



Journal of Educational Studies and Multidisciplinary Approaches (JESMA)

www.jesma.net

On the concept of internationalization: Socially just research collaborations between the UK and MENA countries

Andrea Abbas ¹

Jie Gao ²

Gihan Ismail ³

To cite this article:

Abbas, A., Gao, J. & Ismail, G. (2023). On the concept of internationalization: Towards a socially just research collaboration between the UK and MENA countries. *Journal of Educational Studies and Multidisciplinary Approaches (JESMA)*, 3 (2), 259-279. <https://doi.org/10.51383/jesma.2023.72>

Journal of Educational Studies and Multidisciplinary Approaches (JESMA) is an international scientific, high quality open access, peer viewed scholarly journal provides a comprehensive range of unique online-only journal submission services to academics, researchers, advanced doctoral students and other professionals in their field. This journal publishes original research papers, theory-based empirical papers, review papers, case studies, conference reports, book reviews, essay and relevant reports twice a year (March and September) in online versions.

¹ Professor, University of Bath, Bath, United Kingdom, aa2452@bath.ac.uk

² University of Bath, Bath, United Kingdom, jg361@bath.ac.uk

³ University of Bath, Bath, United Kingdom, gnmi20@bath.ac.uk

On the concept of internationalization: Towards a socially just research collaboration between the UK and MENA countries

Andrea Abbas <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3528-7393> 

Jie Gao <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4537-4471> 

Gihan Ismail <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7244-6990> 

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Theoretical article

DOI 10.51383/jesma.2023.72

Received 15 December 2022

Accepted 26 March 2023

ABSTRACT

This paper argues for a wider range of critical perspectives to be brought to bear on the phenomenon of internationalization. We argue that the role of internationalization research should be to promote reciprocity and respect between academics and students from different systems. This paper was developed as a discussion piece for the Re-Knox Conference in Cairo (August 2022). It is based on a process of independence and co-reflexivity regarding three of the authors' research projects. It conveys and illustrates three principles regarding theory and method that we found valuable for understanding how research that builds a more sustainable, equitable, and cooperative form of higher education could be developed. The goal is to unpick and transform the destructive, exploitative, and negative relationships that are embedded in internationalization and affect all parties.

Keywords: Higher education, epistemic justice, comparative analysis, MENA countries, China, UK, Criticality.



This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original authors and source are credited.

Introduction

To further advance the understanding of internationalization, the research underpinning this exploratory paper aimed to develop insight into how we could enhance and deepen research in this field. Our investigations led us to conclude that critical theory beyond the dominant, so called, Western universities and countries was needed to address issues pertaining to justice (Kim, 2009). We propose that to achieve this, research in this area should: a) broaden the conceptual scope by incorporating literature from outside the more mainstream studies of internationalization, including works on decolonization, and concepts emerging from the global south (Dados & Connell, 2012; Campbell & Neff, 2020), and perspectives developed by marginalized groups such as disability scholars and feminists; b) analyze any phenomena related to internationalization they encounter in their research in the context of their actual or potential contribution to generating hierarchical relations between nations, people, institutions, and knowledge; and c) recognize and acknowledge, through reflexivity, the historically unequal relations or biases embedded in knowledge production, even when it is intended to promote social justice.

The notion of criticality proposed by Santos (2014), which is ‘premised upon the idea that there is no way of knowing the world better than by anticipating a better world’ based on knowledge and research practices that ‘provide intellectual instruments’ for ‘unmask(ing)’ harmful processes *and* practices that ‘sustain’ and legitimize injustice along with the ‘political impulse to struggle’, is helpful in framing our argument (p viii). We do not want to exclude Western critical perspectives but instead advise underpinning theories, practices, methods, and empirical findings with principles that assure questions of justice addressed. Our suggestion is to widen the range of perspectives used, their geographical sources, and the standpoints of scholars and research participants, as suggested by Chen (2010) and Smith et al. (2018). Whilst we believe that these principles are broadly important for any research in internationalization, this paper was developed for the Re-Knox (2022) conference in Cairo and was thought through as principles that could underpin research between the UK and the MENA countries.

The three principals were derived from a process of independent reflexivity on one research project by each author (described in more detail in the next section). This was followed by joint co-reflexive writing and discussions focusing on the framing, methodologies, analysis, findings and theorization of the projects. The process effectively led to co-reflexive writing akin to that described by Sobande and Wells (2021), through which we generated new understandings by combining our experience and our work by reflexively entwining them. We focused on what was important for producing a critical understanding of internationalization. This has enabled us to learn from the connections and contradictions between them. It is distinct from combining research through reading as the authors and researchers have more direct engagement with one another’s work and thought processes and self-determine their representation within the context. The discussion was driven by our overarching aim to embed and promote values and practices toward greater global social justice through research.

In the next section we explain the authors' contributions to the paper and introduce their individual projects. Next, we explore the importance of developing critical concepts of internationalization for social justice drawing upon the literature (Andreotti et al., 2018). Subsequently, the methodology we used in our projects is elaborated before evidencing and describing the findings: the three principles derived from our collective analysis. In the discussion and conclusion, we return to consider their combined contribution and their implications. Finally, we reinforce our call for deeper understanding of the phenomenon of internationalization and that a more sustainable, equitable and cooperative form of international higher education is needed (Engwall, 2016).

Author Contributions and Projects

Each of the three authors has explored how the concept of internationalization as conceived or articulated by UK universities, explains how research participants become positioned and (dis)valued in the UK, China. The analyzed findings from very similarly organized qualitative biographical interview studies with postgraduate students, graduates and academic staff who have worked or studied in the UK system. All three authors contributed to all aspects of the paper in equal measure.

Andrea Abbas's analyzed data from research conducted with her colleagues (Monica McLean and Melanie Walker) explores the development of the careers of 6 international and 8 national academics over a period of ten years. The overall study interrogated longitudinally the impact of funding changes in the UK system on the careers of academics working in the social sciences and humanities. She draws upon findings relating to the way participants perceived the impact of the universities criteria regarding their international research profiles on their success and failure in feeling valued and getting promoted in UK universities.

Jie Gao contributed an analysis based upon a comparative study of Chinese Professionals who were graduates of UK and Chinese universities. He investigated how UK international undergraduate education compared with Chinese home education, in terms of its impact on graduates' careers and professional identities in China. The participants were 11 UK-educated graduates and 10 Chinese-educated graduates who are lawyers in China and, 11 UK-educated graduates and 11 Chinese-educated graduates who are ICT (Information and Communications Technology) professionals in China. The analysis compares what the professionals believe the respective forms of undergraduate education have contributed to their career development and professional identities in China.

