

Implications for Canadian Higher Education Internationalisation Policies: Critical Considerations on the Impact of the Shift to Knowledge Exports from Cooperative and Development Programming

ALLYSON LARKIN
Western University

INTRODUCTION

The desire to internationalise campuses and to provide students with global learning opportunities is evident in the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada (AUCC) report *Internationalizing Canadian Campuses*. The report summarises a 2007 survey of Canadian university presidents' institutional internationalisation priorities. In the AUCC report, 95 per cent of university presidents in Canada cite the formation of international partnerships and the achievement of global competencies among graduates as top institutional priorities (AUCC 3). Yet a closer read of the report reflects what many scholars of globalisation and education policy raise as concerns: A growing emphasis in policy on the production of knowledge as an export and a preoccupation with international institutional status and rank (Rizvi and Lingard 6). Included within the potential knowledge to be exported is reference to (i) international development and cooperation programming, where the report suggests that such initiatives could potentially provide "many spinoffs ... such as creating opportunities for exporting education programs abroad and marshalling [sic] substantial resources back to the campus" and (ii) the future possibility of charging a 'fee for services' related to international development and cooperation initiatives (AUCC 14).

These two themes are examples of a shift in the direction of higher educational policy in Canada and require critical analysis to consider how this trend may impact those communities where development and cooperative programming

take place (Longo and Saltmarsh 117). There is a gap in the literature exploring the link between higher education policy related to international development and cooperative programming and the implications of a shift to a competitive, marketised approach to these initiatives. Throughout this analysis, the terms 'Global North' and 'the West' are employed to refer to Europe and North American and the terms 'Global South' or 'developing world' are used to refer to non-West, typically those regions of Latin America, Africa and parts of Southeast Asia. The literature linking education, globalisation and the postcolonial experience will provide the framework for raising questions related to the impact this shift will have on developing regions of the world (Tikly 151).

Evidence from postcolonial and critical development studies urge the incorporation of local values and leadership in international endeavours to ensure the success and sustainability of development programs. A postcolonial conceptual framework positions the perspective of those in the Global South and their experience of Western interventions in local political, economic and cultural activities (Crossley and Tikly 148). Postcolonial analysis examines the tension between the political and economic interests of the Global North particularly as they are expressed within the Global South. It is a recurrent theme within the literature of international development: projects and programs conceived of within institutions of the West or North that do not engage local partners in the formulation of projects or recognise cultural, historical, and political values result in failure, or worse, a further marginalisation of vulnerable populations (MacEwan 231). Research on the impact of internationalisation and partnerships in higher education conducted in Tanzania found that contrary to assumptions that such relationships create greater capacity for local institutions and secure more collaborative research opportunities for faculty or students, the reality is that the benefits of partnership accrue largely to the Northern partner. For example, publications, research opportunities and scholarships do not flow to the local university (Ishengomo 3). To acknowledge the dominant role that states and institutions from the North have in the South, postcolonial analysis also encompasses neo-colonialism and the spread of Western hegemony through a new imperialism, "the emergence of a new form of western imperialism that has as its purpose the incorporation of populations within the formerly so-called 'Second' and 'Third worlds' into a regime of global government" (Tikly 173). The integration of the second and third worlds is accomplished through market interactions with implications for educational activities that define populations in the Global South as consumers of Western knowledge (Tikly 174).

Taken together these trends present significant challenges from a critical policy perspective concerned with social justice. The social justice impact of marketised global educational policy is considered here in an effort to challenge the implementation of policies that continue to subordinate non-Western interests and ideas (Tikly 186). The definition of social justice put forth by Nancy Fraser is grounded in the notion of participation parity. She argues that:

...according to a radical-democratic interpretation of the principle of equal moral worth, justice requires social arrangements that permit all to participate as peers in social life. Overcoming injustice means dismantling institutionalised obstacles that prevent some people from participating on a par with others as full partners in social interaction (16).

Her definition forms the foundation for a social justice perspective in this analysis of higher education policy. It is one that values pluralism and diversity. Fraser argues that there are three dimensions to social justice: redistribution, recognition, and representation. Redistribution relies primarily on economic mechanisms to redistribute the resources and wealth in society. An economic system that results in an unequal distribution of goods results in a state she terms 'maldistribution'. The concept of recognition:

... targets injustices it understands as cultural, which it presumes to be rooted in social patterns of interpretation, and communication; misrecognition or being subjected to patterns of interpretation and communication that are associated with another culture and are alien and/or hostile to one's own, or being rendered invisible via the authoritative representation, communicative, and interpretative practices of one's own culture. Representation refers to equal access in decision-making and political affairs (12-13).

