

# CONNECTED UNDERSTANDING: INTERNATIONALIZATION OF ADULT EDUCATION IN CANADA AND BEYOND

**Shibao Guo**

University of Calgary

**Daniel Schugurensky**

OISE/University of Toronto

**Budd Hall**

University of Victoria

**Tonette Rocco**

Florida International University

**Tara Fenwick**

University of Stirling

## Introduction (Shibao Guo)<sup>1</sup>

Fueled by globalization, the internationalization of adult and higher education in Canada is happening at a rapid pace. According a recent study (AUCC, 2007), the number of international students in Canadian higher education was 70,000 full-time and 13,000 part-time in 2006. Yet, despite its increased use in describing the international dimension of education, there has been a great deal of confusion about what “internationalization” means (Bond, Qian & Huang, 2003; Knight, 2004; Zha, 2003). The term can mean many different things to different people. For some, it means a series of international activities (e.g., academic mobility of students and faculty), international linkages and partnerships, and new international academic programs and research initiatives, while for others it means the delivery of education to other countries through satellite programs (Knight, 2004). According to Knight, internationalization can be defined as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (p. 11). Despite Knight’s claims that the term is generic enough to cover all aspects of education, it is not clear if it really applies to the context of adult education, which consists of learning that takes place in both formal and informal settings.

---

1 I would like to thank Janet Groen for co-hosting the CASAE Opening Panel with me.

This panel therefore explores the internationalization of adult education in Canada and beyond. The panelists will examine a number of issues, including:

- What does internationalization mean to adult educators?
- What is the purpose of internationalization? Is it to prepare our graduates to critically understand global issues and their local effects on individuals and communities? Or, is it to prepare graduates for a global market place?
- To what extent is adult education in Canada and elsewhere moving towards the internationalization of research, programs, and practice?
- What are the emerging trends and challenges?

### **Internationalization of Higher Education: Dimensions and approaches** (Daniel Schugurensky)

Since most of us are located in higher education institutions, I would like to say a few words about the internationalization of higher education. First, the university, since its medieval origins, has always had an international dimension. Second, when we talk about the internationalization of higher education, we are probably referring to several different aspects that may fit under this umbrella concept, and it would be pertinent to clarify which aspects we are considering when discussing this topic. Indeed, the internationalization of higher education is a broad topic that includes many different areas, six of which I would like to discuss as my contribution to this panel.

The first area relates to student mobility, which ranges from short-term study abroad programs, like summer programs, to longer-term stays, like 'year-away' sandwich programs, to—and mainly—graduate and post-doctoral programs. During most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, most international students were undergraduates, and recent trends suggest that undergraduate international students are on the increase and may outnumber graduate international students once again. The flow of students is often South-North, but there are North-South, North-North and increasingly South-South flows as well. Indeed, international students are increasingly remaining in their regions of origin. This is particularly the case for Latin America (11% in 1999, and 23% in 2007), and in East Asia (from 36% to 42%). Student mobility programs include not only the development of professional skills and disciplinary knowledge (from engineering to chemistry to law), but also foreign languages and intercultural understanding. These programs are funded by private and public sources, and are guided by different rationales. I will come back to this in a moment.

A second area, one that many of us in this room are familiar with, relates to faculty mobility. This includes short-term leaves, such as summer teaching in other universities or sabbatical years abroad, but also the hiring of academics trained abroad, an issue that has been discussed extensively in the literature on international development in relation to brain drain and brain gain dynamics. One issue that is affecting the mobility of scholars is the increasing difficulty experienced by scholars from the south with visas and work permits.

A third area could be called 'institutional mobility'. In this case, it is not the students or the faculty members who move, but it is the university as an institution that 'moves', either through setting facilities abroad or through creating joint programs with local academic institutions. The majority of branch campus provision flows from North to South, and even very traditional universities are part of this new phenomenon. For instance, the University of Bologna, arguably the oldest university in the western world, currently has a branch in Argentina. Another possibility is the delivery of programs to students who reside in other countries through distance technologies. The recent proliferation of offshore universities and programs can be explained by academic rationales but also by profit motives, and this cannot be isolated by initiatives carried out by the World Trade Organization (WTO) through instruments like the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) to make higher education activities subject to commercial transactions in a market-driven sector that could coexist with a state-driven sector.

A fourth area to consider in the internationalization of higher education includes a wide variety of collaborative projects, such as joint international research projects, long-term partnerships, collaborative conferences and symposia, and collaborative academic programs like the one between the University of Victoria in Canada and PRIA in India.

A fifth area relates to the internationalization of curriculum content, and this includes the presence of more international content in a variety of study areas, the vibrancy of international and comparative programs, the growth of global education as a field in itself, and extracurricular activities like centers and student clubs with an international focus, international film festivals on campus, and so on.

