

An Alternative Social Imaginary for Internationalization in Universities

by

Janet Teasdale

M.Ed., University of British Columbia, 2005

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

in the
Faculty of Education

© Janet Teasdale 2017

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Spring 2017

All rights reserved.

However, in accordance with the *Copyright Act of Canada*, this work may be reproduced, without authorization, under the conditions for Fair Dealing. Therefore, limited reproduction of this work for the purposes of private study, research, education, satire, parody, criticism, review and news reporting is likely to be in accordance with the law, particularly if cited appropriately.

Approval

Name: Janet Teasdale

Degree: Doctor of Education

Title: An Alternative Social Imaginary for Internationalization in Universities

Examining Committee: **Chair: Dan Laitsch**
Associate Professor

Peter Grimmett
Senior Supervisor
Professor Emeritus

Ann Chinnery
Supervisor
Associate Professor

Heesoon Bai
Internal/External Examiner
Professor

Amy Metcalfe
External Examiner
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Studies
University of British Columbia

Date Defended/Approved: January 9, 2017

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to make recommendations for the practice of internationalization at public research institutions. Responding to the calls to challenge the meaning and intentions of internationalization in higher education, this is a conceptual inquiry into internationalization, relying upon public documents revealing the history, practices, and policies as well as the literature, to investigate how a public research institution in Canada has understood and experienced internationalization and to imagine an ethical and educative implementation of internationalization in the future.

This inquiry found a disconnect between some of the practical policies of the institution and government, and the voice of the institutional leader and the students. This difference was reflective of the social imaginary operating behind the policies and actions. The voices of the leader and the students almost exclusively operated from the more collaborative and communicative imaginary. This exploration into the discourse of internationalization has led me to believe that rather than being a mechanism for coping with globalization, internationalization offers individuals and institutions the opportunity for required growth and development. Internationalization is a policy position that can result in practices that inspire an ethic of interconnected problem solving, individual identity development, and an ethos of care in institutions.

I argue that without an approach to internationalization that promotes a social imaginary of collaboration and networked institutions, characterized by global citizenship and intercultural learning, universities are at risk of succumbing to the forces of neoliberal policy directions, marketplace politics, and the tradition of status and rankings.

This alternative social imaginary for internationalization—valuing a network of people and institutions in order to create conditions that serve, support, and inspire collaboration for learning, research, and change across the globe—will yield a new way of being for universities, one that results from our history and resonates with our contemporary purpose.

Keywords: internationalization; higher education; public good(s); neoliberalism; networked institutions

Acknowledgements

This program inspired and tested our resilience as thinkers and educators, and the collective experience offered far, far more than I had ever anticipated.

Dr. Peter Grimmett captured my mind through his teaching and critique of education. He pushed me to think about the politics and practice of education, and his careful guidance and gentle encouragement has guided me for years.

I am grateful for Dr. Ann Chinnery's partnership, and for her time, wise counsel, and commitment to the ideas within this paper.

Finally, to the students, faculty, and staff with whom I have worked over the last 25 years, thank you for constantly reminding me about what really matters in the daily experiences of learning and of student life. Our complicated conversations have inspired these ideas and influenced this study. I am grateful for the opportunity to work with others who share a passionate belief that education and the opportunities created through supportive and diverse learning communities in higher education can change the world.

Table of Contents

Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
Chapter 1. Introduction: Further Imagining Internationalization	1
Context for the Study	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Research Questions	5
Overview of the Study	6
Situating Myself in the Study	8
Recognition of a Bias Inherent in the Approach	9
Chapter 2. Internationalization in Higher Education	11
Internationalization at the University of British Columbia	11
Internationalization Defined	15
Globalization Defined	17
Internationalization Practices	19
Comprehensive Internationalization	22
Internationalization at Home	24
Sustainable Internationalization	26
Conclusion: The Future of Internationalization	26
Chapter 3. Conceptual Framework	30
Three Social Imaginaries for Higher Education	30
Public Goods	32
Taylor’s Social Imaginary	36
Contributions from Habermas’s Theory of Communicative Action	40
Putting Internationalization into a Context Strengthened by MacIntyre	45

Chapter 4. Research Design	49
Specific Research Questions and Approach	49
Sampling	50
Analytic Strategy	50
Data Sources	52
Chapter 5. The Social Imaginary of Higher Education as an Economic Market	61
Introducing Neoliberalism	61
Neoliberalism in Practice	63
An Economic and Competitive Social Imaginary	66
Canada’s International Strategy	68
International Tuition Fees	72
Privatization and Internationalization	75
Chapter 6. Global Rankings: The Social Imaginary of Status and Competition	79
Emergent at a Time of Globalization	80
Steering Effect	82
University Rankings in Canada	84
Global Rankings	86
A Historically Powerful Social Imaginary	88
Chapter 7. Internationalization: The Networked and Collaborative Social Imaginary	92
Communications of a University Leader	92
Globalization and Global Citizenship	94
The Role of a University	96
New Internationalism: An Advocate for Internationalization at Home	101
Internationalization as a National Economic Strength	106
Cautioned for Global Rankings and Neoliberalism	108
Internationalization is Experience	110
Conclusion: Creating a Collaborative and Networked Imaginary for Universities	113
Chapter 8. Exploring the Imaginary: Speech Acts at a Public Research Institution ...	115
Institutional International Strategy	116

Student Leadership	120
Academic Collegial Governance	124
Conclusion: Evidence of a Networked Social Imaginary.....	128
Chapter 9. A Call to Action for Universities Engaged in Internationalization: Changing the Imaginary to Fit Educational Purposes.....	132
Internationalized—A New Way of Being	135
Recommendations for Practices of Internationalization at Universities.....	137
The Practices Constitutive of Internationalization	138
Future Areas of Research	140
Conclusion: The Promise of Internationalization, Global Universities, and Student Learning.....	142
References	144

Chapter 1.

Introduction: Further Imagining Internationalization

Context for the Study

Many university commitments and processes exist outside the imagination and scrutiny of public discourse. However, internationalization in higher education is an exception to this benign neglect. Within a university's residence halls, in the national media, and at the kitchen tables of engaged taxpayers and other consumers of higher education, internationalization is a strangely common point of discussion and debate. It is a dialogue that impacts politicians, policy leaders, institutional boards and senates, students and faculty, neighbours and communities, and, by extension, much of society as a whole.

In these Canadian spaces and places, internationalization is often understood to be an institutional commitment to a business model targeting, marketing, selling, and delivering higher education to non-residents who are willing to pay a premium for the product. The underlying assumption of this view is that importing students from abroad is a lucrative endeavour for Canadian universities otherwise strapped for critical funding. The monetization of education, detractors argue, warps institutional priorities, and undermines—even corrupts—the development of public goods associated with internationalization. I want to explore this seemingly inevitable corrupting influence, driven by market forces and arising from neoliberal ideology in an ever-expanding globalized society.

According to the independent student journalists at the University of British Columbia (UBC), the commitment to international student recruitment is fuelled by the institution's financial imperative rather than informed by ethical and educative practice:

education is “sold to the highest bidder” (Sharlandjieva, 2015). The motivations for and resultant outcomes of internationalization in the current context are worthy of deeper investigation to question the accusation of a drift in the public nature of universities and institutional commitment from the societal benefit of enhanced intercultural understanding to a strategic preoccupation with boosting institutional reputation, market share, and revenues.

Observing the policy discussions focused on the internationalization of higher education at institutions and within governments in Canada exposes a flaw in logic. The general themes of this dialogue often centre on the value of diversity and on prioritizing our domestic students—two apparently competing ideas. For example, concerns regarding enrolment targets and fees for international students are often tempered by the belief that the quality of education in Canada affords tremendous opportunities for international students while enhancing a diverse learning environment, to the benefit of all. The practices are further defended by assertions that the recruitment of international students does not displace domestic students. In fact, institutions across Canada consistently claim that revenues generated by international student fees help to create a better educational system for our domestic students than could otherwise be realized.

Notwithstanding the motivations of institutional leaders, it remains a fact that Canadian universities and colleges are increasingly dedicating some resources to the recruitment of international students and are exhibiting a growing reliance on the resultant revenues to fund their research and operations. It is important to understand how we got here and where we are headed. The financial imperative of internationalization has resulted in a confused narrative about the theoretical, conceptual, and practical understandings of the value of internationalization. This study seeks to clarify the purposes and practices of internationalization from an educational perspective.

Altbach & Knight (2007) argued that globalization and internationalization are very often confused even though they have distinctly different meanings. Globalization is the “economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement” (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290). Globalization is

synonymous with the contemporary world and therefore is a critical context for internationalization. Altbach & Knight (2007) have positioned internationalization as the practices and policies, indeed the choices, of “academic systems and institutions – and even individuals – to cope with the global academic environment” (p. 290).

This study will respond to the overdue calls to “challenge orthodoxies about internationalization and globalization in higher education” (Bourn, 2011, p. 559) and investigate: (i) our practices and commitments to internationalization, (ii) calls to action for global citizenship and diversity in higher education, and (iii) the other ways in which universities are responding to the forces of globalization in order to realize the promise of internationalization. It is time to challenge the ways in which we have conceptualized and practiced internationalization and imagine the future for internationalization as constituent for higher education.

Marginson (2012) has proposed that the “public good and goods” of higher education result from what we imagine the prospects to be. If we are to realize the public good and goods of education, we must contend with the “established ways of imagining and practicing higher education” (p. 14). He offered three imaginaries that are not mutually exclusive, and I will draw heavily on this framework to recommend engaging in internationalization through an imaginary illustrative of “the communicative world of flat networks and collegial relations, which lends itself to open, democratic, collaborative forms and gives authority to knowledge from anywhere” (p. 22). Internationalization is practiced differently through this imaginary than through the other, more common and competing, imaginaries of higher education—namely, an economic market or a field of status and competition. Without an approach to internationalization that promotes a social imaginary of collaboration and networked institutions, characterized by global citizenship and intercultural learning, universities are at risk of succumbing to the forces of neoliberal policy directions, marketplace politics, and the age-old game of status and rankings. Failing to resist the current corporatization and privatization of what has long been a public good in Canada will impact the equity and inevitably the health of the world (Marginson, 2012).

Universities are meaningful organizations largely as a result of the role they play in society. Internationalization deeply understood through this new social imaginary can change the culture, language, and sensibilities of institutions. The purpose of this imaginary takes the institution well beyond being a producer of education and research and reaffirms that universities have the potential to continue to aid society as value-based organizations serving the public good and developing public goods in individuals and communities. Amidst the powerful forces steering internationalization is an opportunity to ensure that we imagine it as part of the way in which we teach, research, and contribute to the public good. Internationalization is not the end but rather the means to the promise of intercultural understanding, global citizenship and collaboration. This shift is critical to the future engagement of universities in the public sphere, where they have long established democratic dialogues and spaces constitutive of the well-being of individuals and communities.

Thus, this study seeks to clarify the purpose and practices of internationalization from an educational perspective.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to make recommendations for the practice of internationalization, specifically about the ways in which internationalization is understood and conceptualized by leaders and leadership bodies at public research institutions in Canada. Relying upon documents that are found in the public sphere, I have analyzed the voices of one institution, including one of its presidents, the student government, the independent student newspaper, and the minutes of the governing academic council. This study is an opportunity to look at an institution that is deeply committed to internationalization, over a period of time when the international student population has dramatically increased, reaching 12,117 students in 2015, or 23% of the campus population.

This study yields an argument that the promise of internationalization will only be realized through a deeper commitment to intercultural understanding. This condition facilitates the collaboration and creation of a greater network of public goods and serves

both individuals and institutions. As a result of the literature review, theoretical framing, and the conceptual analysis of leadership voices at one institution, I argue for an orientation to internationalization that is built upon the values that relate to the interconnected and interdependent world in which we live, where universities achieve something greater than prestige and financial security and do not give in to instrumental rationality. Through such an orientation, universities have the opportunity to demonstrate their unique purpose, unfettered by nation-state borders.

Research Questions

This study will proceed as a conceptual inquiry into internationalization and I will question how internationalization is understood, and how related processes and practices in higher education are constructed based on one's understanding. I will investigate the following questions:

- How is internationalization within public research universities in Canada understood?
- What are the consequences of this complex change for higher education and Canadian society?

The specific research questions that have guided this inquiry include:

1. What does Marginson's (2012) notion of the three imaginaries for higher education—as an economic market, as a field of status and competition, and as a collaborative network—reveal about university practices to promote and engage in internationalization? In what ways has internationalization been a generative process or a corrupting process for universities?
2. How has a public research institution in Canada experienced internationalization? How does a university president speak about the complex changes of internationalization? How are the outcomes of internationalization understood and characterized?
3. How does leadership¹ impact the process of internationalization? What are the practices that contribute to an ethical implementation of internationalization? What indication is there that universities can move from the social imaginary of status and competition, or the economic social imaginary, into a collaborative and networked space benefitting universities and students worldwide? What would this mean at Canadian institutions?

¹ The term leadership is used broadly here to include not only administrative and academic leadership but also the voices of student leaders and the university's governing academic council.

I will accomplish this through an investigation of one large, public, research institution looking specifically at aspects of the history as well as a literature review and review of policies that expose the ideas driving internationalization and the practices sustaining the current understandings.

I have considered the connection between the method of inquiry and the resultant meaning of the work. Many scholars (for example, Firestone, 1987; Fraser & Naples, 2004; Kilbourn, 2006) have identified the significance of the choice of method and its impact on epistemology. The alignment of method of inquiry and meaning contributes to how research improves our knowledge but also opens avenues for potential action. The present research reflects a care and commitment to “the intellectual project of understanding the world and the political project of changing it” (Fraser & Naples, 2004, p. 1106). The choices made in this study are reflective of my interest in hearing and responding to the call to action that Nancy Fraser (in Fraser & Naples, 2004, p. 1106–1107) articulated:

[T]here are also real tensions between the theoretical and the practical orientations. To make these tensions productive requires some imagination and subtlety. We all know of theoretical work that, however brilliant, is so abstract and disengaged that it surrenders the capacity to illuminate political practice. But the reverse is equally problematic; when scholarship is too immediately political, too myopically focused on practical application, it loses the capacity to pose questions about the big picture. The trick, of course, is to keep both concerns simultaneously in view—but in such a way that avoids subordinating one to the other, and so preserves the integrity of each.

This study will investigate internationalization through a conceptual inquiry of words spoken and actions taken, all the while considering the ways in which the learning that emerges can serve the interconnected social and political purposes of higher education.

Overview of the Study

This dissertation is developed through seven chapters, each exploring a particular aspect or condition of university commitments to internationalization and

thereby revealing more about how it is understood and conceptualized. The final chapter presents recommendations for the practice of internationalization.

Following the present overview, Chapter Two puts the research question into greater context through a brief history of international students at one large, Canadian public research institution and a review of the literature. Particular attention is paid to how internationalization is conceptualized within the larger forces of globalization and the emerging manifestations of internationalization. This chapter begins to construct an argument for internationalization to be an ethos or imaginary that is deeply wedded to all of the institution's commitments.

Chapter Three describes a number of theoretical contributions, including Marginson's three imaginaries for public higher education, Taylor's description of a social imaginary, McIntyre's concepts of "the practice," and Habermas's concept of the public sphere. Acknowledging the potential harm arising from neoliberalism and rankings, discussed in the following chapters, these contributions begin to develop a third imaginary for the internationalization of higher education, built upon the prospect of collaboration and the conditions of global communication and networks (Marginson, 2012). This chapter concludes with a lingering question about how such a shift can be realized, and the hope that contemporary discourse can reveal a way of being for universities that shapes and structures their role in a global community. They thereby can create the conditions for public goods that transcend the individual goods resulting from either teaching or research, and can further the fundamental task of internationalization as it manifests in the identity and role of universities and higher education. The following chapter describes the research design, including the sources that are analyzed and interpreted in the three subsequent chapters, each corresponding to one of Marginson's three social imaginaries.

One of the primary challenges for internationalization is the impact of neoliberalism. Chapter Five argues that neoliberalism is having a steering effect on internationalization practices and that the inherent public good of internationalization is at risk of being subsumed, reinterpreted, and rationalized as economic activity. This chapter presents internationalization experienced through the economic social

imaginary. Neoliberalism is willingly hosted in this imaginary and has been a dominant ideology impacting internationalization over the last two decades. By looking at three specific policy examples, this chapter critiques the ways in which this paradigm fails to develop a coherent and ethical approach to internationalization in the field of higher education.

Global rankings may obscure the role of higher education and the institutions themselves, and they constitute a powerful second imaginary of higher education as a field of status and competition. Chapter Six analyzes the practice of global rankings and their impact on internationalization across the system of higher education. While global rankings have taken on new meaning over the last decade, largely facilitated by the ease with which the world can communicate, they illustrate the long-standing competition between institutions as well as the age-old pursuit of status and prestige. This is an important paradigm to understand because internationalization could easily become simply another tactic for further competition.

Chapter Seven investigates the speech acts of Professor Stephen Toope specific to internationalization and distils the values underpinning his vision of internationalization. This analysis is presented as one Canadian example of a leader who is deeply engaged in putting forward a new social imaginary. Chapter Eight analyzes student voices through their participation in a formal consultation process as well as through the student newspaper and the role of Senate in the dialogue about internationalization. These chapters provide a foundation for recommendations made in Chapter Nine to ground institutions in an ethical commitment to internationalization and the promise of intercultural understanding.

Situating Myself in the Study

As an administrator at this large, public research institution, I have been motivated by the individual ambitions of students and faculty with whom I work each day. Further, I have been inspired by the ideas of former President Stephen Toope, in whose administration I worked for many years, and it is a privilege to foreground, through his example, the ideas of an alternate social imaginary for internationalization. This study is

an opportunity to investigate the ideas of one institution, with the goal of contributing to the larger challenges of internationalization and the practice thereof in Canadian higher education. I have been ruminating for almost a decade upon many questions about the conceptualization and practices of internationalization. I have worked in international education for many years, first for a humanitarian organization and then, for the last 20 years, at a public research university, where I have had the opportunity to develop international residence halls and international student services, solve complex problems for students and their families, and advocate for policies and practices that would ethically support international students and the communities of peers with whom they live, study and work on campus. I orient myself each day as a learner. I am grateful that I have the opportunity to work and learn with a tremendous network of colleagues, students, faculty and staff, as we set about discovering new practices of internationalization, facilitating intercultural learning, and creating conditions of support and well-being for all students. It has been a pleasure to investigate internationalization from a number of perspectives and question the purpose of such a commitment.

Recognition of a Bias Inherent in the Approach

One of the primary weaknesses of this study is my complete reliance on research published in English. It is important to articulate this at the outset so that you can read with this limitation in mind. The global north dominates this field of research. Reluctantly, I have replicated such inequities through the manner in which I have researched literature for this study.

I am grateful for the ever-expanding community of scholars from around the world, including those moving from the global south to the global north to take up a voice within the more dominant centre. These colleagues bring an intellect to this dialogue that is based on literature in other languages, familiarity with communities abroad, and the lived experience of internationalization. While there may always be a sense of the dominant centre, it is my hope that the nature of the centre can change. Indeed, this is what the present project is about: the internationalization of higher education with a focus on the moral outcome of greater and growing intercultural understanding that becomes part of who we are and changes us while we are in the process of becoming

something different. I am aware of the profound inequities in education and, sadly, this dissertation fails to overcome them in this regard.

Chapter 2.

Internationalization in Higher Education

Internationalization at the University of British Columbia

On March 4, 1959, at the University of British Columbia (UBC), Eleanor Roosevelt opened International House, the first of its kind in Canada. In attendance was renowned social anthropologist Margaret Mead. Its origins can be traced back 10 years, to the establishment of the International Students' Club, by Frene Ginwala, a UBC international student. The intent of both the club and its evolution as International House was to support the social and community aspect of an international student's life at UBC. At the 40-year anniversary of its opening, the director of International House commented that "International House will continue to do what it does best—serve people who feel culturally displaced and to make them feel welcome at UBC and in Canada" (Stern, 1999). In 2016, while International House continues as the centre of services for international students, the entire campus, including faculties, residences, and the student union, are sites of internationalization, often led by the ideas and initiatives of international students. The internationalization of campuses has been a transformative, complex, and at times subconscious evolution for universities in Canada and for Canadian society. Hence, it is necessary to critically question the meaning, intentions, values, and practices behind internationalization as a key strategic priority for institutions in Canada as well as around the world.

Internationalization as a function of a globalized stage of higher education has been a developing set of ideas and practices that has grown in scope, sophistication, and relevance at Canadian universities since the latter part of the last century. In 1959, UBC had 526 international students in a campus community of 10,642 (UBC, 1959). As of the 2014/15 academic year, 11,965 international students were part of the university

community of 59,659 students (UBC, 2015). The number and percentage of international students has increased from 4.9% in 1959 to more than 20% today. This growth has been accompanied by changes across the campus, including changes in the curriculum, the development of services designed to support international student transition and retention, as well as a different vision for student learning and institutional strategic planning, arising from a deeper and more intentional commitment to international engagement.

The history of International House is a concrete expression of the history of international students at UBC as well as the story of internationalization writ large. There was a time when a safe haven, one that created a supportive community home on a foreign campus, was required to support the internationalization of UBC. Even the physical form and location of International House reflected the founders' inspirations and aspirations. It was designed and built as a pavilion in the woods, a small home within a beautiful treed and lush landscape, set apart from the centre of campus. Its location marked it as a place that symbolically withdrew from the core yet still was a connected piece of the campus.

The original intention of attracting students from abroad was to promote the free exchange of ideas between scholars from Canada and elsewhere, and in so doing to support the development of societies around the world. International House was motivated by a desire to recruit international students to UBC and a concomitant ethical interest in developing a social facility to support the lives of all international students on the campus. With the development of such a robust and diverse international student recruiting practice and the resulting growth in the student population, how International House was imagined and developed no longer symbolizes the relationship between international students and the campus. International House is no more UBC's home away from home, as all aspects of the campus have become, out of necessity and intention, sites of international interaction and engagement.

As noted above, international students constitute a substantial percentage of the overall student body at UBC. However, in some ways, the current international student community has more in common with the domestic student population because of the

ways in which globalization, specifically immigration practices, have also changed the domestic student population in Canada. Canada is a linguistically and ethnoculturally diverse country. The vast majority of Canadians were immigrants at some point, and many reflect the ethnocultural background of their country of origin. In 2011, three in 10 Canadians who identified themselves as members of a visible minority had been born in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2011). This means that the student body at UBC mirrors the diversity of Canada and that our domestic students often speak other languages and reflect the ethnocultural background of their family's heritage. The categories of "domestic" and "international" further fail us as many of UBC's international students may have studied at Canadian secondary schools to prepare for admission to university, and a number of domestic students will have never studied in Canada. The only universal difference is that the international students are studying on a visa and paying international tuition fees. This is an important acknowledgement, as very often in the discussion of internationalization the categories of international and domestic students are misconstrued.

The obvious and required simultaneous changes in programming and services that have accompanied the growth in the number of international students have had a collective and cumulative impact on internationalization within and across UBC over the last 50 years. More of the campus is strategically focused on internationalization. This is evident in the strategic plans for the university dating back to 1988, when President David Strangway reported that the university would increase the number of international undergraduate students from foreign countries from less than one percent to between four and six percent while at the same time continuing to provide more opportunities for UBC students to study abroad (Strangway, 1988). Ten years later, UBC's strategic plans under President Martha Piper identified the twin goals of internationalization as advancing international scholarship and global education (UBC, n.d.). Today, the entire campus operates in a global context. Similar stories of internationalization can be told through the lenses of research and community engagement.

This is not a comprehensive story of internationalization at UBC, but it does illustrate the growth of the international student population over the last 25 years, and it shows that the original goals were as much about internationalizing the community of

scholars at UBC as they were about capacity building for societal health and prosperity, both here and abroad. In President Strangway's 1988 annual report, titled *Toward the Pacific Century*, he commented that:

Our survival in the next century depends on our ability to build with other nations a common future. The capacity of Canadians to contribute will depend not only on scientific and economic energies and expertise, but on our ability to understand and appreciate how other people feel and think. (p. 39)

This is a democratic viewpoint and a very human reflection, and it was authored when international student recruitment was set to expand. It grounds us in the intention of the time. International student recruitment, one practice of internationalization, was driven by intercultural understanding and a commitment to contributing to a caring, interconnected world. While the matter of tuition fees requires a much more thorough treatment (and will be discussed in detail in Chapter Five), it is worth noting that international tuition did not begin to dramatically outpace domestic tuition until the late 1990s, when governments began to cut back on funding from the public purse for universities.

If we fast forward to the current state of internationalization at UBC, the picture is very different from what Strangway sketched in *Toward the Pacific Century*. The recruitment of international undergraduate students is a strategic operation, and admitting as many academically prepared students who will study on visa is a priority of almost every faculty with a significant cadre of undergraduate students. International tuition fees continue to rise, and the primary rationale for the increase is no longer the cost of education; rather, it is much more connected to the global value of the degree, and the global education market's tolerance for higher tuition fees. UBC's student newspaper, *The Ubyyssey*, quoted the executive director responsible for undergraduate international student recruitment to highlight the market-driven rhetoric. University education is referred to as a product, students as customers, and the value of the education is determined by international ranking:

"It doesn't always mean that your customers drop off when your fees go up," McKellin said, noting UBC's international ranking. "If you have a

really good product ... then some parents and families just dig a little deeper.” (Sharlandjieva, 2015)

It is possible to imagine that the narrative of internationalization has changed from one of international engagement designed to educate citizens from around the world so that communities and economies can be led and influenced by an educated citizenry—on the premise that those benefiting from international educational opportunities return home, stay abroad, or move to new nations to positively impact the development of communities and nations—to one where international students are merging into institutions around the world to achieve greater individual capacity so as to build their careers and engage in the marketplace of education. However, there are significant limitations to a plan for the internationalization of higher education in Canada that prioritizes the private goods for individuals resulting from education in order to advance themselves economically. A better grasp of how internationalization is understood will help to advance the vision for its continuation at Canadian institutions.

Internationalization Defined

Internationalization is a complex change in which the vast majority of the world’s universities are engaged. During the past 20 years in particular, there has been heightened research interest in and activity regarding internationalization. However, while the research may be relatively new, universities have been engaged in internationalization for many more decades, reflecting a societal shift from local to global. This movement to a global perspective has been hastened by information technology, the emergence of the knowledge economy, the increased mobility of students and staff, social media, the development of borderless programs and providers, and “an integrated world economy” (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 303).

Knight, a Canadian scholar, did much of the work in the late 1990s to make sense of the conceptual confusion surrounding internationalization in higher education. She proposed adopting a definition that would posit internationalization as a “process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2003, p. 2). Typically, this would

encompass: how students are recruited to the institution and from where; how they are supported throughout their degree; how the curriculum takes shape; the development of branch campuses; the establishment of special English language programming; partnerships and collaborations to enhance research; and how research engagement is developed and supported. It is a broad and expansive definition that, in theory, starts at the top of an institution with its strategic plan and engages all aspects of university activity. Knight's definition is silent on the matter of outcomes or rationale—intentionally so, because it is meant to be universal and widely applicable to the vast diversity of institutions and jurisdictions within international education.

Knights earlier work had sought to summarize the discussion of internationalization in Canada and found three additional ways of viewing internationalization beyond her definition (which was one of process): (i) as a set of programs and projects, (ii) as the development of intercultural competencies to prepare people to live in an interconnected and diverse world, and (iii) as the cultivation of an institutional ethos that values cultural perspectives and supports programs for international cooperation and exchange (McKellin, 1998). In her 2003 article, Knight asserted that the “critical point is that the international dimension relates to all aspects of education and the role that it plays in society” (p. 2). If we use her definition, which has become widely accepted, we can then begin to explore some of the internationalization processes and investigate the trajectory of outcomes, realities, and missteps. Additionally, this definition provides the opportunity to pause and deliberate on the usefulness of a concept that focuses solely on process, without a more clearly mapped rationale or goal.

Knights and Altbach (2007) subsequently described “internationalization as the policies and practices undertaken by academic systems and institutions—and even individuals—to cope with the global academic environment” (p. 290). This is not incongruent with Knight's earlier definition and further places the process into context. Clarifying the relationship between internationalization and globalization is critical for the present investigation, notwithstanding that these terms remain contested in the literature.

Globalization Defined

Lewin (2009, cited in Bourn, 2011, p. 560) described globalization as:

the borderless nature of the production and marketing of goods, the declining role of the nation state as the principal site of identity construction and the speed and scope of global communications, characterized by (resources permitting) instant access to information and dialogue around the world.

This is globalization in the broadest sense, and it is the context in which higher education operates. The discussion of internationalization is tightly coupled with the forces of globalization, and for many there is confusion between the two terms and the ways in which these concepts relate to each other. Globalization denotes “the economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st-century higher education toward greater international involvement” (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290), resulting in the knowledge society and the requirement for an educated professional class in order to support national economic growth. Altbach and Knight (2007) have been deeply convincing in their argument that while globalization is “unalterable,” we have many opportunities to make “choices” about how to engage in the discourse and practices of internationalization (p. 291). In later chapters, it is precisely these choices that I will analyze.

Globalization is a compelling force that leads institutions to engage in internationalization and also creates opportunities for other market-driven players. For example, KPMG, a global consulting firm, released a strategy document in 2013 detailing approaches for and considerations in building an international expansion plan for higher education institutions. KPMG argued that “the forces of globalization have accentuated the demand and value of international education, creating an increasingly competitive global marketplace for higher education institutions” (p. 5), and it cited the demand by employers for global skills, the need for economic growth and national capacity, as well as the need for enrolments and revenue as the rationale for building a business case for internationalization. Both the corporation involved as well as the tactics described illustrate the ways in which higher education has become a business operation. The language of education is being co-opted by private interests. For

example, in the KPMG quote above, the language suggests that globalization is a positive force that has created further value for higher education. It also positions the goods resulting from international education as private goods that lead to individual gains in employment and benefits for nations. KPMG, this document suggests, may actually be helping higher education do what it intends to do. I do not intend to imply that KPMG, or any other industry partner, comes to work with institutions who are naive to the partner's practices or intents. However, isn't it possible that these kinds of partnerships and this kind of discourse is exploitation? The hiring of professional consulting firms may actually accentuate the development of institutional practices that require ongoing professional engagement with practitioners outside the academy. I am not suggesting that all those external to the institution are necessarily not partners in the public development of higher education, as innumerable parties *are* key partners in the development of higher education as a public good and are facilitators of intercultural learning and democracy. However, some parties appear to be motivated by and interested solely in private goods and the fostering of a reliance on additional professional skills to further develop higher education as a marketplace commodity.