Torres argues that the tendency to analyse public policy, including educational policy, from a value neutral stance, ensures that "the research is exclusively empirical-analytical, thus oriented toward potential technical control, rather than an historical-hermeneutic interest or a critical-emancipatory one" (Torres 157); the saturation of ideology in policy-making is not scrutinised. To resist this tendency, policy texts must be deconstructed to contextualise their historical, political, cultural, and social

implications, emphasising that today, all educational policy is contested and reflects power and particular interests (Olssen 234).

Policy grounded in neo-liberal and marketised values neutralizes or ignores questions of culture and human development. It is the goal of this article to suggest areas for further research into the impact that a shift to education as a competitive enterprise may have within communities in the developing world. Five points will be considered within this analysis of higher education policy trends: i) the context of globalisation and its influence on policy; ii) the focus on the production of knowledge as a marketable export; iii) the lack of ethical oversight in international programming; iv) the impact of standardisation and global governance on higher education; v) the challenge of equitable international partnerships in higher education.

GLOBALISATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY IN CANADA

The context of globalisation and its impact on education is particularly important in the critical analysis of policy from a postcolonial perspective. Two items require clarification here: the use of the terms 'postcolonial' and 'globalisation'. In this analysis, a postcolonial critique "... draws attention to the transnational aspects of globalisation and of social inequalities and seeks to highlight forms of resistance to Western global hegemony as they have manifested themselves in education" (Tikly 152). The definition of globalisation advocated by Held best describes the experience of global education policy because it emphasizes globalisation as a process versus conceiving of condition. In his words, globalisation is:

... a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organisation of social relations and transactions assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact—generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction and the exercise of power (Held in Tikly 163).

Education itself is cited as a conduit that facilitates the transmission of global values and knowledge. It can be argued that in terms of the influence of globalisation as a transcontinental process, education is one of the crucial avenues for the dissemination of global knowledge and practice, yet it is uneven in its impact in different contexts (Crossley and Tikly 153). Here is where a link can be made between globalisation, policy, and capitalist markets. Within the literature on globalisation and education policy, there is a general acknowledgement that education is a mechanism by which

capitalism and its corresponding economic interests are expressed, particularly through the current emphasis of skills-based education throughout most of the Global South (Crossley and Tickly 184).

Among the impacts of globalisation on higher education documented by scholars are: 1) the emphasis on competition between institutions at a global level; 2) the aligning of educational objectives with those of the private sector; and 3) the production of research as a knowledge export (Fahey et al. 83). Each of these three developments is referred to in the AUCC report. Globalisation plays a key role in the impetus for university internationalisation, bringing with it a new set of opportunities, as well as ethical dilemmas for institutions (Apple 24). The current global environment within which universities now operate is more competitive and outcome-oriented, both with respect to student achievement and faculty knowledge production (Stomquist 52). Canadian universities have actively participated in this shift. According to research by Delhi and Taylor:

Canadian policy reports over the past 15 years have constructed arguments for changes in the governance of faculty research in terms of the demands of a new global economy, comparisons with other 'developed countries, the need for innovation and the challenges of migration, multiculturalism and social cohesion (Delhi and Taylor 69).

The AUCC report clearly reflects this statement, specifically highlighting opportunities to showcase faculty research and innovation in international markets as well as the potential to recruit talented students through international programming.

The emphasis on competition between universities and the focus on profitability from research and teaching emphasized in policy, raise concerns when positioned in the context of North-South relations. The rise of international rankings of universities, whereby institutions compete in a global marketplace for students, and where faculty members compete for scarce grants and research funding, is now the norm; there are intense pressures for faculty members to engage in the competition for research funding or risk elimination (Stromquist 24). Yet this is the direction that policy is moving; the trend in higher education policy, particularly with respect to internationalisation, is to emphasize applicability and measurable outputs and it seeks programming that is revenue generating and statistically measurable (Rizvi and Lingard 38). This particular shift in higher education internationalisation policy reflects what Olssen argues is a trend toward 'governmentality' in higher

education policy, with the state attempting to control all matters that suggest unpredictability (Olssen 233). It is a high stakes race, with institutions seeking new sources of revenue. In this environment, international arenas are viewed as potential sources of funding, talented students and research sites, as well as contributing to the overall institutional prestige that ensures status and position among universities in the global community.

