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Rationale:  
In the current context of a global imperative (Pashby, 2008), the university’s role as a critic and as the conscience of society is both heightened and attacked. Universities are increasingly responding to calls to internationalize through bringing in international students, sending students abroad, building international research partnerships, and internationalizing course curricula. This paper will present an overview of an inter-disciplinary, international mixed-methods research project funded through the Academy of Finland and involving 20 university sites in 10 countries. The research responds to timely concerns that current economic crises have served to intensify those internationalization policies in universities that prioritize profit-seeking over those that prioritize ethical alternatives (Khoo, 2011). The project examines how internationalization processes in higher education construct ideas of epistemic difference, transnational literacy, and global citizenship. At the SRHE conference in December 2013, we will be able to present the collectively developed analytical framework, key aspects of the methodology, and some preliminary findings.

Theoretical orientation and conceptual framework  
To establish a basis in global ethics, the project draws on postcolonial and decolonial theories (e.g. Bhabha, 1994; Chakrabarty, 2000; Mignolo, 2002; Quijano, 1997; Said, 1978; Spivak, 1999) to understand the barriers and opportunities for ethical engagement with internationalization policies and the persistence of colonial relations of power in academic contexts. Several authors have continuously called for a pluralization of knowledges in higher education (see for example Andreotti, 2009; Hickling-Hudson & Sidhu, 2011; Hoppers, 2009; Lavia, 2007; 2010; Rizvi, 2007).

Drawing on this theoretical orientation, the project examines how three concepts are constructed in internationalization processes of higher education. First, epistemic difference refers to historically marginalized forms of knowledge and subjectivity (Mignolo, 2002). Second, transnational literacy (Brydon, 2004; Spivak, 1999) refers to a combination of knowledge about ‘glocal’ (Bauman 1998) flows and the ability to engage with otherness in hybrid epistemological spaces shaped by center/periphery relationships. Finally, global citizenship refers to supra-territorial forms of subjectivity that highlight interdependence (Abdi & Schultz, 2008; Dower, 2003; Peters, et al., 2007;); ecological fragility (Krogman & Foote, 2010), cultural hybridity (Bhabha, 1994; Stevenson, 2005), complex flows of knowledge and power (Rizvi, 2007; Willinsky, 1998), as well as implications and responsibilities related to unequal distributions of wealth and labor in local and global spheres (Andreotti, 2007, 2011; Spivak 2002).
Methodology:
Based on the four main research questions below, this mixed methods project (Biesta, 2010; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010) utilizes policy discourse analysis as well as quantitative and qualitative methods to map trends in values, predispositions, and attitudes related to internationalization processes in the 20 participating universities. Case studies will be developed in order to inform innovative practices.

1. **How is epistemic difference perceived in internationalization policies and initiatives in participating universities?**
   - Method: Discursive analysis of policy and promotional materials and interviews with key figures responsible for internationalization policies and practices.
   - Data: National strategy documents, university strategies of internationalization, and university initiatives of internationalization.

2. **How is difference constructed and what value is attributed to it in terms of capacity for relevant knowledge production in institutional relations: between international and local faculty, international and local students, faculty and students, curriculum design, indigenous/aboriginal students, as well as international partnerships?**
   - Data: Staff and students responses to online survey (4 co-horts from different disciplinary programmes in each university).

3. **How is the role of the university, faculty and graduates perceived in terms of global citizenship ideals?**
   - Method: Quantitative and qualitative instrument (online survey).
   - Data: University strategies of internationalization, university mission statements, staff and students responses to online survey.

4. **What kinds of educational policies and processes have the potential to resist and disrupt hegemonic patterns of knowledge production that restrict possibilities for ethical relationalities and solidarities in local and global academic spaces?**
   - Method: Discursive analysis of curriculum and qualitative instruments (interviews and ethnographic observations) and case studies.
   - Data: Programme/course documents, ethnographic observation notes, and transcribed interviews.

Academic Contribution:
We build on previous research concerned with the effects of ethnocentrism and of deficit views of diversity in higher education initiatives related to curriculum internationalization (Kelly 2000; Tarc 2009); the transnational identity capital of international student and staff (Kim, 2010), study abroad and volunteering schemes (Cook, 2008; Zemach-Bersin, 2007); international development partnerships (Kaapor, 2008; McEwan, 2009); and strategies for global citizenship (Andreotti et al., 2011; Andreotti & Souza, 2011). According to this literature, policies, partnerships, and curriculum design are largely framed by neoliberal market imperatives that value epistemic difference only when it is domesticated and corporatized (Kelly, 2000). Therefore, such internationalization practices tend to reproduce ideals of exceptionalism, entitlement, and (market) expansionism. We aim to identify and examine datasets and contexts that contest or confirm this thesis in the
co-horts of the (20) participating universities. This project also aims to contribute data and frameworks for understanding existing possibilities that can help to steer processes in higher education towards more ethically oriented versions of internationalism.


---

2 Some of the partner universities have specific programmes that explicitly attempt to promote ethical internationalization practices in curriculum design, pedagogy and international development partnerships. Two examples include: The Centre for Development Education Research, University of London; and The Centre for the Study of Global Citizenship, University of Alberta. Additionally, we have also planned study visits to universities focusing on models of ethical international partnerships and epistemological pluralism at the interface between indigenous and non-indigenous knowledge systems (Jones, 2008; Rendon, 2008).