Slaughter and Leslie (1997) claimed that the globalization of the political economy at the end of the 20th century was destabilizing the traditional patterns of university professional work. One of the major changes that has taken place as a result of globalization is that faculty, who were previously situated between capital and labour, are now positioned squarely in the marketplace. To grasp the extent of the changes occurring and to understand the forces of change, they examined the current state of academic careers and institutions, with a particular focus on public research universities in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia. They concluded that universities now engage in what they labelled *academic capitalism*.²

Thus, institutions and the organizations operating within the field of higher education have bifurcated the purposes and outcomes of internationalization. On the one hand, there is a capitalist mentality at work, and universities are aided in the

² Metcalfe (2010) contested Slaughter and Leslie's claim that only Canada showed signs of resisting the forces of academic capitalism, maintaining that Canadian exceptionalism to academic capitalism may rest upon the sustainability of the so-called "Québec exceptionalism" (Fisher, Rubenson, Jones, & Shanahan, 2009) as a consistent provincial variation to the national trend.

development of business planning by consultancy organizations motivated to generate capital. This is not to say that they are not productive or ethical in the development of behaviours and programs that serve to internationalize institutions. In fact, they may very well use good practices, because their success depends on fostering the outcomes valued by institutions of higher education. However, this does not negate the goal of the activity. Conversely, institutions are participating in deeper international engagement, intercultural learning, and global dynamics in order to provide worthwhile educational and research opportunities in the 21st century. It is a reality that researchers and scholars are connected worldwide and have ambitions that join them across nation-state boundaries. Internationalization within a globalized world appears to be a process whereby institutions act in ways that are identified as international, intercultural, or global; in so doing, institutions become iteratively more engaged in internationalization, producing outcomes for learning and research likewise informed by internationalization.

Many have argued that internationalization is a process resulting from the pressures and opportunities of a globalized world. Understanding how to lead and engage in this process may not be well understood by administrations and senior academic councils of universities. Indeed, there is a divide between theory and practice within universities with respect to how the institution engages with education scholars in strategic planning and leadership priorities for the institution, as well as, ultimately, for students, faculty, and societies.

Internationalization Practices

Knight (2006) conducted a thoughtful investigation into what drives internationalization. She summarized the key drivers for federal or national bodies, as well as individual institutional priorities, thus:

National-Level Drivers	Institutional Drivers
Human resource development	International branding and profile

Nation and institution building	Quality enhancement/international standards
Income generation/international trade	Alternative income generation
Social-cultural development and mutual understanding	Student and staff development
Strategic alliances	Networks and strategic alliances
	Knowledge production

It is hard to ignore the overwhelming fiscal tone of these drivers of internationalization and disconcerting to see such alignment between collegially governed academic institutions and provincial or federal government agendas. In a subsequent chapter, the marketplace of education will be further explored.

This is an important place to acknowledge the inherent bias and inequity that operate in the implementation of internationalization. These are important themes, and how they manifest in neoliberal governance and global rankings will be further explored in subsequent chapters. Globalization tends to concentrate wealth, knowledge, and power in those already possessing these elements. International academic mobility similarly favours well-developed education systems and institutions, thereby compounding existing inequalities (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 291).

Institutions across the north and south, developed and developing countries, are engaged in the internationalization of higher education. International mobility is a beneficial practice that has dramatically increased over the last 20 years. However, this activity reinforces the current inequities and is experienced differently, if at all, by those of different socio-economic levels, genders, races, and ethnicities. As Altbach and Knight (2007) have pointed out, the benefits are heavily weighted toward participants in privileged institutions. Lee and Cantwell (2012) concluded that even when fee-paying international students from abroad are recruited to the USA, they are often not afforded

the same level of access or support as domestic students. While international students are sought and welcomed because of their productivity and tuition fees, and because they bring an element of global status to the institution, they are likely to experience systemic racism.

Stepping back from the individual experience of students, it is evident that institutions within Canada or elsewhere in the global north participate in the development of strategic partnership agreements between institutions. These partnerships express the commitment that each institution has to work with the other for mutual benefit, and they may explicitly address the opportunities for student exchange or the intention to foster research collaborations. These partnerships are important to each institution and take on meaning. For example, one can assess a given institution in part by assessing the status and quality of the institutions with which it builds partnerships. This again underscores the benefits that are afforded to well-developed institutions, reinforcing the status quo and making it that much more difficult for developing institutions to work in partnership with the more revered institutions. As Altbach and Knight (2007) have pointed out, this compounds existing inequalities. Furthermore, Canadian institutions and others in the north control the partnerships and processes and inevitably stand to benefit more than their partners in the south. As internationalization tactics are operationalized, it is important that, given the purported goals, practices be critiqued and developed in a manner that addresses inequities so that individuals and institutions from the global south can realize greater benefits.

As we look at the results of internationalization, we can see how universities are behaving similarly: almost all are engaging in international student recruitment and study-abroad opportunities. It is interesting to investigate the reasons and ways in which they act differently—such as whether they provide need-based scholarships for international students when the priority is on revenue generation; whether they have chosen to build a campus in an international destination and, if so, how they have gone about this initiative; and whether they are partnering with third-party private companies to develop international programs. Each university is making a number of decisions that, over time, will define the intentions of their internationalization program. This intense commitment to internationalization will generate changes that result in new forms and

understandings of teaching and research, and a continued redefinition of the role of universities in society.

The prolific nature of internationalization makes this a very significant discussion. Within Canada, the research carried out by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) has promoted the idea that “internationalization is now an integral part of Canadian universities’ institutional strategies, organizational approaches, and expected learning outcomes for students” (AUCC, 2007, p. 3). This is not just true of higher education in Canada but is characteristic of the Western world (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Knight 2001, 2004).

By definition, internationalization involves all aspects of the institution; therefore, the activities and involvement of faculty and students are critical. In reviewing the internationalization literature, one might ask whether these views and voices have been central to the dialogue. Many of the key internationalization practices have been led by the administration, which is an effective way to expedite implementation and routinize it in a consistent manner. However, it is important that internationalization be debated and defined by all members of the institution so that the changes are systemic and broadly acted upon as a result of being understood by students, staff, and faculty. Such institutional dialogue will ensure that internationalization is core to an institution’s educational and research orientations. Higher education is a complex social movement, serving to develop citizens who will engage in the greatest challenges facing humanity and the sustainability of the planet. Internationalization has been lauded as a process that is germane to the relevance of higher education in the 21st century, so surely it is a dialogue and priority that should be deeply understood by all those participating within the institution.

Comprehensive Internationalization

Many find the deep involvement of financial consulting firms in university international engagement strategy offensive, particularly in the discussion of educational practices. Yet this kind of strategic planning is not only the domain of outside consultants but is also a common practice within the administration of institutions. We are witnessing

the development of a language in internationalization that will define this field of practice within the institution. While the intention is laudable, it also borrows language that is changing the ways in which higher education operates. Hudzik and McCarthy (2012) authored a document for the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA), today an association of international educators, titled *Leading Comprehensive Internationalization: Strategy and Tactics for Action*. This built on their research- and practice-based leadership in the field and described a process called comprehensive internationalization, also referred to as CIZN. They proposed that institutions adopt a strategic or business orientation to the university's engagement in international, intercultural, and global education, and they defined CIZN thus:

Comprehensive internationalization (CIZN) is a commitment, confirmed through action, to integrate international, global, and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education. It is a means to advance the core learning, discovery, and engagement objectives of higher education in a twenty-first century context. (p. 2)

Hudzik and McCarthy (2012) called this a paradigm shift because of the nature of engagement and the scale of involvement for the university community. They were acting on sentiments that have been widespread among many scholars but that Bourn (2011) summed up thus:

Whilst there may be a degree of consensus within higher education that internationalisation should involve equipping the university and the staff and student bodies for learning in an international and multicultural context, in practice internationalisation has been subject to highly variable interpretations. (p. 561)

The ways in which Hudzik and McCarthy (2012) have expanded and defined comprehensive internationalization are broad and begin to challenge the core of what a university is. Hudzik and McCarthy have concluded that internationalization is the product of the actions taken to advance learning, research, and community engagement. I suggest that this is an appropriate challenge and that the outcome should result in an engagement in the development of public institutions creating public goods and acting to connect students, faculty, and scholarship in ways that are more reflective of the interconnected world in which we live. An attentive examination of the commitment to

internationalization may further reveal an aim to understand the identity of universities as institutions embedded in a complex and interconnected, global world. Thus, I want to argue that internationalization can become a process and commitment that results in a new way of being for universities.

To what extent is the development of this terminology and language in internationalization co-opting the language of universities in a globalized world? Universities have needed to respond to society through each decade by reflecting key social issues, seeking to discover new knowledge that will positively impact society, and developing alumni who will engage constructively in civil society. In many ways, the future of internationalization is most heavily influenced by a globalized world, and universities will adapt and change to reflect this societal reality. Although the terminology and proposed step-by-step process for CIZN is limiting to the very idea of a university, there are merits to this discussion, one of its strengths being the focus on culture and on the fact that time is required to make an institution comprehensively international. As the term *comprehensive internationalization* takes on greater and greater meaning for those who are responsible for internationalization at universities, I would caution against the formulaic and administrative overtones arising from a simplistic understanding.

Internationalization at Home

The phrase *internationalization at home* was coined during the last decade to mean the ways in which a student can be engaged in the learning outcomes of internationalization by participation on an internationalized campus. This phrase and the corresponding educational practices are developing as a counterpoint to student mobility, which has arguably been the dominant form of international education for students.

Studying abroad is a powerful immersive experience for students; beyond facilitating their travel to others parts of the world, it engages students in different cultural practices both at institutions of higher education and socially within communities and in the international setting. However, practitioners of international education have long been aware of the barriers to participation, one being that it requires the resources to

leave a home life in one country and relocate to another. For internationalization to truly achieve the intentions of influencing all aspects of institutional functioning and learning, there must be a focus on the process of internationalization that occurs on the campus and invites the participation of the entire community. No amount of focus on study abroad will ever deliver on the promise of internationalization. Internationalization at home is a call to action for institutions to focus on the community that they have recruited, and to engage in a learning community that facilitates intercultural engagement.

Jos Beelen and Elspeth Jones have written about the “conceptual fog” that has surrounded the term *internationalization at home* since the original definition in 2001. The first, albeit not overly helpful, attempt to define the activity failed to adequately identify what it was; the phrase “any internationally related activity with the exception of outbound student and staff mobility” lacks any mention of strategy and guidance regarding the practice(s) it is intending to define (2015, p. 13). Beelen and Jones proposed the following definition: “the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students, within domestic learning environments” (2015, p. 13). This definition has a number of important attributes. The phrase *purposeful integration* helps to define the intentional nature of internationalization on a campus. One cannot simply admit international students on the campus and expect that their being a part of the community will necessarily impact the learning outcomes for other students, either domestic or international. The focus on broadly understanding international and intercultural dimensions seems very appropriate, as the breadth of activity is significant and, more importantly, there is a direct link between international and intercultural learning. Highlighting the totality of the experience for students also signals a realistic grounding of the definition, as students often comment on the learning that happens in residence halls, in clubs and student activities, and in many of the other informal aspects of university life.

The International Association of Universities commented in their 2010 report on global trends that, given the cost of international mobility, internationalization-at-home activities will become an alternative and deeper form of engagement for universities. This is a helpful discourse after the last 30 years’ focus on internationalization practices

external to the institution. It has the chance to contribute to a different way of understanding and enacting internationalization.

Sustainable Internationalization

Based on the assumption that internationalization is a practice driven by the economic motivation to achieve a balanced budget and therefore sustain the educational institution, Ilieva, Beck, and Waterstone (2014) set out to ask questions that more broadly and ethically address the possibilities of internationalization, with specific inquiry into what internationalization sustains and what it ought to sustain. The early conceptual work that they presented suggested recasting internationalization as a more critically understood concept and offered “opportunities to see internationalization in its complexity, and to rethink and reorder practices that are not in alignment with educational goals and values” (p. 1). They have described an educational sustainability lens as a tool for thinking about how to foster “dynamic, ethical practices of internationalization in which all participants can flourish” (p. 14). The comments from students that they cited are not unlike what we expect to hear on campuses today, and in my own experience, students find ideas such as global citizenship inspiring and useful.

Conclusion: The Future of Internationalization

Internationalization arguably has been part of institutions of higher education since their inception. Ward, Bochner, and Furnham (2001, cited in Gu & Schweisfurth, 2011) noted scholars in 272–222 BC engaging in exchanges and seeking out intercultural education. However, just as the nature of universities’ activities has changed over time, so have the ideas, priorities, and meaning of internationalization. Gu and Schweisfurth (2011) have categorized and summarized the phases of internationalization over the last half century thus: in the 1970s, the focus was on international aid; in the 1980s, it shifted to cooperation and exchange; in the 1990s, internationalization further concentrated on international trade; the first decade of the 21st century was focused on heightened competition for international students worldwide as well as an increasingly diverse set of international study options and destinations for

a burgeoning population of mobile students. The continued evolution of internationalization will be ethically and educationally improved by a discussion about what it ought to look like. Further investigation into how institutions are being shaped by internationalization and how it is conceptualized, discussed, and understood is critical to defining the next phase of internationalization. Within this evolution, university leaders and students will have to wrestle with how they can best be involved in internationalization and to what outcomes they are most committed.

Perhaps this investigation has uncovered what internationalization has looked like in the recent past: an overriding metaphor of an international education marketplace punctuated with the virtues of student mobility. The question is: how should it be seen today? It is my contention, drawing upon a brief review of UBC documentation from 1960 to 2000, that internationalization at this institution was intended to yield a deeper understanding of intercultural communities, for individuals—both students and faculty—to learn the ways in which problems are interdependent and interconnected.

Imagining internationalization in higher education as a process that brings positive and generative outcomes to students and faculty, as citizens of the world, is difficult, especially since the discourses around revenue generation, rankings, and reputations seem to be key motivators for central actors and further may be holding the process captive to these ideas. The literature shows a fixation on process, definitions, and operations rather than on internationalization as an opportunity that can stimulate human development and creativity for students and faculty. Remembering that the early rhetoric a half century ago was focused on global citizenship and the need to engage in a globalized world, I wonder whether internationalization has fallen short of its promise, or perhaps whether a better understanding of universities in a globalized world reveals the need for a focus on intercultural understanding. Internationalization at home would likely look like the development of globalized curricula, communities, and campuses inherently aware of the nuances of intercultural learning.

Internationalization is a complex change, but learning to lead and participate in this phenomenal process is central to the future activities and priorities of universities. Whose agenda is internationalization? Which competing agenda(s) will prevail? How do

institutions take part? Has internationalization as an educationally rich practice become corrupted by the instrumental rationality of higher education? University communities are interactive and generative places because of the diversity of citizens who are engaged in stimulating and contested thinking and in acting beyond nation-state borders. Education has long been about building connections for the strength of nations and communities, according to the modern liberal idea. The postmodern world, however, is now a globalized place that reframes the building of connections toward the strength of the internationalized community.

“Higher education was always more internationally open than most sectors because of its immersion in knowledge, which never showed much respect for juridical boundaries” (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007, p. 3). If we understand that the commitment to internationalization has veered from it being an inherently university practice that was visible well before the term internationalization emerged, to a focus on marketization and neoliberal priorities, then we can see a different future going forward. In our globalized world, our understanding of internationalization has changed, and we have forgotten the rich roots of interconnected and interdependent knowledge and practices between institutions and citizens. Perhaps the focus of internationalization championed by governments has sidetracked institutions into a preoccupation with economic growth and prosperity. Our commitment to higher education may require international activity, as well as local activity and engagement, and perhaps our focus should be on intercultural learning in a globalized world.

Internationalization “aims to recognize and value both cultural differences and diversity in order to respond to the differentiating and homogenizing forces of globalization that are reshaping people’s identities and their social imagination” (Bourn, 2011, p. 562). This is a period of change for universities, and by embracing a dialogue about internationalization and ensuring that this dialogue is deeply seeded within and across all teaching, learning, and research functions of the university, we will be able to identify the goals as well as the supports required to achieve those goals. Without a set of intentions shared comprehensively across the institution, internationalization will produce only the outcomes required by each defined task. The promise of internationalization is much greater. A new social imaginary for universities has the

potential to emerge, one that can hold the neoliberal forces in check and allow the public goods of universities to thrive in a globalized world.

Chapter 3.

Conceptual Framework

Three Social Imaginaries for Higher Education

Marginson (2011) has described three interrelated imaginaries for higher education that collectively shape how we understand universities and facilitate our imagination of the possibilities for universities in society. One is an economic market, where “higher education is seen as a system for producing and distributing economic values and for augmenting value created in other sectors” (Marginson, 2012, p. 14). The second imaginary is a more mature manifestation of ranking and status. At research institutions, this imaginary is responsible for replicating a social ranking of institutions, one that remains largely unchanged decade after decade and captures “the real objective—the timeless power and prestige of the university as an end in itself” (p. 15). The “networked and potentially more egalitarian university world patterned by communications, collegiality, linkages, partnership, and global consortia” describes the third social imaginary (p. 15).

What is possible for higher education is expressed through these dominant imaginaries, although clearly the economic marketplace and the field of status and competition outpace the third. Somewhat surprisingly, Marginson (2012) concluded that what limits the public good and public sphere of universities is the longstanding ranking and status imaginary, not the economic market and neoliberal ideology. These two imaginaries, although related and influencing each other, are separate and distinct. The economic imaginary is a willing host of neoliberalism, and internationalization is viewed as an opportunity to distribute goods that are of value in the marketplace to both individuals and institutions. However, this imaginary is limited by the lack of a global state to set up a market in order to transfer economic goods across borders, whereas

the status and network imaginary thrives in a globalized world without the regulations of a nation-state. While every institution is discussing its financial prospects, the tradition and seduction of status and rankings are so tied to the identity of universities that this imaginary holds unyielding power. However, it is the imaginary of networks and collaboration that offers the greatest hope for ethical practice and the continued relevance of the public goods offered by universities.

One might ask what it will take to unseat the power of the rankings and status imaginary and to control the impact of operating as though universities perform within a marketplace. In the imaginary characterized by networks of collaboration, knowledge from anywhere or anyone is assessed solely on the quality of the scholarship. This is a powerful idea for universities. I will argue that internationalization is a core process for expanding and developing this imaginary, just as internationalization is a core process for universities in the globalized world. As these changes work in sync with each other, the collaborative imaginary may take on more prominence, and university internationalization may continue to develop how universities engage with one another, with their core purpose, and in the eyes of the public. It presents the possibility for pathways of reciprocal relationships and collaboration, and it has the power to address some of the most significant global challenges. This is one of the important ways in which internationalization needs to be recast. Research universities are more than the sum of their parts. They are not about teaching and research, equity and diverse communities, or societal and community engagement; they are about something greater, something that has the potential to be an open and democratic space for critique and inquiry into the greatest experiment of all—humanity and the sustainability of our global world. Internationalization is core to the development of the stronger imaginary of networks and collaboration, which provides an alternative to what the other imaginaries bring and enables us to imagine what is possible for public higher education as a result of global public goods.

In this chapter, I introduce philosophical and theoretical contributions to develop a broader framework for understanding internationalization. This enables a discussion of practices to administer, guide, and develop internationalization within the research-intensive university. I will begin with a deeper discussion of public goods and the ways in

which these relate to internationalization and the purpose of higher education. Following this, and given the centrality of Taylor's (2004) social imaginary, I will focus more on this concept and complement it with the ideas of Habermas and MacIntyre. Each of these concepts is infinitely more complex and more powerful than I will be able to appropriately describe below; however, even with this less nuanced presentation, they will help as I draw on Marginson's considerable work over the last two decades that positions research universities as unique institutions able to interact collaboratively in the global public sphere.

Public Goods

Marginson argues for a robust definition of public/private that draws on both political and economic theories. He defines public goods as goods that are non-rivalous, non-excludable, and "made broadly available across populations" (2007, p. 315). A good is considered non-rivalous if one person's use of the good does not diminish another person's use, and it is considered non-excludable if a person cannot be prevented from using the good. Marginson makes clear that public goods and private goods are not mutually exclusive and that an understanding that conceptualizes these ideas as heterogeneous is more accurate. He goes on to consider that these qualities are also interdependent where the production of one leads to the production of the other. Most importantly, Marginson proposes that whether or not a good is deemed public or private is "not determined by the 'intrinsic nature' of the good (including services) but is a prior policy decision" (2007, p. 315). In the case of internationalization, the institution must consider in advance of the development of practice whether or not the goods resulting are public or private. Internationalization theorized and practiced with an understanding of the private/public divide as Marginson conceptualized it can result in the development of global public goods. The development of global public goods is both ethical and required as we look ahead to looming issues impacting the care, health, and sustainability of our interdependent world (Marginson, 2007).

Marginson (2004) drew on Hirsch's work to argue that higher education is a positional good. Although a degree comprised of a specific set of courses may be taken at many universities and deemed equal for the sake of transfer credits or equivalency,

student seats are ranked by institution and area of study. A degree from one institution is not always seen as equivalent to a degree at another; degrees from specific institutions are presumed to carry greater status and opportunity. These positional goods “confer advantages on some by denying them to others” (Marginson, 2004, p. 7). One may argue that the ability to go on exchange or study in another country is largely viewed as a positional good. Students with the ability to pay the cost of international education, remove themselves from their responsibilities to their family or community, and support themselves in another country can pursue the positional goods offered through an international experience. University policy frameworks must ensure that all individuals have the opportunity to engage in the international opportunities envisioned by the institution if these are to become public goods, otherwise these experiences will be held within a framework of private, positional goods. Marginson argues convincingly that the neoliberal agenda is operating within higher education, and within the current approach students view the world as “a map of opportunities for self-enrichment” (Marginson, 2004, p. 3).

Hence, while many view higher education in Canada as a public good, it simply is not so. It is partially publicly funded, theoretically open to all, and theoretically has enough room for all Canadians. However, given the rise of marketization and the neoliberal agenda, the practice of higher education has become more and more dominated by the pursuit and enhancement of individual private goods. While public institutions in Canada are “state-owned,” the agendas of students, institutions, and, to a lesser extent, faculty are focused on delivering a system of higher education that produces both public and private goods. Education is not intrinsically a public good, and it is the practice of education that reveals the underlying framework. To determine the degree to which it is practiced as a public good, one must investigate the policy frameworks and ways in which students are educated. For example, the criteria for ranking business schools include the level of income a person makes after graduation. It is in the business school’s best interest to get a high ranking, and if their graduates all pursue work in the not-for-profit or public sector, the rankings will be negatively impacted. Therefore, the business school is driven to operate within a framework that encourages the development of skills, experiences, and ambitions to succeed in roles with high salaries. In practice, it is interesting to note that business faculties also have

their own career centres and offer great services in this regard to both undergraduates and graduates. In this example, public education is operationalized as a private good, and the student develops positional goods. The policy framework for business schools is largely driven by increasing and valuing private goods. Of course, every experience of education likely produces public goods as a secondary effect, and in this situation, business schools are contributing to increasing the general educational level of the population (Marginson, 2004, 2006, 2007).

Universities of the 21st century are still debating a substantive and fundamental point dating back from the turn of the 12th century: what is the purpose of a university education? These debates centre on the question of the value of a liberal arts or utilitarian education and the role of a university in this education. Inherently, this discussion also reveals the framework of developing higher education as a public good (Bourdieu, 1998; Boyer, 1998).

In 1959, Cardinal Bishop Newman published a series of discourses entitled “The Idea of a University.” He eloquently presented his philosophy of education and provided his description of a university. Newman stated that the main purpose of a university is to develop a philosophical habit. Describing a philosophical habit as “the special fruit of the education furnished at a university, as contrasted with other places of teaching or modes of teaching” (p. 129), he characterized knowledge as “the indispensable condition of expansion of the mind” (p. 152). Many have argued that the role of internationalization is to diversify the learning community, and that goods arising from this significantly advantage individuals and thereby societies. In this context, we can see the value of internationalization as a complex change at work in the contemporary university, delivering upon the aspiration to expand the minds of students.

Earlier in the 20th century, Dewey (1926) stated that education was always of a moral nature. He did not view this morality as imbuing the difference between right versus wrong, good versus bad, but rather “in the sense of developing an ethics of participation and of inquiry. The basic achievement of an education is the achievement of participation in an educated community and the achievement of a more sophisticated moral agenda” (Dewey, 1926, p. 117). In this respect, Dewey was discussing the role of

education in developing a morally engaged citizenry. This offers important principles for consideration in operationalizing internationalization as a public good or in developing public goods.

Emberley (1996) provided an important perspective on the function of a university. He argued that it cannot be truly understood outside the historical context from which it emerged. Referring back to the 13th century, he suggested that the meaning of a university degree is summed up in the meaning of the terms “universitas” and “civitas”. Universitas is an association of common understanding and shared purposes. The goal of a university in that era was rooted in the Socratic conception of developing civil society and political order through knowledge and the capacity for rational thought. Civitas refers to the customs and norms governing civil behaviour, specifically what contributes to a climate of civility through dialogue, discussion, and debate. These two ideas are critical in Emberley’s discussion of the function of a university. They describe the culture of a university’s academe as a place for engaging in civilized intellectual exploration. Emberley was clear in his definition that education is a process unto itself, as exemplified by his quotation of Oakeshott: “University education is not a beginning and not an end, but a middle . . . a mysterious interaction of the needs of students and the scholarly culture” (1996, p. xii–xiii). Emberley’s emphasis on civility knitting the academic community together is indeed relevant in this conceptual inquiry into internationalization.

There remains much debate about the meaning and intention of a university education. Increasingly, discussions focus on the need for universities to assume a supportive role in the creative and intellectual growth of future leaders and citizens. Emberley’s argument is persuasive. An education should help prepare future citizens to make effective decisions throughout their lives—decisions, for example, about which problems to tackle or how to lead organizations. The actions arising from these decisions can promote change within local and global communities and are a direct result of developing public goods.

Taylor's Social Imaginary

Charles Taylor's concept of the social imaginary refers to the totality of "the ways people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations" (2004, p. 23). Applying Taylor's concept of the social imaginary to universities illustrates the fullness of the problem and opportunity of internationalization. If we describe the predominant imaginaries, a better understanding of the principles required to ethically engage in internationalization may emerge (Taylor, 2004).

For a number of reasons, the social imaginary becomes eminently useful in understanding the issue of internationalization within the university community. Taylor contended that the social imaginary is about "the way ordinary people 'imagine' their social surroundings" (2004, p. 23) and how they present their perceptions in the stories, myths, and images they share. The concept of the social imaginary describes widely shared beliefs and is tied to practices. Whereas social theory describes a particular behaviour within a group, the social imaginary is "that common understanding that makes possible common practices" (Taylor, 2004, p. 23). The issue upon which we are trying to gain a broader perspective is the everyday experience of internationalization as it is felt, lived, understood, and imagined by students, parents, faculty, administrators, and the wider public. We strive to answer questions such as: How have we come to believe that global rankings are an important end? Why does the government's international strategy barely mention student learning or intercultural understanding? Why do so many people believe that international student recruitment can solve financial crises for universities? The social imaginary reveals for us what the university community, governments, and the larger public are thinking and believing about internationalization and the interconnected practices that form and sustain these ideas. Understanding that these ideas are deeply engrained in broader and competing imaginaries appropriately positions the practices as extensions of the ideas we hold. The notions of these three social imaginaries—economic, ranking and status, and collaborative—determine what is possible in internationalization.

Taylor describes modernity as “that historically unprecedented amalgam of new practices and institutional forms (science, technology, industrial production, urbanization), of new ways of living (individuals, secularization, instrumental rationality); and of new forms of malaise (alienation, meaninglessness, a sense of impending social dissolution)” (2004, p. 1). One of Taylor’s defining approaches is to confirm the multiple modernities or social imaginaries that exist, compete, and interact to create different ways of being in the world. Indeed, the modern university is a form of modernity and a site for interactions between individuals moulded by modernity. Considering how internationalization manifests as instrumental rationality or a sense of meaninglessness facilitates a critical review of practices and helps us to question how we are engaged in and living the process of internationalization within higher education. For example, instrumental rationality may describe the approach of both governments and institutions when it comes to understanding the focus of fiscal priorities or the international tuition dialogue. Further, unpacking the ideas of new ways of living and forms of malaise may help as we inquire about the impact on student learning when a student’s motivation to attend university is increasingly an instrumental decision to prepare for a specific career and personal advancement, rather than the pursuit of a passion and the desire to deeply engage in a scholarly community. Taylor associated these new ways of living with new forms of malaise, which may be informative as we look at the promise of intercultural learning. For example, the feelings he stated to be characteristic of modernity will not manifest themselves in a community where stopping to meet those around you and connect with those different from yourself is the kind of spontaneous activity within the learning community, but they are likely to appear in people living in residence dorms and barely aware of who is on their floor or in their building. This aspect of Taylor’s social imaginary confirms for us the larger landscape in which UBC students and the university are embedded. To transcend the aspects of modernity that Taylor delineated, we need to understand how to develop a collaborative, communicative, networked social imaginary of universities and set the ambition and practices of internationalization within these imaginaries to explore outcomes and experiences, and thereby determine how we want to achieve a strong educative community (Taylor, 2004).

One of Taylor’s hypotheses was that our modernity is characterized by a new moral order that has fundamentally changed our social imaginary. “[A] moral order is

more than just a set of norms; . . . it also contains what we might call an ‘ontic’ component, identifying features of the world that make the norms realizable” (Taylor, 2004, p. 10). Taylor described pre-modern societies as being ordered on notions of hierarchical complementarity, which have been replaced with a commitment to “the mutual respect and mutual service of the individuals who make up society” (Taylor, 2004, p. 12). At the very heart of modernity is an understanding that political society has been created to serve individuals. The modern university has been set up by individuals guided by this moral order; therefore, we can question how the university creates patterns of interaction and encourages norms that are fundamentally related to serving individuals rather than communities. As when we compare the modern social imaginary with the pre-modern one, we can see differences between the university today and the historic university. In the early 13th and 14th centuries, universities were communities of roaming scholars who collectively defined standards for the acquisition and testing of knowledge. Today, students’ pursuit of knowledge can comprise a completely individual set of transactions. The erstwhile interdependence no longer exists. In fact, one may argue that the inherent competition between students for scholarships, restricted majors, co-op positions, graduate supervisors, and many other “advantages” works against the kind of academic community that originally maintained universities.