The language of commerce in policy underscores Delhi and Taylor's findings that government agencies are now openly skeptical about the social sciences model of teaching and research (Delhi and Taylor 113). There is a growing demand for solution-oriented research and applied programming, particularly in higher education. According to Delhi and Taylor, "The problem identified in some critiques is not merely that we have failed to disseminate and 'translate' knowledge that can be used to address educational and social problems, but rather that the questions we ask and the manner in which we ask are inappropriate or misdirected" (Delhi and Taylor 105). This suggests that producing results that are valued in the international marketplace is the way to ensure the value of research. However, this view of the Global South is a key issue critics point to with respect to moves by the West that position the Global South as either an arena within to apply new technology or a marketplace to sell ideas.

Defining knowledge as an export is a move that emerged as a result of changes to university governance and resource allocation in a neoliberal, globalised context (Rizvi and Lingard 12). The subsequent emergence of policies that refer to international development and cooperation programming as potential knowledge exports signals more than a change in the relationship between Global North universities and Global South communities; it would appear to redefine the common concept of knowledge which, according to Samoff and Carol, required:

... multiple initiatives and efforts, exchanges of findings, analyses, and interpretations, and an accumulation of understandings influenced by accepted earlier knowledge. Those exchanges may be more or less friendly, more or less organised, and more or less fruitful. Whatever their problems, the development of knowledge cannot proceed without them (80).

Recasting knowledge as a commodity, and research institutions as competitive enterprises, will have implications for how knowledge is developed and refined.

A central theme in the research on higher education and internationalisation policy is the desire on the part of universities to seek remuneration for scholarly interests; programs that place less value on return-oriented learning, and whose results are realised over time, are less likely to be pursued by program planners (Rizvi and Lingard 47). Linking this development to trends in Canadian higher education, the AUCC report cites the “offshore delivery of educational products and services that [will] provide the foundation for other types of value-added activities such as internships, research collaborations and professional development” (AUCC 26). One of the significant changes related to educational values often reflected in internationalisation policy in this context is the move to emphasize efficiency over democracy and equity in education (Rizvi and Lingard 76). In a social efficiency framework, the emphasis in education is on the “system’s capacity to make an adequate return on investment, assessed in terms of its contribution to producing workers with knowledge, skills and attitudes relevant to increasing productivity within the knowledge economy” (Rizvi and Lingard 78). However, an emphasis on efficiency would arguably lead to the suppression of difference, culturally, politically or economically.

The domination of one set of cultural values over another is a further example of Fraser’s concept of misrecognition (72). The policy language referring to the ‘delivery of educational products and services’ clearly indicates that the relationship is conceived in terms of producer to consumer versus a reciprocal or cooperative partnership. However, positioning the Global South as a potential consumer of Northern knowledge products presumes a mercantilist stance on the part of the North. The historical, political, social, and cultural contexts that exist in the Global South require consideration if an equitable trading relationship is to evolve. The current language engaged in the AUCC report and global trends in education suggest a more competitive positioning on the part of Northern educational institutions.

The focus on equity in education is now centred on issues such as access to educational opportunities; it is rarely set within a broader cultural context (Lingard and Rizvi 152). By focusing on quantifiable indicators such as the number of children enrolled in primary education, governments, international organisations, and analysts are absolved from considering the historical and political contexts that contributed to the creation of social inequality. In contrast to theories of justice that emphasize equity, participation and community, market driven policies have pushed nations and institutions to consider education in terms of human capital and investment and in isolation from cultural and political contexts. The impact of such policy on marginalised populations raises ethical concerns and will impact the formation of

global educational partnerships. It is useful here to consider some examples from research on international partnerships in education between North and South.