Gihan Ismail contributed an analysis of her qualitative study involving 22 Arab doctoral students and Arab graduates from UK universities; and 6 UK supervisors of Arab students. Her study explored participants' perspectives on the value of UK doctoral education and the actual and potential impact and relevance of UK doctoral education upon returning to their local contexts. The analysis provides insights into issues pertaining to an understanding of the complex relationship between knowledge, ethics and power and highlights the challenges and opportunities involved in the education acquired in international settings.

Rationale for the expansion of critical concepts for the study of internationalization

In higher education literature, the term internationalization is mostly used to refer to a trend of now well-established practices, strategies, and actions that relate to having more internationally focused activities in universities. These were initially associated with the so-called Western universities (a term confusingly applied to North American, European, and Anglophone universities including Australasia). The activities have grown exponentially over the past forty years (Sperduti, 2017; Tight, 2022). Even at the earliest stages of university development, scholars traveled and communicated internationally as it was embedded in the construction of universities and is still important to most involved (De Ridder-Symoens, 1992; McLean, 2006). However, the size, significance, and range of activities, alongside the variety of countries, people and universities involved has altered, and the process has accelerated with technological developments (e.g., internet and travel) since the 1980s, as measured by a host of indicators (Lee, 2021). Activities include international student recruitment, student and staff exchanges, research collaboration, knowledge exchange or transfer, the recruitment of staff from more diverse nationalities, exchanging or transferring skills, setting up branch campuses in other countries and having joint programs across countries (Crossley, 2022; Ge, 2022; Lee, 2021).

For some universities in Europe, North America, and Australia, internationalization underpins business models for running universities and is associated with the marketization of higher education and the economization of knowledge (especially for the neo-liberal university systems which are dependent

upon monies raised by such activities) (Bamberger, Morris and Yemini, 2019). For example, the more marketized universities of the US (United States), the UK and Australia, are increasingly funded by the fees paid by international students. Aspects of internationalization have become important key indicators of quality in national and global university league tables and those universities aspiring for high status, shape the structures of universities to support internationalization activities, This includes regions where the modes of internationalization and the funding and ideological structures might be different, such as in Africa, Asia and South America (Crossley, 2022; Lee, 2021; Pan, 2021; Tight, 2022). Consequently, in these universities there are international offices, pro-vice chancellors or vice principals for internationalization, faculty and department personnel who are responsible for internationalization, performance indicators linked to it and money and resources that are targeted to support these activities (Whitley, 2012; Henard, Diamond and Roseveare, 2012). While success in doing this brings reputational rewards in league tables and increases in international students and fees, the range of such activity and the rewards are hugely variable both within and between countries (Bedenlier, Kondackci and Zawacki-Richter, 2018). The governance of internationalization within university impacts status, pay, recruitment, mobility opportunities, and so forth. Internationalization also shapes how governments fund research nationally and the forms of funding available for different universities and students within the system (Guan and Abbas, 2022).

Increasing connections and growing activities between universities, students, and scholars across the globe are mostly agreed to be a good thing, including the authors' work. However, the focus of this paper concurs with critiques of the currently dominant models of internationalization and contrasts its position with research that sees the number of activities and the rise and fall of these activities in various parts of the world as evidence of change or indicators of actual or potential growing equity. Instead, we align with scholarship that challenges the validity of the current form of internationalization and the implicit and explicit claims of its value to the world (Gacel-Ávila, 2021). Such research suggests that embedded within western universities (their practices, knowledges, pedagogies, funding models, quality systems, value systems and so forth) are injustices built on past values, advantages, and power differentials (Gerbert, 1993; Lincicome, 1993; White, 2015). The so-called elite or world-leading universities of the West were facilitated by the massive financial rewards they reaped from colonization: violence, the obliteration of peoples, and cultures, the appropriation and use of their resources and the devaluation or destruction of their knowledge and education systems (Santos, 2014). The logic and development of internationalization continue this process (Quijano, 2007; Mignolo and Walsh, 2018; Walker, 2020; R'boul, 2022). A single example illustrates a complex and multifaceted process: wealthy international students from poorer countries transfer fees that could be bolstering and developing the resources put into universities in their home nation, to elite universities usually in Western countries or other wealthier institutions (Marginson, 2007). The concepts of elite, world-leading, and excellence are powerful, in attracting money and draining resources from poorer countries toward the richer Western university systems (Firoz, 2016). The investment of money from colonization on which the universal education systems and university research of the West were built, results in success that is, with some exceptions, treated as a glorious achievement and celebrated purely as evidence of the excellence and superiority of Western science and education.

The competitive agenda and ideology underpinning internationalization positions universities in rivalry with one another and invisibilizes the source of the West's success. International activities are scored and ranked in terms of quality as defined by Western-dominated league tables (Hertzog, 2016). Recruiting international students and having international staff scores highly on league tables even though being able to do this is highly linked to the wealth of a nation, which is influenced by its unfairly earned advantage in the reputation stakes. Hence, internationalization has been incorporated into what has been termed the competition fetish of the global higher education system (Naidoo, 2018; Lepori et al, 2015; Matić, 2019). This is generated by something akin to Hoeschele and Kennet's (2010) model of the economics of abundance, which is based upon a false sense of scarcity. Knowledge from low-

ranked countries in league tables that potentially adds to the global abundance of knowledge is given low or worthless status and silenced or absented. In addition, the nations that are dominant in the league tables, or more accurately, specific groups within those countries and internationally, continue to unfairly benefit. Hence, critical perspectives on internationalization are required to explore what a fairer system might look like.

There are a range of perspectives that can be utilized. De-colonizing or de-imperializing perspectives are important (See the works of Connell, 2007; Chen, 2010; le Grange, 2016). Critical studies on the development and role of universities and internationalization are helpful (Collini, 2012; Kim, 2009; Marginson, 2022; Carpentier and Courtois, 2021; Lee and Stensaker, 2021; Spiro, 2014; Trahar et al, 2016; Wheelehan & Moodi, 2021). Importantly, other intersecting inequities become embedded in international systems in complex ways and to understand this: feminist perspectives (Arya, 2012; Morley et al., 2020; Pereira, 2017, Xu, 2009); those challenging ableism in the academy (Boda, 2022; Mireles, 2022); LGBTQI+ based analysis and perspectives (Capobianco, 2020); work interrogating how race and ethnicity generate inequity (Bhana, 2014; Kim, 2009; Sun et al, 2021); and, social-class or economically informed critiques need to be drawn upon and understood through different national lenses.