Taylor (2004) wrote of the “great disembedding”—how we have come undone from society, spirituality, and the cosmos, and the resultant changes in the way we see ourselves in relation to others. For example, we no longer define ourselves in terms of being mothers, daughters, or other “roles”; we are individuals. This significant change has fundamentally shifted the social imaginary and changed how people act and interact. Society is set up to serve individuals, and we place individualism at the core of our society. In the imaginary of status and ranking, individuals are required to develop assets that continue to serve the institution, whereas the focus of neoliberalism is on the individual’s capital and ability to be engaged in the economic marketplace. This is a drastic change from a time when people could not conceive of themselves as separate from the larger community. This is not to say that these imaginaries rest only on individuals, as the premise of the economic model is that there is a marketplace of consumers, and the premise of the rankings imaginary has long been supported through the ways in which scholars collaborate in research innovations. The primary difference is

that the nexus of the status and ranking imaginary centres on an individual and extends outward to others that bring material or positional worth. The third imaginary is promising, as it is a way to counter individualism and bring the development of collaborative communities to the forefront for universities in the ultimate aspiration of achieving a more meaningful engagement in society (Taylor, 2004).

In any discussion about collaboration and community, we must look at the public sphere. Taylor (2004) defined this as

a common space in which the members of society are deemed to meet through a variety of media: print, electronic, and also face-to-face encounters; to discuss matters of common interest; and thus to be able to form a common mind about these. (p. 83)

He cautioned us about confusing common space and the public sphere. Common space is “when people are assembled for some purpose, be it on an intimate level of conversation or on a larger, more public scale for a deliberative assembly, a ritual, a celebration, or the enjoyment of a football match or an opera” (p. 86). On this basis, we can see many examples of common space through the daily experiences of internationalization at universities, such as conferences and orientation programs. However, the public sphere “transcends such topical spaces. We might say that it knits together a plurality of such spaces into one larger space of nonassembly” (p. 86). Through a complex meshing of issues, where individualism and the new moral order interact within the modern social imaginaries, there emerges a problem with the maintenance of and attendance to the public sphere. When universities are envisioned through an imaginary of economics or status, there is a lack of necessity for—and therefore desire to develop—a common mind. This is again an aspect of our modern social imaginaries that helps to inform internationalization as collaboration. As will become more evident in Chapter 7, internationalization creates the opportunity for intercultural understanding and global citizenship, and it is these kinds of outcomes that will contribute to a culture within the context of the public sphere that brings value to the world and indeed is required to tackle some of the more pertinent issues of our time, such as climate change and well-being. As this is a central concept for the present

study, and Taylor's work has been informed by Habermas, we will revisit this issue in the next section.

Advances in communication and information technology as well as aviation and other sectors have made global interaction a reality for everyday life. Within this context, universities can take up the opportunity to reimagine themselves as collaborative, communicative, networked places whose core purpose is enhanced by ethical internationalization. University life can be transformative when augmented by a deep and profound commitment to internationalization. Universities have always had a tie to the everyday life of individuals and communities, and to fail to engage in the wider world would, indeed, limit universities' relevance and potential for leading and engaging in the societal dialogue for sustainability and well-being, knowledge and research, democracy and justice. Ultimately, belonging to and participating in an internationalized university can facilitate a dialogue that is constitutive of an individual's self-interpretation of daily life. This is the making of a public sphere that is alive with interconnections and intercultural learning, one that arises only from an internationalized space and place whose core purpose is research and learning in order to contribute positively to the world. Hence, I believe that the development of an internationalized, diverse educative community is essential for a good education and is equally essential for modern universities.

Contributions from Habermas's Theory of Communicative Action

Sergiovanni (2000) has developed a theoretical model of leadership for educational communities that is grounded in the awareness that the "lifeworld" and the "systemsworld" must be in balance with each other, and that leaders need to be aware of the function of each and focus their leadership appropriately:

Culture, meaning and significance are parts of the "lifeworld" of the school. This lifeworld can be contrasted with the "systemsworld." The systemsworld is a world of instrumentalities usually experienced in schools as management systems. These systems are supposed to help schools effectively and efficiently achieve their goals and objectives. This achievement, in turn, ideally strengthens the culture and enhances

meaning and significance. When things are working the way they should in a school, the lifeworld and systemsworld engage each other in a symbiotic relationship. (p. 4)

The lifeworld must be at the centre of internationalization at universities; the systemsworld, in forms such as federal international education policy and policy-driven tuition consultation, plays a supportive role in an internationalized university community. Sergioivanni reminds us that the instrumentalities of the system facilitate the “culture, meaning and significance” of teaching and research in an internationalized community. The remarks and ideas of a university leader that I review in a later chapter reflect exactly this. The heartbeat of internationalization is described as relationships and academic dialogue between individuals, the opportunity to engage with others from around the world, and the promise of partnerships between individuals and institutions working in collaborative teaching and research opportunities. However, are institutions, students, faculty, and administrators all focused on the lifeworld while attending to the systems? Neoliberalism and rankings can be viewed as systemsworld imaginaries focused on narratives of strategic action, economics, media and communication, power, and rationality. This focus creates a risk to the lifeworld of an internationalized university community, as the lifeworld is being rationalized, which “makes possible the emergence and growth of subsystems whose independent imperatives turn back destructively upon the lifeworld itself” (Habermas, 1987, p. 186). The independent imperatives of money and individualism in the economic imaginary lead to the destruction of interpersonal learning and community engagement, just as the homogeneity resulting from global rankings begins to destroy the individual visions of institutions that reflect their own strengths and the needs of their more local and national communities as well as what they can develop as international communities. When instrumentality and efficiencies take over—and unless administrative, student, and faculty leaders are able to speak from their values and experiences through communicative action and meet each other through the shared lifeworld of an internationalized university—the opportunity is lost and the system imperatives “burst the capacity of the lifeworld they instrumentalize” (Habermas, 1987, p. 155). Internationalization goes awry, and it is no longer a human experience changing teaching, learning, and research.

Habermas's theory of communicative action and his precise distinction between systemworld and lifeworld help in understanding the generative possibilities for internationalization within a university. Eriksen and Weigard (2003) argued that communicative practice is both an end and a means; it is a precondition for things to work: "Unconstrained communication is not the quintessence of the good society; it is rather what enables citizens to decide its content" (p. 199). For groups of people to be able to function, there needs to be an expectation of participation from all members. Internationalization and intercultural learning benefit from a university that is communicating about its intentions and how the system articulates and enacts the principles of internationalization, as well as from the lifeworld experiences that students and faculty create and perform. Learning from the lifeworld enables a better approach to internationalization. Internationalization is not simply an economic or media power strategy; it is a set of values and intentions, it is an activity, and it is created as a result of the communication practices of the community that connect deeply to the lifeworld. Looking at students', faculties', and administrators' communication is required to understand what internationalization means to their lifeworlds. By applying Habermas's theory of communicative action, we can act with "institutional principles that can bring *relatively more* communicative reasoning into decision-making situations" (Eriksen & Weigard, 2003, p. 200). This is particularly important as we consider larger and more complex systems. Our modern universities are infinitely more differentiated than medieval ones, or even most universities of the 20th century, so we require new ways of living in community in order to support international and educative environments. Without principles for communicative action applied with respect to the integrity and autonomy of individuals, we will be limited to decision making and ways of being that are merely constitutive of a framework of instrumental rationality.

Habermas is, for two reasons, critical of the instrumental rationality that dominates the Western world. First, its strictly "means and ends" efficiency approach completely negates the prospect of dialogically created self-understanding. Second, in terms of the action resulting from a framework of instrumental rationality, the interpersonal element of the action is not considered. This seems to offer incredibly important insight into internationalization at universities, particularly when viewed within the context of the three competing and complementary social imaginaries. An approach

that is interpersonal and communicative results in action where there is a degree of agreement about the lifeworld and the lifeworld is valued. Internationalization at universities opens up the possibility for intercultural learning between all members of the community. Participants in an intentionally diverse learning community will come to engage interpersonally and actively, thereby creating a lifeworld that values diversity and learning as a result of the dialogical opportunity for self-understanding. Through communicative action, the benefits of diversity will come to be understood by all and will impact individuals through the lifeworld, as well as students, faculty and staff involved in creating a systemsworld to support an engaging and alive lifeworld. Communicative action has much to offer for preparing individuals to solve complex societal problems and live in complex communities, and for achieving the promise of internationalization in university communities (Edgar, 2006).

The processes of internationalization that matter most to universities may be limiting the potential of the lifeworld for student learning. “Communicative actors are always moving within the horizon of their lifeworld; they cannot step outside of it” (Seidman, 1989, p. 171). Administrators may not see the impact of their actions on the lifeworld of students when it comes to internationalization. Has the systemsworld of internationalization crushed the lifeworld for intercultural learning? Are administrators focused on tuition policy and global rankings as a result of the compelling imaginaries of rank and status and the economic marketplace, rather than taking on the role of communicative actors moving seamlessly from systemsworld to lifeworld to explore and engage in the promise of internationalization? Habermas would argue that when “society becomes more complex, then the systemic elements of it become more and more obscure to the ordinary member of society” (Edgar, 2006, p. 152). Although the system exists to make larger, complex places work, at some point the size and complexity of the system results in a sense of meaninglessness in communities.

The burden of systems poses many risks in a large institution. “If the expansion of systems inhibits my freedom, then it also inhibits my capacity to give meaning to my life,” noted Habermas (cited in Edgar, 2006, p. 154). He called this risk the “colonisation of the lifeworld.” The lifeworld is a key component of Habermas’s theory of communication action; it is “not a mere stock of cultural resources, but part of a complex

process of interaction, through which we use language to establish, maintain and repair social relationships to others” (Edgar, 2006, p. 89). The lifeworld presents rules that are far richer and more complex and therefore more appropriate for many aspects of daily life. Contemporary society is built on a tension between system and lifeworld. Lifeworld competencies can easily meet the demands of small communities and are regularly used to maintain social relationships. As the size and complexity of organizations increases and the lifeworld becomes overwhelmed, organizations are unable to function. It is at these breaking points that systematic rules are put in place. Working in communities where there is reliance on the lifeworld means that by definition, individuals are acting based upon a shared way of understanding how things work and what is valued. Therefore, larger communities risk not only a lack of creativity but also a lack of meaning if the interactions within the community are overly systematized (Edgar, 2006; Seidman, 1989).

Student residences continue to be strong examples of the lifeworld and systemsworld and offer the opportunity to create meaning as a result of internationalization and the daily experiences that come from this context. Members of a floor communicate with each other, across traditional boundaries, in very beneficial ways. These students are usually not all friends but rather become intimate acquaintances, and this provides a rich and wide circulation of information. Similarly, if the learning processes in classrooms also rely upon and require relationships, the opportunity for engagement and intercultural learning is promising. Leaders who focus on outcomes such as global competencies for employment as a result of being a student at an internationalized university risk becoming corrupted by the system. The tight and oppressive coupling of employment and university study is an example of rationalizing the lifeworld. Relationships within a university community and resilient, informal networks are based on communicative logic rather than instrumentality and may prove to be more critical for internationalization than other priorities. As the community functions through classroom projects, labs, and cafeteria tables, students develop themselves through a recursive and sophisticated dialogue and discover ways to work within the system rather than be fractured by it. Student dialogue also develops to a level where they overtly talk about “beating the system” as they come to recognize as a community that their lifeworld is being colonized. Universities must be deliberate in the design of internationalization so

that members of the community are pulled into participating within, creating, and maintaining the lifeworld. When the balances of the lifeworld and the system are off, institutions need to remain open and receptive to protests and statements from students regarding their concerns about university life. Taylor's proposition is that individuals are dialogically created—hence, we must give students the opportunity to develop the skills and confidence to participate and engage with each other. Smaller communities as well as opportunities to develop communication skills are necessary aspects of a good internationalized educative environment.

Putting Internationalization into a Context Strengthened by MacIntyre

Internationalization is a narrative that all research universities in the world are living, and it is a process and goal undergoing constant change due to the shifting political and social contexts in which higher education operates. Yemini (2014) called internationalization “one of the most popular terms in education” (p. 66). Understanding the experience we are living is aided by looking back at our words and actions and then looking forward with a new set of principles, values, and realizations that guide our future actions. I have chosen to look at the words of a university leader (in Chapter Seven) as well as the words of UBC students (in Chapter Eight) over roughly the same period of time and to extract meaning by contextualizing their narratives within the social imaginaries of economics, status, and collaboration. Proceeding in this manner with the theoretical supports of the imaginaries as well as the philosophical contributions of MacIntyre, Habermas, and Taylor facilitates a set of recommendations for the practice of internationalization. Here I will discuss MacIntyre's concepts of narrative and practices, specifically to understand internationalization with the narrative history of universities in order to imagine our future.

MacIntyre presented a compelling understanding of the “interrelationships of the intentional, the social and the historical” (1997, p. 208). This culminated in the presentation of what he called “narrative histories” as “the basic and essential genre for the characterization of human actions” (p. 208). For example, we can only comprehend an individual's actions if we understand them in the context of “their role in his or her

history” and “their role in the history of the setting or settings to which they belong” (p. 208).

It is because we all live out narratives in our lives and because we understand our own lives in terms of the narratives that we live out that the form of narrative is appropriate for understanding the actions of others. Stories are lived before they are told—except in the case of fiction. (p. 212)

This becomes an important contribution to understanding the promise of internationalization at research universities. Each student’s narrative could be woven together with others to create the story of student learning, particularly if we are operating through the imaginary of collaboration. If we become convinced of MacIntyre’s argument about narratives, we come to understand that we actually need narratives to see and construct our lives—that, indeed, narrative is a necessary part of life. Individuals are living out narratives. And in this way, to understand our own intentions, we need to ask, “[O]f what story or stories do I find myself a part?” (MacIntyre, 1997, p. 216). Individuals learn about their roles through storytelling, so all university students have learned about their role and their experiences through the stories they have heard. When the imaginary is one of status or economics, the student’s role is different from what is occurring if the imaginary is collaborative. This becomes the quintessential predicament for intercultural understanding and internationalization at UBC, as the current stories are in conflict with the ideal experience for students. And unless we change the dominant social imaginaries—and, in so doing, change the storytelling—the promise of internationalization is limited. Chapters Seven and Eight present an opportunity to reflect on the stories told by students as well as a president of UBC, all of whom are important communicative actors of internationalization.

A second contribution of MacIntyre is the notion of *practice*. MacIntyre defined practice as

any coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity through which goods internal to that form of activity are realized in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to, and partially definitive of, that form of activity, with the result that human powers to achieve excellence, and human

conceptions of the ends and goods involved, are systematically extended.
(1997, p. 124)

He was abundantly clear that practices should not be confused with institutions: “Institutions are characteristically and necessarily concerned with what I have called external goods” (p. 131). A university is an institution structured in terms of power and status, and it exists to distribute degrees—external goods. This is not to be looked upon negatively; rather, universities are necessary because, as MacIntyre pointed out, practices cannot be sustained without institutions.

Bearing in mind MacIntyre’s caution about institutions, I wish to pursue the idea of the practices of internationalization and question the goods that are being sought by students engaged in a campus that is intentional about internationalization. Students at such a campus would experience global citizenship and international understanding through dialogue that is differentiated by the diversity of students and scholars. They would commit the time required to inquire into and master a discipline, to solve problems in cross-disciplinary ways, to understand different points of view, and to express their own true understanding of cooperation and teamwork. They would develop better communication and interpersonal skills, and the loyalty, friendship, and enjoyment that arise from and with a community. These are all goods internal to the practice of being a student at an institution that is committed to internationalization through the imaginary of collaboration and communication.

What MacIntyre (1997) said about goods internal to practice is critically important and reveals a very common issue at universities. We cannot teach students excellence more effectively than they can learn it once they embed themselves in the learning community. This means, for example, that students will seek to question concepts of physics outside the physics lab and in doing so engage in difficult technical and social interactions with other students while seeking mastery in their discipline. However, we have seen that students are motivated by goods external to university practices, such as getting a job, or being able to articulate what they are going to do next, or defining how their study is meaningful in the economy. Have administrators or decisions makers lost their understanding of the “goods internal,” those that can only be experienced by students?

MacIntyre used the term “goods internal” because they are internal to the specific activity to which they refer and, more importantly, “because they can only be identified and recognized by the experience of participating in the practice in question. Those who lack the relevant experience are incompetent thereby as judges of internal goods” (MacIntyre, 1997, p. 126). Indeed, this is strong reminder about the role and contribution of students who step forward to serve as members of Senate or the Board of Governors, or who stand for the elected student government. Institutions benefit greatly from their contributions, as only they can speak authentically to the internal goods of being a student on that campus. Likewise, internationalization will be best supported through dialogue with students who experience the goods internal and can give voice and credibility to these outcomes. Administrators need to see these outcomes as legitimate and respond collaboratively to the requirements of an internationalized student community. Students at UBC need to be seeking such excellence and thereby benefiting from the goods internal to the practice of internationalization. The benefits of learning from an internationalized and diverse community will come to individuals as a good internal to the practice of being a student. In this way, a university can foster the development of global citizens and a capacity for intercultural understanding.

Chapter 4.

Research Design

Specific Research Questions and Approach

Internationalization is an applied phenomenon and was investigated through an intentional and purposeful sampling of key documents at a Canadian research institution as well as key policy documents. The analysis and interpretation sought to address the following specific research questions:

1. What does Marginson's (2012) notion of the three imaginaries for higher education—as an economic market, as a field of status and competition, and as a collaborative network—reveal about university practices to promote and engage in internationalization? In what ways has internationalization been a generative process or a corrupting process for universities?
2. How has a public research institution in Canada experienced internationalization? How does a university president speak about the complex changes of internationalization? How are the outcomes of internationalization understood and characterized?
3. How does leadership impact the process of internationalization? What are the practices that contribute to an ethical implementation of internationalization? What indication is there that universities can move from the social imaginary of status and competition, or the economic social imaginary, into a collaborative and networked space benefitting universities and students worldwide? What would this mean at Canadian institutions?

This study engaged in a form of conceptual inquiry that essentially became an interpretive analysis of the implementation and operation of internationalization at a public, West Coast, research-intensive university.

Sampling

The most common sampling strategy used in this kind of qualitative research can be labelled as purposeful sampling (Creswell, 1998, 2008). The present study aimed to depict central, important, or decisive aspects of the investigated phenomenon (in this case, internationalization in higher education), so the sampling was framed around a case study of a university's approach to instituting a policy of internationalization. The researcher's judgement determined the units for study. Given the professional nature of the inquiry and the background of the investigator, this seemed appropriate. The intention was to make generalizations after an in-depth inquiry into one particular case. The study was not carried out in the grounded theory tradition, where the result of the study is a complete theory of the phenomenon, and the preferred sampling strategy is referred to as theoretical sampling. Sampling in this study was purposeful and is referred to as critical case sampling, to reflect the research problem of internationalization in higher education. It drew on source documents from the president, senate, and student council of a West Coast, research-intensive university to illustrate the conflicts and tensions involved in moving a university away from social imaginaries steeped in neo-liberalist economics and ranking of status, to an imaginary based on networks and collaboration. The value of moving through source documents is that they are present in the public sphere, create the public record of internationalization as a complex change at universities, and deeply influence one's understanding of internationalization. Hence, the documents selected for analysis were consistent with the study's purposes and research questions.

Analytic Strategy

To analyze means "to break into parts and examine the components." *To interpret* means "to offer possible meanings." The phrase "close reading" is sometimes used to describe this kind of study, as it requires close examination—detailed and careful reading, sentence by sentence—of one or several small parts, sometimes as little as a line (in a speech), a paragraph (in an essay), or a couple of pages (in a book) to *critically* (thoughtfully and carefully) explain a perspective (i.e., a new imaginary) on the phenomenon under study: internationalization (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Seidman, 2006).

Interpretive-analytical writing is divided into two modes, expository and critical. Expository analysis is strictly informative: it describes, for example, objects, events, people, places, processes, and concepts. Critical analysis, on the other hand, goes beyond mere description to formulate arguments about its subject matter. These arguments can themselves be divided into two types: interpretive and evaluative. When we interpret any subject matter, we address questions about its meaning or significance. When we evaluate any subject matter, we address questions about its value (e.g., whether it is effective or ineffective, democratic or undemocratic, reliable or unreliable) (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Seidman, 2006).

Questions about meaning and significance can really be understood as questions about origins and consequences, respectively. When we discuss the meaning of any particular subject matter, we address the basic question of why it has its particular form and content. When we discuss the significance of any subject matter, we take up the basic question of what possible consequences it has had or will have. We particularly take note, in this case, of the patterns and anomalies in the documents about internationalization in higher education. These patterns and anomalies serve as entry points for interpretive analysis. A strong pattern usually reveals the basic character of our subject matter, while an anomaly reveals some kind of meaningful fracture within that character—such as a contradiction, an inconsistency, a vulnerability, or an evolution. Consequently, observing patterns and anomalies helps us to formulate questions of meaning that guide the research analysis (Creswell, Hanson, Clark Plano, & Morales, 2007).

The approach to data analysis was intensive, iterative, and accomplished through immersion in the richness and depth. I described each case or document or phrase in detail and situated it within the setting. Following this strategy, I sifted through the data again and again, interpreting it against the research questions within the bounds of the conceptual framework, looking for both cross-cutting themes and emergent findings. It is in the interpretation of the data, a formulation of an “in-depth, contextual understanding,” that meaning emerges (Creswell et al., 2007, p. 245). Therefore, after understanding the details of the piece of writing, I pulled out themes or important concepts that were relevant for addressing the research questions, and the

case commonalities and distinctive features began to emerge. As I built an interpretation of what I learned, it revealed a complexity indicative of competing ideas and tensions in the theory-to-practice paradigm that is generalizable across different institutional contexts and situations (Creswell, 2008; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Stake, 2005).

Critical to understanding the experience of this research-based university was an understanding of the voices of leadership. I defined this as the expressions, arguments, and public speech acts of the president; the debates and discussions in the governing academic council; and the voices of our student leaders, expressed through documents developed for the purpose of tuition consultation or documented in the student newspaper. Collectively, the voices of students, faculty, and the administration represent the leadership voices. Additionally, I analyzed the federal international strategy as well as a number of specific provincial reports that were commissioned by the provincial government. These sources provided insight into the values, influences, and practices of internationalization at a research-based institution in Canada.

Below is a comprehensive table of data sources.

Data Sources

Year	Category	Source
1959	University President	Mackenzie, N. A. M. <i>The president's report, 1959–1960</i> . Retrieved from http://www.library.ubc.ca/archives/pdfs/presidents/1960.pdf
1988	University President	Strangway, D. <i>Toward the Pacific century</i> . Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia. Retrieved from https://www.library.ubc.ca/archives/pdfs/presidents/1988.pdf
1993	Provincial Government	Francis, A. <i>Facing the future: The internationalization of post-secondary institutions in</i>

Year	Category	Source
		<i>British Columbia. Task force report.</i> Vancouver, Canada: British Columbia Centre for International Education. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED377759.pdf
1993	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Minutes of the ninth regular meeting of the Senate of The University of British Columbia for session 1992–93.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/va_minutes_may1993.pdf
1997	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. (1997). <i>Vancouver Senate. Minutes of September 17, 1997.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/va_minutes_september1997.pdf
1998	Provincial Government	McKellin, K. <i>Maintaining the momentum: The internationalization of British Columbia's public post secondary institutions.</i> Vancouver, Canada: The British Columbia Centre for International Education.
1999	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Vancouver Senate. Minutes of April 21, 1999.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/va_minutes_april1999.pdf
1999	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Vancouver Senate. Minutes of May 19, 1999.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/va_minutes_may1999.pdf
1999	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Vancouver Senate. Minutes of September 15, 1999.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/va_minutes_september1999.pdf

Year	Category	Source
2004	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Vancouver Senate. Minutes of September 22, 2004.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/va_minutes_september2004.pdf
2006	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Vancouver Senate. Minutes of March 22, 2006.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/va_minutes_march2006.pdf
2006	University President	Toope, S. J. <i>International law and global citizens.</i> Vancouver Institute Lecture, Vancouver, Canada. doi:10.14288/1.0108978
2008	University President	Toope, S. J. <i>Canadian universities and a new internationalism.</i> Address to the Congress of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Retrieved from https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubcpresidentsspeechesandwritings/25805/items/1.0107470
2008	University President	Toope, S. J. <i>Crossing borders, contesting values: Do universities matter?</i> Address to the Congress of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Retrieved from http://president.ubc.ca/files/2010/04/congress_sshf_20080603.pdf
2009	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Okanagan Senate. Minutes of February 11, 2009.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/ok_minutes_february2009.pdf
2009	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Okanagan Senate. Minutes of April 8, 2009.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/download

Year	Category	Source
		oads/ok_minutes_april2009.pdf
2009	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Vancouver Senate. Minutes of September 16, 2009.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/va_minutes_september2009.pdf
2009	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Vancouver Senate. Minutes of October 14, 2009.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/va_minutes_october2009.pdf
2009	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Okanagan Senate. Minutes of October 21, 2009.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/ok_minutes_october2009.pdf
2009	University President	Toope, S. J. International engagement and global influence: A discussion paper draft 2. Retrieved from http://diversityatubc.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2010/11/Promoting-Intercultural-Understanding_August-2009.pdf
2010	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Okanagan Senate. Minutes of January 27, 2010.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/ok_minutes_january2010.pdf
2010	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Vancouver Senate. Minutes of May 12, 2010.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/va_minutes_may2010.pdf
2010	University President	Toope, S. J. Diversity improves our university and our country. <i>Vancouver Sun.</i> Retrieved from https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubcpres

Year	Category	Source
		identsspeechesandwritings/25805/items/1.0107507
2010	University President	Toope, S. J. Stephen Toope (UBC) on global challenges and the organizational-ethical dilemmas of universities. <i>Inside Higher Ed</i> . Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/globalhighered/stephen_toope_abc_on_global_challenges_and_the_organizational_ethical_dilemmas_of_universities
2011	University President	Toope, S. J. <i>Conspiring to change the world for the better</i> . Address delivered to the Vancouver Board of Trade. doi:10.14288/1.0102612
2011	University President	Toope, S. J. <i>Opening us to larger worlds</i> . Address to the AUCC Centennial Membership Meeting, Montréal, Canada. Retrieved from http://president.ubc.ca/files/2011/10/aucc_toope_speech_bilingual_20111026.pdf
2011	University Administration	University of British Columbia. <i>UBC international strategic plan</i> . Retrieved from https://research.ubc.ca/sites/research.ubc.ca/files/vpri/UBC-intl-strat-plan-2011.pdf
2012	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Okanagan Senate. Draft minutes of March 28, 2012</i> . Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/ok_materials_20120328.pdf
2012	University President	Toope, S. J. <i>Intercultural understanding</i> . Address to the UBC Equity, Diversity and Intercultural Understanding Colloquium, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Retrieved from https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubcpresidentsspeechesandwritings/25805/items/1.0107509
2012	University President	Toope, S. J. <i>Pluralism and pragmatism: The role of universities in developing human potential</i> . Inaugural keynote address in the Isma'ili Lecture Series, Isma'ili Centre, Burnaby, Canada. Retrieved from

Year	Category	Source
		http://president.ubc.ca/files/2012/01/inauglecture2012jan31.pdf
2012	University President	Toope, S. J., & Leshner, A. I. Innovation, international collaboration go hand in hand. <i>Vancouver Sun</i> . Retrieved from https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubcpresidentsspeechesandwritings/25805/items/1.0102596
2013	University President	Toope, S. J. <i>I love you, you're perfect, now change: The new relationship between universities and the world they serve</i> . Paper delivered at the Association of Commonwealth Universities—Centenary Conference. Future Forward: Taking Charge of Change, University of London, London, UK. Retrieved from http://president.ubc.ca/files/2010/03/Association-of-Commonwealth-Universities-2013Oct16.pdf
2013	University President	Toope, S. J. <i>Learn, discover, contribute, disrupt: The mission of the global university</i> . Address to the Canadian Bureau for International Education Conference, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Retrieved from https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubcpresidentsspeechesandwritings/25805/items/1.0102627
2014	Federal Government	Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada. <i>Canada's International Education Strategy: Harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity</i> . Retrieved from http://international.gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/assets/pdfs/overview-apercu-eng.pdf
2014	Student Newspaper	Joseph, R. New enrolment policy to allow for increased international admissions. <i>The Ubyyssey</i> . Retrieved from http://old.ubyssey.ca/news/new-enrolment-policy-to-allow-for-increased-international-admissions-485/
2014	Governing	Senate of the University of British Columbia. <i>Minutes</i>

Year	Category	Source
	Academic Council	<i>of the eighth regular meeting of the Vancouver Senate for the 2013/2014 academic year.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/20140416_va_materials.pdf
2014	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Okanagan Senate. Minutes of September 24, 2014.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/20140924%20Okanagan%20Senate%20Minutes.pdf
2015	Student Newspaper	Sharlandjjeva, V. Sold to the highest bidder: International students at UBC. <i>The Ubyyssey.</i> Retrieved from http://ubyssey.ca/features/a-history-of-international-students-at-ubc-from-benevolence-to-economics/
2015	Private Sector – International Education	Taylor, C., et al. Future perfect: What will universities look like in 2030? <i>Times Higher Education.</i> Retrieved from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/what-will-universities-look-like-in-2030-future-perfect
2015	University Administration and Student Government	University of British Columbia. <i>Report to the Board of Governors. Agenda item #3.7b.</i> Retrieved from http://bog3.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2015/11/3.7b_2015.12_International-Tuition-Fees.pdf
2015	Student Government	Alma Mater Society. <i>AMS submission to the UBC Board of Governors on proposed international tuition increases.</i> Retrieved from http://www.ams.ubc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/International-Tuition-Submission-AMS-and-ISA.pdf
2015	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Okanagan Senate. Minutes of January 28, 2015.</i>

Year	Category	Source
		Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/20150128%20Okanagan%20Senate%20Minutes.pdf
2015	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Okanagan Senate. Minutes of the sixth regular meeting of the Okanagan Senate for the 2014/2015 academic year. February 25, 2015.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/20150225%20Okanagan%20Senate%20Materials.pdf
2015	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Okanagan Senate. Minutes of the first regular meeting of the Okanagan Senate for the 2015/2016 academic year. September 24, 2015.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/20150924%20Okanagan%20Senate%20Materials_0.pdf
2016	Private Sector – International Education	Navitas. <i>Navitas celebrates 10 year partnership in Canada.</i> Retrieved from https://www.navitas.com/organisation/story/345
2016	Private Sector – International Education	Quacquarelli Symonds Limited. <i>Top universities.</i> Retrieved from www.topuniversities.com
2016	Governing Academic Council	Senate of The University of British Columbia. <i>Vancouver Senate. Minutes of the fifth regular meeting of the Vancouver Senate for the 2015/2016 academic year. January 20, 2016.</i> Retrieved from https://senate.ubc.ca/sites/senate.ubc.ca/files/downloads/20160120%20Vancouver%20Senate%20Materials.pdf
2016	Private Sector – International Education	Shanghai Ranking Consultancy. <i>Academic ranking of world universities.</i> Retrieved from www.shanghairanking.com

Year	Category	Source
2016	Private Sector – International Education	<i>Times Higher Education. World university rankings.</i> Retrieved from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings

The table of data sources provides a summary of documents that I consulted, analyzed, interpreted, and reviewed. They span the time period of 1959–2016, although the review was not comprehensive but instead purposeful and directed by the research questions. Early on in the study, I reviewed a number of institutions and found that UBC had by far the greatest number of public documents developing the ideas of internationalization. I therefore determined that it would be more effective to review one institution in depth than to compare institutions. UBC was deeply engaged in the discussion of internationalization and already contesting the values and ideas therein.