A sixth area relates to the proliferation of transnational public spaces for exchanges among professors, students, social activists, government officials, and other social actors. These transnational forums have existed for some time, but took off after WWII with the establishment of UNESCO. In our field, a good expression of this was the creation of the International Council of Adult Education (ICAE) in 1972, with regional activities and programs in every continent. A more recent expression of transnational public spaces for exchanges is the world social forum, which was created at the beginning of this century in response to the world economic forum and has consolidated itself as a planetary forum for discussion and strategizing among progressive social movements. A key factor in the proliferation of transnational public spaces in the last decade is the explosion of online fora and other exchanges through a variety of information and communication technologies (ICTs), which allow instant access to information and the possibility of communicating with others anytime from almost anywhere in the world.

I have no time to elaborate on each of these six areas, so please allow me to share a few comments about the first area, the one on student mobility. My first comment is that the regional origin of international students has changed over time. The first census of international students was carried out in 1948, and at that time, the top sending country was Canada. Last year, the top sending country was India. While the top places of origin have changed significantly in the last 60 years, Canada and India are the only two countries that have figured among the top 10 places of origin since 1948. Interestingly, Canada has always been among the top senders and the top recipients of international students. It is also

interesting to note that six decades ago, the regions of origin of international students were more evenly distributed than today: in 1948, 26% of international students came from Asia, 23% from Europe, 23% from Latin America 23%, and 17% from North America. Today, students from Asia outnumber students from all other regions combined, representing 62% of the total.

Secondly, since the last quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century there has been a steady growth of international students worldwide, from 600,000 in 1975 to 1.2 million in 1990, to 1.9 million in 2000 and 2.9 million in 2006. Admittedly, this is a modest percentage of total enrollments worldwide. According to the OECD, there are 135 million students in higher education worldwide, which means that domestic students still represent over 97% of enrollments. Although 3% of total enrollments is indeed modest, 2.9 million is an impressive figure in itself, and the rapid rate of growth suggests that the number of international students will continue to increase in the foreseeable future.

For this reason, and this is my third comment, a few countries are quickly tapping into the so-called "market" of international students. The drive for international students as an income generation strategy can be traced back to the introduction of differential fees for international students in the early 1980s, first in the UK, and soon thereafter in other countries like Australia and Canada. The contributions to national economies are significant. In Australia, international students make up 20% of total higher education enrollments and constitute the third largest export revenue, after coal and iron, and ahead of tourism. In New Zealand, international students generate more revenues than wine exports, and in the UK they generate more revenues than automotive or financial services. Here in Canada, in 2008 alone, the expenditures of international students amounted to \$6.5 billion, surpassing the exports of lumber (\$5.1 billion) and coal (\$6.1 billion). Given these figures, it is not surprising that the competition for international students is escalating. Continental Europe is now a major contender to the US, Canada, Australia and UK due to the introduction of international student fees and the growth of English-language programs, which have tripled since 2003.

My fourth comment is that the competition for international students is not exclusively driven by economic rationales (treating foreign students' revenues as export commodities), but also by immigration policies tied to the recruitment of top talents. This is particularly evident in societies with low demographic growth like Canada, Northern Europe, Australia and Taiwan. The other side of this 'brain gain' is the 'brain drain' of sending countries. For this reason, some countries are engaging in 'brain return' strategies to encourage their international students to come back after they complete their studies abroad.

Finally, I would like to suggest that three models guide the internationalization of higher education, particularly regarding student mobility. I also suggest that these models, with some variation, are also relevant to adult education. The first model, "human capital development", is characterized by the training of individuals in foreign universities, in areas perceived as economically relevant by the sending countries, by the host countries, and/or by international agencies. This model uses economic metaphors such as 'technological change', 'competitiveness', 'productivity', 'growth', 'applied research', and 'innovation' and is driven by labour forecasting, expecting that students will find a job in their field

in their home country or in the host country after graduation. Student training may be funded by the sending country (sometimes as part of the national debt), by the host country, by international funding agencies, by the individual students, or by a combination of the above.

The second model, “export commodity”, understands foreign students as customers who contribute tuition and fees to the university coffers (and to the national economy) in exchange for an educational service, which ranges from short courses (especially language courses), diplomas, and undergraduate and graduate programs. Australia, the US, UK, Canada, France, Germany, Japan and South Africa are the top hosts to mobile students, who usually come from developing countries and gravitate towards business-related programs. In a recent article suggestively entitled “The economic benefit of making education an export commodity,” a professor from a school of business argued that making education an export will bring money, generate new ideas, would allow a shift from local to global markets, change the consumption patterns of future generations, and create a market for goods, services and even political ideas. The key logic here is not aid but trade, international students as often perceived as ‘cash cows’ to cross-subsidize local students. A complementary strategy of this model –and another revenue source– is institutional mobility, establishing branches abroad. A recent survey of the International Association of Universities found that most universities believe that internationalization brings benefits to higher education, but they are also concerned about risks associated with the export commodity orientation, like the commercialization of education, the proliferation of “diploma mills” granted by low quality foreign providers, and brain drain.

