

This is a peer-reviewed, accepted author manuscript of the following research chapter: Samier, E., Elkaleh, E., & Hammad, W. (2021). Editors' critical introduction: conceptions of internationalisation challenging dominant knowledge traditions. Manuscript in preparation. In E. Samier, E. Elkaleh, & W. Hammad (Eds.), *Internationalisation of Educational Administration and Leadership Curriculum: Voices and Experiences from the 'Peripheries'* Emerald Publishing Limited.

Editors' Critical Introduction: Conceptions of Internationalisation Challenging Dominant Knowledge Traditions

Eugenie A. Samier, University of Strathclyde, UK
Email: Eugenie.samier@strath.ac.uk

Eman ElKaleh, Zayed University, United Arab Emirates
Email: Eman.elkaleh@zu.ac.ae

Waheed Hammad, Sultan Qaboos University, Oman and Damietta University, Egypt
Email: whammad@squ.edu.om

Abstract

This chapter provides a critical and comprehensive review of the internationalisation literature. It starts with a brief discussion of the main factors and features that need to be considered when internationalising the educational administration and leadership field. This is followed by a critique of the internationalisation of education and the many challenges that hinder the achievement of proper internationalisation. The third section provides an overview of the internationalisation models and practices in different disciplines such as psychology, sociology and political science, which is followed by a discussion on the internationalisation of education organisations in different countries with some examples from Arab and non-Western countries. The final section presents a critical review of literature on internationalising the curriculum and how culture competency and knowledge acquisition are key factors in achieving effective internationalisation. The chapter concludes with an overview of the book collection and the main ideas and concepts discussed in each chapter.

Keywords

1. educational administration and leadership
2. internationalisation
3. Postcolonial critiques
4. International curriculum
5. Non-western educational administration
6. Non-western educational leadership

Introduction

This project has been borne out of many years' experience of the three editors in teaching in non-Western or non-Anglo-American contexts where the dominant international literature is not adequate or appropriate in other countries, affecting supervision and research projects as well as teaching foreign graduate students whose preparation does not adequately prepare them for research and practice in their home countries, or students who plan to work abroad or have a diverse work environment. In order for the field to serve a truly global and international community, its theories, models and perspectives need to be able to not only serve Western countries and their various national systems, but also the local needs in other countries.

The purpose of this volume also corresponds to a number of UN sustainability development goals proposed in the UN 2030 agenda to ensure sustainable development in the economic,

societal and environmental aspects such as providing quality of education to all and promoting life-long learning opportunities, facilitating economic growth and productive employment for all, fostering innovation, creativity and resilience, and promoting peace, inclusiveness and social justice within and across societies (Costanza et al., 2014). Part of this UN initiative is to reorient higher education internationally towards ‘public service, relevance and social responsibility’ that can be reflected in vision, mission and goals statements as well as the policy regimes in individual organisations (Global University Network for Innovation, 2017, p. 35). One means of doing so is to create an internationalised curriculum in a number of fields, a principle we are exploring in this volume in the educational administration and leadership field. One of the persistent voices in creating a more inclusive curriculum to produce global citizenship, social justice, decolonisation and to inform the development of governance and leadership identities, values and practices is the indigenous literature from many communities and parts of the world (see McKinley & Smith, 2019). Finally, the volume responds to the worldwide criticism of doctoral education for being rigid, having a low quality of academic training and research and lacking the relevance, interdisciplinarity and international orientation required for economic growth and nation building in an increasingly complex, unpredictable and interconnected global market (Yudkevich, Altbach & de Wit, 2020).

Arar et al. (2017) see the aims of the field as threefold: understanding how educational leadership is constructed in its national and cultural contexts; how it tries to close gaps between national and global values carried through this role; and how it can address socio-political challenges in local or regional contexts in contrast with global values. Through their comparison of Egypt, Turkey and Israel, each with different histories, socio-economic and political systems, and cultures, they focus on four questions that need to be addressed in such an approach in relation to how the field can accommodate the needs of these countries’ populations. To some extent, this volume also pursues these questions: What factors enhanced educational leadership among the constituent groups in countries, including gender, ethnic and cultural groups? What factors worked as impediments to professional development of educational leaders? What policies at organisational and governmental levels have been used to promote equality of opportunity? And what future research could contribute to understanding how to foster better leadership within these contexts?

