology; Institute for Social and Cultural Studies.

D) Academic Interests (Teaching and Research)

Policy, Politics and leadership in Education/ International Education, Globalization, and Internationalization of Higher Education/ Critical Policy Analysis Approaches/ Interdisciplinary Research and Education/ Epistemology and Methodology in Education/ Philosophy in/of Higher Education.