The third model, “international cooperation and understanding”, is premised on values of solidarity and social transformation. Among the many examples of this approach we can mention the Coady International Institute, which is an offspring of the extension program of St. Francis Xavier University and the Antigonish Movement, and has been training community leaders from Africa, Asia and Latin America on co-operativism and community development since 1959. Speaking of 1959, another example can be found in the free education of medical doctors and other healthcare professionals provided by Cuba to countries of the global south. A third example is the recently created University of Latin American Integration (UNILA), a bilingual university (Spanish-Portuguese) located in a triple border that has faculty members and students from all Latin America, that includes all areas of knowledge (sciences, engineering, humanities and social sciences), and that is conceived as a political-pedagogical interdisciplinary and plural project to promote cooperation among Latin American countries. *Convergence*, the quarterly journal of the already mentioned International Council of Adult Education, is another example.

I could conclude with a pessimistic comment, lamenting that in the last two decades the third model has been in decline. To illustrate this trend with the two Canadian examples from the last four examples, the international cooperation programs of the Coady Institute have shrunk considerably due to declines in budgetary support from government agencies, and *Convergence* is currently at risk of being discontinued after more than four decades of circulation. However, inspired by Gramsci’s motto, I would rather conclude with an optimistic remark to acknowledge that Canadian adult educators have a long and proud history in the tradition of international cooperation and understanding, a tradition

that we still keep alive in our daily activities and institutional commitments. In this regard, we need to include more colleagues from the South and languages other than English in our conferences and publications. I just returned from an international conference on citizenship education and participatory democracy in Argentina that was jointly organized by the Transformative Learning Centre of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and the Universidad Nacional de Rosario. It was a wonderful event that brought together scholars and activists from all over the world. Probably many of you here have similar examples, and I hope that you will share them to inspire us. My point here is to reaffirm that, despite structural and institutional constraints, adult educators can exercise some agency to advance a model of internationalization that promotes the values that we collectively cherish.

**Everything Old is New Again: The Importance of Engagement to University-based Adult Education in Canada (Budd L. Hall)**

“The modern state university is a people’s institution. The people demand knowledge shall not be the concern of scholar’s alone. The uplifting of the whole people shall be its final goal” Henry Marshall Tory, University of Alberta, 1908.

“There is an international convergence of interest on issues about the purposes of the universities and colleges and their role in a wider society. Much of this is structured around perceptions of the vital role of higher education in both sophisticated and developing knowledge economies. Meanwhile there has been a dearth of scholarly attention to the practice (as opposed to the rhetoric) of civic engagement by universities and colleges in various cultural contexts”, Sir David Watson, Institute of Education, London, 2007.

Adult Education as a university matter in Canada traces its roots to the British Extramural tradition that is associated with 19th century developments at Cambridge University. The creation of the Department of Extension at the University of Alberta in 1913 by the founding President, Dr. Henry Marshall Tory was the first major institutional commitment. Extension and continuing education units became a part of normal knowledge architecture as universities opened up across the country. The Extension unit at St. Francis Xavier was the base for the Antigonish Movement. McGill University’s Extension unit at St Anne de Bellevue in 1938 created the organized radio listening group approach, which eventually led to the Farm Radio Forum and the Citizen’s Forum. The University of Toronto was the administrative home of the Worker’s Education Association in the 1930s and the University of Saskatchewan was linked similarly to robust community engagement and learning opportunities.

Research into adult education in Canada began to develop more quickly with the creation of adult education academic units in the 1960s that generated a need for research on the Canadian experience. The Universities of British Columbia and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education were the first two academic departments to be created. Throughout the 70s and 80s adult education became an accepted part of university academic life

associated with the professionalization of the field of adult education. And while there have been a series of administrative cuts to universities that have effected adult education departments, the academic field of adult education in Canada continues to be a dynamic and important space. The creation of the Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education in the early 1980s has been the organizing lifeline for the field and its journal, the means by which we most often share our research findings.

In 1998, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council created a new form of research grant that signaled the beginning of a newer era of engaged research. Drawing inspiration from the Service aux Collectives experiences in Quebec Universities and the theory and practices of participatory research in English-speaking Canada, the Community University Research Alliance (CURA) required a partnership between community organizations and academics. The CURA grant has become over the several years of its life, the most competitive of all SSHRC grants as it struck a chord amongst scholars who had been longing to find support for action oriented community-based research.

The Université de Québec à Montréal pioneered the idea of a university-wide structure for the support of community-based research and other forms of community engagement. The Service aux Collectivités was created in the 1970s and continues to flourish to this day. In English-speaking Canada, the creation of specialized structures to support research and other forms of engagement are more recent. Memorial University has the Harris Centre. The University of Victoria created an Office of Community-Based Research ([www.uvic.ca/ocbr](http://www.uvic.ca/ocbr)). The University of Alberta has given the engaged scholarship leadership to the Faculty of Extension. York University has a Knowledge Mobilization unit. The Community-University Exposition conferences have been held three times (Saskatchewan, Manitoba and British Columbia) bring 500-600 'engaged' scholars together each time.