There are a number of important features in internationalising the educational administration and leadership curriculum, particularly in non-Western parts of the world that will be investigated in various chapters:

1. For the field and its professional practitioners to effectively serve their communities and countries, they need not only an understanding of education internationally, but also locally – within the context of the constitutions, laws, policies, social institutional configurations and conditions that prevail. They need the knowledge that allows them to think globally while acting locally.
2. Many non-Western countries have been colonised in the past in the Middle East and other regions, for example, through European imperialism in the early modern period during which colonial education was used in part to establish and maintain political control and promote Western culture. They are experiencing a neo-colonisation or neo-imperialism through globalised education, which usually means the importing of knowledge, skills and role constructions from the West, in this field mostly Anglo-American. The consequences of this are covered in many forms of postcolonialism that affect ideas, style of thinking, values, styles of social relations and interactions,

assumptions (often as hidden curriculum) about politics, economics, decision-making, etc. from many parts of the world, including East Asia (Takayama, Spriprakash & Connell, 2016; Yang, 2018).

3. Part of internationalisation is the recognition of universities in many non-Western parts of the world that are overlooked, devalued, marginalised or actively ignored, such as the many Muslim universities that have been established in several African states (Lo & Haron, 2016), whose contributions to higher education development are relevant and valuable.
4. The philosophical foundations for education vary considerably internationally reflecting different knowledge, cultural and religious or belief systems such as Islamic philosophies, East Asian systems of thought like Confucianism, aboriginal systems, explored by the Humanistic Management Network in a number of their publications (Amann & Stachowicz-Stanusch, 2013; Dierksmeier et al., 2011) that could serve as a model for internationalising educational administration.
5. Countries also have different types of populations, social institution arrangements, cultural norms, political and economic values and goals, and internal political or cultural tensions and conflicts.
6. Countries also are affected by regional conditions and politics, infrastructure and levels of resources, by invasion, humanitarian crises in what is sometimes referred to as 'turbulent times' such as Shapiro (2013) or in more dire and extreme forms as 'conflict zones' by the UN.
7. Influence from foundational fields and disciplines that affect educational administration and leadership that have internationalised considerably in the last two decades such as sociology, psychology, political science, and management studies (discussed in more detail below).
8. The process of internationalising can also involve stages of development, described by Jones and Killick (2013) at one UK university using an institutional level approach to consist of a first phase of a framework of three attributes of graduates consisting of a global outlook, employability and digital literacy, followed by a second phase of internationalised curriculum and learning outcomes.

There are a number of underlying rationales for an internationalisation of the field, some philosophical and theoretical and others pragmatic, although these categories are interrelated especially when considering societal continuity and social justice achieved through education that recognise cultural diversity and the need for inclusion (Lopez 2016). It is important to note, though, that conceptions of these vary internationally, including across Western countries even though scholarship often overgeneralises the 'Western' or 'non-Western' world. For example, there are practical consequences to differences in conceptions of social justice, examined by Rowney and Taras (2008) in universities involving fairness in relation to procedures, punishments and academic awards as well as teaching and learning styles emphasised and use of curricular materials through a comprehensive meta-analysis.

This collection focusses on developing a more internationalised educational administration and leadership curriculum through principles and practices that reflect the cultural and social institutional context in a broad range of countries. Included are systems of knowledge and values that inform them for both graduate curricula, and internationalised programmes in Anglo-American contexts where there are foreign students and faculty building a more diverse framework in the field. Constructing a new curriculum involves the inclusion of conceptual frameworks, models, theoretical approaches and strategies that can inform and guide the development of genuine internationalisation that reflects the different perspectives

and traditions of knowledge worldwide, and may require cultural competence training, as advocated by authors in the field (e.g., Bustamante, Nelson & Onwuegbuzie, 2009). These can affect all aspects of the field like institutional culture, national and minority cultures, values and research design and methods orientations, faculty recruitment and development, learning styles and pedagogical approaches, accreditation and standards for quality assurance, and political orientation, policy, and availability of financial resources, that may facilitate or inhibit the internationalisation of the curriculum.

This is a timely project for two reasons. First, it addresses an important topic that has gained increased emphasis in recent times. The internationalisation of higher education has been adopted by many academic systems and institutions as an organisational response to the global impacts created by globalisation such as social justice that adequately take into account societal differences (e.g., Hopson et al., 2010) and the negative impacts in non-Western countries on national culture, heritage and identity (Ateyat & Gasaymeh, 2015). There are also many unintended consequences that have arisen for all universities, noted by Knight (2013) to include greater commercialisation, the rise of diploma and accreditation mills, skewed and Western-oriented ranking systems, and a 'great brain race.' As they engage in the process of internationalising their systems, faculty are challenged to think about how best to internationalise their curricular content and pedagogical practices. Second, within these global transformations, the field of educational administration and leadership has also witnessed significant developments in the foundational disciplines it uses. Most notable is a growing recognition of the need to diversify knowledge bases in the field and the importance of taking contextual factors into account. It is our hope, therefore, that this book will assist scholars and practitioners to achieve this goal.