The following four chapters provide detailed analysis and interpretation of the documents and my review. My focus was on understanding the statements, contradictions, and choices indicative of the social imaginary operating behind the intention; I also aimed to challenge the meaning and significance of the words, phrases, direction, and narrative in order to address the research questions.

Chapter 5.

The Social Imaginary of Higher Education as an Economic Market

Introducing Neoliberalism

Universities are being shaped by the impact of neoliberalism (Giroux, 2002; Klees, 2008; Marginson, 2013). One of the areas of educational policy and practice where I find this to be most obvious and concerning is internationalization. Internationalization appears to appeal to almost all decision makers and to the university community. This is part of the neoliberal approach—having many stakeholders engaged in making decisions that are efficient, helpful, and ultimately facilitate greater opportunity for the institution. If you are operating from a neoliberal perspective, there is tremendous value for the institution if it privatizes aspects of education, charges what the market will bear, and focuses on preparing graduates for global careers. However, internationalization also creates the conditions to focus on (i) the social and intercultural learning resulting from a more diverse campus, (ii) the development of international service learning to both learn and support organizations involved in international development, and (iii) an ethic of global citizenship for university graduates. There has been little institutional resistance to internationalization; students, faculty, and administrators alike see its value. The problem appears to be the underlying intentions of internationalization. While we all agree to pursue an agenda of internationalization, the differences appear in the decisions about how to engage. Therein lies the conflict that very often remains below the surface. The neoliberal ideology has steered internationalization practices, dialogue, and policy development, and I believe that if we do not resist the intoxicating influence of neoliberalism, then it very likely will continue to iteratively and incrementally encroach on the inherent public good of higher education in Canada.

Some authors have confused globalization and neoliberalism, and others have suggested overlapping and related definitions for internationalization and globalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007). While these terms are all related, and still contested, both neoliberalism and globalization, in the context of the internationalization of higher education, have been homogenizing and catalytic forces. Globalization, as I have argued in an earlier chapter, relates to the interconnectedness of the world and the ease and speed with which these connections happen (Bourn, 2011). It speaks to relationships beyond the nation-state and is a broader world condition in which higher education operates. Neoliberalism is an ideology applicable well beyond higher education, and its emergence coincided with the conditions for globalization. Globalization has not directly resulted in the market-driven practices within universities; rather, I would argue, these are a result of neoliberalism.

The relationship between English and neoliberalism is worth mentioning in this initial background, prior to getting into the more substantive discussion. The foundations for neoliberalism were laid in the 1960s in Anglophone countries. Hence, English accompanied neoliberalism as the dominant language for commerce, aviation, and business. Phan and Barnawi (2015) have reminded us that English is both “a product and a promoter of neoliberalism” (p. 545) and plays a pivotal role in internationalization. Students have sought out Canadian institutions, particularly the best-ranked research universities, because they will become proficient in English. However, this also makes Canada ripe for the prospect of internationalization corrupted by neoliberalism. Canada’s commitment to equity and diversity, as well as the quality of its higher education, make it an ideal nation for internationalization. Delivering on that promise is far more desirable than being an ideal nation for the neoliberal exploitation of internationalization.

In this chapter, I will discuss how neoliberal ideology has influenced higher education globally, and I will use three Canadian examples to illustrate the instrumental ways in which this is being practiced. First, I will set the stage for the government’s role in higher education by reviewing the language within the most recent federal International Education Strategy. Second, I will address the ways in which international student tuition has changed over the last 25 years. And third, I will conclude with an example of privatization within research universities that is developing in Canada to

provide access and support to international students. These examples demonstrate how neoliberalism is corrupting internationalization through shifting the opportunity from one of intercultural learning to a strictly economic activity. Neoliberalism is hosted within the economic imaginary and is an exemplar of it. My argument is that continuing to lead and imagine internationalization through this social imaginary will likely limit the social and educative value of internationalization and higher education.

Neoliberalism in Practice

Neoliberalism's "objective is to reform institutions, systems, subjects and behaviours to render them instrumental for capital accumulation" (Marginson, 2013, p. 354). However, it is not universal in application, and practices vary from sector to sector. It has been a dominant force across the world—rationalizing, for example, the privatization of roads, health care, shipping, and aviation. Operationally, neoliberal policies

call for a series of interrelated reforms: macroeconomic stability; cutting back government budgets; privatisation of government operations; ending of tariffs and other forms of protection; facilitating movement of foreign capital; emphasising exports; charging user fees for many public services; and lowering worker protections through flexible labour markets. (Klees, 2008, p. 312)

One of the particular traits of the neoliberal ideology is interlocking and interrelated reforms. Over time, the principles on which these reforms have been carried out come to be the value system of the organization and create a different organizational culture. For example, one can make an argument to cut back on student services because the budget does not balance and the academic courses are the basis of the degree; however, when international student recruitment is at an all-time high, the organization should, perhaps, be investing more in student services to ensure that the transitions of all international students are supported and successful. In this example, over time, support services for international students would become nice-to-haves rather than valued provisions for their academic success. This changes the ethic of the organization. Universities where international students are recruited but not supported with issues such as immigration, medical insurance, or personal counselling are leaving

the students with a tremendous burden to manage while also focusing on their studies. This nudges the culture of the organization more towards a “sink or swim” mentality. In the long run, this neoliberal tactic changes the values of the institution, likely does not save the institution financially, and certainly creates a burden for students requiring support—and this last factor likely also impacts the faculty who teach and support students. The culture and values of an organization are often changed as a result of the implications and subtlety of neoliberal reforms intended to support the organization through prudent spending.

The practices of neoliberalism have been conceptualized in two ways: new public management (NPM) and, more fully employed, the neoliberal market model (NLMM) (Marginson, 2013). The rise of accountability and assessment, goal-based performance, and additional fees for service developments to assist students are examples of NPM, as each initiative is developed through a market-based scenario and often, in the end, provides better conditions for the individual engaged in the sector. Most of the decisions presented by NPM are viewed as common sense and yield little objection from invested groups. NLMM, conversely, is a wholesale shift to private operations and does not exist anywhere in higher education. Marginson has portrayed the incremental increasing domination of neoliberalism as a result of “a particular kind of critical reflexivity, one that rests on an ambiguity between ‘is’ (higher education is an already existing market) and ‘ought’ (higher education should be made into a market)” (2013, p. 355). The result has been a more corporate-like institution with business-like practices and efficiencies.

Neoliberalist logic is grounded in an economic model, and neoliberal ideologies have succeeded largely as a result of the budget pressures facing most institutions. Matus and Talburt (2009) proposed that internationalization has become a critical revenue stream for universities, and this has been made possible through neoliberalist logic. For example, universities rationalize the decision to charge international students more so that the institution can give international students a good educational experience and therefore then be in a position to pursue the more ethical aims of internationalization; it is commonplace to hear that Canadian institutions have no choice but to increase tuition for international students, noting that tuition fees for domestic students are controlled by government and there are few ways to raise the income

required to run the institution. Understanding the means and ends of neoliberal policy directions is critical for the leadership and management of universities. There are tremendous trade-offs in any situation when a financial solution is chosen as a result of compromising one's values. Many authors have voiced significant concerns over neoliberalism, and there appears to be a growing sentiment about the consequences of continued neoliberal policies and practices in higher education. Giroux (2002) put it this way:

One wonders where this type of madness is going to end. But one thing is clear: As society is defined through the culture and values of neoliberalism, the relationship between a critical education, public morality, and civic responsibility as conditions for creating thoughtful and engaged citizens are sacrificed all too willingly to the interest of financial capital and the logic of profit-making. (p. 427)

There are examples of neoliberal ideas at work across all functions at universities, and the repetition and cumulative effect of this logic also results in changed dynamics and roles for faculty, administrators, and students. This becomes defining for the institution. Cowen (2007) has suggested that it looks like this:

Such a university will probably define its knowledge in terms of a competences and skills discourse, it will be undertaking contract research for money, it will be offering "useful" courses, it will know the occupations which its graduates entered, and it will have well-monitored information about its market share of international and national students, its consultancy income, and its levels of internationalization. It will have a clear mission statement that will probably say something about transparency, efficiency, and a globalized world, the economic one, that is. (p. 25)

Neoliberalism logic impacts the ways in which the institution operates—and over time, this creates more of a corporation than a collegially governed academic organization.

Neoliberalism is not an ideology held by administrators and higher education leaders who seek to cause irreparable harm. Quite the contrary. Those in support of neoliberal practices are often attempting to fund the institution, create opportunities for those less fortunate than themselves, and help generate a more sustainable world. However, actions arising from a neoliberal framework are deeply impacting our culture

including core educational values, the public sphere, and democratizing goods – “understood as the very precondition for the modes of agency and engaged citizenship necessary for any just and inclusive society” (Giroux, 2002, 180). Klees (2008) has argued that over the last 25 years, neoliberal thinking has resulted in repeated failed educational policies, and has concluded that neoliberalism needs to continually be challenged and ultimately delegitimized. Given the lack of positive outcomes (Klees, 2008), the obvious question is: Why does this continue? Quite simply, many believe that there is no other alternative.

The neoliberal discourse dictates that universities focus on internationalization to improve students’ and each institution’s ability to economically engage. As a result of strategic internationalization informed by neoliberal logic, higher education has privatized public goods, prioritized institutional branding and educational marketing, changed funding mechanisms, and focused on performativity and accountability. For many institutions, internationalization is now a practice in fiscal sustainability. This is a dramatic policy shift for international education. Institutions across the globe are acting similarly in the space of internationalization, and there is a reciprocal and reinforcing set of practices that have drawn institutions into commitments and ways of operating that were not intended when early pledges to international education were made. It is becoming harder and harder to resist these practices. I will argue that internationalization within Canadian universities is being corrupted by the neoliberalist ideology and potentially colonizing the core values of Canadian higher education. While many believe that there is no other way to practically meet budgetary demands, continuing to operate in this manner will cannibalize public higher education and the resultant democratizing impacts.

An Economic and Competitive Social Imaginary

Neoliberal discourse animates the most compelling and captivating social imaginaries for universities and presents a rigid and inevitable decision-making scenario. It feeds an ambition to be innovative and foster excellence, and the corporate issues of the organization almost always can be solved through shifting to neoliberal practices. Whether those are to spend funds that were earmarked for a future expense or a

different expense, or to raise tuition, or to develop new, more costly programs that are outside the core mandate of the institution, neoliberal thought is changing universities in Canada. These decisions are made so that the core value, the institution itself, can continue to thrive and be ultimately efficient in the circumstances of the day. The neoliberal policies serve the global economy, making individuals and nations more competitive (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). “The new corporate university values profit, control, and efficiency, all hallmark values of the neoliberal corporate ethic” (Giroux, 2002, p. 234).

Neoliberal globalization is a particular approach that values private over public, individual gain over community benefit, competition over collaboration. In the governance of a university, it looks like “a pervading economic and individualistic social imaginary of contemporary educational life, and is comprised in policy terms of initiatives that adhere to notions of market efficiency” (Gulson & Pedroni, 2011, p. 165). For example, within this imaginary, the usefulness of a university education has shifted to become preparation for an individual to be able to succeed in the global marketplace, have global career prospects, realize financial gain, and, ultimately, achieve status and worth in relation to the market. In a very short period of time, and in a stealth-like operation that is occurring in plain sight, the role of universities is being shifted. Given the collegial governance characteristic of universities, the proponents of this shift are deep within the institution: they are our students and faculty and administrators, individuals who believe that they are leading the institution in a positive direction. After all, the approach values education—a public good—and addresses fiscal challenges. Gulson and Pedroni (2011) have presented the deeply intertwined connections between neoliberalism and educational policy and have argued for more attention to the ways in which educational policy is a lever of neoliberal politics. Universities are complicit in this dynamic, and we must step forward and resist this pressure, or the long-standing mission of universities may be threatened.

Higher education is changing as a result of globalization, but it must not change its character as a public good. By resisting the economic social imaginary and leaning into an ethical articulation of internationalization, our campuses can remain the kind of places where substantive intercultural learning happens and civic engagement begins.

Canada's International Strategy

Prior to developing the discussion regarding Canada's international strategy, and subsequent to this discussion about tuition, we must begin with a closer look at the roles of the provincial and federal governments in Canada. Unlike in many other federal systems, education in Canada is a provincial matter, and there is no overarching national strategy (Desai-Trilokekar & Jones, 2015). Internationalization activities are supported by a number of federal departments, and research and development are explicitly funded by the federal government. However, the provinces and the federal government "find themselves, almost constantly, in conflict over the issues of territory and responsibility for international education" (Desai-Trilokekar & Jones, 2015, p. 13), which further complicates the matter of strategy and obstructs the development of a more national policy approach.

Canada's international activity began under Lester Pearson's leadership as Secretary of State for External Affairs. Pearson is regarded as one of the key thinkers of liberal internationalist theory and practice. He believed that "internationalism," or "participatory internationalism," was paramount to national policy. In Pearson's view, adherence to the concept of participatory internationalism required that "we always ask ourselves not only 'What kind of a Canada do we want?' but 'What kind of a world do we want?'" (Simpson, 1999, p. 81). He was known as a leader who believed that by increasing communication and interactions with those different from ourselves, individuals and nations could develop the "friendship" and "goodwill" that were critical for a world of peace and harmony (Simpson, 1999). Under his leadership, the Canadian federal government strategically supported and initiated programs to help universities attract foreign students as a commitment to internationalization, including international development and the development of international partnerships. Canada has a history of international citizenship. I am intrigued by the lessons from our early leaders in federal government, and I wonder what we can learn from Pearson's ideas of "participatory internationalism" as we contemplate our present position regarding internationalization on university campuses.

In 2013, an international panel was charged with the responsibility for the development of a comprehensive international education strategy, resulting from broad consultations and their own deliberations on recommendations. This effort responded to the need for an overall strategy in Canada. Desai-Trilokekar and Jones (2013) argued that “the absence of a national policy in Canada has led to a piece-meal and largely uncoordinated approach,” resulting in less of the global market than we might expect for Canada. In 2014, the federal government’s then Minister of International Trade penned Canada’s International Education Strategy, boasting that it would set up Canada for success in the 21st century by making international education a priority. “In short, international education is at the very heart of our current and future prosperity,” stated the minister’s introductory message (2014, p. 4). Such rhetoric and communication tactics show the document to be a neoliberal policy statement. This orientation to international education is far from the original commitments of the government that sought to prepare leaders and scholars from abroad to enhance the capacity of other nations to develop. This strategy is primarily focused on international education as a means to economic security. While the strategy was written by the government, it was informed by the recommendations of an expert panel. This is a particularly important point, as the leaders and experts on the panel were almost exclusively internal to the working of universities. The panel members brought legitimacy to the strategy as a result of their identities. They were seen to represent the interests and visions of universities—specifically, the public goods of the institutions; however, the process of this strategy and its results might lead one to question how international education has become an economic and trade activity for the country, and the costs of this activity for our country, students, universities, and global partners (Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada, 2014).

The strategy begins by positioning international education as a priority arising from earlier policy work that identified the sectors where Canada can be more competitive in the global market. The rationale for prioritizing international education is presented quite simply, identifying how we can be successful in the market for international students and why international education is good for Canadians. The report claims that Canada is a highly desirable destination for foreigners to send their children. Additionally, it presents four results of internationalization that are important for

Canadians: (i) considerable economic benefits to all Canadians, such as job creation and economic growth, (ii) the development of qualified future employees, given that Canada's future competitiveness and innovation is presently compromised by our limited access to skilled labour, (iii) the recruitment of international students who can be educated for our labour force, meeting our long-term need for "labour-force vitality," as Canada's own growth cannot meet the demand, and (iv) new "jobs and sources of prosperity" being created for everyone in Canada when we bring more international students to the country. For each point, the rationale is financial, and very little consideration is given to international education activities other than student recruitment. The overall sentiment is one of ambition, urgency, competition, and financial gain. Canada's international strategy reads exactly as Stier warned (2004, cited in Ilieva & Waterstone, 2013): "a predominant ideology of internationalization in higher education today is 'instrumentalism', with the goal to enrich the labour force and consolidate the economic prowess of a country, as well as maximize revenue for educational institutions" (p. 16).

Canada's International Education Strategy seems to exemplify the elements of instrumentalism. There is very little content in the strategy or vision for international education. One of the only clear goals is to double the number of international students by 2022. The context for this goal is the resulting financial impact: "86,600 new jobs"; "\$16.1 billion in international student expenditures"; "boost to the Canadian economy of almost \$10 billion"; and "\$910 million in new tax revenues." There is absolutely no discussion about planning to ensure capacity for this kind of growth, no consideration of the positive impacts, beyond money, of international students on our Canadian higher education campuses, and no discussion about international or intercultural learning outcomes or the promotion of global citizenship. The strategy is myopically focused on financial gain and competitive advantages for Canada.

The strategy goes on to prioritize international partnerships in order to stimulate innovation in Canada, and to commit national resources in order to "maximize results" and increase scholarship funding and coordination. The strategy also promises the creation of a brand for Canadian education, advising that it will be developed in a "rational and value-conscious way" (2014, p. 11). It invokes the credibility of the

Governor General of Canada through a well-placed quote about the diplomacy of knowledge, which speaks to a broader ethic of internationalization that does not appear anywhere in the actual strategy. The strategy seems to achieve its goal, which is to stimulate a financial plan as a result of recruiting more fee-paying, soon-to-immigrate, intelligent international students. Within the strategy, the government uses terms such as: “develop the export of education”; “study abroad and bring back new ideas and discoveries”; “seize our competitive advantages in a strategic, collaborative, and measurable way”; “branding campaign and priority-market plans”; “making the right investments and working with the right partners”; “add billions of dollars to our economy”; “international students are a future source of skilled labour . . . Canadian credentials . . . proficient in at least one official language.” These terms and phrases reflect the neoliberal ideology, and the final section—on measurement and success—is an excellent example of new public management. The prose of this strategy is longing for educational merit and philosophy. It is unrecognizable as a product of Pearson’s early commitments. As Giroux (2002) has written:

The language of neoliberalism and the emerging corporate university radically alters the vocabulary available for appraising the meaning of citizenship, agency, and civic virtue. Within this discourse everything is for sale, and what is not has no value as a public good or practice. (p. 456)

There are a couple of mentions of study abroad, but absolutely no other mentions of the value of international education for our campuses here in Canada.

Not unlike the federal strategy, the provincial strategy in British Columbia is embedded within the economic imaginary, similarly focused on the economy and the provincial jobs plan. This strategy speaks to the cultural and social benefits of international education, yet the metrics published are largely economic and quantify the economic impact of international education for the province (BCCIE, n.d.).

With government strategies such as these, it is entirely understandable that the public believes that international education is about profit and offers nothing other than funding to, say, a university classroom or residence dorm. The strategies commodify

education. The practices and priorities arise from a commitment to make a profit and to enhance our economic position and global reputation. Our federal government³ and the BC provincial government are operating from an economic and competitive social imaginary, and even though the federal government has recently changed, it will be difficult to change the policy direction embedded in the recent International Education Strategy. Universities will face significant moral challenges in managing the impact of a strictly economic imaginary for internationalization.

International Tuition Fees

For Canadians and Canadian higher education, global rankings have developed contiguously as higher education has become more internationalized and the world more globalized. During this same period, in the 1990s, international student tuition fees began to rise in Canada. In British Columbia, not unlike many jurisdictions in the world, internationalization and the recruitment of international students is happening in the context of decreasing government funding to higher education and increasing participation in higher education by the domestic population. Institutions feel the pressure of continued and changing expectations for teaching, learning, and research, yet with fewer funds. This creates a weighty scenario in which institutions find themselves needing more financial control, and boosting international tuition is a particularly attractive strategy. Understanding the policy context in which international tuition decisions are being made helps to expose the underlying ideology at work. By looking back to the thinking in the mid-1990s, we can analyze the governments' and institutions' motivations and interests, and see how these have continued to evolve.

In 1998, the British Columbia Centre for International Education published a report, *Maintaining the Momentum*, on the status of internationalization in the province. It was a follow up to a survey done in 1993 and told the story of internationalization at institutions across the province. McKellin (1998, p. 71) concluded that “the ambitious

³ In October 2015, Justin Trudeau led the Liberals in a federal election that defeated Stephen Harper's Conservative government. The international education strategy that I am referring to was developed under the Conservative government in 2014.

goals” for internationalization and international student recruitment “represent revenue potential” and therefore are “understandable given the current sobering fiscal realities of public funding for post-secondary education.” Institutions and experts in the field of internationalization in BC also predicted in this research that there would be an increase in the competition between institutions to ensure that they recruited their “market share.” Institutions at the time were developing the infrastructure, programs, and staff to support internationalization. Additionally, the revenue was required to fund operational needs that were not being met by tuition, government grants, and fundraising.

Canada has very few private higher education institutions; education is primarily a public enterprise that is funded by governments for domestic students. International students are admitted as full fee-paying students, above the seats that are funded by the provincial government for domestic students; this approach has meant that institutions can reassure the public that international students are not being admitted in place of domestic students. International students are admitted over the domestic student targets, and they pay for the full cost of their education, whereas domestic students, theoretically, pay only the difference between the provincial government grant and the cost of their education.

The revenue potential of international students is tempting, as institutions need funds to sustain operations, balance their budgets, and continue to develop programs to serve the public good. In addition, unlike domestic student tuition, international tuition is unregulated. Domestic tuition fees are regulated in Canada by the provincial governments, and in British Columbia in the 1990s, the government froze domestic student tuition as a way to curry political favour with the electorate and ensure that access was affordable for the province. This kind of policy development coincided with the expansion of international student recruitment and an emphasis on enrolment management. Thus began an era of increasing international tuition to meet the institutions’ budgetary needs. It was a policy window left open by the provincial government at a time when institutions were all facing tremendous budgetary pressures.

Increases in international student tuition have been observed worldwide, not just in Canada (Phan & Barnawi, 2015). One of the hallmarks of neoliberalism is user fees,

and in this case, the institutional need for resources was well matched by the opportunity to set higher fees for international students. Here, it is appropriate to make a few observations about the intended and unintended consequences of this decision.

By facilitating international student tuition increases, the provincial government left the decision in the hands of the institutions, thereby promoting their autonomy and, with this as a viable solution to budget shortfalls, also releasing the government from the obligation of having to dedicate more funds to higher education. Institutions responded by taking up the opportunity. What remains unclear to me is what the government of the time intended by leaving the decision of international tuition to the institutions. In many respects, this is entirely appropriate; prescribing international tuition policy seems outside the role of government, as such policy is an operational decision for each institution. However, by creating this space for institutions and, at the same time, leaving them strapped for critical funding, the government may have been indicating its preference for institutions to capitalize on international tuition fees. Capping domestic tuition to win votes speaks to the government's politics and inclination for revenue over international collaborations, public goods, and global citizenship and looks like a neoliberal approach to internationalization.

Ball (2015, p. 259) reminded us that governing institutions “are not simply victims here, we are complicit, indeed we are sometimes beneficiaries” in neoliberal policy imperatives. Neoliberalism presents a solution. International educators across the institutions in BC may in fact support increased tuition because they wish to ensure that international students have the services they require, knowing that without fee increases, it will be difficult to create programs and support services for students. However, as tuition has increased in BC, the institutions have become reliant on it, and the rationale and objectives of international student recruitment have changed, morphing from an internationalization strategy to a financial strategy. The interest of the government (to spend less on education) and the interests of the institution (to continue to grow, innovate, and compete) are both met. This traps institutions and blinds them to the real intentions, which may lead to even further funding cuts.

In 1993, the first Task Force Report on internationalization across the higher education sector in BC was published; its author, Anne Francis, concluded:

There is every indication that campus internationalization will be a necessary rite of passage into the twenty first century. Internationalization is not a trend. For British Columbians to be competitive in the world and productive at home, they must have international perspective. . . . Internationalization provides the world view on which the students of today will depend tomorrow. (p. 67)

Reflecting on the original intentions, it is important to question whether the foundation continues to be the development of an international perspective in our students or whether internationalization is now simply an economic strategy.

Privatization and Internationalization

The privatization of public services is a key objective of neoliberal rationality because it reduces the public's investment and opens up the potential for revenue generation—a double-win (Glynn & Bauder, 2015). Institutions in Canada can choose to partner with private-sector companies as long as they have the approval of their governing boards and educational councils. As a result of the federal and provincial governments' urging to recruit more international students, coupled with the universities' interest in doing so, many new programming arrangements are emerging. For example, universities are starting to partner with private-sector learning organizations that provide pathway programs for students not yet eligible for university entry.

Developing agreements with private-sector international student learning organizations is a consideration being discussed by many institutions across Canada, following the lead of institutions in Europe, Britain, Australia, and other jurisdictions that have already become reliant on international tuition revenues. This is advantageous for the university, and these organizations would likely argue that it is also advantageous for the students. The university develops a strong pool of prospective students who are interacting, living, and studying as though they are students of the university, often on the same campus, using the same services. The university has virtually no responsibilities and as part of the financial arrangement is compensated for the affiliation

with the institution. The students are engaged in full pathway programs that provide the academic courses, often including English language training, as well as the cultural and social education that allegedly prepares them to be more successful in their transition to the university. Very often, students believe that they are in a particular program of the university, even though the organizations are separate. The branding is wedded to the university and presents the partnership as a fully integrated package. For example, Navitas and Simon Fraser University (SFU), one of the longest partnerships of this kind in Canada, have been working together for 10 years and describe their partnership thus:

The Navitas & SFU collaboration supports the University's internationalization goals resulting in a stronger, more diverse international student population; improved academic outcomes; increased global profile for the institution; and sustainable revenue streams for reinvestment in key areas of the university. (Navitas, 2016)

These key outcomes resonate with the neoliberal ideology. The program is understood to be more effective than what the university could do on its own, SFU's reputation is enhanced, and revenue flows into the institution. This kind of partnership is founded on a shared priority between the private organization and the university. They both engage because of the potential financial benefit. While one has the aim of gaining revenues for shareholders, the other is simply interested in efficiently preparing international students for the university—along with any other financial incentive they are offered.

The practice of outsourcing international student preparation is an illustration of how internationalization strategies are being impacted by neoliberalism. At what cost to the institution? I believe that this is the thin edge of the wedge. The values—largely economic and customer service—upon which these activities are based will influence the dialogue about international students, as well as their role and success at the institution.

There is little research on the impact of these programs on the university, although Klees (2008) claimed these neoliberal policies do not even deliver what they promise, adding that there is no logic or evidence to support privatization in education. Arguments that funds can only be found via user fees are weak, and the privatization that has occurred has not been educationally beneficial, equitable, or cost-effective.

Klees (2008) characterized this kind of global activity thus: “We live in a world structured by capitalism, patriarchy, and racism, where the dominant ideology leads to policies that help the advantaged accumulate ever more advantages and help maintain poverty, inequality, and marginalisation” (p. 339). More research is required to understand who the students are in these kinds of private or quasi-private ventures and how this pipeline of students is impacting the community of international students at universities. Klees (2008) has brought our attention to some of the issues emerging from the neoliberal values that initiate this kind of partnership. The students entering pathway programs may be the students who can afford the programs, not those for whom a university education would potentially change the trajectory of their lives. These programs have some financial aid programming; however, I am not sure that this commitment is driven by the valuing of diversity, equity, and access. More likely, financial aid from a private educational enterprise can be marketed effectively as attention to diversity, care for accessibility and affordability, and part of the overall character of a public institution that values equity. These kinds of partnerships are confusing to prospective students and their families, yet their brand is growing worldwide, and this kind of practice is gaining significant momentum. Private international student learning organizations straddle the global scene and influence the marketplace activity for international student recruitment. Universities may be legitimizing their efforts by working in partnership, and their doing so may affect their public character and goods, all the while eroding the value proposition of internationalization.

The neoliberal social imaginary is affecting higher education and the community of faculty, scholars, and administrators. While some of the neoliberal practices and policies have been disguised as helpful strategies to address fiscal challenges, perhaps we need to be more courageous or creative as we consider the most difficult dilemmas facing higher education. Ball (2015) said it well when describing how this threatens our core:

There is for many of us in education a growing sense of ontological insecurity; both a loss of a sense of meaning in what we do and of what is important in what we do. Are we doing things for the “right” reasons—and how can we know? (p. 259)

This ontological insecurity is understandable, especially when we can see the ways in which our partners in governments so easily move into this discourse. It is therefore even more important for institutions to clarify their values and work toward a coherent approach to internationalization with the end result in mind, all the while guarding against the narrative of neoliberalism for institutional decisions. Canadian universities remain relatively autonomous, and we should rely on this strength, while we take up the promise of internationalization.