Community-university engagement is arguably the strongest new theme cutting across all our university campuses these days. There has been a veritable explosion of writing on community-university engagement over the past five to six years. Ernest Boyer laid down the conceptual foundations with his development of the concept of "engaged scholarship" (1996). The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities (Kellogg Commission 1999) shifted the terms *research*, *teaching* and *serve* to the words *discovery*, *learning* and *engagement*. Susan Ostrander from Tufts University did a study of civil engagement on five campuses in the United States during 2001, which resulted in the articulation of a number of necessary components for effective engagement. (Ostrander, 2004).

David Watson former Vice-Chancellor of Brighton University initiated a robust Community-University Partnership Programme (CUPP) at his university, but in addition is one of the most persuasive and eloquent spokespersons for the links between lifelong learning, communities and university engagement. (Watson 2007, 2008, 2009; Watson & Maddison, 2005). Angie Hart, current academic director of CUPP has added much to our understanding of how community engagement works and some useful ideas about how to evaluate the impact of this work. (Hart, Maddison & Wolff 2007; Hart, Northmore & Gerhardt, 2007). Barbara Holland and Judith Ramaley of University of Western Sidney and Winona State University respectively have reviewed community engagement approaches



in the UK, Spain, Germany, India, Japan, Vietnam, Thailand, Philippines, Australia, USA, Canada, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil and South Africa and have created a typology of how Universities approach the change associated with the community-university change agenda (2008). At the Canadian Association for University Continuing Education national conference and in their journal, I have elaborated the opportunities for Canadian continuing education (Hall, 2009).

Engagement, citizenship, democratic practice, recognition of the knowledge creating capacities of all peoples in diverse ways has been at the heart of our Canadian scholarly discourse. Please read this piece as an invitation for us to find out more about the engagement strategies in our various universities, to bring our theory and practice to bear on this newly emerging way of institutional thinking, to find ways to support these efforts and to make sure that they serve the communities where we are located. At a national level, Community-Based Research Canada, CBRC, ([www.communityresearchcanada.ca](http://www.communityresearchcanada.ca)) is a way to follow national developments. An exciting new intellectual and practical space in the form of the Knowledge Commons Initiative ([www.knowledgecommons.ning.com](http://www.knowledgecommons.ning.com)) was launched in June of 2010. At the global level, the Global Alliance on Community Engaged Research, GACER, was launched in May of 2008 and shares the CBRC website.

### **The Case of Florida International University (Tonette S. Rocco)**

Before responding to some of the questions posed by the organizers, I'm going to start with a description of my university as a case of internationalization of higher education—a form of adult education. Florida International University is the southernmost situated university in the United States. The university is in a part of Florida that was minimally developed by colonists until the late 1800s. After the late 1800s southern Florida came into its own after WWII with counties and cities being formed. As a bit of historical context, Florida was under the Captaincy General of Cuba until 1821 when the Spanish completely left Florida in exchange for the U.S. staying out of Texas (we all know how that went; "Florida," n.d.). The first Spanish/Cuban soldiers and their families moved to Florida in 1565 to establish St. Augustine, Florida ("St. Augustine," n.d.). As an aside many students in my classes don't know Florida was a Spanish colony for 300 years. For some current affairs the republican candidate for governor in Florida is running on a platform in support of Arizona's strict illegal immigration law (Ader, 2010). Both states were originally colonized by Spain and had Spanish speaking populations long before English speaking populations arrived. Both states have a substantial population of Hispanics and Spanish speaking citizens along with the less dominant illegal migrants.

The university was founded in 1969 to achieve three goals: education of students, service to the community, and greater international understanding (Riley, 2002). Greater international understanding meant "to become a major international education center with a primary emphasis on creating greater mutual understanding among the Americas and throughout the world" (Riley, 2002, p. 5). FIU has worked towards this goal through the creation of centers that focus on specific geographic regions, course offerings, programs abroad, campus activities, and administrative commitment. Four of these actions are among the seven the Global Studies Foundation recommends (Harth, 2006). The other three recommended by the Global Studies Foundation, graduation requirements, infused



content, and institutional structure, were achieved more recently as a part of an initiative designed to earn FIU accreditation.

The student body is composed of 83% minority students and only 17% Anglo students. The majority of the minority students are Spanish speaking. FIU is the top university for graduating Hispanics with bachelors or masters degrees (About FIU, n.d.). While a local private university Nova Southeastern University is the top producer in the US of Hispanics and Blacks earning doctorates.