There is not one critical concept of internationalization that is likely to suits all purposes, although there may be underlying epistemological agreements that could be reached, as argued by Danermark (2019) in presenting a framework for interdisciplinary research. Given the scale of the problem, the amount and type of research needed can at best be a collective endeavor based on a shared mission to read, utilize, apply, reference, link and develop critical perspectives and methodologies from across the globe. It is to such a project that our paper speaks, and we believe that researchers could develop sets of principles to underpin it. We offer three examples for illustration and discussion.

Methodology

The analysis conducted for this paper combines three separate studies that were specifically analyzed to explore the research question: How can participants' experiences and perspectives inform socially just approaches to internationalization? The studies were particularly well-suited to address this question because each of them revealed injustices stemming from the participants' encounters with the internationalized higher education in British universities. The brief outline of the studies describes the sample and the focus of each project.

We discuss the three methodologies employed to gather the data and explain how the three data sets were analyzed independently before being combined to generate the themes that informed the principles presented below. Although the studies shared similar methodologies, there were slight variations to account for their respective purposes and sample characteristics. Volunteer participants were recruited for each study using a mixture of purposive and snowball sampling (Denzin and Lincoln, 2018). All the participants were interviewed using semi-structured interview techniques and we each had a broad biographical approach to understanding participants' experiences of studying and working in UK higher education, in relation to the concept of internationalization. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed thoroughly through developing open coding and then analytically themed (Denzin and Lincoln, 2018). For Abbas and colleagues, participants were interviewed for two hours in the first year to incorporate a biographical understanding of their lives, followed by a career-focused interview. They were interviewed for one hour in the subsequent three career-focused interviews. There were 2-to-3-year intervals between all four interviews, and they took place between 2011 and 2021. Gao's participants were interviewed with a similar initial longer biographical interviews, but follow-up

interviews were broken down into shorter conversations. There was more of a two-way interaction over a period of a year. This was important for building trust with a group of participants who were less familiar with the qualitative interviews. Ismail's biographical interviews were one to two hours long and each participant (students, graduates and supervisors) was interviewed once. The interviews were semi-structured, and a similar process of data transcriptions, coding and analysis was followed.

Each of us coded data based on an overarching theme of internationalization. This was done independently and coded using the qualitative data software, NVivo. We then each wrote about each of the themes and what we felt they meant and then exchanged them. Once we had thoroughly read one another's analysis we had several shared meetings in which we reflexively discussed commonalities and differences in the themes of our individual studies, and these led to the generation of the principles for developing a critical understanding of the concept of internationalization of higher education.

Findings and Discussion: three principles for critical understandings and more just forms of internationalization

To develop work that engages with the problematic nature of internationalization is important because each time we normalize current understandings of the concept in our research, we inadvertently play a part in perpetuating the oppressive processes. Our work shows that a critical understanding of this extremely large issue, internationalization, can be developed through our comparatively small individual research projects. It also demonstrates how through the combined development of principles we increase the validity of our individual arguments.

Principle 1: Expanding the conceptual landscape for internationalization research

In this section, we emphasize the value of a diversity of critical theories generated by scholars from a variety of national contexts, in raising questions that promote justice.

Ismail chose the concepts associated with the critical pedagogy of Paulo Freire (1974, 1996, 1997) to interrogate participants analyzed data. She kept to the fore the goal regarding her desire to empower students and supervisors. She identified what Freire (ibid) defines as oppressive systems that stereotype students and lead supervisors to misjudge or misrecognize students and their previous education in Arab countries.

The supervisors' data demonstrated a prevalence of stereotypical views about Arab students and their national contexts, e.g., gender-based oppression, religious conservatism, lack of discipline, and lack of knowledge. They saw students' existing knowledge as being infused with this (but mostly, not their own). Institutional policies regarding supervisors' responsibilities to generate a particular kind of thesis in a defined time, also compounded the forces preventing supervisors' genuine and open engagement with their international students. Consequently, students' experience and understanding were rarely given a space. The critical consciousness that Freire (ibid) sees as necessary for challenging the unjust conditions did not transpire, because it would involve a discussion of students' and supervisors' different understandings and a collective interrogation of any light these different perspectives shone on the situations studied. In addition, students trust in the capacity of the UK systems of supervision to find solutions for the local social problems and issues of Arab countries prevented such relationships. Most students and graduate participants arrived in the UK with internalized images of their existing knowledge being low in the international hierarchy. This gave the students a sense that they were academically incompetent, and they accepted the superiority of Anglophone or British ideas they encountered.

The critical analysis produced, helped to identify and articulate the mechanisms by which the dehumanization of supervisors and students occurs as they pursue the apparently pragmatic, but actually materialistic, goals of universities (to get students through the system). Overall, she found that there was the objectification of students and their past experiences (as representing a prejudiced and inferior education system) and that this minimizes the possibility for genuine knowledge exchange between supervisors and students. Upon returning home, the graduates initially maintained their commitment, believing that the dominant Anglophone theoretical knowledge and methodologies they had become competent to use could fix the social problems of Arab societies and blamed their academic systems for resisting change. However, the ability to fix things did not materialize even for graduates who had been in their home country for many years.

Ismail's use of Freire highlights the ethical implications of unequal power relations embedded in international engagement (Liu, 2022; Buckner & Stein, 2019) and challenges the equality and neutrality ostensibly embedded in practice and rules regarding academic encounters in internationalized contexts. This illustrates the importance of critical research into internationalization because it is not enough to understand the quality of doctoral supervision through the lens of host countries. We need research to explore holistically what people and countries benefit from internationalization. The lack of development of relevant knowledge and skills through the doctorate for the students' home context needs urgent consideration. While Peck (2021) recently decried the lack of attention to the pedagogical approach in international doctoral education in British universities, for impairing genuine knowledge exchange due to the absence of authentic collaborative scholarship, we need more of this type of research. Ismail's Freirean analysis goes beyond this and articulates that the double oppression of supervisors and students has consequences for both partners.

Gao critically conceptualizes internationalization through a comparison of UK-educated and Chinese educated graduates, working in Chinese law and IT, using the concept of *youki*. *Youki*, also called *Shiyo*, is a Japanese translation and adaptation of the Marxist term *aufhebung*. It emphasizes the process of progression and development either for individuals (Senuma, 1930) or society and the Japanese nation (Kubo, 1913). It was developed in the late 19th century and early 20th century. It describes a process of transformation, whereby change involves taking what is valued and applicable and discarding what is not. Among Japanese scholars of that period, Kurata (1953) particularly emphasized the use of *youki* to understand and internally reconstruct the then influx of Western knowledge alongside traditional Japanese knowledge and philosophy and in doing so generate a new dialectic.