Chapter 6.

Global Rankings: The Social Imaginary of Status and Competition

The practice of global rankings contributes to the globalization of higher education and emerges from the highly networked, internationally connected system of higher education, particularly in research-based institutions. Indeed, one of the somewhat controversial “global” behaviours of research-based universities is to participate in externally managed global rankings. This practice has emerged over the last 13 years and, in a relatively short period of time, has become a homogenizing and powerful force on institutions of higher education. Global rankings are an outgrowth of national ranking systems that were designed and marketed as unbiased methods of providing information to those seeking to make decisions about a given institution. Although they were largely focused on prospective students, the audience for such rankings has grown to include governments, administrations, and even faculty, and their impact reaches well beyond directly interested parties.

The role of rankings with various stakeholders continues to diversify and develop. Today, one sees decisions about funding and partnerships being influenced by global rankings, making them a potentially dangerous and catalytic factor. For example, given that we are working in a knowledge economy, and that talent development as well as the immigration of educated citizens or prospective students has a positive impact on a nation’s economy, governments are invested in supporting globally ranked universities (Stack, 2016). Universities are also more dependent on donor funding, and global rankings as well as the role of a given university internationally are often used as part of the marketing to support specific development campaigns. Moreover, the general public, who may not be as savvy to the politics of information, has come to assume that global and national rankings reflect institutions’ worth and prestige.

I would argue that while international organizations have often produced reports that highlight best practices and that may investigate institutional data and thereby compare institutions, global rankings are a competitive communication tool that obstructs higher education institutions' ability to truly engage in an international and collaborative environment. Global rankings are having a widespread impact on these institutions—on the one hand, steering and enriching the dialogue about higher education, but on the other, creating the sense of a uniform set of values and practices for universities, focusing on comparative data as comprising a statement of quality, and aligning rank with worth and prestige. This practice and the consequent set of outcomes are creating an unsettling dynamic between higher education and the political relevance of universities. The purpose of higher education is becoming more tightly coupled with private goods and globalization, and this has a knock-on effect on the institution's approach to student learning, university governance, local and national priorities, research publications, and worldwide knowledge-based collaboration. For example, scholars at lower-ranked institutions are not as mobile as scholars at higher-ranked institutions. This shift is impacting the ways in which internationalization plays out as a strategic priority in globally ranked research-based institutions.

A number of different systems and issues arise in a consideration of university rankings. The point of this chapter is not to fully investigate the practices and methodologies, nor to provide an overview of all rankings, but rather to expand on the issues and impacts, unintended and otherwise, that rankings have on research-based universities engaged in internationalization.

Emergent at a Time of Globalization

In the space of higher education, global rankings are a critical instrument of globalization—they are a mechanism that brings the dialogue around higher education across a vast and diverse world into one tight list of power and worth. As mentioned above, international organizations in this field have for a long time published reports and comparative studies; but never before have global rankings exerted this level of power and control in the marketplace of higher education.

The relationship between rankings, globalization, and institutional internationalization is complex and confounding and will be further teased apart in this chapter. I want to begin from the understanding that was explored earlier in this dissertation, where I argued that (i) an ethical commitment to internationalization results in an intentional focus on relationships with other institutions and communities, (ii) internal processes reflect this commitment, and (iii) supports are developed to recognize and respond to the diversity of scholars—both students and faculty—engaged in that academic community. That is to say, international students and faculty are recruited with a commitment to understanding how their recruitment impacts organizational structures, teaching, learning, supports, and other services, and the university changes to reflect that commitment. This process of internationalization, happening at most large research institutions in Canada and around the world, has been both aided and altered by the context in which it is occurring, specifically the context of global university rankings.

The mechanisms of and discussions about global rankings are embedded in an environment of globalized communication technologies, and these technologies provide real-time access to the relevant information. Not only is it easy to connect with the world through a series of clicks and, seemingly, gain comprehensive information about institutions worldwide—including narratives about a given university's status and positional worth measured against a common set of criteria. The globalized world also means that it is relatively easy for those in more affluent areas to see themselves studying at universities in other countries. In fact, international mobility, student visas, and all of the associated processes promote the ease and viability of studying abroad and fuel the idea that it is in students' best interest to gain international and global experience so that they are better able to operate as future employees. This narrative is in line with the shift from education as a public good to a private good, and the pursuit of higher education with a focus on employment and resulting economic gain rather than on the development of important skills, knowledge, and attitudes for global citizens. Most top-ranked institutions reflect this kind of sentiment on their websites—and so the politics of information begins, and the purpose of higher education is put in the hands of marketers and web masters.

It is clear that students from more affluent countries no longer see only local or national institutions as choices for higher education. They have grown up with the understanding that it is very possible to pursue higher education in a country other than the one where they live, which may also be different than the country where they were born. Given the tremendous growth in student mobility, the environment for metrics has been ripe for and supportive of the development of global rankings, arguably a simple system to order a set of different and complex institutions in an interdependent and interconnected world.

Steering Effect

Rankings have created a language for the dialogue on higher education, identifying the practices and qualities that are deemed most desirable for institutions. Rankings similarly review institutions across all countries, without consideration for the local or national contexts in which they operate. The global rankings methodology is blunt and uniform, rather than according any specific attention to how each institution is developing in line with its primary purpose or in relation to its local or national contexts. This has resulted in a steering effect on institutions, which are to some extent being guided toward a common set of criteria that forms the basis for rankings. This common look and feel has become a template for research-based institutions. The rankings suggest the model for universities that is most valued. Hazelkorn has called this “a norming effect on all higher education” as a result of the “simplistic trumpeting of world-class universities as the recipe for success in the global economy” (2014, p. 20). It is important to note that these ranking are remarkably stable; the top 10 institutions in the major global rankings have remained largely unchanged and are entirely made up of Western, English-speaking institutions. If Hazelkorn is correct—that affiliation with these institutions leads to success in the global economy—then the global rankings may be a tool that accords an advantage to certain nations, and specific individuals, in the global economy.

The media has played an important role in socializing these rankings and in determining the criteria on which institutions are ranked. This dynamic has provided the media and independent ranking organizations with tremendous influence, and I would

argue that it has positioned them as dual architects of universities. Given the role that rankings play in internationalization and specifically the recruitment of international students, conforming to the template is very tempting, as it may improve an institution's rank as well as bring fee-paying international students to the institution.

The goal of the major global ranking programs is to provide prospective students with information about higher education, with students being positioned as consumers making a purchasing decision. Some observers have asserted that universities have benefitted from the increased attention to rankings, and they cite the rising focus on higher education as evidence. However, I believe that this has been at a significant cost for universities. Arguably, their status and worth have been distilled to a rank in an international field of universities, determined by a corporate body that is external to the universities and is focused on marketing institutions to prospective students. Stack (2016) has further suggested that while rankings give the perception of choice because they provide information, on a wide scale, about a large number of institutions, they have actually decreased accessibility because governments and donors are more likely to fund institutions at the top of rankings to further secure their place and, consequently, the nation's place.

Universities have been complicit in the practice and yet perhaps caught by surprise by the real and tangible impact that global rankings have had on their strategic operations. For example, rather than universities focusing on developing more meaningful and balanced engagements between local and national priorities and relationships, they are now fixated upon international priorities, their international peer group, and developing international affiliations that strengthen their ability to perform well according to the criteria for global rankings.

Internationalization has been misguided by the captivating agenda that has been set by global rankings. Institutional ranking has ceased to be a secondary aim, something achieved as a result of being dedicated to a primary set of goals that are unrelated to the rankings dialogue. Instead, global rankings have become an annual focus for universities and boards. University administrative staff are, year round,

engaged in submissions and analyses to determine how the university's progress will support their overall ranking. Institutional ranking has become the end in itself.

Although globalization has created the demand for rankings, I believe that the process has resulted in a homogenization of university practices. No longer are institutions valued as distinctive places deeply embedded in their local, national, and international contexts. This kind of differentiation would be virtually impossible to measure objectively and distil into a particular rank; by definition, a ranking system requires a common set of criteria. Consequently, though, data are taken out of context so as to be reported in a simple and objective manner. This leads to many questions, such as why we do this, whom it benefits, and how the practice is changing the integrity of institutions themselves. A university's reputation matters—to prospective faculty and students, to provincial and federal governments, and to other institutions. As a result of a strong reputational showing, governments provide funding, and as a result of increased funding, researchers have more and can do more, and alumni are more engaged. This becomes a circle of activity that builds on itself, and global rankings thereby have become an instrumental part of the operation of universities. Without a doubt, rankings “refigure discursive spaces of what it means to be a university, and a ‘good’ one at that” (Stack, 2016, p. 1).

University Rankings in Canada

About eight years after the media in the USA started a national rankings dialogue for universities, Canada got into the game. In 1991, *Maclean's* magazine began to publish a national rankings issue, focused on prospective students and their families. This was just the beginning for *Maclean's* and was followed by a specific university selection guide publication—and, most importantly, an annual dialogue controlled by this media engine regarding the criteria on which to choose a post-secondary school. This is a massive enterprise for *Maclean's* today and has continued to expand in ways that serve the public, and that sell.

Maclean's was the first experience of rankings within Canada; however, it was not what initiated data collection or even the transparent release of data for prospective

students. Simultaneous with the *Maclean's* dialogue, institutions were becoming more interested in understanding the experiences of students and assessing the ways in which the concept of the institution was changing to support student learning and faculty research. Each year, there was a discussion about the *Maclean's* ranking and how to respond to the magazine's requests. Which student stories should be profiled? What were the top ways we changed in the last year? What is "best" about the institution? *Maclean's* was committed to publishing data that parents and students could then compare in order to make a decision. They wanted to know about scholarship dollars, programs, and faculty–student ratios, and they implemented their own reputational surveys of employers and alumni to assess the perceived value of a given degree from a specific institution.

All of this rankings noise was happening at the same time as institutions became more focused nationally on strategic enrolment management and on recruiting students from across the country. One practice emerging from this focus on recruitment and the selection of students was for universities to begin to publish their own viewbooks. Along with associated web portals for prospective students, viewbooks are universities' primary marketing tools and provide a glimpse into life at the institution, including academic programs, student life, and information about how to apply.

As the *Maclean's* rankings continued in Canada, the larger institutions came to believe that they were better off not participating in this annual exercise—engaging in the arduous process of responding to detailed questions, arranging for visits to the institution, and submitting to a process of reputational ranking into which they had no collegial input. After reconsidering the impact of participating in the *Maclean's* rankings process, a number of the major research-based institutions in Canada pulled out in 2003. This was a courageous, values-based decision, and their withdrawal left *Maclean's* to use, in these instances, information that they could gather through publicly accessible websites (Samarasekera, 2007).

It is understandable, even laudable, that these institutions came to question the rationale of dedicating staff to respond to *Maclean's* so that the universities could be objects within a rankings game. Participating in the *Maclean's* rankings process costs

institutions resources that (i) could be dedicated to exercises that have a greater impact on the public good, (ii) could better meet the objectives of providing information to prospective students, and (iii) do not contribute to the continued marketplace dynamics of higher education in Canada. On the other hand, *Maclean's* likely had its own reasons for not being interested in collaborating with these Canadian institutions more effectively: the magazine's autonomy and editorial control, which arguably they require to make the best decisions for themselves; and their goals, which include their own reputation, economic benefit, and the freedom to develop stories without the influence of those who stand to benefit from the magazine. An opportunity to collaborate was nixed by the dominance of the marketplace. However, this is not to say that Canadian universities are not focused on rankings, especially global ones.

Global Rankings

A quick search of "UBC and rankings" lands one on a page on the university's website designed to communicate the institution's strategic planning process and priorities. This page is headlined: "OUR PLACE AMONG THE WORLD'S BEST." This kind of university acknowledgment brings both importance and legitimacy to the practice of university global rankings. The statement shows how the university is choosing to market itself, as well as its investment in the rankings system. Given the earlier discussion about national rankings and the larger universities' decision to pull out, one might question what is different about global rankings and why UBC is granting legitimacy to this practice. To better investigate this question, I will first briefly discuss the global ranking systems.

One of the three most commonly cited and highly regarded is the Shanghai Jiao Tong University rankings (now called the Academic Ranking of World Universities, ARWU). In 2003, the Shanghai Jiao Tong University engaged its Institute of Higher Education to investigate the world's best universities in order to meet China's interest in understanding how Chinese national institutions compared with other institutions around the world. The goal was to develop an internally focused set of comparative data to improve China's higher education system. It was not intended to be a global rankings program, but that is exactly what it initiated. The Institute of Higher Education had set out

to understand how other institutions were operating so that it could make recommendations about how to improve institutions within China. Nonetheless, the timing—including the context of globalization, the marketplace for higher education, and a number of other conditions—led to this research program instigating a global rankings program. Since 2009, the ARWU has been published by Shanghai Ranking Consultancy, which is now a fully independent organization focused on higher education (see www.shanghairanking.com).

The other two rankings referenced most often are the Times Higher Education (THE) and Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) rankings, which began as a partnered enterprise in 2003. They published jointly between 2004 and 2009; subsequently, THE has partnered with Thomson Reuters. The THE World University Rankings claim to “provide the definitive list of the world’s best universities, evaluated across teaching, research, international outlook, reputation and more” and confirm that the “data are trusted by governments and universities and are a vital resource for students, helping them choose where to study” (Times Higher Education, 2016). Further descriptions include an “international university performance table judging world class universities across all of their core missions—teaching, research, knowledge transfer and international outlook.” The website describes the assessment as comprising “carefully calibrated performance indicators” and confidently reports that the data are “the most comprehensive and balanced comparisons available . . . trusted by students, academics, university leaders, industry and governments.”

These words provide no room for scepticism or even healthy critique. The assumption is that users can be provided with comparative data and will understand how to use the data to inform their decisions. Words such as “calibrated” and “balanced comparisons” sound objective and convey an impenetrable notion of accuracy and correspondingly justifiable confidence in the rankings. The suggestion is that the rankings are undeniable statements of fact, based on this scientific methodology. Moreover, the THE employs an ethic of consumerism, conveying that the ranking is separate from the institutions and so the data are reliable and trustworthy. However, a politically aware review of the landscape of global rankings leads one to question the motivation for such efforts, and to ask who actually benefits.

The QS rankings are accessed through a web domain called “top universities” (see www.topuniversities.com). After registering as a member of the top universities community, one can gain access to a suite of informational materials, such as brochures about how to engage in study abroad in Canada, through to the individual country-based rankings and institutional data. By building a community and cultivating relationships with individual prospective students, QS develops marketing leverage that results in financial gain and economic power in the field of higher education. The website, not unlike the other ranking sites, is a web of information in which one can quickly become lost in data, unable to discern what the baseline is or how to effectively use the information. There are so many different ways to look at the rankings and so many overall rankings that it would take the most skilled administrator, highly knowledgeable about the field, to understand what the data are saying and how they might be applicable to a student’s experience at the institution.

These three powerful systems are working to create a marketplace of information about the quality of institutions. In many cases, institutions that might have opted out of national ranking systems are nonetheless fully engaged in the global rankings. UBC ranked 40, 34, and 50, respectively, in these three systems in 2015. For many faculty and students, this will be a point of pride and afford them different opportunities as a result of the confirmed prestigious nature of the institution.

Higher education institutions are in a difficult place when it comes to rankings—there is no easy solution to this predicament, and the nature and use of information is likely to continue to complicate matters, given the innovation of communication tools in the globalized world. However, finding a values-based plan for internationalization will afford the institution some control over how it chooses to respond to and engage with the external forces of global rankings.

A Historically Powerful Social Imaginary

Social status and competition together constitute one of the oldest imaginaries for universities. “Symbols of status are integral to hierarchical academic affairs, with their medieval forms of public display, and status positions universities in relation to one

another” (Marginson, 2012, p. 15). This imaginary has been definitive in organizational structures and practices, in priorities, in the physical development of campuses, and in almost every other aspect of university operations, particularly within the most highly ranked institutions. Global rankings have become a contemporary method of conveying how institutions are positioned against each other. But this imaginary has a long history and—not unlike global rankings—will be difficult to destabilize. In fact, the context of globalization has strengthened this social imaginary, bringing the world closer together; indeed, global rankings are flourishing, and the historical prestige of institutions is being directly reinforced for all the world to see.

Understandably, institutions that currently hold high status in the rankings, and have done so for decades or even centuries, are exerting considerable pressure to maintain that status. Arguably, there is a “glass ceiling” in this realm, as it is very difficult for institutions to break into the established upper levels (Hazelkorn, 2014). Global rankings have become synonymous with this historical social imaginary of status. Marginson (2012) has argued that “status competition overlaps with the economic market. Success in one helps success in the other. In research universities, however, the desire for status outweighs love of money” (p. 15). One of the primary goals of world-class institutions is the recognition that they are indeed world-class—what Marginson has called “the timeless prestige and power of the university as an end in itself” (2011, p. 33).

Relationships, funding, and history continue to reinforce the status of universities. Those institutions with existing status drive behaviour that enables them to maintain their position in the world. For example, these institutions can be the most selective about students and faculty, and very often faculty and students go on to contribute to the institutions’ status. The families of students are also brought into the institutional network and become part of the lexicon of positional worth. This drives development and fundraising behaviour, as once a student graduates with a degree, the graduate and the graduate’s family will be more inclined to support that institution so that its reputation and positional worth continues to be as strong as it was when the graduate chose to attend the institution. Similarly, those at the more elite institutions reinforce the status of the institutions through research networks and citations. These institutions attract top

researchers as a result of the resources they can offer, and they can also be highly selective about graduate students. Graduate students studying under the top researchers at the best institutions in the world also go on to academic positions in other high-ranking institutions and serve as connectors to ensure that researchers and labs with the top globally ranked university stay intertwined. These patterns of behaviour were not designed to maintain the status of institutions, but that is exactly what they do.

One of the unintended impacts of global rankings is the understanding that they create about the countries in which the universities are located. Reflections on the universities are also interpreted as reflections on the countries, thus creating a competition and ranking among countries as well as institutions (Erkkilä, 2014). This can create a national discourse about the direction of universities and ways in which they must change in order to maintain their country's global positioning. The countries that have been almost exclusively favoured by the global rankings are English-speaking ones. Internationalization elsewhere in the world has subsequently begun to focus on English, resulting in the domination of English in the market of higher education and the globalization of knowledge (Phan & Barnawi, 2015). Such entanglement of higher education and government policy engagement further promotes the discourse of rankings and competition.

This social imaginary is strong. Internationalization operates within it and is also reinforcing it. Decisions about where to recruit students from, what institutions to set up strategic partnerships with, and with whom to network in academia are all influenced by a sense of where there is strength. These connections are built to maintain and improve the status of the institution.

Global rankings are a political and powerful force creating an isomorphic influence in higher education indiscriminately homogenizing values and practices. Further they matter for the recruitment of international students, and therefore, matter for institutions and increasingly so, for governments (Hazelkorn, 2008). Universities must act with awareness and sophistication in the engagement with global ranking and related communication tactics understanding their limitations and subversive nature.

Internationalization as a practice and an ethic cannot be mediated through such a lens if institutions are to realize the promise of internationalization.

Chapter 7.

Internationalization: The Networked and Collaborative Social Imaginary

In an effort to look at the historical narratives of internationalization at a research-intensive university, and with an interest in leaning into the voices of the communicative actors, it was important to select perspectives and documents that could reveal the institutional intentions for internationalization. Guided by wanting to understand the imaginaries and ideas that are part of the public sphere, I was drawn to documents capturing the ideas that imbued the speeches of the day or the discussions of academic debates in Senate. In this chapter, I will analyze the speeches of a former UBC President as an example, perhaps exemplar, of an alternate social imaginary and in the following chapter, I will look at Senate minutes, the UBC student newspaper, and policy documents from the student government.

This chapter brings forward illustrations of the third imaginary—one of collaboration, equity, and networks, one that builds on an individual’s role within the institution, and one that offers the greatest hope for internationalization.

The University of British Columbia was served by Professor Stephen Toope, as President and Vice-Chancellor, for eight years between 2006 and 2014. Professor Toope is an international law scholar, and internationalization was both a focus for him and a top priority for the institution during this time.

Communications of a University Leader

An inquiry into the writings and speeches of Professor Stephen Toope, former President and Vice-Chancellor of the University of British Columbia, reveals an inspiring

dialogue of strategic thinking about the role of universities in society. In focusing on internationalization, a topic and interest in which Toope has long been invested, he has brought tremendous insight grounded in both practice and theory. There is an opportunity to learn by investigating the discourse he presented about the university's role as a public research institution and the values that he exposed through the words and ideas in his public expressions made as President during a period of intense internationalization. Upon unpacking these ideas, we can then juxtapose them with the theoretical ideas of internationalization, globalization, and neoliberalism, and the social imaginary of rankings and status. This will allow us to propose some ways forward, as students, faculty, staff, and administrators strive to practice internationalization so that it benefits them and facilitates the mission of the university to develop new knowledge, communicate knowledge, and inspire an ethical and engaged citizenry.

I feel privileged to have taken the journey of reading and rereading speeches, and looking back on the contexts and audiences for the ideas they contain. Toope's ideas have arisen from his discussions and thinking as a human rights lawyer, internationally connected president, and leader who puts himself forward to urge change as a result of focusing on intercultural learning. Arising from a practitioner and leader in the field of university practices, the dialogue is rich and hopeful and can inspire practices that will assist university leaders, faculty, staff, and students, as we continue to navigate the policy, and politics, of internationalization in higher education in a globalized world. It is important to note that I believe that these ideas are not specific to one institution or leader but rather I have chosen to investigate one example of this kind of thinking. This third social imaginary represents a way of being that is found in pockets across the globe and my interest is to better understand what it represents and how it can guide practice and policy.

Specifically, it may be possible to further clarify for all of those engaged in university life the potential and promise of internationalization.

Globalization and Global Citizenship

Toope (2006) wrestled with the concept of global citizenship, a term that was heavily embedded in UBC's strategic plan, *Trek 2010*, which was inherited from the previous administration.⁴ The plan outlined core commitments in the areas of student learning, research excellence, and community engagement, with the ultimate vision of fostering global citizenship and advancing a civil and sustainable society. As a president with a deeply international and intercultural lens, he questioned the use of the phrase *global citizenship*. In a lengthy 2006 address for The Vancouver Institute, he shared how he came to resolve this dissonance, having concluded that the term could indeed be decoupled from the more bleak outlook of globalization. Globalization is not to be confused with global citizenship, and he addresses both terms through this speech, offering some important reflections.

Toope (2006) begins by asserting that the terms *globalization* and *global citizenship* “plague the literature” and questioning whether these terms convey a sense of “productive, aspiring visions” or “bring with them a sense of doom and gloom.” As a leader, he wonders whether his own sense of the productive outcomes resulting from an interdependent and connected world are reflected in these terms. Do they hide or convey the value of humanity that can be engaged in common issues across the globe? Arguably, his aim is to tease out whether or not to continue with the use of these terms in the university's strategic plan or to select other terms that more appropriately describe his intentions and those of the university more broadly. While he muses that *global citizenship* is “intended to remind of us of the nature of our citizenry,” he questions the legitimacy of the term and the impact it has, particularly during a time of globalization. Toope goes on to suggest that globalization as a term is meaningless and “is often used as a stand-in for complex understanding of our world.” Urging us to be more rigorous in our thinking about how the world is interacting, he further critiques the use of the term as primarily conveying an economic state.

⁴ *Trek 2010* was the strategic plan for UBC that was developed under President and Vice-Chancellor Martha Piper, who served from 1997 to 2006. The subsequent administration worked toward this plan and ultimately launched a refreshed strategic plan for the university in 2009, called *Place and Promise*.

Toope questions the value of the term global citizenship when it may simply initiate a set of ideas about economic domination resulting from market-based opportunities and global career prospects. He asks whether or not the term can be reclaimed—and, I would suggest, therefore be of value for a university, as well as for the inspiring and aspiring objectives relevant to the institution's roles and to the place of university education and research in the development of global citizenship. He cautions us against the process of re-colonizing the world through well-intended efforts that begin as a result of the rhetoric of global citizenship. He argues: "It must be about something different than re-colonizing the world through global citizens who are actually agents of economic domination. I want to suggest that global citizenship *can* be rescued from the rhetoric of globalization" (Toope, 2006, 4:53).

After making this claim, Toope goes on to argue that global citizenship is a worthwhile and aspiring term, and he supports this position through discussion of his own discipline, international law. He concludes that we can, indeed, continue to use this term in our efforts to educate. Further, in his experience, global citizenship is a term to which students particularly respond, and this concept has a role in the dialogue about creating a healthier, equitable world order. However, the values behind the term *global citizen* must be aligned with the intentions of international and intercultural learning. Acting as an agent of economic domination is not acting as a global citizen. This is to say that universities, faculty members, and students need to be focused on developing global citizens with a different frame of reference than an exclusively economic one. Here Toope has named the social imaginary of economics and indicated his inclination for a greater and more powerful way to imagine global citizenship. He also references the impact that the term *global citizenship* has on the lifeworld of students: it matters in their narrative.

In the next section, I will explore how Toope characterizes the values and position of a global citizen.

The Role of a University

A common theme within the study of higher education is that universities have outlived their purpose. Before we enter into a discussion that addresses the role of universities in the world today, let me first draw on Toope's language to show the relevance of universities, and their ability to change to meet the contemporary needs of the day, all the while remaining true to their roots:

universities are one of the only social institutions to have survived, both intact and wildly changed, since the medieval era. (Other examples are religious institutions, now under increasing attack, and some political institutions, like the Icelandic parliament). This is no accident. Universities have proven themselves to be crucial to social, economic and cultural evolution. In seeking to promote needed change, we must be careful to acknowledge the strength that we bring to the task. (Toope, 2010, p. 2)

One of the ideas that Toope speaks about most often is exploring, imagining, and defining the role of the university in society. He presents the ways in which he sees the university engaging with society and describes the functions and values of the university, ultimately offering a social imaginary of action, collaboration, and cooperation that challenges the boundaries drawn by national states and that focuses on global citizenship as a student outcome for research universities in the 21st century. Exploring the institution itself is critical for understanding how internationalization—a value, character, and set of processes of the institution—is embedded in the larger whole. The institution will facilitate the ways in which global citizenship is understood, and so the first point of interest is to better understand the role of the university.

In a speech titled *Pluralism and Pragmatism: The Role of Universities in Developing Human Potential*, Toope defines the university as

a place unto itself but connected to the wider world; a place of study and research that will benefit those outside its confines; a place of collaboration and cohabitation; a safe place for significant conversations about sensitive issues, among people of profound cultural diversity. (Toope, 2012, p. 10)

There are several aspects to this definition, which urges a certain set of values and activities. First, the university works as part of the wider world; it is a place unto itself, but equally importantly it is connected to the wider world. When we consider what activities facilitate connections to the wider world, we come to see the value placed on people—on students and faculty—as they are key connectors to the wider world. Students and faculty have the potential to bring issues and problems into the university, to research and puzzle over them and ultimately bring solutions or a clarity of thought that yields a better understanding of a given problem. They also have the capacity to act as individuals and in collaboration with others to improve the world. While internationalization is also about how institutions themselves are networked into a larger community of universities and organizations around the world, I am struck by the role of individuals in this definition. This fact is reinforced when Toope describes the kind of functions that are paramount at a university: to study and research, collaborate and cohabitate, and engage in conversations. These are all functions of individuals. Toope is making the point that universities are about people engaging with difficult matters and with each other, all to the benefit of the world. In each of these functions, Toope is urging us to consider the role of a university as a space and place for creative collaborations between people on issues of importance. Here we see the institution as a facilitator of these practices—and the institutional role, as MacIntyre reminded us, is to sustain these practices.

Toope further illustrates the role of universities as unique and different physical places enabling and facilitating interactions that lead to individual changes, learning, and personal growth. These outcomes are greatly enhanced by the diversity of individuals on the campus, including the presence of international students. In short, he is arguing that interactions matter in the development of global citizens.

As a student walks the paths from building to building, class to class, she should begin to notice three things: First: that although she may enter only three or four or five buildings each day, there is teaching and learning going on in all of the buildings. What she is learning, what she will have learned at the end of four years, is just a tiny fraction of what is available to be learned in this place. Second: that although each building she enters is a separate edifice containing a distinct subject matter within its walls, there is a common denominator ... and it is she, herself. All of these different realms of ideas are in fact not separate at all, but

interconnected with all of the others, and where they connect is within her. And third: that every person she encounters is similarly a connecting point for an astonishing diversity of ideas and understandings and experiences, and that if she wants to expand exponentially beyond what is available to her in the classroom, what she has to do is ... say hello. (Toope, 2012b, p. 11)

The role of universities is to develop individuals with a greater awareness of knowledge, the discovery of knowledge, and the interrelated nature of knowledge; however, the ability of any one individual is enhanced as a result of personal interactions, relationships, and friendships. Universities are the kind of places and spaces that foster these outcomes. Emerging from this quote is a vision of the university's social imaginary of collaboration. Universities are about knowledge and collaboration for the good of the world. The primary actors in this venture are our students and our faculty—those who become lifelong learners and researchers of knowledge.

The value of a university is in offering experiences, at a particular time in one's life, that expand and clarify our human potential. Toope (2012b) suggests that

[u]niversity is meant to be a liminal experience, a threshold between youth and adulthood, between careers, or between life stages. Time and space outside of ordinary time and space—away from our usual habits and practices, in a place outside our familiar four corners—to investigate who we are in relation to the diversity of experiences, customs, cultures, and values we're now encountering. And, to imagine who we might yet become. (p. 12)

Here, he beautifully captures the development of global citizens. It is the growth or change in individuals that results from being in a place unlike any usual setting, disrupting or upsetting the normal values and principles from which we operate and prompting us to engage in an arena of ideas and people that present difference, all with the outcome of "imagining who we might yet become." Being a student at university is about engaging in a personal journey of learning through the rigorous and difficult process of substantive disciplines, and of encountering individuals who think differently as a result of who they are and their development to this point. University offers students the opportunity to change—potentially, the opportunity to change into global citizens,

individuals who engage in the wider world with an ethic of care for themselves and for others.