FIU where languages other than English are being spoken constantly and everywhere on campus felt there still was a need to internationalize its curriculum. As the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) portion of FIU's reaccreditation process for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), FIU established the initiative Global Learning for Global Citizenship. According to Hilary Landorf the director of FIU's QEP the "use of the term "international" rather than "global"" is important, while "international" commonly refers to a relationship between nation-states, "global" is a broader term, encompassing global, international, intercultural, and local interconnections" (QEP report, p. 16)." The initiative went on to adopt the definition of "global learning" provided by the American Association of Colleges and Universities' (AAC&U): "the process by which students are prepared to fulfill their civic responsibilities in a diverse and interconnected world" (Hovland 2006, as cited in QEP report)." I would suggest this diverse and interconnected world is driven and dominated by American and Western European ideologies and sensitivities.

From the QEP report (2009, p.17), "Global learning is an educational approach developed in response to the ways in which globalization has transformed everyday life. Many of these changes were driven by an unprecedented acceleration in the pace, volume, and scale of information sharing during the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Castells 1999; Thompson 2003). Thick information networks not only opened individuals' eyes to diverse problems and perspectives, they also enabled a new understanding of the interconnectivity of individuals and societies. According to Drucker "The truly revolutionary impact of the Information Revolution is just beginning to be felt...This is profoundly changing economies, markets, and industry structures; products and services and their flow; consumer segmentation, consumer values, and consumer behavior; jobs and labor markets. But the impact may be even greater on societies and politics and, above all, on the way we see the world and ourselves in it" (Drucker 1999, p. 47)."

The case of FIU demonstrates that internationalizing curriculum is generally in service of some other goal then becoming a citizen of the world. FIU's motivation was to achieve accreditation and improve our rankings by the other organizations that rank universities.

One question the panel asked was: *What is the purpose of internationalization?* Internationalization or globalization or global market place are all polite terms for colonization though colonization was a polite word when nations felt discovering, conquering, and developing new worlds was in their economic best interests. Prior to this we had empire building. For example the Roman Empire gave the world many new technologies, new government structures, used Roman citizens and locals loyal to the

empire in control, and left its cultural mark in many places. Empire building, colonization, internationalization, and globalization are all violent acts. In some ways we are less violent in our conquering of new markets and cultures now while in other ways current globalization is more violent than the colonization of the Americas. Internationalization is a seemingly nice word that implies caring for other cultures and people in those cultures. I'm not fooled. Americans use this word and these concepts to mask our quest for power in the world whether the power is gained through increased market share for our corporations or control of a foreign government. For me the true purpose of internationalization is to establish markets for consumer goods, to establish one dominant culture throughout the world, and to increase the wealth of those in power. If we truly cared about other cultures we would not need to establish heritage months, languages other than English would be taught in all schools, as would the history of other countries. Americans are so devoid of international understanding that we know little of our neighboring countries.

Internationalization is a word and idea more frequently embraced by those with education and white collar jobs. The purpose of internationalization or globalization is to increase employability of workers and to change consumer behavior, jobs, and labor markets. If it's so important for Americans to embrace globalization and internationalization of curriculum, why are languages not taught in all schools from preschool on? Why do we insist that the world speak English? Why are we so anti immigrant, legal or illegal?

A second question was: *What does internationalization mean to adult educators?* Internationalization for some adult educators means working in less developed countries to assist the people or governments with developing jobs, creating sustainable farming, and improving living conditions. For other adult educators, internationalizing adult education makes our programs more marketable, more valuable to our institutions, and helps educators with job security. For some adult educators internationalization implies working against or for NAFTA and other similar treaties. Notice when we talk about free trade we talk about commodities not people.

*What are the emerging trends and challenges?* The trends and challenges to internationalization are the same as they were for colonization and empire building. Do we respect local governments and cultures? When companies become global do they respect the environment, the people, the cultures of the countries they inhabit/conquer? When we offer degree programs in other countries do we require students to take US based qualifying exams? Do we require English language proficiency?

To conclude, are we internationalizing to expand market share, decrease cost of production, and make our institutions and countries more powerful or prestigious? Or are we internationalizing to engage people in other countries and cultures and learn about them and honor them?

### **Responsibility, Adult Education and International Engagement (Tara Fenwick)**

Although, the remit for this panel is to examine internationalization in adult education per se, I am going to focus my remarks upon adult education activity in higher education: research, teaching and knowledge exchange. I'm choosing this focus partly because there are others on this panel who speak much better than I to community-based activity. But

also, I want to address some of the mundane issues touching all of us who ‘do’ adult education in ivory towers.

It is worth mentioning that we have an inspiring history of university-based Canadian adult educators engaged in international activity, beginning with the Antigonish model of community economic development which continues to travel the planet today, and continuing with the strong tradition of community-based participatory research and peace education promoted by colleagues like Budd Hall, Daniel Schugurensky, Paz Buttedahl, Toh Swee Hin, the anti-globalization work of Shahrzad Mojab and others, and the leadership that Canadians such as Paul Bélanger have exercised in the International Council for Adult Education.