The use and development of this concept arise from Gao's analysis of, and engagements with, graduate participants' reflections on their previous educational, social, and employment experiences (from when they chose their university to their current employment context at the time of the research). *Youki* generates a conceptualization of how each graduate continuously acquired, reconstructed, reformed and applied their knowledge. It illuminates what knowledge transfer discourses often conceptualize as general contexts (e.g., acquired in the UK and applied in China) as needing more attention concerning the lived subjectivities and perceived layers of context that are brought to bear as graduates who undertake the process and enact knowledge transfer. *Youki* conceptualizes this as a process that begins with graduates choosing their degrees and learning knowledges in the UK or China, which integrates into their identities, decisions, and practices in diverse ways. It is affected by the context in which they learned it and then reconfigured in the enactment of identities and knowledge in their different career contexts.

One example illustrates how context can be influential: two participants educated in the same university and who worked in similarly prestigious Chinese law firms had significantly different perceptions of the embedded ideologies of their UK law degrees. Conceptualized as a process of *youki*, Gao's analysis identified whether participants associated the knowledge acquired in the UK with 'Western values and

ideologies' depended on whether they engaged with students from a diversity of international contexts in their studies or not. Similarly, IT participants who worked in distinct types of Chinese businesses had different views on whether their UK-acquired knowledge was globally applicable. Those whose companies mostly employed domestic graduates or handled domestic cases, saw UK-educated participants' modes of working, (e.g., forms of team collaboration, and their professional standards) as opaque and unacceptable. UK graduates in these firms doubted the applicability of their UK knowledge in China.

The theory of youki argues that what is usually called knowledge transfer is more accurately seen as a process of knowledge generation that occurs when students return to their home countries. It takes place through dynamic interactions, which are best understood through critical evaluation of the way knowledge is generated through reflection and readjustment in Chinese contexts. In practical terms, universities should contextualize what they study for international students' contexts, which would also improve UK students' understanding of international contexts. Graduates would have liked to have gained some support in gaining the reflective and critical skills needed to adapt to UK-learned knowledge, skills, and professional identities (including ethics, ways of relating and so forth).

Abbas and colleagues drew upon the work of British sociologist Margaret Archer's (2007, 2012) understanding of the morphogenetic society. In contemporary fast-changing morphogenetic societies, it is assumed that the form and direction of the internal reflections, decisions, and actions of individual academics are affected by university and society contexts but also that individual decision making is increasingly prevalent in shaping lives. Also collectively, decisions have the power to impact upon contexts and societies and alter them. As educational, employment, living, social and personal contexts are more likely to change, there are fewer blueprints that allow intergenerational continuity in terms of what decisions are made. Change can be toward or away from generating justice. Internal conversations, that take place in people's heads to evaluate the situation (alone or in consultation with others), and reach decisions involve balancing out competing and concordant concerns and pressures. However, in our interviews we found university criteria and preoccupations, such as the need for their staff to be international researchers are highly influential in shaping what academics do and how they feel about themselves. The need for universities to survive financially in neoliberal universities is reflected in the criteria for promotion.

Archer (2007) identifies and explores distinctive styles of internal conversation and decision-making according to people's key concerns. The predominant mode of decision making is the focus of people's life projects, the four involve: remaining part of their existing community, natal or collegiate group (communicative reflexive); moving on and up the career ladder (autonomous reflexive); being driven by a commitment to values and ideals (meta-reflexive); and, when rational decision-making breaks down (fractured reflexives). Most people have all of these in their repertoire. Regarding internationalization, for this paper Abbas generated an analysis that illustrated that all academics in their study had careers that were affected by internal conversations and decisions based on their need to be international (Pásztor, 2015) and to contribute to the internationalization agenda of the various universities in which they worked. Sometimes this was part of their project as a meta-reflexive as promoting the research they valued, for example, social justice for women in Asia or a generating a theoretical perspective that was globally accepted was part of a values driven life project and the accompanying decision making (Archer, *Ibid*). Personally, it affected academics' decisions about what (not) to do, people's (in)confidence, and even their health. However, it also plays a role in generating hierarchies between academics from different countries in enacting their careers. The insights developed in relation to this are illustrated in relation to principle 2.

Principle 2: To contextualize and analyze the phenomena of internationalization in relation to its actual or potential role in generating hierarchical relations between nations, people, institutions and knowledge in other parts of the world.

Here, the importance of using theoretical lenses to identify the hierarchies generated using the internationalization processes studied is illustrated.

International academic work is not normally judged on ethical grounds or the production of just outcomes (de Wit, 2020). Being international for Abbas and colleagues' interviewees involved activities such as publishing in internationally renowned English language journals, presenting at international conferences in English language, and bringing in money for international projects carried out and published in English. Although this approach can be highly ethical and beneficial in some respects, internationalization work can also cast international colleagues as instrumental to a nationally born academics career end and the process of being involved in international projects with renowned UK scholars can inadvertently make international colleagues and their work invisible. Also, controversially, three of the six international lecturers who were part of this study and whose positions in UK universities enhanced their universities' international league table scores (as judged by the measure of international staff and students), felt their international identity was not valued by their UK universities and their systems of promotion. For example, a southern European male lecturer said his most important and impactful work that he wanted to do to give back to his birth country, was not valued and he had to do things he thought were of lesser public and personal value to maintain his UK system-defined notion of international reputation. Another female international lecturer who thought her international identity was beneficial for her international students did research in different countries and concluded after attempting promotion that she was not the right type of international to help her with promotion. There is often a mismatch between what international participants valued regarding the contribution they could make and what their universities wanted from them. Many of the international staff had or felt that the internal conversations they had about internationalization. were linked to their not being promoted or recognized for the international contributions they valued. In two cases, not getting promoted when they felt they had spent years building what they deemed international work, was linked by participants to declining mental health and well-being. The demand to be internationally renowned to gain promotion also impacted upon UK born academics who chose to focus on the teaching aspects of their careers.

Principle one and two combined illustrates the important work critical theory can do in identifying how the process of internationalization and its enactment in universities can end up reinforcing a range of hierarchies including those between many academics. Nationality is important but participants indicate it is also experienced differently according to other aspects of identities.

Gao's study challenges the UK and Chinese government narratives, which both tend to see international students as largely beneficial to both countries (despite the prominent counter narratives which we don't have the capacity to go into in this paper). However, these accounts focus on the economization of outcomes.

Since 2010, Chinese returnees from UK education have been seen as important to the Chinese Government in bringing back 'advanced [western] knowledge needed for the development and re-establishment of China in the new era' (Opening statement, 19th National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, 2017). This is evident in policies and incentives (e.g., housing and finances) to attract Chinese returnees to priority locations and businesses. Such explicit favoring from the Chinese government suggests that overseas returnees and education are more valuable than domestic graduates and education. However, the senior manager research participants challenged this binary and absolute view of overseas returnees and domestic graduates, claiming that they were valuable in diverse ways and in relation to distinct positions and tasks within their workplace.