According to Seddon, “each partner is not just an abstracted decision-making agency, but is encumbered by its own history and culture. As a consequence, they each have different priorities and different definitions of social or individual need (Seddon, Billett and Clemans 130). It is essential to examine how each partners’ history, experience and governance are different in order to effectively analyse the impact policies will have in different contexts. The critical analysis of education policy is particularly necessary in cases where it is imperative to “understand the implications policy has for all those affected by its implementation” (Ozga 34). Further:

... conscious or unconscious assertions of particular ways of working within global educational partnerships can be experienced as a kind of professional or institutional imperialism which denies other partners’ knowledge, routines, and voice, and creates patterns of marginalisation and exclusion. Organizational habitus is not just anchored in particular institutional or professional cultures, but is embedded in broader social relations based in gender, ethnicity and class (Seddon, Billett and Clemans 130).

Collaborative partnerships between academic institution and local communities take time to develop, to cultivate trust, and to understand local values (Fahey, Kenway, Bullen and Simon 22). This process would seem to connect to Fraser’s parity of participation requirement for socially just partnerships. However, the process of contextualising local partnerships and seeking input from all stakeholders is considered inefficient in the new economy of higher education. It is interesting to note that the AUCC report does not indicate a role for international partners to play in the formulation of policy, partnerships or the direction of international programming. The language used in the report focuses exclusively on the “delivery of educational products and services” to provide the “foundation for other types of value-added activities such as internships, research collaborations and professional development” (AUCC 16). Yet as Samoff and Carol document in their research on educational partnerships, it is a rare instance when the benefits of research result in publications for faculty in the Global South, or that a significant number of scholars from the South are provided with opportunities for study in the North (82).

Ethical issues surrounding policy and the practice of international development are largely ignored in policy because mechanisms are currently lacking for the review and evaluation of policies where they are implemented. The AUCC report acknowledges, "The major argument for internationalisation is that it increases the quality of the institution...yet very few Canadian universities have carried out either internal or external peer reviews to assess the quality of their internationalisation practices" (20). John Mallea, in his project *Going Global*, a study of more than 51 Canadian universities and their approach to internationalisation, commented that, "[i]t (is) mystifying that every aspect of university life goes by the external peer review process, except internationalisation" (AUCC 20). This fact is particularly problematic in programs and partnerships that are negotiated from institution to community organisation or individuals, where there are issues regarding each partner's available resources, different operational frameworks and goals for project outcomes. In fact, many programs that can be classified as international development and cooperation are formed through informal channels, and are often the result of professional contacts of particular faculty members and, in contrast to other institutional partnerships, they are subject to little oversight and ethical evaluation (Sutton 137).

One of the criticisms of higher education internationalisation policy is the tendency to portray values as universal; local values are overlooked or deemed inefficient by policymakers (Rizvi and Lingard 63). The global trend is toward homogenizing or streamlining educational experiences, including curriculum and subject areas (Martens, Rusconi and Leuze, 14). Research by Meyer on global education policy demonstrates how education systems are becoming increasingly similar in content and delivery the world over (267). At the same time that policies are neglecting local input, new actors on the global education stage, such as international organisations (IOs) including the World Bank, OECD, the IMF and other non-governmental organisations (NGOs), are playing a much larger role in the formulation of policy and funding of education internationally, which contributes to the standardisation of education content. According to Martens, Rusconi, and Leuze, "New models of education collaboration and new types of qualifications are being developed (by IO's) and there is a significant impact on communities through the process of policy implementation" (Martens, Rusconi, and Leuze 7). Moreover, since educational programming is widely recognised as a key means of transmitting and informing cultural, political, spiritual, social, and other values, the power of education supported by multinational institutions, to silence indigenous

culture, is significant (Stromquist 53). These trends reflect the practice of cultural misrecognition resulting in the further silencing of local values, voices and histories in education.

The marketised approach to educational policy and international development sparks critiques of Western interventions in the developing world, including international development, put forth by writers and researchers from the Global South. Critics of international development challenge the language and ideology embedded in policies that Western higher education institutions adopt in reference to the Global South. The impact of policies on local communities, developed and implemented without careful consideration of local social geographies, are documented by critical development and postcolonial scholars.

Rather than promoting social progress and economic equality, Escobar argues that development experts from outside local communities contribute to uneven social, political and economic geographies and usurp autonomy. His analysis of the impact of development on the South resulted in conditions that fomented dramatic inequality. Instead of the kingdom of abundance promised by development theorists and politicians in the 1950s, the discourse and strategy of development produced its opposite: massive underdevelopment and impoverishment, untold exploitation and oppression (Escobar 4).