But more generally, ‘internationalization’ in universities has many meanings and conflicting motivations. These are not always made explicit. Motivations range from a positive desire to learn and inquire alongside others, to promote equity and to work with and for communities, to enhance academic CVs, or even to enhance our students’ employability. But for many higher education institutions, internationalization largely means a revenue stream. Revenue generation and colonization in the form of building campuses overseas can be masked with rhetoric of global citizenship. Motives of inquiry can be played out through programs delivered largely as paternalistic one-way transmission. Opportunistic economic partnerships can be rolled out in verbiage of mutual knowledge exchange that obscures highly exclusive types and terms of partnership. UBC president Stephen Toope, in his address about internationalization to the 2008 Congress of Humanities and Social Sciences, urged that much more must be done to open up universities in the face of ‘fears that can be generated by difference [that] are at work in our own country’ (Toope 2008:3). He went on to note that despite the important benefits and responsibilities to be realized through internationalizing our student numbers, Canadian universities have demonstrated disappointing commitment to action. Of graduate students enrolled in Canada, only 18% are non-Canadian citizens (almost half the percentage of the US in the same period), and universities send only 2.2% of Canadian students abroad.

Toope’s view is that through internationalization, Canadian universities have great opportunity to work for social justice through influencing policy, widening accessibility for international students, opening our own students’ global awareness, and partnering in international research to address the most pressing issues that threaten global health, rights and well-being. And many of us would agree with such ideals, perhaps protesting that we are doing a great deal to enact them. But I worry about what happens in our everyday practice of adult education scholarship with respect to internationalization. Here are just a few examples:

1. International students in Canadian adult education are still small in numbers, and vastly under-represented in our scholarly projects, meetings and publications relative to Canadian students. As a former Head of Department at UBC, I heard first-hand the many everyday difficulties of settlement that international students struggled with, often feeling isolated and under-supported.

2. Scholarly conferences in adult education, often labelling themselves international, are concentrated in North America and Europe. These are prohibitively expensive for our colleagues in the global South, and fraught with practical difficulties such as obtaining visas.
3. Refereed journals in education are mostly in English, with most concentrated in the US and the UK. Our colleagues writing in English as an alternate language have for years reported their difficulty getting published in these journals. The stakes are ramping up even more tightly now, with the increasing emphasis on publishing in tier 1 and tier 2 journals. This trend simply reinforces more exclusionary, western-centric, and excessively narrow forms of scholarship.
4. Edited volumes in adult education rarely include a wide balance of authors. My complaint here is not just that we should be doing better than including a token author or two from outside the Euro-North American usual suspects, but more broadly: that our books tend to reinforce dominant worldviews and favoured perspectives. Some of us do tend to indulge a preference for critical or 'post-post' forms of theorizing that exclude our colleagues from regions where the dominant questions are about basic skills training or human resource management. Some of us do tend to diminish or ignore the rich intellectual traditions brought to scholarship by certain international colleagues.
5. Important adult education research conducted with developing international regions is actively prevented by our academic institutional rhythms, foci, and reward systems. The lengthy periods required to build relationships with international partners, as well as the costly travel and interpretation arrangements required, are almost impossible to accommodate adequately within our current funding and publication structures that demand research 'outputs' within three or five years. The delicate ethical challenges of partnering with international communities for purposes of academically-driven research remain extraordinarily difficult, and the uncomfortable questions continue to be raised about just whose interests are actually being served in community-university collaborations.

Actually internationalization is a very big word. It is strange that we use the same word to describe our engagements with refugee communities in Africa, with wealthy Australian universities, with post-conflict eastern European regions, or with vast cosmopolises in China. The notion of 'global citizenship' continues to perpetuate a dream of unity, of shared interests, instead of multiple knowledge authorities and multiple worlds. We talk about a 'global conversation' in adult education, but such a phenomenon is conceived in the western imagination, largely in terms of the west's goals and the west's anxieties. It might even be reasonable to ask the question whether 'global citizenship' and the notion of 'global conversation' is to some extent a failed imaginary.

So to respond to the question about internationalization for adult education scholarship and teaching, let us go back to consider just why we want to promote it, with whom, and for what benefit. One way of considering this is to return to our very

purpose - our *responsibility* - as educators. For me that responsibility is about offering different opportunities, opening new possibilities, for expanding people's encounters and experiences of what it means to be human. In other words, as I have written elsewhere, learning is about coming into presence through encounters with *difference* (Fenwick 2003). This statement may seem self-evident and even banal. Naturally much of our adult education activity in the spirit of internationalization seeks this intention: bringing diverse people and perspectives together, arranging encounters of sharing diverse knowledge and opportunities for collaboration.

But I want to particularly draw attention to the issue of difference. Despite all of these gatherings, despite all of these supposed encounters, I wonder to what extent we truly are reaching across very different worlds – not just listening to worldviews, not just appreciating perspectives, but actively touching difference. The philosopher Michel Serres calls for an education that departs from “home” and encounters otherness, separated from the familiar and determined, becoming the wanderer, the nomadic consciousness, opening to multiplicity (Serres, 1997). Opening ourselves to truly encounter the sometimes breathtaking, sometimes frightening world of difference posed by the other. Accepting the disorientation posed by this difference to the structures holding in place our own worlds and our own taken-for-granted privilege. Appreciating the responsibility posed by difference for the way we live our lives and go about the practice of adult education.