Furthermore, in generating social identities and positions daily, the level of internationalization that UK-educated participants could present was far from straightforwardly valued. More than half of the UK-educated participants believed they needed to suppress or exaggerate what they see as making them international graduate-employees, to gain acceptance and recognition from their peers and clients. They would avoid clothing choices such as Western-styled cufflinks, consciously use fewer English words and terms, even with other UK-educated colleagues, and tread very carefully when discussing social events. Being perceived as ‘Westernized’ could impair their identities, hinder their relations with clients and place them hierarchically lower than Chinese-educated graduates.

Like Gao’s research, Ismail’s study challenges the normative evaluation of the value of internationalized programs in the UK, which sees doctorates as a proxy for status and indicative of a drive for change in the students/graduates’ national contexts. The tripartite data collected from students, graduates, and supervisors helped Ismail unpack the experiences and outcomes from multiple perspectives. The UK supervisors’ views echoed the long-standing position of privilege of ‘English-language knowledge’ and its association with quality and status for those who choose to (or can) receive their education in the UK.

‘... western and English language knowledge is extremely prestigious globally and Britain has a good reputation globally for the quality of education. Therefore, if you can take this knowledge back to your own country, that will raise your status and value in your own country... the knowledge is in English. So, they have the benefit, Britain benefits them in this.’

(Richard, Social Sciences)

Similar findings can be found in the mainstream literature on international education (Madge, Raghuram & Noxolo, 2015), supporting arguments for the value of North-South (or Western to others) knowledge transfer. However, the use of other voices problematizes this commonly accepted impact of this knowledge. Arab graduates’ perspectives combined with those of British supervisors create a much-needed nuance and an understanding of the ways in which Anglophone knowledge impacts (or not) the returnee’s national context. This quotation is only a small example of the value of this data. This participant had pride in completing their UK PhD, but this coexisted with their questioning of the practical use of doctoral knowledge and training in their national setting.

‘I have been here in (my country) for 5 years now and I did change, literally, nothing... because in management things come from up and go down. So, maybe the decision-makers do not want this. They just want the simple and traditional way of doing things...’

(Hisham, graduate, Management)

Such narratives indicate a paradox that goes beyond the economic (better employability) and cultural (status and prestige) benefits for international doctoral students, and we believe this supports our call for a more concerted effort to understand the value of critical perspectives for critical insights as well as for analysis that focus on the value of internationalized education for all partner countries and persons.

In the study of the internationalization of doctoral education in the UK, only recently has there been scholarly interest in studying the expectations and challenges of international doctoral students (Cadman, 2000; Russell et al, 2010; Young, 2009). However, the focus of this study is mostly on the challenges for British higher education with little to no focus at the added value for the returnees and the sending contexts (Montgomery, 2019; Liu & Lin, 2016). The critical perspectives developed by Gao and Ismail add to this.

Principle 3: Acknowledges and accounts for, through reflexivity, the historically generated unequal relations or biases embodied by the knowledge generated

It was in preparing an analysis for the Re-Knox conference that our ideas about an international project based on critical theories emerged. Viewing the manifold relationships and articulations, we need to

chase through our data to really understand how participants' lives become mechanisms for generating a form of internationalization, that appears to benefit the already advantaged parts of the world.

The phenomenon of internationalization is constituted by almost infinite configurations of diverse mechanisms, located in times, places and spaces across the globe and in history whereby its copious manifestations (both positive and negative) are sometimes noticed and often invisible (Beck, 2021). They are embedded within all of us as individuals, significant groups of people, governments and organizations' policies, universities and their cultures, pedagogies, curricula, and research practices combine with economic factors, thoughts, ideas and spaces. As none of our projects can capture this complexity, we propose that reporting our research and its findings along with any biases, injustices, and other factors that (re)generate hierarchies is important.

Our projects, like others before and after us, are necessarily focused on small parts of internationalization, but the point is to build on the diversity of critical perspectives from different positionalities. Our projects offer partial perspectives that should, as Sayer (2010) suggested, be judged in terms of their practical adequacy in providing a reasonable explanation for the injustices we identify in relation to how we have framed our research. Known and unknown biases shape us as researchers and influence every tool and heuristic device at our disposal, making all knowledge fallible and subject to re-evaluation. Therefore, systematic attempts to build a critical field require systematic mapping of and honest reflections on our efforts. A collective project involving colleagues globally should not be fueled by focusing on national interests, or by tinkering with small aspects of internationalization that facilitate the continued pursuance of national interests (for example, how to maintain a flow of students from sending countries) but be genuinely learning focused on how to turn studies of internationalization into a wider and mutually beneficial project.

Abbas and colleagues had known from previous research and literature that the expectation to be international weighed heavily on UK staff. However, through the analysis of the data for this project that we gained insight into the insidious and unjust nature of internationalization in relation to academics. Reflections lead Abbas to believe that this project would be enhanced by exploring how the UK version of internationalization interacts with other countries' academics and systems of promotion on health, well-being and the knowledge that is produced. There is clearly much collegiality, respect, goodwill, and rewarding relationships between international colleagues. However, alongside this, international people and phenomena (e.g., universities, knowledge, curricula) are positioned and any collaborative work includes and generates hierarchies. The perspective produced is partial but leans towards a more holistic and just understanding of international impact.

Gao's research similarly raises many critical questions by prioritizing Chinese graduates' perspectives on their careers post-university: an important perspective on internationalization (Song & McCarthy, 2018) as it challenges the common perspective in China and the UK. Transferred knowledge is deemed to be of less value or at the very least more complicatedly positioned, than a regular assessment of the value of UK higher education. At a simple level, once UK IT graduates return to China, they learn that Chinese companies value the speed of any initial code produced. In contrast, in the UK, they learned to prioritize correct code over speed. Chinese universities focused more on how to build a flexible/adjustable structure quickly and then apply debugging skills afterwards (to sort out the faults). The ideologies and identities that are developed in relation to the different forms of professional knowledge, practice, and dispositions through Chinese and UK education have much more complex impacts. This research provides a counterbalance to most research and indicates a need for more international perspectives; however, it is necessary to develop these ideas regarding how such approaches can be used for international good. However, a more comprehensive, nuanced, and complex understanding is needed to understand how to turn this work into an international good.