This view is grounded in the experience of entrenched poverty and social inequality that continues to be the reality for many communities in the Global South and is a condition that Escobar directly attributes to hegemonic moves on the part of the Global North or West to develop and implement strategies and import technologies that are inappropriate to conditions in the Global South (13). The hegemonic effect of international development corresponds to Fraser's analysis of misrecognition and maldistribution such that externally imposed approaches to development practices in the Global South continue to marginalise local initiatives, subordinating them to the technical expertise of the Global North. The move to view the former development sites as markets for exports suggests that the humanitarian element of development will be removed in favour of a streamlined market approach. Considering higher education policy from the postcolonial perspective problematizes ethical issues such as what counts as knowledge (Apple 56); there is nearly a complete domination of Western epistemology and approaches to education over non-Western values and ideals that are documented in the critical literature on development and education (Spring 335). Hommi Bhabha argues that postcolonial criticism gives voice to the desire to speak back to Western paradigms of knowledge

in the voice of 'otherness' to show how the 'constitution of Western subjectivity' and knowledge depends on the interactions with subjected others (27). Bhabha's argument, applied to higher educational internationalisation policies, highlights how Western institutions position the Global South as an arena to showcase Western knowledge and technology. Moreover, in the course of trying to attract attention for their projects, they displace local knowledge, institutions, technology, and voice.

CONCLUSION: FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND CHALLENGES

The challenges outlined above confront attempts to internationalise education: the subordination of local values to Western knowledge exports, little evaluation or oversight of policy and a trend toward global educational standards that discount local authority and values. From a social justice perspective, marketised trends in higher education policy risk the further marginalisation of already vulnerable populations. Operating with parity of participation between partners as a threshold to evaluate the equity of policy, (particularly when considering that education is the field under examination), recognises the relative strengths and weaknesses that exist between Global North and South institutions. The redefinition of this relationship to focus solely on economic aspects such as trade leaves out crucial considerations of the impact of market activities on vulnerable populations; in this relationship it is nearly impossible for many communities to challenge Western resources and hegemony and to participate fully as peers (Ishengomo 8). It is one of the hallmarks of a postcolonial analytic framework that an alternative must be found to the neocolonial relationship that currently governs so much of North and South partnerships and exchanges (Tikly 180).

The issues raised in this article demonstrate how the language used in higher education internationalisation policy is redefining how Canadian universities view the Global South with respect to development and cooperation programming. Exploiting developing world communities as markets for knowledge exports could displace local initiatives, potentially contributing to the further marginalisation of some communities, and drain vital local intellectual resources through recruitment of talented students and faculty. Not enough is yet known about the consequences of higher education policies and practices that operate without consideration of the context and culture of global partners (Lingard and Rizvi, 2010). Yet the findings from critical research on international development initiatives suggest that a one-sided formulation of policy can lead to the exacerbation of social problems due to the exclusion of local stakeholders.

The lack of a mechanism for the regulation and review of international programming creates a situation that could potentially lead to abuse if a rigorous program of external evaluation is not implemented. The call for peer evaluation and external review in internationalisation policy and practice is necessary to ensure integrity in university practices and partnerships (AUCC 23). This article has argued that the standard by which programming and policy should be judged is on the basis of peer participation, defined by Nancy Fraser as the democratic access to participation in decision making, the free expression of one's culture and values and an equal share in the distribution of goods and resources (13). Future internationalisation policies should strive to maximise the participation of all partners and to conceive of knowledge in emancipatory versus market terms.