My colleague at the University of Stirling, Gert Biesta (2007), writes that to take difference seriously means that we have to give up the idea that we can know otherness before we can adequately engage with it. We differ *in the moment* where we encounter and experience difference – which more often than not means: as it confronts us (Biesta, 2007). We could, then, consider our responsibility with respect to international engagement as helping to open encounters with difference. That is, encounters for purposes of expanding people's experiences and possibilities of what it means to be human. Again, this is not about simply experiencing diversity, as though *difference* consists of interesting variations that need not disturb our ethnocentric norms, values and interests. As Homi Bhaba points out, diversity “doesn't generally recognise the universalist and normative stance from which it constructs its cultural and political judgements” (1990, p.209). Instead, I am talking about expanding our own, and others, opportunities to actively meet difference. Not to simply treat it as another worldview, a curiosity, which can be folded into our own little settled ontology. But to meet difference on its own terms, as a unique and different world to our own.

So if we accept this as part of our purpose and responsibility as adult education academics, what does it actually mean for our practice? I have a few mundane suggestions for departing from home, separating ourselves from the familiar, and deliberately engaging with difference.

First, perhaps we could begin with our own attitudes, learning to extend our thinking and our connections beyond our North American neighborhoods. We are pretty comfortable in Canada. We all know that our news media is rather parochial, and that we perhaps don't fully appreciate the extent to which we are interconnected with the shattering daily events of 2010 unfolding in the Sudan, Pakistan, Iraq, Thailand, or with the euro-crisis. As an academic working comfortably in Canada, I admit that I had not



fully appreciated the difficult challenges in funding and accountability faced by our academic colleagues Europe and elsewhere: the massive importance of league tables, the audit regimes, and the job losses. One example of many is the University of Edinburgh School of Education, which issued Notices of Redundancy to all faculty members in winter 2010 as it prepared to cut 50 positions. I had also not appreciated the dramatic cuts to research funding in the UK. The ESRC (Economic and Social Research Council), which in the UK has been the primary funding council for academic research in social sciences including education, funded only 14% of all applications in 2009 of which only a tiny percentage were education-related (ESRC 2010). By way of comparison in Canada, SSHRC (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council) funded about 40% of all applications received (SSHRC 2010). Academic staff in the UK are often expected to earn part of their salaries through external grants, so they have become very strategic about amassing international teams and bid writing for large foundations. All academic research in the UK also is subjected to regular quality assessment (the next one, called the Research Excellence Framework, should occur in 2013), the results of which inform the allocation of research funding, 'establish reputational yardsticks', and 'provide accountability for public investment' (REF 2010). These trends are not isolated. Canadian educational scholarship could learn much by repositioning itself defensively and strategically to respond to the changing futures of research politics.

Further, our Canadian adult education research perhaps leans a bit too much towards small scale, one-off individual projects, driven by personal interests rather than by issues. More of us could work to build larger research collectives and teams, linking with colleagues and teams in other regions and other countries, looking towards the big questions. It's perhaps time for more of us to move beyond the project of defending adult education as a discipline and to look much more broadly, to link adult education questions to global issues in public health, peace, ecology, poverty reduction and human rights.

We could do so much more to reach across knowledges, actively engaging ourselves and our students with epistemologies that are different to our own, actively reading in different traditions to our own (and not just French post-structuralists) without folding them into our own views. Here in Canada we are privileged to have access to Aboriginal knowledge communities and scholarship that can teach us much about engaging with difference. Aboriginal scholarship can help us appreciate not only how we inhabit different ontologies, but also how difficult it is to truly encounter another's world without colonizing it as part of one's own.

Second, in our academic communities, in groups like CASAE (Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education), we can challenge our practices of organizing. We can question our academic meetings and associations: Who would like to be included but cannot, given our location? Who comes but is ignored because they are unknown or their work seems tangential to those at home? We can question our publications, particularly any journal that calls itself 'international', speaking up on those journals where we serve on editorial boards about review policies and preferences, about supports that might be put in place for international colleagues writing in English as an alternate language, and about the extent to which a journal truly reflects international issues and debates. We can name parochialism or insularity wherever we find it in academic volumes, as feminists



and critical race theorists have been doing for many years. We can engage in international organizations and debates such as CONFINTEA, holding them and ourselves to account to actually do something about the policies and pronouncements that are produced.

Finally, looking at home, we can question the initiatives in our own institutions for internationalization. We can request explicit clarification of motive, of interests, of who is participating and who is excluded, and of the potential negative consequences for other countries. We can question the ways in which our international students are welcomed and settled in, from the process of assessing their applications to our programs to the assistance provided for their accommodation to utterly different cultural and pedagogical practices. To what extent do we seek reflections of our own certainties about what knowledge counts most? To what extent do which we truly engage with the different knowledge traditions and experiences of these students, and actively open opportunities – and expectations – for our home students to engage with these differences?