Similarly, Ismail's engagement with the internationalized doctoral experience brought to the surface a perspective on the repressive aspects of internationalization for Arab students and those who supervise

them. Students remained submissive to being assimilated into learning and propagating the UK version of Western knowledge: through studying in the UK, working with their British supervisors, publishing in the English language, and then teaching updated Western knowledge to students in the UK if they took on teaching as part of their studies. Students' national knowledge was deemed unimportant and made invisible. Supervisors sustain the hegemonic epistemologies and pedagogies of the UK, because they must. For example, international students must be able to frame their research strictly within Western paradigms and learn the skills considered important. By having a process of doctoral supervision that does not include open debates about knowledge and cultural understandings of what knowledge is for, supervisors and students do not benefit from a rich cultural exchange. Students arriving in the UK have achieved strongly in their own countries before they arrive. This study illustrates that an important aspect of international education is its failure to draw upon and develop a form of critical consciousness that can inform the development of emancipatory practices in research and teaching in different educational systems, cultures, and contexts. However, as with the other two projects, this requires mapping and developing.

Conclusions

Our own projects did not originally seek to contribute to a project around bringing together internationalization and decolonizing research, something that has more recently been advocated by other authors, but our analysis led us to position this work within a collective effort toward critical understandings of internationalization. Based on this work, we argue that researchers could identify and map out what is understood about the impact of internationalization practices in various parts of the world and identify people working and studying in the respective parts of the higher education sectors within countries who relate differently to these agendas.

It can unite understandings of the negative and positive impacts located within all countries and seek to undermine the generation of unjust hierarchies in which there are winners and losers. We have selected theoretical frameworks from theorists of different nationalities. One of the key arguments that we want to present to our readers is the dire need for collaborative research in the field of internationalization of higher education.

We contend that we cannot depend on the unilateral Westernized lens of internationalization phenomena and that the contribution of multiple perspectives is pertinent to our nuanced understanding of its intricacies, particularly from those who have historically been marginalized. Our paper calls for more grass-roots movements for collaborative research between western and southern universities by those invested in generating new knowledge to inform new ways of doing the internationalization of higher education more collaboratively. We need to move beyond guidance on methodology, data collection, and analytical approaches (Secret et al., 2011), towards research that invests time in understanding the significance of North-South communication (Kahn, 2015; Delgadillo, 2016) and the value of reciprocity (Sutton et al., 2012).

Strengths and Limitations

A strength of our project is that it is built on the discussions undertaken for and at the Re-Knox conference in Cairo (August 2022). This provided a promising opportunity to initiate, not just research collaboration between MENA and British academics, it provided a place where all parties involved could find ways to work together, reflect on their positionality and commitments and create future trajectories. Haley et al (2022) pinpoint the danger of maintaining a western epistemic hegemony in such academic endeavors by imposing Westernized structural conditions but overlooking the cultural ones. The significance of our research is that it illustrates what might be achieved regarding the

development of underpinning knowledge that could drive the types of collaborations we call for. It illustrates the work that is needed if we are to produce international education and research that does not: a) consolidate further exploitation of the South by providing labor (an army of researchers from the Global South); b) create new markets for Western research or invest in research agendas that encourage research consumption in the South while increasing research production in the North (Al-Katatsheh and Al-Rawashdeh, 2011). Trust-building is critical in understanding the value of internationalization, collaboration, knowledge production, of constructing supportive mechanisms for fair and equitable international collaboration.

A limitation of the research underpinning our paper is that it was not generated specifically to address the question of how we operate more collaboratively to achieve the ideas we are advocating. In addition, it is in some ways contradicting its own values as scholars who are developing their research careers in western universities. Our methods, perspectives, and ways of approaching research are hopefully helpful, but they are shaped by this context.

Acknowledgements

1. All of the authors are greatly indebted to their participants who went beyond what could be expected to engage with the questions we asked them.
2. We thank Monica McLean of the University of Nottingham and Melanie Walker from the University of the Free State for their extensive work and generous collaboration on the Academic Careers Project which explored the role of academics' agency from early to mid-career project and enabled the analysis of this work developing in this article.
3. A note on ethics: All three projects were conducted in line with the University of Bath (UK) and the British Research Association ethical guidelines. For further information on ethics, please contact the authors.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors have confirmed that there are no conflicts of interest underpinning any of the three pieces of research underpinning this study.

Funding

This research didn't receive grants from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- Al-Katatsheh, M.H. & Al-Rawashdeh, M.S. (2011). "The Future of North-South Dialogue in the Context of Globalization". *Journal of Politics and Law*, 4(2), 108-119.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/jpl.v4n2p108>
- Andreotti, V., Stein, S., Sutherland, A., Pashby, K., Suša, R. & Amsler, S. (2018). Mobilising Different Conversations About Global Justice In Education: Toward Alternative Futures in Uncertain Times. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, 26 (Spring Issue), 9-42.
- Archer, M.S. (2007). *Making Our Way through the World: Human Reflexivity and Social Mobility*. 1st Edition. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.



- Archer, M.S. (2012). *The Reflexive Imperative in Late Modernity*. 1st Edition. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Arya, R. (2012). "Black Feminism in the Academy. Equality, Diversity & Inclusion", 31(5/6), 556-73. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02610151211235523>
- Bamberger, A., Morris, P. & Yemini, M. (2019). "Neoliberalism, internationalization and higher education: connections, contradictions and alternatives". *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 40(2), 203-216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2019.1569879>
- Beck, K. (2021). "Beyond Internationalization: Lessons from Post-Development". *Journal of International Students*, 11, 133-52.
- Bedenlier, S., Kondakci, Y., & Zawacki-Richter, O. (2018). "Two decades of research into the internationalization of higher education: Major themes in the *Journal of Studies in International Education* (1997-2016)". *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 22(2), 108–135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315317710093>
- Bhana, D. (2014). "Race Matters and the Emergence of Class: Views from Selected South African University Students". *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 28(2), 355-68. <https://doi.org/10.20853/28-2-335>
- Boda, P.A., Nusbaum, E.A. & Kulkarni, S.S. (2022). "From 'what is' toward 'what if' through intersectionality: problematizing ableist erasures and coloniality in racially just research". *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 45(4), 356-369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2022.2054981>
- Buckner, E. & Stein, S. (2019). "What counts as internationalization? Deconstructing the internationalization imperative". *Journal of Studies in International Education* 24(2), 151–166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315319829878>
- Cadman, K. (2000). "Voices in the air: Evaluation of the learning experiences of international postgraduates and their supervisors". *Teaching in Higher Education* 5(4), 475-479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713699170>
- Campbell, A. C., & Neff, E. (2020). "A Systematic Review of International Higher Education Scholarships for Students from the Global South". *Review of Educational Research*, 90(6), 824–861. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320947783>
- Capobianco, S. L. (2020). "Examining International Education Research and Practice through a Queer Theory Lens". *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 32(1), 12-33. <https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v32i1.432>
- Carpentier, V. & Courtois, A. (2022). "Public good in French universities: principles and practice of the 'republican' model". *Compare*, 52(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2020.1722943>
- Chen, K.H. (2010). *asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization*. E-Duke Books Scholarly Collection. 1st Edition. Durham and North Carolina, US: Duke University Press.