Universities are well known for the number of administrative meetings that fill the days. In his *Pluralism and Pragmatism* speech, Toope offers a light-hearted remark suggesting that he would like more “meetings”—meaning the kind of meetings that are a genuine engagement of two individuals, rather than the more administrative engagements. The role of the university, he argues, is to create the conditions for meetings to achieve the greater goal of facilitating interpersonal and intercultural learning, for universities to increase out-of-province and international student enrolment to achieve a diverse community at the university. “The flow of university students across borders sparks such meetings and builds nations. It creates lifelong links between individuals and organizations in every sphere of life” (p. 13). Toope links the individual behaviour of saying hello to a stranger with the opportunity to meet other students at university, and this in turn to the future potential for solving economic crises, responding to climate change, and addressing poverty. He is creating the narrative of the university as a community in which personal interaction within a diverse community builds the capacity to engage in the world once you have physically left the university, and to carry with you the experience and habits gained as a result of such a place. The internal goods that are developed serve society as a result of individuals acting with greater and more informed self-understanding.

Beyond facilitating hellos, he argues, the educative process and programs create spaces for students to learn how to be global citizens.

Through casual conversation and formal dialogue; in the classroom and in community service; through hosting international scholars at home and creating opportunities for study and research abroad, universities invite their students, staff, faculty, alumni, and members of the broader community to become global citizens. This is a designation that cannot be conferred by any country or institution but only through participation and practice. We transform ourselves into citizens, and that transformation is sustained by a recognition that, as moral beings, we are here to help one another. That we cannot set someone outside our circle, we cannot turn our back on someone less fortunate than ourselves without in some way compromising ourselves and our own humanity. (p. 26)

In addition to describing the patterns of interaction that create opportunities for the development of students, of humans, as global citizens, Toope offers a subtle but critical point about the interconnected and interdependent nature of human success. He is suggesting that by making decisions, engaging in programs, or acting in ways that are good for others, the individual in turn benefits as well, and that all of humanity can benefit. This is a second construction of a collaborative imaginary, and it sketches out the development of internal goods arising from the practices described by MacIntyre. Only by considering others—rather than simply your own individual gain, economic or otherwise—and how you can work as part of a more networked and interconnected global community can you improve your own condition, and that of others at the very same time. Universities are tasked with creating communities that are diverse and that provide this kind of opportunity to learn more about the roles humans play in helping each other. This practice results from interactions and decisions that are collaborative in nature and that consider the goods beyond those that benefit the individual. Toope here defines global citizenship as an individual's transformation into a moral being who understands the interdependent nature of humanity. This is a characteristic that arguably will serve not just university graduates but all individuals, given the forces currently upon them to engage in the world individualistically.

Many have debated the outcomes of universities. In a number of speeches, Toope addresses this and positions the goods arising from universities as “ultimately, personal. By ‘personal’ I mean that the benefits to Canada flow not merely from universities as institutions, but also and *primarily* from the people whose lives have been touched by them” (Toope, 2011b, pp. 7–8).

As a result of focusing on the individuals—our students—and the interactions and growth that they can experience in university, we initiate greater change. Little is accomplished by institutions themselves. Our focus should be on the ways in which the university is changing and adapting, through internationalization, in order to prepare our students for the world in which they will live, act, and engage. These personal benefits then become benefits for others and for the communities in which they live, work, and participate.

Imagining the role of universities in a globalized world means believing in a transition for universities, letting go of the familiarity of local and national priorities, and engaging more widely to reflect the globalized nature of our world. This is a change in how universities engage, not a change to their core mission. Toope considers the progress universities are making and the obstacles inherent to such an important change:

Some of us are groping towards a conception of the university's role and responsibilities that crosses disciplinary borders and helps increase the permeability of state borders. But we are constrained by two powerful forces: lingering positivist sensibilities that reinforce content-determined conceptions of education; and difficulty in escaping the nationalist sensibilities that provide comfort amidst social complexity. (2008b, p. 5)

Toope is advocating for universities to evolve, and he defines the forces—perhaps outgrowths of neoliberal policy directions—that are impeding our success. He proposes that by reimagining the priorities for learning and setting our sights on the more global sense of interpersonal and cultural relations, universities will become global actors, which is required for the interconnected and interdependent nature of the world. This creates the imperative for universities to prioritize internationalism and intercultural learning.

New Internationalism: An Advocate for Internationalization at Home

In an address to the Congress of Humanities and Social Sciences, Toope offers the opportunity to ponder Canadian universities and a “new internationalism.” “[T]he search for knowledge should never be circumscribed by borders or nationalities” (2008a, p. 7). He gives credit to the Canadian government for more adequately funding research, allowing the best scholars from around the world, and within Canada, to choose to be at an institution in Canada, referring to this as intellectual internationalism. At this point, having described what new internationalism for research priorities looks like, he turns his attention to the dissemination of knowledge and student learning and focuses on internationalization efforts as a critical and timely policy for higher education. This is a common trajectory for Toope's remarks and is noteworthy in itself. Toope is an advocate

for internationalization for the purpose of student learning. Perhaps he is also choosing to take up student learning as a priority, given that research is in no danger of not being funded, prioritized, or recognized as an inherently beneficial and critical internationalization strategy. Or possibly he believes that student learning is the core of the university; after all, good researchers were once students, and if we develop students with the sensibilities of intercultural understanding, for example, the approach to research will eventually change. Nonetheless, his commitment to student learning, and particularly ethic of intercultural learning and global citizenship, is steadfast. Toope endeavours to educate about and advocate for the purpose of a new internationalism in order that the citizens of the world can effectively respond to the pressures and opportunities of globalization.

Toope (2008a) argues for a new internationalism on the premise that many people learn to fear others who are different from themselves. Fearing others often manifests as racism and discrimination, truly some of the most oppressive roots of conflict in the modern day. He reflects, sadly, on the real impacts that this has had on individuals, communities, and societies within Canada and around the world and argues for a better future. Toope proposes that by teaching others how to engage with those who are different, diversity will come to be understood and valued rather than feared. Universities are spaces and places that foster intercultural learning and global citizenship, and a deeper commitment to international engagement contributes positively to these outcomes.

Universities strive to be communities where problems do not result from the differences between people, but rather where problems common to all people are solved because of the diversity within these university communities. When Toope considers the problems common to all individuals, he is thinking, for example, about environmental sustainability, healthcare issues such as the AIDS epidemic, and rising cancer rates. He describes these as “enemies that, whatever their origins, know no national borders” (2008a, p. 5). He argues that higher education has an important role, as the solutions to these worldwide challenges will inevitably come from the “engines of discovery,” our universities. However, in order for answers to come from universities, research alone will not be enough; rather, institutions must be focused on internationalization and

intercultural learning that encourages an imaginary of collaboration and global citizenship across well-networked universities, globally.

Toope proposes that being an engaged student in a university community creates the opportunity to learn more about the value of diversity. To foster this kind of learning, a university community needs to reflect the world, not just the local or national community, notwithstanding that both local and national communities are diverse. Student mobility is greater than it has ever been, on a global scale, and facilitates the development of a diverse community reflecting traditions, values, and perspectives from around the world. Bringing together students from a wide and diverse set of backgrounds is essential for universities in the 21st century. “Cynics might observe that international students pay higher fees, and bring much-needed revenue to cash-strapped institutions” (2008, p. 8). However,

the pursuit of international students is linked to a recognition that, if we are to gain credibility and recognition for our teaching and research, we must become part of the network of learning that encompasses the globe. And in large part that means fostering diversity and global awareness at home, by attracting good students from abroad. (2008, pp. 8–9).

These statements position the need for the university’s teaching and research to gain credibility and recognition. I am going to suggest that this does not mean achieving a certain standing in the global ranking tables; rather, it means others knowing that the university provides an excellent learning environment and has brought together an outstanding research community that is internationally engaged in addressing significant world problems and fostering research endeavours. This kind of recognition and identity for institutions facilitates their continued engagement in the global network of universities. It is recognition as a community of action, not recognition on a list of rankings. Bringing students to the university from around the world fuels the mobility of ideas and scholarship, and steadily works at the continued development of a network that will serve the immediate needs of the university community and well beyond amongst subsequent alumni networks. A network of universities is far stronger than the position or capacity of any one university.

Building a diverse community of students, however, is not enough. There must be an intentional nature to the ways in which the university acts, educational opportunities are structured, residences and non-curricular events are facilitated, teaching happens, and decisions such as who is hired are made. If the goal is intercultural learning as a result of a diverse campus community, the university must structurally reflect this as well as make this central to teaching and learning. Students must be engaged in dialogues, both in the classroom and as they participate in club activities or residence hall conversations, in ways that enable them to bring their experiences, values, histories, and ideas as valued contributions that deepen and strengthen the dialogue and learning for all. Toope speaks to this directly in his address on equity, diversity, and intercultural understanding: “But contact with diversity does not in itself produce intercultural understanding. Tension, in and of itself, does not engender a creative response” (2012a, p. 4). Making internationalization and intercultural learning priorities is the first step to ensuring that the community of learning reflects a vast diversity of views, but, says Toope, truly moving beyond the comfort of our current curriculum and national sense of diversity calls for action and direct encounters between those who bring a diversity of life experiences. He urges universities to begin to build this capacity in students on our campuses at home. He is an active proponent of internationalization at home as a strategy to transition universities into global institutions.

Toope believes that the priorities of international education are to develop global citizenship and intercultural learning. This is not a learning outcome for universities to leave to those very few university students who choose to study abroad; rather, it should be a priority for all students and all global universities. It is more than a priority—it is a “revolution”:

When any nation excludes any segment of the population from full participation, full citizenship, full expression, it denies itself its most precious resource: the full complement of strengths, gifts, perspectives and diversity that lives within all of its people. We cannot hope to lead in the international realm unless and until we are playing with our entire team. (Toope, 2013b, p. 11)

By discussing the links between internationalism and globalization, showing how technology and communication have brought people from around the world together,

and cautioning that while virtual connections and collaborations are good, nothing replaces the physical experience of bringing people together, he sets our vision on lived experience. Toope suggests that we start at home, on our campuses, and that we provide direct experiences that matter in our students' learning and to those who are teaching and facilitating the learning. Universities need to proudly and confidently bring students from around the world to a physical campus where they can live together, work in labs, play in recreation programs, and debate in class together.

It's not enough to ramp up the percentages of foreign students. We have to mix them up, create reactions, disruptive reactions. If we are seeking to define the mission of the global university, I submit to you that this is it. (p. 14)

Internationalization as a policy in higher education is a requirement to (i) ensure that institutions develop in a way that creates an environment for and catalyzes the personal development of our students, and (ii) weave an interdependent web or network of individuals and institutions worldwide. We need to set up collaborations at the level of individuals and institutions to enable universities to continue as communities of discovery, solving the problems that face humanity and developing peaceful civilization. "The fact is that we need to internationalize if we are to achieve and maintain the standing we aspire to as research institutions" (Toope, 2008a, p. 10). It isn't clear whether by standing he means global rankings, but I would submit that he is talking about creating communities that foster excellent research in order to serve the world, and the standing he is referring to is that set by the universities themselves. Internationalization and a global network of universities encourage students and scholars to participate in study abroad, in research projects with students and faculty engaged beyond nation-state borders; this leads to a different construction of problems that are defined according to a wider set of stakeholders, and the promotion of the global citizenship ideal.

Toope presents this as a more difficult way to engage, and he challenges universities, students, faculty, and leaders to "transcend social or political barriers to offer others the benefits of our research and learning, and to learn from their work—thus making it possible for us to effect positive changes in their and our lives" (2008a, pp. 18–

19). Foundational to his proposed internationalism is this value of reciprocity. International engagement is about learning across cultures and sharing knowledge that results in mutual gains for each involved party. It is not a surface-level interaction; it is deeply transformational, and the relationships built through this process of mutual learning and collaborative research overcome the barriers and will change those engaged as well as the outcomes. Presenting internationalization as a priority that is in our own best interest as well as the best interests of others is a key principle for the actions of internationalization, as not all strategies do this. For example, Toope (2008a) also offers an opinion on setting up university campuses overseas. He cautions against doing this, naming it a new form of colonialism, urging us instead to seek more cooperative and collaborative opportunities and forums that aim to build strong, reciprocal, international relationships and to sustain them.

While Toope describes the ends of new internationalism for students and universities themselves, he also points out the influence that universities with this kind of ethic may have, over time, on governments and national policy, both politically and economically. As we consider the ways in which we can respond to neoliberalism and the economic imperatives resulting from globalization, our actions as universities will matter and influence these important partners. Beyond these meta-outcomes, the goods resulting from the development of international projects that engage scholars from around the world will deliver new solutions, new means, and new opportunities to address the international problems of today. These scholars will produce outcomes that will impact equity, sustainability, and well-being in international settings and here at home.

Internationalization as a National Economic Strength

Toope argues throughout his speeches that international engagement in a deeply interconnected and interdependent world develops better universities, better research, and better student outcomes. In a letter to the editor in the *Vancouver Sun* newspaper, Toope (2010a) expresses his opinion about the recruitment of international and national students. Addressing the musings that parents and the broader community often raise about admission patterns that disadvantage local students, he argues that international

students “bring perspectives to the classroom and to dorms that lend otherwise unattainable insights into the global community for our local students.” However, in this piece of writing, to an audience that is broad and only loosely connected, if at all, to the university, he argues that one of the positive impacts is economic. International students bring a “whole network of family, business, academic, cultural and social ties that Canada needs to succeed in the global community” and will develop relationships that later form business and diplomatic ties. Then, in a one-line paragraph, the reader is drawn to his conclusion that “these activities have tremendous benefits for the B.C. and Canadian economies.” Toope asserts that admitting international students yields a net benefit for domestic students and the university. He then returns to the idea of building a network of universities, and the role of international mobility in doing so.

In the present review of 11 speeches or other public documents, this is the only place where Toope endorses an argument that does not uphold the virtues presented elsewhere in this body of work, which urge actions that are good for our students as well as for others. I would suggest that there are excellent non-economic arguments to make for internationalization. They are more difficult, and their rationale is embedded in imaginaries other than the economic; indeed, these other arguments require a different vision for the purpose of a university. One might question, when the audience was beyond the university or university partners, why Toope ventured into a more strictly and simplistic economic argument. Although this is an easier argument that calms those who fear the growing diversity of students at Canadian institutions, and what this means for their sons and daughters, we must find a way to describe the policy, and politics, of internationalization and our interest in international students in terms other than transactional economic benefits to universities. The public needs to come to understand intercultural learning and the objectives of the university through public speech acts and to recognize the tension arising from different views of internationalization. In this example, the public sphere may have been changed as a result of seeing the practices of the university resist the attraction of a neoliberal, economic agenda for internationalization.

If our social imaginaries represent ways of creating meaning for our collective experiences, and our speech acts contribute ideas to the public sphere that reinforce

and illustrate our ways of being, the integrity of each speech act is important. The ideas and speech acts of Toope are remarkably consistent and coherent. The reason for spending some time on this example, although it may seem quite insignificant in comparison to the larger issues, is to explore the impact of competing and divergent concepts. This caused me to think about an idea put forward by Stack (2016) that illustrates the ways in which public affairs and media relations staff at the university are often called on to negotiate the space between the university's intentions and the public's understanding of those aims and resulting activities. She suggests these communication experts are "boundary workers." I suggest it is possible that public affairs had a hand in drafting Toope's 2010 letter of opinion for a local newspaper, and as Stack (2016) has reminded us, they felt compelled, at times, to find an approach that would work for an antagonistic audience. Although I feel compassion for those given the unenviable task of creating messages for a broad, diverse, and largely unengaged audience, I believe that even in these situations, we must deal with the competing demands of each imaginary and strive to base our approach in values. The imaginaries compete, even coexist, and at the very least we should always work to bring this reality to the surface in the public sphere. I have referenced many speech acts wherein Toope has masterfully presented the vision of the collaborative imaginary in relation to the tension caused from the other imaginaries. The opportunity to have the collaborative imaginary possess meaning and relevance outside the institution is critical to the politics of internationalization.

Cautioned for Global Rankings and Neoliberalism

There are many moments throughout Toope's writing where one senses that one of the greatest risks for universities is that they may become enamoured with what and who they are—quite simply, that they (or we) will think they (we) are good. As I read these ideas, I wondered about the impact of rankings on this sensibility. In 2010, Toope directly addressed university arrogance and called out institutions who have fared well in the global rankings:

Hubris may be the greatest flaw of universities, especially big ones with strong reputations. We need to recognize that our own brilliant hiring and

attraction of “top” students cannot of itself create a critical mass of talent sufficient to solve fundamental global problems. We must find partners. We must collaborate, not only with other universities but with community groups, civil society organizations, industry, and government. (2010b, p. 3)

Universities, he intimates, must let go of the imaginaries created by status and competition, or by economic policy models. He goes on to state this directly in a section titled “Chasing Ephemera.” The words “ephemera” and “hubris,” both ancient Greek terms, eloquently and exactly describe the condition; at the same time, these word choices convey a sense that these are sentiments of a time past, which contrast with the ranking and status imaginary still very much alive today. In this discussion, Toope is critical of the impact of global rankings and neoliberal policies and steers us back to the core mission of universities. He questions whether we are chasing global rankings, which offer universities and students nothing of lasting significance.

Rather than focusing intently on what needs to be improved in the world, university leadership can become preoccupied with superficial measures of reputation: university rankings; collecting prestigious partners; satisfying consumerist understandings of what student learning is all about. Universities can also find themselves responding to the immediate rather than the important. (2010b, p. 3)

I would suggest that universities cannot be good on their own. As a result of deep collaboration with partners that have been definitive in the development of universities, such as local communities, governments, international bodies, and other universities, each individual university will improve its capacity for student learning and research. Both learning and research transcend local and national boundaries, so further collaboration beyond the traditional boundaries of local communities and nation-states will serve to strengthen universities at a time of globalized interactions. The primary barrier may be the historical organization of universities within provincial or federal governments and the interest that governments have in continuing in this way in the emerging knowledge economy.

Internationalization is Experience

In developing a network of universities and a more dominant imperative for collaboration between universities, one might ask what kind of activity we should focus on. Toope offers some suggestions on this point as well, encouraging members of the university community to engage in dialogue about tough issues, about differences, to challenge the status quo and in so doing, to generate a strong social fabric that supports students' learning and the development of more just societies.

In a 2012 speech opening a colloquium, he calls on the inspiration of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., asking the community to dig deep into the areas of dialogue: "We who engage in nonviolent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive" (2012a, p. 1). He goes on to play with the idea of tension and to describe how UBC and each individual at UBC needs to stretch between who we are today and who we want to become. He suggests that great invention and creativity can come as a result of engaging in the tensions within and between ideas: "All of UBC, stretched between our present state and the commitment we made, the *promise* we made to our stakeholders and to the community we serve, to become an institution of intercultural understanding and fluency" (p. 1). Toope suggests, in this speech as in others, that direct experience is the key and that "intercultural experiences must be intentionally and structurally embedded in both the academics and the operations of the University" (p. 5).

In an address to the Association of Commonwealth Universities, he provocatively accuses universities of changing to please the world, describing the very long list of change drivers and the interests of a growing community of stakeholders, and concludes it is "enormously complicated!" (Toope, 2013a, p. 5). Then, he moves to a sense of calm, suggesting that our root mission is clear and remains unchanged. The only change we need to make is to facilitate, promote, and engage direct experiences for students and scholars. We need to create a sense of ease that invites students and scholars to cross borders, collaborate internationally, relate what they study to the world around them. In this moment, he also ventures into the area of intercultural understanding, suggesting that "universities too often shy away from the social realities of deep diversity" and

proposing that universities “are afraid of the no-man’s land of contested values” (p. 8). Instead, they should be shaping the experiences of students and scholars in a way that ensures they open up far beyond the perspectives of Canadians, and value the understanding that arises from new contexts and difference. This is not an easy journey for students and scholars, and it is one that has yet to be facilitated by universities themselves: “I will say that universities’ failure so far to fully democratize access to direct experience—whether it be information or intercultural encounters—is based in fear. Our fear—of losing control. Of being irrevocably and detrimentally altered” (p. 9).

Simply put, this sounds like fear of the unknown, of how we will be changed through the process of contesting values and engaging directly with each other. Toope goes on to suggest that the barrier is the institution itself, not the students and scholars. “It’s what attracts our students, our staff, our faculty: the *direct experience* of putting our unique gifts into service to the world” (p. 10). The value of focusing on direct experience is that each university will pull on its strengths—those of its students and scholars. Universities are actors with community members, internationally, for the purposes of innovation, of increasing access to course content and of digitizing content. The transformation for universities is not a change in what they do, but rather in how they do it.

In 2010, Toope offered a number of strategies for resolving the ethical–organizational dilemma arising from an organizational way of being that had served universities in past times, and he cited the need to respond to the challenge to improve the world—the simplest mission of a university in contemporary times. Research is a given, but it is interesting to note that Toope believes research is “inevitable” and not enough. He is calling for participation and action by the institution, institutional culture, students, and alumni. He is suggesting that we need to practice the habits of what we claim to believe, and that by our doing so, these habits will come to define our students and alumni; through their interactions in the world, they will be able to address problems or perhaps work in ways that actually prevent further complications and problems resulting from practices that are not sustainable for the people or the planet. The five strategies below set a new organizational dynamic for the contemporary university’s role in society—a role that is no different than it has always been, except that how we enact

this role requires new practices, behaviours, organizational changes, and actions. These include (Toope, 2010b, pp. 4–5):

1. “Build from the bottom up”: Facilitate research teams and teams of student scholars to work across national borders. Allowing our students to build networks and practice ways of working on dedicated projects across borders will ensure that the university changes to support this kind of learning and that our graduates have different skills.
2. “Challenge national myopia”: Look beyond the global north, challenge national funding schemes for research, support the migration of students and scholars. This is the strategy that addresses any neoliberal ideology and suggests, rather than a model of competition, a model for those who can truly value international engagement, believing that different nations have different contributions to make, and that in the end this will improve all nations.
3. “Communicate authentically about strengths”: Know where your strengths are as a university, and partner with others to address key world problems. This particular strategy addresses the ills of global rankings, opposes the currency of individual institutions, and shifts us to thinking about networking and partnerships to facilitate collaborations.
4. “Help our students and alumni become global citizens. In focusing, as we almost inevitably do, on research as a means of addressing global problems, we should never forget that our most important ‘translators’ are our graduates.”
5. “Walk the talk”: Toope urges us to do more than simply research and then disseminate our findings. We must act on our campuses, in the community, and in the world. For example, rather than just talking about sustainability, universities need to become leaders in how we manage our own greenhouse gases, set human resources practices, and model intercultural dialogue. We need to act with the ethic of a global citizen and live our research findings, modelling a state of being that supports the development of a better world.

These organizational shifts offer some direction to universities that are stuck in a historical organizational model, unable to meet their contemporary mission and therefore falling short of the promise of internationalization. The actions institutions take must be grounded in a vision; I am arguing that the social imaginary from which leaders act is a significant contributor to the vision of their organizations.

Conclusion: Creating a Collaborative and Networked Imaginary for Universities

Three dominant landscapes in which internationalization is trapped in Canada include the worldwide forces of globalization, the neoliberal policy framework, and the iron cage of global rankings. All of these bolster a set of responses that erect internationalization as a strategic priority for universities and yet undermine the institutions' real potential and have detrimental impacts on individuals and societies. These forces push internationalization into a strictly economic mode. We must break free of the association between internationalization and economic frameworks. Given that we are still in the early years of such dynamics, we have yet to even begin to understand the impact of these outcomes once they are replicated over time and across all institutions. It is imperative that institutions respond to the opportunity to focus on internationalization at universities as the opportunity for a social imaginary of collaboration. To unseat these powerful and compelling forces of neoliberal thought, status, and power resulting from the role of university global rankings, and the ever-increasing dialogue of globalization as an opportunity for individual economic gain and national economic domination, universities must collectively and collaboratively engage differently.

This will take a commitment from many universities. While it is inspiring to see that the kind of ideas that are required to lay the foundation for this sort of change are being talked about, we have yet to see either national education policies or institutional policies change to the extent that this becomes a recognized way of being for universities.

Much of the communication arising from universities, government policies, and global ranking engines creates a proliferation of (i) marketing ideas about higher education as a private good, (ii) educational outcomes resulting from the gains of attending specific institutions, rather than as the products of what students do at the institutions they attend, and (iii) the university's role in economic sustainability in the era of the knowledge economy. This kind of communication creates a suffocating environment in which to gain ground, let alone accelerate a different way of thinking. It is

a competitive model, and there is a tone of urgency surrounding the thinking, thereby creating a sense of fear in those who would like to pause and consider a different way of moving forward. Universities are developing campuses in other countries in order to expand their role in the global world. They are focused on attracting more and more international students in order to address real budget pressures, and they continue to strategize about how to engage internationally in ways that contribute to bettering their position internationally. Thoughtful and courageous leadership is needed to address the changes required to build a more collaborative approach that generates the kind of learning environment that supports the development of global citizenship and intercultural learning for all students attending university. Such an environment can result from dialogues between those who fundamentally disagree with each other, those who bring different backgrounds and values to the community, and those who want to explore the world's shared problems.

Foundational to Toope's proposed internationalism is this value: that the engagement is about learning across cultures and sharing knowledge that results in mutual gains for each party that is engaged. These ideas can radically change our practices, and indeed our institutions.

Courage, commitment and principled action is required to bring about a change in the social imaginaries for universities. The impact will be felt in the form of decisions made, actions taken, and perspectives developed as a result of this new imaginary, and the outcomes will be cumulative over time. However, this will "mean a more difficult voyage" (Toope, 2008a, p. 18).

This chapter has focused on one example of how internationalization is understood, and the views put forward by a university leader into the public sphere for invested parties to debate and deliberate on. How has this position been understood by the university? In the next chapter, I will look at the ways in which UBC's Senate and student leaders have engaged in the discussion of internationalization. I want to investigate how internationalization is being understood, acted upon, and debated by two of the key leadership bodies that can influence the direction of the institution.

Chapter 8.

Exploring the Imaginary: Speech Acts at a Public Research Institution

In the present chapter, I will address these questions: How does leadership impact the process of internationalization? What are the practices that contribute to an ethical implementation of internationalization? What indication is there that universities can move from the social imaginary of status and competition, or the economic social imaginary, into a collaborative and networked space benefitting universities and students worldwide? What would this mean at Canadian institutions? After reviewing the publicly available documentation that plays a role in the historical, institutional memory of internationalization as well as in current practices, I have selected three specific examples of documentation for analysis. First, I will look to the institutional international strategy as a counterpoint to the federal strategy discussed in Chapter Five, with particular attention to the ways in which internationalization is conceptualized for the institution and the evidence for the kind of imaginary that is grounding the thinking and actions of the administration and institution. Second, I will look at documentation arising from the consultation period to increase international student tuition. As a matter of Board of Governors policy, any increase in international student tuition must first go through a student consultation process before the administration seeks approval from the Board; I will analyze the documents that were produced by the level of student government with whom this consultation occurred, as well as some student journalism around this event, and unpack the words of students, thereby opening up the opportunity to see what matters to students and how they understand internationalization. Third, I will look into the minutes of UBC Senate meetings and ascertain the kind of Senate discussions that have occurred over the last 20 years. This case study of one institution's communications and high-level actions will contribute to our understanding

of internationalization and initiate a conversation about possible directions for an ethical imaginary for internationalization and the resultant practices.

Academic governance is vested in a university's Senate according to the University Act of British Columbia, and all other matters are the purview of the Board of Governors. Both of these complementary forums include elected student representatives as well as faculty. One of the primary places of dialogue between the administration and student government at UBC has been created as a result of a Board of Governors' resolution that requires consultation. In reviewing the kind of leadership dialogue that is happening at this institution, it is important to note that internationalization is both an academic and a non-academic matter.

Institutional International Strategy

Most universities have a strategic plan that sets out the institution's aspirations, celebrates its values, and points to a specific number of priorities to be achieved over a certain period of time. In this case, one of the top priorities is internationalization, and UBC published an international strategy as the contextual action plan for that priority. A review of this plan may offer insight into how internationalization has been conceptualized and acted upon over the last five years. This international strategy was published in 2011 and updated as opportunities and new directions arose. As of January 2016, a process has been underway to renew the strategy.

One of the international strategy's central statements is directly presented in the plan's introduction and reinforced throughout the plan, framing the concept of internationalization for the university. It is that every activity is international in nature, and all members of the university community should see themselves as engaged in internationalization. This represents a paradigm shift for internationalization operations. No longer is one office responsible for international students or international activities. While particular offices may offer specific support and resources, internationalization is being portrayed as part of everyone's work at the institution. This implies that it is inseparable from, for example, teaching, research, community engagement, alumni and development, student services and residence life. Such a conceptualization of

internationalization challenges past practices, wherein it was operationalized as a more discrete function, and honours the ways in which activities are interconnected at the institution. Understanding that activities are related to each other, I would argue, is the beginning of an ethical practice. It prevents the organization, or leaders within the organization, from making disconnected decisions that may be opportunistic, and it creates the conditions for truly transforming the institution—decision by decision or action by action—into a more intentionally international and inter-culturally aware university. This is also an invitation to the community to participate in the process of internationalization. Everyone has a role to play, and this kind of explicit encouragement is the only way to ensure that there is not a specific unit hired to carry out the international agenda; rather, every individual is encouraged to consider the ways in which they hire, act, teach, program or respond with international and intercultural considerations. This also can lead to a different kind of ethos within the organization, as everyone is asked to begin to see internationalization as part of their role. Internationalization is then a more systemic change and one that is increasingly sustainable as everyone becomes involved. This is the beginning of a more networked and collaborative institution.

The international strategy also seems to play a role in revealing the administration's thinking about internationalization and in communicating this to the university community, thereby alleviating any misunderstanding and providing greater clarity on the intent. At a large, research-based institution with many individual actors, this seems like an important act of leadership—stating the overall direction and rationale for internationalization while allowing everyone to continue with their projects and approaches and “to unite their purpose with the larger goals of the University” (UBC, 2011, p. 2). No longer is it questionable how internationalization is understood or what kinds of practices would be of greater benefit to the institution's core mission.