Basically I am asking, like Maxine Green (1978), that we open to adventures of awakening. That we reach out, reach up, think big, think bigger. Most of all, I am asking that we move with courage, and with humility, into genuine encounters with difference – and in the process, perhaps, to meet ourselves coming into presence in new and unpredictable ways.

### References

- Ader, B. (2010). Rick Scott: 'Bring Arizona's immigration law to Florida. Now.' *The Florida Independent*. Retrieved July 24, 2010 from <http://floridaindependent.com/3964/rick-scott-bring-arizonas-immigration-law-to-florida-now>
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) (2007). *Trends in higher education: Enrolment*. Ottawa: AUCC.
- Bhaba, H. K. (1990). *Nation and narration*. London: Routledge.
- Biesta, G. G. (2007). *Beyond learning: Democratic education for a human future*. Paradigm.
- Bond, S., Qian, J., & Huang, J. (2003). *The role of faculty in internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum and classroom experience*. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Boyer, E. L. (2006) The Scholarship of Engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1 (1), 11-20
- Castells, M. (1999). *Information technology, globalization, and social development*. Discussion paper, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. [http://vega.soi.city.ac.uk/~abct353/SM1061N/Castells\\_1999.pdf](http://vega.soi.city.ac.uk/~abct353/SM1061N/Castells_1999.pdf)
- Drucker, P. F. (1999, October). Beyond the information revolution. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 284, 47-59.
- ESRC. (2010). *ESRC Today*. Swindon, UK: Economic and Social Research Council. Retrieved from <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/index.aspx> on 7 June 2010.
- Fenwick, T. (2003). *Learning through experience: Troubling assumptions and intersecting questions*. Melbourne: Krieger.
- Florida International University, (n.d.). About Florida International University. Retrieved July 24, 2010 from <http://fiu.edu/about-us/index.html>

- Florida. (n.d.). Wikipedia. Retrieved July 24, 2010 from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Florida>
- Green, M. (1978). *Landscapes of learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hall, B. L. (2009). Higher Education, Community Engagement and the Public Good: Building the Future of Continuing Education in Canada" *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*. Spring, 2009
- Hart, A., Maddison, E. & Wolff, D. (2007) *Community-University partnerships in practice*. Leicester: National Institute for Adult and Continuing Education.
- Harth, A. (2006). Internationalizing the Curriculum: Impediments, Imperatives, and Rationales. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, Renaissance Hotel, Washington, DC. Retrieved July 24, 2010 from [http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p101418\\_index.html](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p101418_index.html)
- Holland, B., & Ramalay, J. (2008). *Creating as Supportive Environment for Community-University Engagement: Conceptual Frameworks*. Keynote address to the HERDSA Annual Conference Rotorua, New Zealand, pp 33-47
- Hovland, K. (2006). *Shared futures: Global learning and liberal education*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Jackson, E. (2008). The CUE Factor: Community-University Engagement for Social Innovation in *Open Source Business Resource, September 2008: Social Innovation* (<http://www.osbr.ca>)
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
- Ostrander, S. A. (2004). Democracy, Civic Participation, and the University: A Comparative Study of Civic Engagement on Five Campuses. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33 (1), 74-93.
- QEP Report. (2009). *Global Learning for Global Citizenship*. Miami: Florida International University.
- REF. (2010). *Research excellence framework*. London: Higher Education Funding Council for England. Retrieved from <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/research/ref/> on 25 May 2010.
- Riley, T. (2002). *Beyond the tower: The history of Florida International University*. Miami: Florida International University
- Serres, M. (1997). *The troubadour of knowledge* (trans. S. F. Glaser with W. Paulson). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- SSHRC (2010). *Competition results*. Ottawa, ON: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.sshrc.ca/> on 7 June 2010.
- St. Augustine, (n.d.). Wikipedia. Retrieved July 24, 2010 from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/St.\\_Augustine,\\_Florida](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/St._Augustine,_Florida)
- Thompson, J. B. (2003). The globalization of communication. In D. Held and A. McGrew (Eds.), *The global transformations reader*, pp. 246-259. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Toope, S.J. (2008). *Canadian universities and a new internationalism*. Keynote lecture presented to Congress 2008, Vancouver, Canada, June 5 2008. Available at <http://president.ubc.ca>
- Watson, D. (2007). *Managing civic and community engagement*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

- Watson, D. (2008). The university in the modern world: Ten lessons of civic and community engagement in *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* vol 3, 1 pp 46-57
- Watson, D. (2009). Universities and Lifelong Learning in P. Jarvis (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Lifelong Learning*, pp 102-113. New York: Routledge.
- Watson, D., & Maddison, E. (2005). *Managing Institutional self-study*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Zha, Q. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in America*, 1(2), 248-270.