- Collini, S. (2012). *What are universities for?*. Milton Keynes, UK: Penguin.
- Connell, R. (2007). *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*. 1st Edition. London, UK: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Crossley, M. (2022). "Policy Transfer, Context Sensitivity, and Epistemic Justice: Commentary and Overview". *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 27(3-4), 357-63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2022.2041876>
- Dados, N. & Connell, R. (2012). "The global south". *Contexts*, 11(1), 12-13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536504212436479>
- Danermark, B. (2019). "Applied interdisciplinary research: a critical realist perspective". *Journal of Critical Realism*, 18(4), 368-382. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767430.2019.1644983>
- De Ridder-Symoens, H. (Ed.) (1992). *A history of the university in Europe: Universities in the Middle Ages*. Volume 1. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- de Wit, H. (2020). "Internationalization of higher education: the need for a more ethical and qualitative approach". *Journal of International Students*, 10(1), i-iv. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v10i1.1893>
- Delgadillo, L. M. (2016). "Best practices for collaboration in research". *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 54(1), 5-8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fcsr.12175>
- Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Engwall, L. (2016). "The Internationalization of Higher Education". *European Review*, 24(2), 221-231. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798715000575>
- Firoz, T. (2016). "A Result or Condition of Internationalization of Higher Education: Brain Drain". *International Journal of Science Arts and Commerce*, 1(7), 54-62.
- Freire, P. (1974). *Education for critical consciousness*. 1st Edition. New York and London: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New Revised Edition. New York and London: Penguin
- Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. 1st Edition. New York: Continuum.
- Gacel-Ávila, J. (2021). The Importance of Internationalization Today and the Leadership Role of IAU. In H. van't Land, A. Corcoran & D.C. Iancu [Eds.]: *The Promise of Higher Education: Essays in Honour of 70 Years of IAU*. Springer Cham, pp. 89-94. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-67245-4_14
- Ge, Y. (2022). "Internationalization of Higher Education: New Players in a Changing Scene". *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 27(3-4), 229-238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2022.2041850>



- Gerbert, E. (1993). "Lessons from the Kokugo (national language) readers". *Comparative Education Review*, 37(2), 152-180
- Guan, S. & Abbas, A. (2022). "'I Am Just a Loser of Higher Education': A Framework for Comparative Analysis of the Value of Adult Higher Education Derived from a Chinese Study". *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(4), 928-940. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1820474>
- Haley, A., Alemu, S.K., Zerihun, Z. & Uusimäki, L. (2022). "Internationalization through research collaboration". *Educational Review*. 1-6 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2022.2054958>
- Henard, F., Diamon, L. & Roseveare, D. (2012). *Approaches to Internationalization and Their Implications for Strategic Management and Institutional Practice: A Guide For Higher Education Institutions*. OECD Higher Education Programme. Retrieved on 25 September 2023. Available from <https://www.oecd.org/education/imhe/Approaches%20to%20internationalization%20-%20final%20-%20web.pdf>
- Hertzig, H.P. (2016). *Going Back to the Source: A Second Look at Rankings*. In H.P. Hertzig [ed.]: *Universities, Rankings and the Dynamics of Global Higher Education: Perspectives from Asia, Europe and North America*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 187-202. https://doi.org.ezproxy1.bath.ac.uk/10.1057/978-1-137-46999-1_7
- Hoeschele, W., & Kennet, M. (2010). *The Economics of Abundance: A Political Economy of Freedom, Equity, and Sustainability*. 1st Edition. Farnham: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Kahn, P. (2015). "Critical Perspectives on Methodology in Pedagogic Research". *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20(4), 442-455. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2015.1023286>
- Kim, T. (2009). "Transnational academic mobility, internationalization and interculturality in higher education". *Intercultural Education*, 20(5), 395-405. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980903371241>
- Kubo, Y. (1913). [哲学概論] *Introduction to Philosophy*. Japan: Hondokan.
- Kurata, H. (1953). [学生と読書] *Student and Reading*] Japan: Aozora Bunko.
- Lepori, B., Seeber, M. & Bonaccorsi, A. (2015). "Competition for talent. Country and organizational-level effects in the internationalization of European higher education institutions". *Research Policy*, 44, 789-802. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2014.11.004>
- Le Grange, L. (2016). "Decolonising The University Curriculum". *South African Journal of Higher Education* 30(2), 1-13.
- Lee, J.J. & Stensaker, B. (2021). "Research on Internationalization and Globalisation in Higher Education—Reflections on Historical Paths, Current Perspectives and Future Possibilities". *European Journal of Education*, 56(2), 157-169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12448>
- Lincicome, M. (1993). "Nationalism, Internationalization, and the Dilemma of Educational Reform in Japan". *Comparative Education Review*, 37(2), 123-151. Retrieved on 25 September 2023. Available from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1188681>

- Liu, W. (2022). International education for the oppressed: A framework for international educators' value-based practice. *Policy Futures in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103221117653>
- Liu, W. & Lin, X. (2016). "Meeting the needs of Chinese international students: is there anything we can learn from their home system?". *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 20(4), 357–370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315316656456>
- Lomer, S. & Mittelmeier, J. (2021). "Mapping the research on pedagogies with international students in the UK: a systematic literature review". *Teaching in Higher Education*, Critical Perspectives, 28(6), 1243-1263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.1872532>
- McLean, M. (2006). *Pedagogy and the University: Critical Theory and Practice*. 1st Edition. Continuum Studies in Education. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Madge, C., Raghuram, P., & Noxolo, P. (2015). "Conceptualizing international education: From international student to international study". *Progress in Human Geography*, 39(6), 681–701. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132514526442>
- Marginson, S. (2007). "Global Position and Position Taking: The Case of Australia". *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(1), 5-32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306287530>
- Marginson, S. (2022). Is the idea wrong or is the flaw in reality? On the definition of 'internationalization' of higher education. Centre for Global Higher Education. Retrieved on 25 September 2023. Available from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8nhJCyE3t30>
- Matic, J.L. (2019). "The internationalization of American higher education: a positional competition perspective. *Globalisation*". *Societies and Education*, 17(3), 274-284. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2019.1584550>
- Mignolo, W.D. & Walsh, C.E. (2018). *On Decoloniality: Concepts, Analytics, Praxis*. 1st Edition. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mireles, D. (2022). "Theorizing Racist Ableism in Higher Education". *Teachers College Record* 124(7), 17-51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01614681221111428>
- Montgomery, C. (2019). "Surfacing "Southern" Perspectives on Student Engagement with Internationalization: Doctoral Theses as Alternative Forms of Knowledge". *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 23(1), 123–138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315318803743>
- Morley, L., Roberts, P. & Ota, H. (2020). "The Affective Assemblage of Internationalization in Japanese Higher Education". *Higher Education*, 82, 765-82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00593-4>
- Naidoo, R. (2018). "The competition fetish in higher education: Shamans, mind snares and consequences". *European Educational Research Journal*, 17(5), 605-620. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904118784839>