WORKS CITED

- Apple, Michael. "Comparing neo-liberal projects and inequality in education." *Comparative Education* 37.4 (2001): 409-23.
- Bhabha, Hommi. "The other question: Difference, discrimination, and the discourse of colonialism." *Out there: Marginalization and contemporary cultures*. Ed. Russell Ferguson. New York: MIT Press, 1990.
- Crossley, Michael, and Tikly, Leon. "Postcolonial perspectives on comparative and international research in education: A critical introduction." *Comparative Education* 40.2 (2004). 147-156.
- Delhi, Kari, and Taylor, Allison. "Toward a new government of education research." *Education research and policy: Steering the knowledge-based economy*. Eds. Jenny Ozga, Terri Seddon, and Thomas S. Popkewitz. London: Routledge, 2006. 105-118.
- Erasmus, Mabel. "A South African perspective on North American international service learning." *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research*. Eds. R.G. Bringle, J.A. Hatcher and S. G. Jones. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011.
- Escobar, Arturo. *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the third world*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Fahey, Johanna, Kenway, Jane, Bullen, Elizabeth, and Simon, Robb. "Knowledge beyond the knowledge economy: Merely cultural? Merely commercial? Merely civilizing?" *World yearbook of education, 2006. Education research and policy: steering the knowledge-based economy*. Eds. Jenny Ozga, Terri Seddon, and Thomas S. Popkewitz. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Foucault, Michel. *The birth of the clinic*. New York: Vintage Books, 1975.
- Fraser, Nancy. "Reframing justice in a globalizing world." *New Left Review*. 36 (2005): 69-88.
- Fraser, Nancy. "Social justice in the age of identity politics: redistribution, recognition and participation." *Redistribution or recognition: A political-philosophical exchange*. Eds. Nancy Fraser and Axel Honneth. London: Verso, 2003.
- Gee, James P. "Discourse analysis: What makes it critical?" *Discourse analysis in education*. Ed. Rebecca Rogers. New York: Routledge, 2011. 23-45.
- Ishengomo, Johnson. "Strengthening higher education space in Africa through North-South partnerships and links: Myths and realities from Tanzanian public universities. Paper presented at the Conference of Rectors, Vice-Chancellors and Presidents (COREVIP) Stellenbosch, South Africa, May 2011. 1-13. Accessed on 3 June 2011.
- Jefferess, David. *Postcolonial resistance: Culture, liberation and transformation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- Lazreg, Marnia. "Development: Feminist theory's cul-de-sac." *Feminist post-development thought: Rethinking modernity, post-colonialism and representation*. Ed. Kriemild Saunders. London: Zed Books, 2002. 123-145.
- Longo, Nicholas V., and Saltmarsh, John. "New lines of inquiry in reframing international service learning into global service learning." *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research*. Eds. Robert. G. Bringle, Julie A. Hatcher and Steven G. Jones. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011. 69-88.
- MacEwan, Cheryl. *Postcolonialism and development*. London: Routledge, 2009.
- Martens, Kerstin, Rusconi, Alessandra, and Lueze, Kathrin. *New arenas of education governance: The impact of international organizations and markets on educational policy making*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Meyer, John W. "Globalization: Theory and trends." *Journal of Comparative Sociology* 48.4 (2007): 261-273.
- Mohanty, Chandra. *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Olssen, Mark. "Neoliberalism, globalisation and democracy: Challenges for education." *Globalisation, societies and education* 2.2 (2004): 231-275.
- Ozga, Jenny. *Policy research in educational settings: Contested terrain*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 2000.
- Ozga, Jenny, Seddon, Terri, and Popkewitz, Thomas S. "Introduction: Education research and policy: Steering the knowledge-based economy." *Education research and policy: Steering the knowledge-based economy*. Eds. Jenny Ozga, Terri Seddon, and Thomas S. Popkewitz. New York: Routledge, 2006. 1-14.
- Rogers, Rebecca, ed. *Critical discourse analysis in education*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

- Rogers, Rebecca. "Critical approaches to discourse analysis in educational research." *Critical discourse analysis in education*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Samoff, Joel and Bidemi, Carol. "The promise of partnership and the continuities of dependence: External support to higher education in Africa." 45th Meeting of the African Studies Association, December 5-8 2002. 1-120. Accessed on 12 Jan 2012.
- Spring, Joel. "Research on Globalization and Education." *Review of Educational Research* 78.2 (2008): 330-365.
- Tikly, Leon. "Education and the new imperialism." *Comparative Education* 40.2 (2004): 173-198.
- Tikly, Leon. "Globalisation and education in the post-colonial world: towards a conceptual framework." *Comparative Education* 37.2 (2001): 151-71.
- Tonkin, Humphrey. "A research agenda for international service learning." *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research*. Eds. Robert G. Bringle, Julie A. Hatcher, and Steven G. Jones. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011.
- Woodside-Jiron, Haley. "Language, power, and participation: Using critical discourse analysis to make sense of public policy." *Critical discourse analysis in education*. Ed. Rebecca Rogers. New York: Routledge, 2011. 154-182.