Strategic planning at a university is certainly a contested practice. One might argue that it runs counter to collegial governance and is a management practice that is contributing to, or at the very least indicative of, increasing corporatization of the academic institution. In recognizing that this administrative practice can give way to a fractured dialogue within the organization, where the administration can be moving along

on one pathway without the deep involvement and engagement of faculty and students, I think it is important to address the purpose of the strategic plan for internationalization. This document succinctly says that planning allows choices to be made, and it reassures that there will be no limits on the institution's approach to internationalization. In other words, faculty can continue to work on internationalization in ways that support their goals, their research, or their teaching; however, the international strategy will be instrumental in setting up the conditions for continued international engagement across the institution.

Fulfillment of the plan will improve the flow and availability of information about UBC's international engagement and help people to form effective links. As with the Place and Promise plan, the international strategic plan is a way for UBC to articulate its values. To this end, one of the goals of the first year of this is to integrate a statement of ethics into partnership protocols. (UBC, 2011, p. 4)

Creating a plan to help others achieve their goals with ease and fluidity while holding all of the institution to a standard of ethics that has been communicated to the community is a powerful set of practices to bolster networks and collaboration. It appears that internationalization, cast this way through the strategic plan, is about the continued development of the institution in a globalized world for the good of the university's mission.

Later in the plan is the expression of a deep commitment that models the kind of human interactions constituting intercultural learning for both students and educators. This reinforces the notion that internationalization is the work of everyone at the institution:

UBC can help students to connect to other cultures and languages simply by offering a supportive environment in which to meet, study, live and learn with people from other places. This is the work of educators both in and out of the classroom who engage students in meaningful dialogue, and support the development of robust peer networks. (UBC, 2011, p. 10)

Not unlike the speech acts analyzed in the last chapter, the focus is on human interaction, and the basis for this is a diverse community of scholars.

I have often wondered whether internationalization is redundant when it comes to large public research institutions also engaged in teaching and learning. However, UBC's strategic plan responds to this question, clarifying the value and centrality of internationalization:

International engagement is essential to any university in the twenty-first century. For a major, research-intensive university such as UBC, international engagement is both a measure of, and means to, success. But international engagement must go further than that. It must demonstrate an ethics and a politics that reflect the core values of the university. (p. 27)

Not only is internationalization not superfluous, but it must become an overriding focus for the university community. The plan also communicates the role of universities within society, declaring that “a university is uniquely placed to build connections that states may find politically unpalatable” (p. 27)—again reinforcing the autonomous and ethical role internationalized universities play in the development of a more just world.

The plan becomes more concrete and, while not prescriptive in tone, it offers a standard for accountability. “Our commitment to sharing knowledge means that UBC is inherently committed to capacity building and public interest around the globe” (p. 27). This direction sets the institution's limits well outside national borders and instead places UBC firmly in the environment of the world, caring about capacity building and public interest regardless of citizenship or location. The plan is also specific when it comes to development work, stating that this is “complex and carries with it the imprint of inequality” (p. 27). It directly expresses the desire for university actions not to be self-interested, saying that “our international engagement cannot always be about us” (p. 27). This is important when we juxtapose this plan against the international education strategy of the federal government at the time, whose specific call to action was to engage in internationalization so that we could build a stronger nation. Here, the institution is unapologetic in its dual commitment to “be a global citizen and to educate global citizens” and “to make a contribution in the world without falling into the traps of hubris and self importance” (p. 27).

This plan offers a dramatic counterpoint to Canada's current international strategy. The strategies need not be similar, as the role of the government is very different from the role of a university. However, I see a remarkable difference in the tone, ethic and aspirations. UBC's strategy is focused on the development of global citizens, based on an understanding of the deep interconnections between people and countries across the globe and on an ethical engagement that is networked and collaborative, whereas the federal strategy is focused on this nation, economics and competition. The underlying principles and values could not be more different—hence the obvious need for institutions to communicate their own international strategies. UBC's strategy provides statements of principles and values that illustrate internationalization as a practice committed to equity, learning and collaboration. These documents reflect different social imaginaries.

Student Leadership

Internationalization is a lived experience. Given the primary mandates of teaching, research, and community engagement, it is incumbent upon us to consider the voices of students and seek out the experience of their lifeworld. How are their voices different? Do they express theoretically informed concepts? What matters most to students when we consider the internationalization of the institution?

At UBC, the Board of Governors has resolved to engage students in consultation prior to approving a tuition increase. This is not specific to international tuition, but it provides a valuable forum wherein both students and the administration are deeply vested in the process and the outcome. The stakes are high for the institution—and for students when it comes to considering significant tuition increases. The Board of Governors approved the following resolution in June 2015, thereby setting the parameters for potential increases:

[T]he Board of Governors requests that the Administration set international student tuition fees at levels that reflect UBC's standing as a global university and the value of a UBC degree. While ensuring that the University maintains healthy enrolment of international students and attracts and retains a diverse range of students, the fees should support

the mission and excellence of the University and should be comparable to those at peer institutions. (UBC, 2015, p. 14)

A review of the submissions from the student government to the Board reveals key aspects of the dialogue between the student leadership and the administration. These kinds of forums are crucial for a university's administration to reflect upon in terms of the lifeworld of students. They become not only our history but our future, as they are places where our current social imaginary is profiled, contested, and further developed. The actors in these bodies are invested, committed students who, for the most part, are working toward the development of the institution and exploring the possibilities for student life and learning. This section is not focused on the increase or on the consultations themselves but rather on what ideas, values, and statements are expressed through this process and thereby reveal more of the lived experiences of internationalization from students' perspectives.

Student journalists also put forward an important set of values and ideas. *The Ubyyssey* reported in 2014 that a change to a Senate policy enabled the cap on the admission of international students to be lifted. The article mused about the connection between admitting more students and the potential economic impact for the institutional budget, but it also confidently pointed to the goals of global citizenship and internationalization within the strategic plan. Here the strategic plan played an important role in conveying a decision and an aspiration agreed upon long ago. Without such a plan, the institution would be open to a critique that this change in admissions was due either to a current fascination with the institution or strictly to economic gain. Identifying the values and principles in a document that is recognized by students and student journalists is a way of them holding the institution accountable for its plans; this is a role they play as invested collegians in the governance of the institution. The article also described the lead administrator as both an executive member and a faculty member, and it chose to assert the strength of the decision through a quote that put her in the classroom as a teacher rather than as an administrator of the institution: "I have seen in the classroom that having international students in the Faculty of Arts, and having them bring their perspectives into debates, is beneficial for all students" (Joseph, 2014). Having her reflect on her position as a professor brought credibility to her as a leader of

this process, both for students and for the greater university community. Maintaining one's identity as an academic is paramount as faculty increasingly take on administrative leadership roles; it is one way in which the systemworld is kept in check through the governance of a university. In this case, internationalization was reflected on as a core process for faculty as educators.

Just 18 months later, when the university announced a tuition increase for international students, the student newspaper characterized internationalization as a process that had changed from "benevolence to the free market" (Sharlandjjeva, 2015). Considering the original intentions of internationalization and the growth of neoliberalism, this phrase can be interpreted as a warning to the community about the direction in which international student recruitment may be headed. Interestingly, the discussion in this article moved toward diversity, a theme that the student government later picked up on with regard to their feedback during tuition consultation. The idea of socioeconomic diversity first arose in this article, and the students began to socialize this idea through the university community. The article argued that raising fees would negatively impact the diversity of international students and the education of all students, as diversity is a key contributor to educational communities and enhances pedagogical approaches. The students quoted in this article believed that "raising tuition more can only limit the educational experience" because only the most privileged will be able to attend, making institutions less accessible. One quoted individual believed that "you learn more from the people than you learn from your books," that limiting diversity narrows the field of individuals from whom to learn, and that at the extreme, "you won't learn anything because you just see yourself." The student journalism team was quick to point out that this is true for formal educational outcomes and for the learning that happens outside classes. In this situation, the students conceptualized internationalization as a process that supports student learning, and they reflected on the value brought to the learning environment by a diversity of students. While the institution did not disagree, the students challenged administrators to consider the impact of rising tuition on their ability to recruit socioeconomically diverse students. The students called for an evidence-based discussion and challenged the institution to collect data so that the socioeconomic diversity of students could be measured. Finally, the student journalist made the point that the argument for increasing fees in order to keep up with peer institutions was not

substantive, and that students deserved to understand the true reason for the increase, suggesting that investing in student financial aid or additional student services, or perhaps even closing the gap on government funding, were all tenable arguments.

The article concluded with a call to action on four specific points:

- UBC should cap international tuition no higher than cost-recovery levels.

- UBC should adopt a policy stating that international student enrollment should be made on academic grounds.

- UBC should immediately begin studying the economic background of enrolled international students and make a summary of that information public.

- Before any international tuition increases are implemented, UBC should publicly provide a forecast of the impact international tuition hikes will have on student diversity. (Sharlandjieva, 2015, citing Arno Rosenfeld)

While these kinds of demands create pressure, and it may be easy to disregard some of the arguments, the students have created a dialogue that is based on the pedagogical value of diversity and are calling for international student enrolment and tuition to be grounded in academic values rather than economic need. The students are upholding a principled debate on access and diversity instead of being divided based on their status as domestic or international. In this institution, the merits of internationalization are deeply educational and are oriented in a community rather than an individualistic framework. A theoretically informed critique of internationalization results from listening to students' lived experiences.

The tuition fee consultation documents formed the basis of Sharlandjieva's article, so the emergent themes were consistent. The student government believed that the administration's proposal failed to meet the expectations set by the Board, and it raised four specific concerns in relation to the four particular aspects of the Board's resolution: (i) with regard to excellence, the student government noted that "excellence" had not been defined, problematized the institution's emphasis on the THE rankings,

and asserted that no research suggests higher tuition correlates with increased rankings; (ii) the student government did not believe there had been adequate assessment of peer institutions and found the methodology to be flawed; (iii) on the point of diversity, they cited the lack of definition, they found socioeconomic diversity was untracked and not a factor of consideration for the administration, and they referenced a study from the United States that demonstrated a correlation between increased tuition fees and decreased diversity on campus; and (iv) they argued that recruitment and retention might be negatively affected by the proposed tuition increase because of the impact on diversity, and they therefore advocated for increased financial aid. In the submission, the student government argued for “tuition benchmarks that reflect a clear commitment to diversity, recruitment, and retention”; “international awards to promote socioeconomic diversity”; “baseline measurement of socioeconomic diversity at UBC and clear strategy to maintain and improved said diversity moving forwards”; and “an official definition of university excellence, produced through rigorous consultation with the UBC community at large” (AMS, 2015).

Through the institutionally set board consultation on tuition fees as well as through independent student journalism, students trumpeting the value of diversity is a remarkably strong moral and educational position for the institution. In moments such as this, it is incumbent upon institutions to respond with transparency of data and other information, education, responses to arguments arising from student dialogue, and a commitment to work toward shared priorities even when responsibilities are different. Ultimately, in this case, the student government’s response to the consultation for an increase in international student tuition rests in a rejection of the social imaginaries of rankings and economics and argues for a vision of internationalization that is more open, democratic, collaborative, and equitable.

Academic Collegial Governance

A quintessential quality of a university is collegial governance. Few organizations have the capacity to benefit from a set of experts, grounded in specific disciplines, who work as thinkers, researchers, and teachers both on campus and around the world. It is faculty who form the foundation for a model of collegial governance at universities. When

a diverse group of faculty can coalesce around a set of strategies, come to own them, and eventually steward continued action toward these goals, then an institution has the chance to become more than the sum of its parts. Each individual action resonates with a larger set of ideas that are understood as “the institution.” This is one aspect of collegial governance that can enhance internationalization. While there are departmental venues for dialogues about internationalization, the one space and place for all disciplines with the authority to impact the direction, and ultimate success, of specific academic strategies is the university Senate. For this reason, as well as the role of faculty in defining the direction of the institution, it is important to reflect on the workings of Senate when investigating UBC’s understandings of internationalization.

Senate offers the opportunity for debate and dialogue—and, inevitably, a future direction arises as a result of such dialogue. Within a university, faculty speak with the knowledge of their disciplines, and this is also an asset in developing broader priorities across the institution. After all, the internationalization of a university should be for the sole purpose of furthering the teaching, learning, research, and community engagement of the institution. The university is organized with a central academic governance body, and I will argue that deeply engaging this body of faculty and students in the discussion of internationalization is central to engaging the entire institution in the resulting opportunities and changes. Done well, internationalization results from a consideration of many, if not all, of the primary concerns and decisions of Senate, including admissions, awards, tributes, teaching, learning, libraries, curricula, and academic policy. By regarding internationalization as part of each aspect of the functioning of the academic institution, we can reveal priorities and biases, and we can seek to redirect the institution from serving the province and nation to reflecting an ethical commitment to the students of the world. I would argue that a university deeply committed to international education cannot function solely as it did when it focused on national priorities, students, and identity. Whether or not international students ought to be recruited to participate in a Canadian institution or an international institution is a larger question—but regardless of how one answers this question, there must be consideration of how international students will engage in the university experience. As an institution, we need to demonstrate our consideration of international students and internationalization if these are to be embraced by the institution’s primary actors: students and faculty.

When I conducted an online search of Senate minutes since September 1991, I found the earliest mention of internationalization to be in May 1993. The discussion was about the budget review process for the university, the reference was to the internationalization of markets and the beginning of globalization, and the speaker concluded that countries and provinces no longer had the funds to support public services even though the demand for such services—education, for example—continued to grow. The discussion, while not directly related to the internationalization of higher education, foreshadowed the connection between internationalization and economic implications. The speaker concluded that governments lacked the funding to support public services and that the university would need to consider a number of strategies to improve the future budget picture.

The next mention of internationalization came more than four years later, when Senate was informed by the Provost about a discussion with the provincial Minister of Education. The minister reported that the institution “has a reputation for putting research, internationalization, and buildings ahead of concerns of its undergraduate students.” While the Provost found the comment to be unwarranted, it reminds us that vested parties, such as government, do not always see the relationship between internationalization and undergraduate students. At the time, internationalization was viewed as a means to build a network of partners that would improve the institution’s capacity for research and prestige.

Senate discussions on the subject somewhat intensified after this, with three discussions in 1999. These focused on internationalization of the curriculum through studies abroad, and they also included the first mention of full fee-paying international students as well as the beginning of a strategic plan for the university wherein internationalization would be viewed as one of the institution’s top five priorities. This makes the intentional approach to internationalization a relatively new phenomenon at UBC.

There are 16 other mentions up to 2016, which does not seem like very many given the scope of Senate’s work and UBC’s increasing focus on internationalization. Some of the more recent comments have pointed to the opportunity for more thoughtful

engagement and dialogue around how the institution conceptualizes internationalization. For example, at one point, a senator asked how Senate could be more engaged in specific international processes that enhanced student learning. One of the most poignant discussions about internationalization was captured in 2009 as a result of a paper written by the then president Stephen Toope, on international engagement and global influence. UBC at this time became more focused upon and committed to understanding internationalization. The president suggested the following:

International engagement is a good idea in itself for it reveals new worlds to students, staff, faculty, and alumni(ae); it is likely to enrich lives and open spirits. Only through increased international engagement will UBC be able to occupy a position at the centre of global dialogue around the issues that matter most to our world. For a major public, research-intensive university such as UBC, international engagement is a fundamental part of what many of us need and want to do; it is not a side-of-the-desk consideration. (UBC, 2009, p. 28–29)

On this particular evening, the discussion in Senate was rich and principled. International engagement was defined as activities that happen on the campus as well as out there in the wider world, and senators were pushed to imagine how students explore perspectives that transcend their own experience. Senators were reassured that the university would continue to build on their existing international relationships and reinforce the university network from the bottom up. More broadly, a range of university activities were discussed, and the president described the quality of international engagement. At one pivotal point in a discussion about internationalization, a senator suggested that international student enrolment should be limited so that governmental funding would not be impacted. The president responded by cautioning the individual about starting a discussion of internationalization that revolved around finances, and he suggested that internationalization was about bringing the best people from around the world to enrich the experience of others and the scholarly work engaged in at the institution. This discussion resulted in a commitment that internationalization would be central to UBC's strategic plan.

Conclusion: Evidence of a Networked Social Imaginary

UBC has a laudable reputation for internationalization, and one might assume that this is a result of the commitment to international students, internationally recognized research collaborations, and the current international strategy that began 10 years ago. However, I would argue that while these factors are all likely contributors, the real strength has resulted from the development of a social imaginary that values networks, collaboration, and global citizenship education and that resists the language of neoliberalism and economic advantages. Ultimately, UBC is talking about internationalization as a process that results in a different kind of university—one that is deeply connected to the world and at the same time intent on creating a learning and research environment yielding internal good for students and faculty. It has been imperative for the institution to act with a sense of values and purpose in a globalized and international context.

A specific plan or internationalization strategy may not deliver on the kind of commitments that an institution leading in internationalization must make. The agenda is now squarely focused on the manner in which teaching, research, and student life happen and on fostering interactions that reinforce the commitment to be internationally engaged. The tone and aspirations and the conceptual development of internationalization in the first strategic plan are thoughtful and based on values that serve a greater good. The discussions and decisions made by Senate, the highest governing academic body of the institution, should reflect the commitment to internationalization. Internationalization is an academic matter and influences all aspects of the institution. It is incumbent upon senators to explore the meaning of this intention and change the institutional approach so as to ethically support internationalization and the success of international students.

My investigation of Senate minutes has not exposed the dialogue that happened in various Senate committees; however, it has revealed the publicly available notes of this decision-making body and the opportunity for further and more substantial dialogue on the ways in which academic decisions should consider and reflect commitments to internationalization and intercultural learning. The dialogues in Senate impact the social imaginary, as Taylor would remind us; further, the written materials become assets

within the public sphere that create a perception of reality. Without actively and intentionally raising the discussion about internationalization through the primary academic matters of the institution, we risk having the discussion weighted toward the economic sphere rather than the cultural imperatives of internationalization. These issues require leadership and debate and education.

In triangulating the strategy, the discussion with Senate, and the activity at the Board of Governors level, there is a disconnect about priorities. Having the strategy socialized beyond the tuition fee increases is critical for the community to understand the priorities, become committed actors, and continue to develop how the institution can take on internationalization that contributes to a teaching and learning environment reflecting a commitment to internationalization. However, too much attention is paid to the issue of economics and tuition—or perhaps not enough is paid to the fuller and more powerful dialogue of internationalization.

Internationalization requires everyone to be engaged. It also requires a thoughtful discussion about how teaching and learning are changing or can change as a result of the shifts within higher education and the process and outcomes of globalization. Internationalization is far more complex than partnership agreements and international visits. It includes a character and an ethic that require time and investment, in order to support a more cohesive dialogue for the institution. It is the value of an academic community. It is something that can be achieved by an academic community and perhaps only by an academic community. Ensuring that the overall aspirations and choices that are made by an institution are understood and are reflective of the voices of students and faculty is critical.

I have wondered whether it is actually redundant to consider internationalization when we talk about higher education. After all, as a result of the globalized world in which we live, the informal and formal programs of student-life activities, the student and faculty communities of peers, and many of the disciplines are now international or set within an international context, and the daily connections that students and faculty have with academic material and each other remind them or are inherently reminders of the globalized world. However, I think the role of internationalization is to initiate this intentional work, otherwise we may not see a coherent shift in university programs,

systems, beliefs, and ways of being that have developed over centuries within the context of national and local priorities.

The institution works within a set of highly defined roles and histories. Practically speaking, changing the dialogues within the Board and Senate is difficult and slow. Yet it is imperative that they change. The practices of teaching and learning, setting fees, and supporting teaching, learning, and internationalization priorities are all informed by a larger commitment to internationalization that involves all university activities. Internationalization should be an aspect of all Board and Senate discussions.

Students have designated seats in the Senate and Board. The students in these roles often organize to ensure that they are connected to other student forums and represent the voice of students beyond their own perspectives. At times, I have witnessed tremendous organization within the student caucus, bringing greater strength to their voices. They are often disoriented at the beginning of the term, and it takes both time and experience for them to gain momentum and comfort in acting in these kind of institutional forums. Perhaps universities can do more to welcome and support student members of the Board and Senate so that they can come into their own as quickly as possible, as that is likely best for them as individuals and for the governing bodies. An orientation and background to both the forum and the issues may support them and possibly even lighten their load; after all, they are students at the same time as they take on these institutional roles.

A genuine commitment to ethical engagement and learning, from faculty and students, about their experience of internationalization will facilitate a collective shaping of the vision for internationalization. This is the essential requirement of a new internationalization imaginary, one that is shaped from the wide participation of everyone at the university and is inseparable from the core mission of teaching, research, and community engagement. Martinson (2012) has argued that the dominant imaginaries currently limit higher education. While the pull toward rankings and prestige remains, there is tremendous hope for a more egalitarian engagement in internationalization, if UBC is reflective of some of the leading institutions. The aspirations at this institution are clearly written in its international strategy and facilitate the involvement of everyone from a common understanding. The leadership communities, including students, need to be deeply engaged, as do all members of the community. This is not a communications

exercise. Stack (2016) has shown us the limits of such approaches and the detrimental impact of allowing core, principled discussions to be led by communication leadership. This is about *university* leadership, *teaching and learning* leadership, *student-life* leadership, and *research* leadership. It is about articulating the ways in which internationalization is a shared ethic, priority, and quality of the institution. Ultimately, a new social imaginary of internationalization can emerge, understood as ethical engagement that improves the quality and relevance of teaching, learning, research, and community engagement as a result of the complexities of intercultural understanding. Our concerns are tied to the concerns of others. Our numerous challenges are interconnected with the rest of the world, and the solutions will result from interdependence. This is at the heart of intercultural understanding and one of the primary reasons that universities will continue to exist. "Education," Nussbaum (1996) insisted, "has a major role to play in enabling us to become such citizens, by learning more about ourselves and by developing problem-solving skills that require international cooperation" (cited in Rizvi, 2008). My claim is that internationalization in higher education can deliver on global citizenship and resist the forces resulting from the focus on higher education as an economic market or field of status and competition.

Chapter 9.

A Call to Action for Universities Engaged in Internationalization: Changing the Imaginary to Fit Educational Purposes

“University” is derived from the Latin phrase *universitas magistrorum et scholarium*, which roughly translates as “a community of teachers and scholars,” and meaningful engagement with society has always been and remains vital in the life of the university. The result of this engagement is the development of the public good and public goods. The focus in this study has been on the internationalization of universities and what this means for the *community of teachers and scholars*, with each faculty member and student being regarded as both teacher and scholar. Universities teach our communities, those within the gates of the university and those beyond the gates to whom we are deeply connected—locally, nationally, and internationally. It is core to the existence of universities to be engaged as a community in the fullness of learning and at this time in our history to contemplate, again, the meaning and practice of internationalization. New ways of conceptualizing internationalization are required so that the public good and public goods of the university are interconnected and interrelated with society. The function of the university in society is sustained through this important dialogue, which continues to impact the contemporary university and its role in society. This special relationship has existed for a very long time. Distorting it through, for example, neoliberal thinking, would eradicate the social critique. The social critique keeps the university in balance—there is a place for each voice.

I have described the context of change facing higher education resulting from the changes in the internationalization of higher education, the world-wide experience of globalization, as well as the practices of neoliberalism and global rankings. This has included analyzing the words of one UBC President, the minutes of the governing

academic council as well as student leaders and student journalists to identify the narratives that mattered and interpretations of the values and principles of internationalization. I looked at the specific strategy documents and policies of governments and UBC, and found varying interpretations of the meaning and outcomes resulting from a commitment to internationalization. As MacIntyre and Taylor remind us, internationalization is a story that is written as it is lived, whose lifeworld of intercultural understanding, Habermas reminds us, needs to be protected from the systemworld of neoliberal economics. This study has yielded a further sense of the broader context in which internationalization is occurring and has wrestled with the prospect arising from different ways of seeing the world. In this chapter, I am going to summarize internationalization as we have lived it, and imagine a way forward that sustains intercultural understanding.

The first overarching research question asks how internationalization is understood at a research university in Canada. The notion of the social imaginaries—economic market, ranking and competition, and networked and collaborative—provides an effective framework for the current understanding and practices of internationalization, as well as enabling us to see what is possible in internationalization. Conceptually, the imaginaries of economics, competition and status, and networked and collaborative have positioned the discourse of internationalization in a manner that, I argue, identifies choices for university leaders. These options include opportunities for an ethical approach to internationalization that promises profound learning and impact on the public good(s). As we saw through Chapters Seven and Eight, intercultural learning and global citizenship can become differentiators in the experience of students at universities that are globally minded.

I find this ambition both congruent with the understanding of the purpose of universities in society as well as definitive of the shifts that the institution will make to maintain that space and the offerings to society. Support is found in conclusions such as those reached by Yemeni (2014), who argued that internationalization must achieve greater results and “yield reconciliation, fostering peace and mutual understanding through the true integration of those dimensions into the means of education” (p. 69). Internationalization is therefore an opportunity for all students, faculty, and institutions to

be interconnected with the “other.” However, most universities are not succeeding in reaching this aspiration to the extent that they could. I would suggest this is a complex problem of purpose and culture. I have shown that viewing the world through the social imaginaries of status and competition or an economic market is unhelpful, perhaps even harmful, when we consider the purpose of universities. Rather, when viewed through the lens of collaboration and networked institutions, aided by the tremendous gains in global communication, unfettered by the borders of nations states, with the awareness that this imaginary may result in different experiences and ideas, a different culture emerges that can result in greater public good(s). Regrettably, this imaginary is in stiff competition with the others for our attention and in nudging our actions; the other imaginaries are far more resilient and well trained in our and others’ minds. Yet the promise of internationalization, and the purpose of higher education, is held within the social imaginary that values and creates the public good(s).

Although a fundamental postsecondary commitment to equity, to discovery and critique, and to individual and community development makes economic growth and social mobility viable alternatives, my claim is that the neoliberal project has demonstrated that strategies beginning with privileging the economic and private benefits of higher education not only fail to ensure equity and community success but also may come at the expense of those core goals. Likewise, the fixation upon institutional rank, which is almost as old as the institutions themselves, is controlled by and privileges Western institutions that rank well; this seems antithetical to the ways in which progress, expertise, and knowledge resources can be shared as a result of internationalization. I would agree with Marginson (2012) that universities have a major and transformative democratic potential at the global level, albeit one as yet largely unfulfilled.

Internationalization for universities is an opportunity to respond both to the needs of the individuals, and in so doing, to the needs of the world. In order to respond to both sets of needs, oppressive rationalization of the lifeworld by the university or government’s systemworld must be resisted; failing to do so will result in the corruption of the promise of internationalization, which must be grounded in the lifeworld for students, faculty, and staff.

The federal and provincial governments are significant stakeholders in all this. In the examples of tuition policy and international education policy, I argued that there is no apparent indication that governments are prioritizing the social, educational, or public goods arising from an ethical commitment to internationalization. As governments are key partners, the question becomes how to engage in ethical and meaningful ways, understanding that there are different values held by each institution.

For all of these reasons, my position is that as internationalized universities, we need a new or alternative “way of being.”

Internationalized—A New Way of Being

Altbach and Knight (2007, p. 290) said it this way: “Internationalization includes the policies and practices undertaken by academic systems and institutions—and even individuals—to cope with the global academic environment.” The second overarching research question asks what are the consequences of internationalization—a complex change for universities, higher education, and Canadian society. This exploration into the discourse of internationalization has led me to believe that rather than positioning internationalization as coping with globalization, it offers individuals and institutions the opportunity for required growth and development. Internationalization is a policy position resulting in practices that inspire an ethic of interconnected problem solving, identity development in individuals, and an ethos of care in institutions.

The purpose of a university is ultimately in the critique of society and development of public good(s) within the community, as the other roles—practical matters such as research and teaching—can be accomplished in many forums other than a university. Herein lies the new paradigm: to engage in teaching and research through a manner changed by internationalization, resulting in a relevant and ever more timely critique of society and the development of public good(s). Perhaps this is why universities have survived for centuries. Teaching and research is better emanating from a scholarly community playing a role in the development of a just society. Higher education operates in an internationalized and global world, and the practice of internationalization is inherent in it. The goods internal to internationalization, such as

intercultural understanding and global citizenship, expand the capacity of the institution to research and teach in ways that will allow universities to fulfill their role in society.

Internationalization may be the project that we are engaged in as we travel to a different place and time, and we may be changed by this engagement and emerge a “new” university. Thus, this study has attempted to reveal how discourses in internationalization as a contemporary practice in higher education are deeply influenced by historical understandings of higher education as well as future imagined states. An institution’s way of being (Grimmett, 2013) is primary to the methods by which it will choose to engage in internationalization. Further complicating this is the collegial nature of the institution and the resulting different perspectives on and engagements in internationalization, sometimes reflecting individuals, at other times disciplines, and at yet other times institutional objectives. A new social imaginary, valuing a network of people and institutions in order to create conditions that serve, support, and inspire collaboration for learning, research, and change across the globe, will yield a new way of being for universities—one that results from our history and resonates with our contemporary purpose.

This new way of being views human kinship as central to the project of being globally connected as a network in a mission to support higher education. Human kinship is another way of understanding global citizenship and intercultural learning. The public goods arising from an internationalized university may be better understood as the complex opportunity to learn through engagement with others, particularly those who are truly different. This resonates with the perspective of Bauman (1995), who argued that “difference is not merely unavoidable, but good, precious, and in need of protection and cultivation” (p. 214). Internationalization and the evolution of this process have provided both the priority and the conditions to support the protection and cultivation of difference within the learning environment. Universities acting with a care for student learning will facilitate the engagement of student communities and faculty members so that the complexity of questions arising from truly understanding difference is exposed. Internationalization can reveal a new social imaginary for universities—one that challenges individuals within the institution to engage in complicated conversations (Pinar, 2011) while the institution navigates complexity in a network of universities. If the

vision is one of human kinship, this new social imaginary offers hope for the interconnected and interdependent challenges we all face, as well as inspiration for the remarkable goods arising from a place where complexity and diversity are not only welcomed but actually required for the dialogue about a new way of being in the context of the contemporary university.