- Pan, S. (2021). "Reconceptualising 'internationalization' in Higher Education: The Case of Hong Kong". *Higher Education Quarterly*, 75(3), 487-500. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12286>
- Pásztor, A. (2015). "Careers on the move: International doctoral students at an elite British university". *Population, Space and Place*, 21(8), 832–842. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.1875>
- Peck, S. (2021). "Beyond knowledge exchange: doctoral training, collaborative research and reflective pedagogies in human geography". *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 47(1), 29-36. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2021.1956882>
- Pereira, M. Do Mar (2017). *Power, Knowledge and Feminist Scholarship: An Ethnography of Academia*. Transformations Series. 1st Edition. London: Routledge.
- Quijano, A. (2007). "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality". *Cultural Studies*, 21(2-3) (Globalization and Decolonial Option), 168–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601164353>
- R'boul, H. (2022). "Intercultural philosophy and internationalization of higher education: epistemologies of the South, geopolitics of knowledge and epistemological polylogue". *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 46(8), 1149-1160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2022.2055451>
- REKNOX (2022) 1st REKNOX Conference, Cairo, 22nd-28th August, 2022. [conference-hand-book-final-v3.pdf \(re-knox.com\)](https://re-knox.com/conference-hand-book-final-v3.pdf).
- Roberts, B. (2002). *Biographical Research*. 1st Edition. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press
- Russell, J., Rosenthal, D., & Thomson, G. (2010). "The international student experience: three styles of adaptation". *Higher Education*, 60(2), 235-249. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9297-7>
- Santos, B.S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*. 1st Edition. Oxon: Routledge.
- Sayer, R. A. (2010). *Method in Social Science: A Realist Approach*. 2nd Edition. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Secret, M., Abell, M. L., & Berlin, T. (2011). "The promise and challenge of practice–research collaborations: Guiding principles and strategies for initiating, designing, and implementing program evaluation research". *Social Work*, 56(1), 9-20. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/56.1.9>
- Senuma, S. (1930). [心理文学の発展とその帰趨] The development of psychological literature and its consequences. Japan: Waseda University.
- Smith, L.T., Tuck, E., & Yang, K.W. (2018). *Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education: Mapping the Long View*. 1st Edition. Boca Raton, FL: Routledge.
- Sobande, F. & Wells, J.R. (2021). "The Poetic Identity Work and Sisterhood of Black Women Becoming Academics". *Gender, Work, and Organization*, 30(2), 469-484. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12747>
- Song, X. & McCarthy, G. (2018). "Governing Asian International Students: The Policy and Practice of Essentialising 'Critical Thinking'. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*". *International student*



- migration and mobility policies: theoretical and empirical insights, 16(3), 353-365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2017.1413978>
- Sperduti, V.R. (2017). "Internationalization as Westernization in Higher Education". *Comparative & International Education*, 9 (Spring Issue), 9-12. Retrieved on 25 September 2023. Available from <https://www.ojed.org/index.php/jcihe/article/view/887>
- Spiro, J. (2014). "Learning Interconnectedness: Internationalization through Engagement with One Another". *Higher Education Quarterly*, 68(1), 65-84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12031>
- Sun, X., LEE, J.J., RHOADS, R.A. & WANG, X. (2021). "Cross-Ethnic Friendships among Ethnic Minority and Han Students at a Chinese University". *Comparative Education Review*, 65(2), 248-271. <https://doi.org/10.1086/713542>
- Sutton, S. B., Egginton, E., & Favela, R. (2012). Collaborating on the future: Strategic partnerships and linkages. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Witt, J. D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.): *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*. California: Sage Publications. pp. 147–166).
- Tight, M. (2022). "Internationalization of Higher Education beyond the West: Challenges and Opportunities - the Research Evidence". *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 27(3-4), 239-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2022.2041853>
- Trahar, S., Green, W., de Wit, H. & Whitsed, C. (2016). The internationalization of higher education. In J.M. Case and J. Huisman [eds.]: *Researching Higher Education, International Perspectives on Theory, Policy and Practice*. pp 23-41. Oxon: Routledge.
- Turner, Y. (2013). Pathologies of Silence? Reflecting on International Learner Identities Amidst the Classroom Chatter. In J. Ryan [ed.]: *Cross-Cultural Teaching and Learning for Home and International Students. Internationalization of Pedagogy and Curriculum in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Walker, M. (2020). Failures and Possibilities of Epistemic Justice, with Some Implications for Higher Education. *Critical Studies in Education* 61(3), 263–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2018.1474774>
- Wheelahan, L. & Moodie, G. (2021). Analysing micro-credentials in higher education: a Bernsteinian analysis. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 53(2), 212-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2021.1887358>
- White, M. (2015). The internationalization of higher education: Tensions and debates. *Antistasis (Proceedings From The 2015 Atlantic Education Graduate Student Conference)*, 5(2), 101-116. Retrieved on 25 September 2023. Available from <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/antistasis/article/view/24322/28156>
- Whitley, R. (2012). Internationalization and the Institutional Structuring of Economic Organization: Changing Authority Relations in the Twenty-First Century. In G. Morgan & R. Whitley [eds.]: *Capitalisms and Capitalism in the Twenty-First Century*. pp 209-236 Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199694761.003.0010>



Xu, F. (2009). Chinese Feminisms Encounter International Feminisms. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 11(2), 196-215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616740902789567>

Young, P. (2009). The loneliness of the long-distance doctoral student: a personal reflection on process and outcome. In T. Brown [ed]: *The Doctorate: stories of knowledge, power and becoming*. pp. 53-59. Bristol: The Higher Education Academy.

Authors' biographical notes:

Andrea Abbas is Professor of the Sociology in the Department of Education and the Centre for Research in Education in Asia. She focuses on understanding and theorising the inequities embedded in higher education systems and identifying more just practices and strategies.

Jie Gao has just completed his doctoral research at the University of Bath, Department of Education. His research interests are on the impact of international education on the careers and development of employees in China and other countries.

Gihan Ismail is a doctoral researcher in the Department of Education at the University of Bath. Her research interests are focused on the internationalization of higher education with a particular interest in the intersection of knowledge, power and ethics.