Recommendations for Practices of Internationalization at Universities

Matus and Talburt (2009) suggested that the principles of an organization will influence and shape the human experience within that organization. Hence, I argue that internationalization for universities entails a redesign of the organization, since internationalization should be inherent in what universities are and how they operate. In taking up this challenge, universities will wrestle with how to redesign their practices, processes, and policies so as to address the purposes of internationalization that are inherent in how individuals see themselves and the institution—specifically, for example, in ways that support and foster intercultural understanding and global citizenship.

The focus on rankings and competition and on the economics of internationalization comes from an inability to step away from one way of thinking about institutional systems. Rather than being primarily focused on the systemsworld and, for example, managing shrinking budgets and improving the rank of the institution, we can more positively impact the institution and the leaders and scholars within by realigning the values of the institution to the experience we want to develop for scholars and our campus community. Only then will other competing values, such as intercultural learning, be seen as on par with economic and reputational issues.

Marginson (2012) concluded that while it is difficult to downplay the impact of rankings and of neoliberalism, the growth of this new social imaginary for universities could achieve this result. Universities are complex and, to function well, require networks based on collaboration (Middlehurst, 2012). Two dominant themes emerged from this study: (1) networked institutions and individuals act with an ethic of care for others, resulting in a social imaginary of collaboration and communication; (2) this imaginary can

sustain itself through communicative action and a shared lifeworld. In the development of this new social imaginary, we will see that the process for internationalization in higher education cannot be separated from the outcomes and experiences of intercultural learning and global citizenship. The means is the end. Further, I expect that we will continue to see mistakes being made in the areas of policy where we are out of step with our values and when the fullness of a strategy of internationalization does not resonate deeply within the institution.

For example, there is a way beyond the neoliberal solution to an economic challenge within a public research institution. Based on a hierarchy of principles in the organization, where internationalization is a required policy for higher education, and collaboration and communication are enablers, institutions could proceed on decisions about how to set tuition for international students based on how this will impact the primary goal of internationalization as intercultural understanding, and whether or not a decision to raise fees is being made with a bias toward the global North.

The Practices Constitutive of Internationalization

Building on the contributions of Habermas, Taylor, and MacIntyre, as well as Toope and Marginson, I wish to suggest some theoretically grounded ideas. Taylor's concept of the social imaginary, the way people "imagine the societies they inhabit and sustain" (2005, p. 6), offers a unique way to consider the priority of internationalization. We can leave behind the systemworld domination of the imaginaries of an economic market or the field of status and competition, embracing instead a commitment to and focus upon an emergent imaginary of collaboration and communication within the institution and as part of a network of institutions.

1. Transcend aspects of modernity: Break the cycle of instrumental growth and create interdependence

Taylor and MacIntyre have shown that individuals are living without community in paths of instrumental reason. Individuals are experiencing alienation, meaninglessness, and a sense of impending social dissolution as a result of modern society. Habermas has shown that in organizations, these conditions can lead to the systemworld stifling the

lifeworld. The university can be one narrative of globalization and internationalization governed by different expressions. With this knowledge of the impact of modernity on our incoming students, we can set up different environments in an effort to steer students away from experiencing these forms of malaise (Habermas, 1987; MacIntyre, 1997; Taylor, 2004).

Setting up experiences to intentionally support students so that they can live with and benefit from interdependence and collaboration is one approach that may break the cycle of instrumental growth. The value of being a university student is in being in this space and place, and engaging in a scholarly community. We need to develop ways of creating communicative community interactions. Expectations for students need to embrace a broad range of actions, reflective of a comprehensive and meaningful student experience. I can imagine mentoring circles, senior leadership roles for students in the classroom as well as beyond, research teams in scientific labs, and support to publish jointly developed research projects. Much of this happens now. My point is that these kinds of experiences will be different as a result of the imaginary in which they are envisioned. Decisions must be made with the whole student and their lived experience as an important consideration. The cycle of instrumental growth must be broken, thereby alleviating the fragmentation of the student experience and internationalization as simply one goal.

II. Focus on the lifeworld

Taylor and Habermas have justified the need for a strong lifeworld. University administrations are precariously close to stifling the lifeworld of students. With a penchant for centralizing systemic rules, large universities are prone to creating obscure and complicated processes for daily life and focusing on the systems required for internationalization. Strategies, speeches, and other communication acts need to focus on the goods internal to being a student in an internationalized institution. The lifeworld needs to stand as a horizon understood and defined by those living it. It is worth the risk of slightly differentiated standards to decentralize decisions and processes and build up meaningful smaller communities. Without this kind of change, decisions will be limited to a framework of instrumental rationality as opposed to communicative action. As

lifeworlds are held together by communicative action, universities must fully embrace this theoretical framework (Seidman, 1989; Taylor, 2004).

III. Seek the goods internal to the practice—intercultural understanding and global citizenship

For students to seek the goods internal to the practice, they must be acting in relationship with one another. However, more is required, amounting to a transformation of the act of being a student. It is an exploration into reconceptualizing the practice. This is not a call for the days of medieval universities, but rather a plea to set up expectations that reinforce student actions for the goods internal and to monitor the persuasion of the goods external. This may be one of the most difficult principles on which to act. It requires students to change their motivations from gaining external goods to achieving those internal to the practice of being a student, without necessarily any immediate reward. The only justification for doing so is that it will develop the good (MacIntyre, 1997). Resulting from the analysis of the networked and collaborative social imaginary, intercultural understanding and global citizenship emerge as goods internal to the practice of internationalization. Students will select institutions not based on the latter's global ranking and status but rather because they fit with the students' intentions.

Future Areas of Research

In the course of researching and writing this study, more questions have arisen, leading me to recommend a number of areas for future theoretical and practice-based research.

This study found that understanding internationalization within the context of competing imaginaries was foundational to recasting internationalization and the resultant policy and practices. I have described the emerging imaginary of networks and collaboration, largely based on Marginson's (2012) theoretical ideas. However, more investigation is required to understand how to build our capacity to act on this imaginary—specifically, more insight into the ways in which students and faculty would behave and engage as a result of committing to this way of being. It is not clear how this imaginary impacts the daily actions of the key participants in this imaginary of

collaboration and networking. Building upon the present work, a more thorough exploration into the kinds of practice-based models and experiments that bring students together from around the globe, and the outcomes that result, would help universities understand what actions are better to initiate.

Second, there is a gap in the literature with regard to the ways in which students envision internationalization. Most of time, we are looking at how they experience the opportunities arising from decisions that governments and institutions have made. More thoughtfully engaging students as a result of their lived experience in the dialogue of internationalization is critical. Student voice and leadership, as well as a role in the governance of the institution, are critical in the development of visions and plans for internationalization—after all, these must reflect a connection to the lifeworld of students at the university.

Third, it is critical to explore the intersection between (i) internationalization as part of a new imaginary for higher education and (ii) the purpose and value of diversity and equity in a scholarly community. How can higher education institutions make these foci less anaemic and more core to what we do and how we do it?

Fourth, the role of federal and provincial governments remains problematic in this emerging social imaginary, because it differs from how they see their mandate. Traditionally, governments have supported educational programs that helped in nation and province building during the modern era of liberalism. This new imaginary calls for an education program that extends outside of our borders and indeed supports, and is supported by, individuals and entities beyond national borders. This will have implications for the relationship between universities and governments; it likely will also impact the power and influence of those institutions and will have policy implications, perhaps even financial or economic repercussions. This is an area requiring further exploration.

Fifth, and perhaps most importantly, the notion of international networks that thrive must be investigated. How do these networks get created, what happens to make them flourish, and what are the results?

Conclusion: The Promise of Internationalization, Global Universities, and Student Learning

Institutions will interpret internationalization as a function of the university and will be interpreted based on the decisions, actions, and speech acts that come to represent the university. It is in the latter that our societies will come to learn about the role of internationalization, and the public good(s) resulting over time will become part of the dialogue between universities and communities. This role of universities is equally important to the role of educating the scholars who comprise their faculties and student bodies. The dialogue will change over time, just as the meaning of internationalization has and will continue to change over time.

This inquiry found a significant disconnect between some of the practical policies of the institution and governments, and the voices of the institutional leader and of the students. This difference was reflective of the social imaginary operating behind the policies and actions. The voices of the leader and the students almost exclusively operated from the more collaborative and communicative imaginary. The public good(s) arising from this social imaginary offer great promise for the purpose of the university as well as the ways in which individuals, particularly students, learn and come to view themselves as citizens of the world.

Paul Ricoeur has presented rich advice regarding the constitution of an ethical person: the “desire for an accomplished life—with and for others—in just institutions” (Ricoeur, 1999, p. 45). I believe that our universities become more just as a result of transitioning to an imaginary in which internationalization is manifest through collaboration, relationships, networks, and communication. Collectively, these differences may shift the institution into living in this transformed social imaginary. It will take real political courage to change practices at large, Canadian public research institutions that reinforce the current social imaginaries. It will also take all participants—researchers, faculty, administrators, and students.

We live at a time of competing ideas and interests about internationalization. This dissertation sought to explore an approach to internationalization that imagined outcomes other than those gained through the neoliberal approach to internationalization

and the intoxicating impact of status and rank. This study has been an opportunity to explore the ideas that emerged from one institution, conceptualize those ideas, understand their politics, and make recommendations for practice; doing so included illuminating the context through the development of Marginson's imaginaries and recommending that institutions take up the opportunity to operate in an internationalized way of being, wherein university practices inspire an ethic of interconnected problem solving, identity development in individuals, and an ethos of care.

References

- Alma Mater Society. (2015, November 17). *AMS submission to the UBC Board of Governors on proposed international tuition increases*. Retrieved from <http://www.ams.ubc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/International-Tuition-Submission-AMS-and-ISA.pdf>
- Altbach, P. G. (2013). *The international imperative in higher education*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3–4), 274–290. doi:10.1177/1028315307303542
- Altbach, P. G., & Teichler, U. (2001). Internationalization and exchanges in a globalized university. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5(1), 5–25.
- Anderson, T. (2015). Seeking internationalization: The state of Canadian higher education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 45(4), 166–187. Retrieved from http://journals.sfu.ca/cjhe/index.php/cjhe/article/view/184690/pdf_38
- Anh, D. T. K., & Marginson, S. (2013) Global learning through the lens of Vygotskian sociocultural theory. *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(2), 143–159, doi:10.1080/17508487.2012.722557
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. (2007). Internationalizing Canadian campuses: Main themes emerging from the 2007 Scotiabank-AUCC workshop on excellence in internationalization at Canadian universities. Retrieved from https://web.archive.org/web/20090424074017/http://www.aucc.ca/_pdf/english/publications/aucc-scotia_web_e.pdf
- Ball, S. J. (2015). Living the neo-liberal university. *European Journal of Education*, 50(3), 258–261. doi:10.1111/ejed.12132
- Bauman, Z. (1993). *Postmodern ethics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- BC Council for International Education (BCCIE). (n.d.). Reports and publications. Retrieved from <http://bccie.bc.ca/resources/reports-publications/?viewall=true>

- Beck, K. (2012). Globalization/s: Reproduction and resistance in the internationalization of higher education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 35(3), 133–148.
- Beck, K., Ilieva, R., Pullman, A., & Zhang, Z. (2013). New work, old power: Inequities within the labor of internationalization. *On the Horizon*, 21(2), 84–95. doi:10.1108/10748121311322987
- Bedenlier, S., & Zawacki-Richter, Olaf. (2015, June). Internationalization of higher education and the impacts on faculty members. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 10(2), 185–201. doi:10.1177/1745499915571707
- Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015). Europe calling: A new definition for internationalization at home. *International Higher Education*, 83(special issue), 12–13. Retrieved from <http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/view/9080/8187>
- Bourdieu, T. E. (1998). *Universitas: The social restructuring of American Undergraduate education*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Bourn, D. (2011). From internationalisation to global perspectives. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(5), 559–571. doi:10.1080/07294360.2011.598447
- Bowen, W. G. (2010). Epilogue: Why colleges and universities matter so much. In W. G. Bowen, *Lesson learned: Reflections of a university president* (pp. 144–147). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University (1998). *Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Cambridge, J., & Thompson, J. (2004) Internationalism and globalization as contexts for international education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 34(2), 161–175. doi:10.1080/0305792042000213994
- Cantwell, B., & Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2009). Four stories: Confronting contemporary ideas about globalisation and internationalization in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 7(3), 289–306. doi:10.1080/14767720903166103
- Considine, M. (2006). Theorizing the university as a cultural system: Distinctions, identities, emergencies. *Educational Theory*, 56(3), 255–270.
- Cowen, R. (2007). Comparing and transferring: Visions, politics and universities. In D. Bridges, P. Juceviciene, R. Jucevicius, T. H. Mclaughlin, & J. Stankeviciute (Eds.) *Higher education and national development: Universities and societies in transition* (pp. 13–29). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

- Cresswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five traditions*. California: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W., Hanson, W. E., Clark Plano, V. L., & Morales, A. (2007). Qualitative research designs: Selection and implementation. *The Counselling Psychologist*, 35(2), 236–264.
- Desai-Trilokekar, R., & Jones, G. (2007). Internationalizing Canada's universities. *International Higher Education*, (46), 12–14.
- Desai-Trilokekar, R., & Jones, G. (2013). Finally, an internationalization policy for Canada. *International Higher Education*, (71), 17–18.
- Dewey, J. (1926). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Emberley, P. C. (1996). *Zero Tolerance: Hot button politics in Canadian universities*. Toronto, ON: Penguin.
- Edgar, A. (2006). *Habermas: The key concepts*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Eriksen, E. O., & Weigard, J. (2003). *Understanding Habermas: Communicative action and deliberative democracy*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Erkkilä, T. (2014). Global university rankings, transnational policy discourse and higher education in Europe. *European Journal of Education*, 49(1), 91–101. doi:10.1111/ejed.12063
- Firestone, W. A. (1987). Meaning in method: The rhetoric of quantitative and qualitative research. *Educational Researcher*, 16(7), 16–21.
- Fisher, D., Rubenson, K., Jones, G., & Shanahan, T. (2009). The political economy of post-secondary education: A comparison of British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec. *Higher Education*, 57(5), 549–566.
- Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada. (2014). *Canada's International Education Strategy: Harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity*. Retrieved from <http://international.gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/assets/pdfs/overview-apercu-eng.pdf>
- Francis, A. (1993). *Facing the future: The internationalization of post-secondary institutions in British Columbia. Task force report*. Vancouver, Canada: British Columbia Centre for International Education. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED377759.pdf>

- Fraser, N., & Naples, N. A. (2004). To interpret the world and to change it: An interview with Nancy Fraser. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 29(4), 1103–1124.
- 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), 425–462. doi:10.17763/haer.72.4.0515nr62324n71p1
- Global Affairs Canada. (2014). *Canada's international education strategy: Harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity*. Retrieved from <http://international.gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/assets/pdfs/overview-aperçu-eng.pdf>
- Grimmett, P. P. (2013, December 13). *The meaning of curriculum is a complicated conversation; the purpose of curriculum is to render a complicated worldview*. Paper presented at the Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy's monthly seminar series on "Ethical engagement with alterity," University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Gulson, K. N., & Pedroni, T. C. (2011) Neoliberalism, cities and education in the Global South/North. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 32(2), 165–169. doi:10.1080/01596306.2011.562663
- Gyamera, G. O. (2015). The internationalisation agenda: A critical examination of internationalisation strategies in public universities in Ghana. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 25(2), 112-131. doi:10.1080/09620214.2015.1034290
- Ha, P. L., & Barnawi, O. Z. (2015). Where English, neoliberalism, desire and internationalization are alive and kicking: Higher education in Saudi Arabia today. *Language and Education*, 29(6), 545–565. doi:10.1080/09500782.2015.1059436
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action. Volume 1: Reason and the rationalization of society*. (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action. Volume 2: Lifeworld and system: A critique of functionalist reason*. (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Hazelkorn, E. (2008). Globalization, internationalization, and rankings. *International Higher Education, Internationalization*, 2008, 8–11. Retrieved from <http://arrow.dit.ie/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1042&context=cserart>
- Hazelkorn, E. (2014). Reflections on a decade of global rankings: What we've learned and outstanding issues. *European Journal of Education*, 49(1), 12–28. doi:10.1111/ejed.12059

- Hudzik, J. K., & McCarthy, J. S. (2012). *Leading comprehensive internationalization: Strategy and tactics for action*. New York, NY: NAFSA. Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/Chez_NAFSA/Resource_Library_Assets/Publications_Library/Leading%20CIZN.pdf
- Ilieva, R., Beck, K., & Waterstone, B. (2014). Towards sustainable internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education*, 68(6), 875–889. doi:10.1007/s10734-014-9749-6
- International Association of Universities. (2010). *Internationalization of higher education: Global trends, regional perspectives. (IAU 3rd Global Survey Report)*. Paris, France: Author.
- Jackson, J. (2011). Cultivating cosmopolitan, intercultural citizenship through critical reflection and international, experiential learning. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 11(2), 80–96.
- Jiang, X. (2008). Towards the internationalisation of higher education from a critical perspective. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 32(4), 347-358. doi:10.1080/03098770802395561
- Joseph, R. (2014, May 1). New enrolment policy to allow for increased international admissions. *The Ubyyssey*. Retrieved from <http://old.ubyssey.ca/news/new-enrolment-policy-to-allow-for-increased-international-admissions-485/>
- Jotia, A. L. (2011). Globalization and the nation-state: Sovereignty and state welfare in jeopardy. *US-China Education Review B*, 2, 243–250. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED528356.pdf>
- Kezar, A. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating change in higher education in the 21st century*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED457711.pdf>
- Kezar, A., & Lester, J. (2010). Breaking the barriers of essentialism in leadership research: Positionality as a promising approach. *Feminist Formations*, 22(1), 163–185. doi:10.1353/nwsa.0.0121
- Khoo, S. (2011). Ethical globalisation or privileged internationalisation? Exploring global citizenship and internationalisation in Irish and Canadian universities. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3–4), 337–353. doi:10.1080/14767724.2011.605320
- Kilbourn, B. (2006). The qualitative doctoral dissertation proposal. *Teachers College Record*, 108(4), 529–576.
- Kim, T. (2009) Transnational academic mobility, internationalization and interculturality in higher education. *Intercultural Education*, 20(5), 395–405.

doi:10.1080/14675980903371241

- Klees, S. J. (2008). A quarter century of neoliberal thinking in education: Misleading analyses and failed policies. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 6(4), 311–348. doi:10.1080/14767720802506672
- Knight, J. (2001). Monitoring the quality and progress of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5(3), 228-243.
- Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2–3.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5–31.
- Lee, J. J. and Cantwell, B. (2012). The global sorting machine: An examination of neoracism among international students and postdoctoral researchers. In B. Pusser, K. Kempner, S Marginson, & I Ordorika (Eds.), *Universities and the public sphere: Knowledge creation and state building in the era of globalization* (pp. 47–63). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- MacIntyre, A. (1997). The nature of the virtues. In R. Crisp & M. Slote (Eds.), *Virtue ethics* (pp. 118–140). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Marginson, S. (2004). National and global competition in higher education. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 31(2), 1–28.
- Marginson, S. (2006). Dynamics of national and global competition in higher education. *Higher Education*, 52, 1–39.
- Marginson, S. (2007). The public/private divide in higher education: A global revision. *Higher Education*, 53, 307–333.
- Marginson, S. (2011). Imagining the global. In R. King, S. Marginson, & R. Naidoo (Eds.), *Handbook on globalization and higher education* (pp. 10—39). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Marginson, S. (2012). The “public” contribution of universities in an increasingly global world. In B. Pusser, K. Kempner, S. Marginson, & I. Ordorika (Eds.), *Universities and the public sphere: knowledge creation and state building in the era of globalization* (pp. 7—25). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Marginson, S. (2013) The impossibility of capitalist markets in higher education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 28(3), 353–370. doi:10.1080/02680939.2012.747109

- Marginson, S. (2014a). Academic freedom: A global comparative approach. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 9(1), 24–41. doi:10.3868/s110-003-014-0003-x
- Marginson, S. (2014b). University rankings and social science. *European Journal of Education*, 49(1), 45–59. doi:10.1111/ejed.12061
- Marginson, S. (2015). The strategic position of Australian research universities in the East Asian region. *Higher Education*, 70, 265–281. doi:10.1007/s10734-014-9839-5
- Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2007). *Globalisation and higher education*. OECD Education Working Papers No. 8. Paris, France: OECD. doi:10.1787/19939019
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Matus, C., & Talburt, S. (2009). Spatial imaginaries: Universities, internationalization, and feminist geographies. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 30(4), 515–527. doi:10.1080/01596300903237271
- Mayer, C. (2015). *How colleges change: Understanding, leading, and enacting change*, by Adrianna Kezar (review). *The Review of Higher Education*, 39(1), 167–170. doi:10.1353/rhe.2015.0045
- McKellin, K. (1998). *Maintaining the momentum: The internationalization of British Columbia's public post secondary institutions*. Vancouver, Canada: The British Columbia Centre for International Education.
- Metcalf, A. S. (2010). Revisiting academic capitalism in Canada: No longer the exception. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 81(4), 489–514.
- Merrill, M. C., & Rodman, R. (2012). Rethinking whose needs are being met by internationalization: Purposes, players, and aberrations. *AUDEM: The International Journal of Higher Education and Democracy*, 3, 4–34.
- Middlehurst, R. (2012). *Leadership and management in higher education: A research perspective*. Maastricht School of Management Working Paper No. 2012/47. Maastricht, The Netherlands: Maastricht School of Management.
- Nash, R. J. (1996). *"Real world" ethics: Frameworks for educators and human service providers*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Navitas. (2016, April 4). *Navitas celebrates 10 year partnership in Canada*. Retrieved from <https://www.navitas.com/organisation/story/345>
- Newman, J. H. (1959). *The idea of a university*. New York: Image Books.

- Pandit, K. (2009) Leading internationalization. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 99(4), 645-656. doi:10.1080/00045600903120552
- Phan, L. H., & Barnawi, O. Z. (2015). Where English, neoliberalism, desire and internationalization are alive and kicking: Higher education in Saudi Arabia today. *Language and Education*, 29(6), 545–565. doi:10.1080/09500782.2015.1059436
- Pinar, W. (2011). *What is curriculum theory?* New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pusser, B., & Marginson, S. (2013). University rankings in critical perspective. *Journal of Higher Education*, 84(4), 544–568. doi:10.1353/jhe.2013.0022
- Quacquarelli Symonds Limited. (2016) *Top universities*. Retrieved from www.topuniversities.com
- Ricoeur, P. (1999). Approaching the human person. *Ethical Perspectives*, 1, 45–54.
- Rizvi, F. (2008). Epistemic virtues and cosmopolitan learning. (Radford Lecture, Adelaide, Australia, November 27, 2006). *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 35(1), 17–35. Retrieved from http://illinois.edu/cms/3943/rizvi___proofepistemicvirtues.pdf
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2000). Globalization and education: Complexities and contingencies. *Educational Theory*, 50(4), 419–426. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=4441914&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Roper, L. D. (2013) Rising to the challenge of the global campus. *Journal of College and Character*, 14(2), 193-196. doi:10.1515/jcc-2013-0025
- Samarasekera, I. (2007, April 2). Rising up against rankings. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2007/04/02/rising-against-rankings>
- Scott, P. (1998). Massification, internationalization and globalization. In P. Scott (Ed.), *The globalization of higher education* (pp. 108–129). Buckingham, UK: The Open University.
- Scott, P. (2000). Globalisation and higher education: Challenges for the 21st century. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 4, 5–10.
- Scott, P. (2010). International education: Alternatives to the market. *International Higher Education*, 61, Article 1. Retrieved from <http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/view/8511/7645>
- Seidman, S. (Ed.). (1989). *Jurgen Habermas on society and politics: A reader*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

- Sergiovanni, T. (2000). *The lifeworld of leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sharlandjeva, V. (2015, October 17). Sold to the highest bidder: International students at UBC. *The Ubyyssey*. Retrieved from <http://ubyssey.ca/features/a-history-of-international-students-at-ubc-from-benevolence-to-economics/>
- Shultz, L. (2015). Understanding the internationalization of education and its demand for a business of knowledge: Emerging issues and discussions in Canadian comparative and international education. *Annual Review of Comparative and International Education*, 28, 73–80. doi:10.1108/S1479-367920150000028004
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Stack, M. (2016). *Global university rankings and the mediatization of higher education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 443–466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Statistics Canada. (2011). *Immigration and ethnocultural diversity in Canada. National household survey 2011*. Catalogue no. 99-010-X2011001. Retrieved from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-010-x/99-010-x2011001-eng.pdf>
- Stern, S. (1999, February 18). Students home away celebrates 40 years. *UBC Reports*. Retrieved from <http://news.ubc.ca/ubcreports/1999/99feb18/anniver2.html>
- 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. doi:10.1080/1476772042000177069
- Strangway, D. (1988). *Toward the Pacific century*. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia. Retrieved from <https://www.library.ubc.ca/archives/pdfs/presidents/1988.pdf>
- Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Taylor, C. (2004). *Modern social imaginaries*. Durham, UK: Duke University Press.
- Taylor, C., et al. (2015, December 24). Future perfect: What will universities look like in 2030? *Times Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/what-will-universities-look-like-in->

2030-future-perfect

- Thomas, M., & Thompson, A. (2014). Empire and globalisation: From “high imperialism” to decolonization. *The International History Review*, 36(1), 142–170. doi:10.1080/07075332.2013.828643
- Times Higher Education*. (2016a). *World university rankings*. Retrieved from <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings>
- Toope, S. J. (2006, October 14). *International law and global citizens*. Vancouver Institute Lecture, Vancouver, Canada. doi: 10.14288/1.0108978
- Toope, S. J. (2008a, June 5). *Canadian universities and a new internationalism*. Address to the Congress of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Retrieved from <https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubcpresidentsspeechesandwritings/25805/items/1.0107470>
- Toope, S. J. (2008b, June 3). *Crossing borders, contesting values: Do universities matter?* Address to the Congress of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Retrieved from http://president.ubc.ca/files/2010/04/congress_sshf_20080603.pdf
- Toope, S. J. (2009, August). International engagement and global influence: A discussion paper draft 2. Retrieved from http://diversityatubc.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2010/11/Promoting-Intercultural-Understanding_August-20099.pdf
- Toope, S. J. (2010a, October 16). Diversity improves our university and our country. *Vancouver Sun*. Retrieved from <https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubcpresidentsspeechesandwritings/25805/items/1.0107507>
- Toope, S. J. (2010b, December 5). Stephen Toope (UBC) on global challenges and the organizational-ethical dilemmas of universities. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/globalhighered/stephen_toope_ubc_on_global_challenges_and_the_organizational_ethical_dilemmas_of_universities
- Toope, S. J. (2011a, September 14). *Conspiring to change the world for the better*. Address delivered to the Vancouver Board of Trade. doi:10.14288/1.0102612
- Toope, S. J. (2011b, October 26). *Opening us to larger worlds*. Address to the AUCC Centennial Membership Meeting, Montréal, Canada. Retrieved from http://president.ubc.ca/files/2011/10/aucc_toope_speech_bilingual_20111026.pdf
- Toope, S. J. (2012a, April 5). *Intercultural understanding*. Address to the UBC Equity, Diversity and Intercultural Understanding Colloquium, University of British

- Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Retrieved from <https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubcpresidentsspeechesandwritings/25805/items/1.0107509>
- Toope, S. J. (2012b, January 31). *Pluralism and pragmatism: The role of universities in developing human potential*. Inaugural keynote address in the Ismai'li Lecture Series, Ismai'li Centre, Burnaby, Canada. Retrieved from <http://president.ubc.ca/files/2012/01/inauglecture2012jan31.pdf>
- Toope, S. J. (2013a, October). *I love you, you're perfect, now change: The new relationship between universities and the world they serve*. Paper delivered at the Association of Commonwealth Universities—Centenary Conference. Future Forward: Taking Charge of Change, University of London, London, UK. Retrieved from <http://president.ubc.ca/files/2010/03/Association-of-Commonwealth-Universities-2013Oct16.pdf>
- Toope, S. J. (2013b, November 20). *Learn, discover, contribute, disrupt: The mission of the global university*. Address to the Canadian Bureau for International Education Conference, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Retrieved from <https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubcpresidentsspeechesandwritings/25805/items/1.0102627>
- Toope, S. J., & Leshner, A. I. (2012, February 10). Innovation, international collaboration go hand in hand. *Vancouver Sun*. Retrieved from <https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubcpresidentsspeechesandwritings/25805/items/1.0102596>
- University of British Columbia. (n.d.). *Place and promise: The UBC plan*. Retrieved from <http://strategicplan.ubc.ca/>
- University of British Columbia. (1959). *Annual report*. Retrieved from <http://www.library.ubc.ca/archives/pdfs/presidents/1960.pdf>
- University of British Columbia. (2011). *UBC international strategic plan*. Retrieved from <https://research.ubc.ca/sites/research.ubc.ca/files/vpri/UBC-intl-strat-plan-2011.pdf>
- University of British Columbia. (2015a, December 3). *Report to the Board of Governors. Agenda item #3.7b*. Retrieved from http://bog3.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2015/11/3.7b_2015.12_International-Tuition-Fees.pdf
- University of British Columbia. (2015b, July 28). *UBC overview and facts 2014/15*. Retrieved from https://www.ubc.ca/_assets/pdf/UBC_Overview_Facts_2014-15_Web.pdf
- Vidovich, L. (2004). Towards internationalizing the curriculum in a context of

- globalization: Comparing policy processes in two settings. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 34(4), 443-461.
doi:10.1080/0305792042000294823
- Wegener, U. E. (1989). Quality and equity: The necessity for imagination. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(2), 240–250. doi:10.17763/haer.59.2.4h3146513056r765
- White, M. (2015). The internationalization of higher education: Tensions and debates. Keynote address for the 2015 Atlantic Education Graduate Student Conference. *Antistasis*, 5(2), 101–116.
- Williams, R., de Rassenfosse, G., Jensen, P., & Marginson, S. (2013) The determinants of quality national higher education systems. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35(6), 599–611. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2013.854288
- Yemini, M. (2014). Internationalisation discourse: What remains to be said? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 18(2), 66–71.
doi:10.1080/13603108.2014.888019