Critiques and Shortcomings of Education Internationalisation

On a philosophical and theoretical level, most of the discussion in education administration is a reflection of the 'Western' tradition', the cumulative tradition traced through authors such as Plato, Aquinas, Kant, Rousseau, and Locke. More contemporary theory accepted as foundational for education is the work of Rawls, Nussbaum, neo-Marxist and Habermasian critical theory, writers such as Friere, Giroux and Apple and more recently Foucault and Bourdieu among others treated as universally valuable and applicable (Zajda, Majhanovich & Rust, 2006). However, a counter-literature has been forming inspired by postcolonial critiques and broader comparative international knowledge that can better represent the character and organisation of education in differing national contexts (Dede & Baskan, 2011). This view is reinforced by Huber and West (2002) who demonstrate that while commonalities exist, there are many differences even across European jurisdictions in how they are constructed and function and affect school head roles.

There is also a bias towards the present and a preoccupation with the short-term future. For example, internationalisation, like globalisation, tends to be conceptualised as a recent modern phenomenon, when in fact there have been several periods historically. The first of which we have evidence for are trade routes in existence 10,000 years ago, with global business strategies developed by 3000 BCE in ancient Sumer (Griffith & Armon, 2014) that included not only goods but knowledge and skills (Cline, 2014; Keohane, 2002). Internationalisation of knowledge and learning also existed in the Islamic Golden Age of scholarship from the 7th to the 12th centuries, where the migration of knowledge from centres of learning like Cairo and Baghdad took place through the travels of Western scholars and book collectors (Bevilacqua, 2018) and the Renaissance migration of knowledge to Europe,

in part through Al Andalus (Al-Rodhan, 2012; Saliba, 2007). It was also a widespread practice in East Asia during the 19th century, often through colonisation (Huang, 2007).

The problems of not internationalising adequately are multiple: ignoring cross-cultural knowledge limits, understanding of motivational and managerial approaches and practices that do not transfer well to other contexts (Griffith & Armon, 2014), and legal, cultural and religious requirements for researchers and students, and for non-Western countries. One highly undeveloped area is the contribution intellectually that foreign students make, contributing to the knowledge of faculty members and other students (Sawir, 2013). There have been many critiques raised in relation to either accepting or promoting, even unconsciously as a hidden curriculum (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977), a pedagogy of the oppressed (Freire, 1954), and the need for a counter indoctrination to pursue reform (Fanon, 1965) in earlier literature. More recently, authors like Yang (2019) criticise comparative education books that start with Western authors instead of prior literature in other parts of the world, resulting in Anglo-American authors used as a ‘universal’ standard. This forms a foundation for development in non-Western countries that ‘involves cultural masquerades due to an intrusion of Western influences’ (64) producing ‘academic colonisation’ (Hwang, 2016). Asian studies in higher education, for example, have expanded substantially in the last few years, providing alternatives to the colonising hegemonic conceptions of westernising globalisation by investigating East Asian sources (Jung, Horta, & Yonezawa, 2018). And there are authors advocating using a non-Western foundation and framework from which to develop curriculum (Haigh, 2009).

Postcolonial critiques arising over the last few decades have challenged the hegemony of Western, particularly Anglo-American, studies in order to internationalise disciplines that have rested on a false assumption of universality that has effectively marginalised other knowledge and practice traditions through prior and current colonisations (Jones & Brown, 2007). This is the main contention of critiques like neocolonisation (e.g., Memmi, 2003; Nkrumah, 1965; Quist, 2001), epistemicide (e.g., Hall & Tandon, 2017) and decolonisation of mind (e.g., Thiong’o, 1986). Mignolo (2011, 2018) is a strong proponent of decolonising countries of Western knowledge and styles of modernisation affecting all social institutions, which through hegemony serves the interests of Western countries (De Sousa Santos, 2017).

One of the foci of a proliferating decolonisation literature is the re-evaluation of higher education on institutional, organisational, and individual levels in its control over knowledge construction and dissemination. Some have critiqued the universities’ suppression of decolonising efforts (Arday & Mirza, 2018) and the colonising effects of curriculum and pedagogy that require decolonising efforts (e.g., Bhambra, Gebrial & Nişancioğlu, 2018). Some also critique the marketing methods and tactics of Western universities, their branch campuses, and Westernised universities in many countries that promote an assumed (although not always consciously or overtly) superiority of such knowledge and education, including its potential complicity in the legitimising of recent populist mentalities (Cupples & Grosfuguel, 2019). One prominent collection is that by Fomunyam (2019), which covers a broad range of topics that comprehensively covers critiques and principles of reconstituting an equitable higher education in an African context: how globalisation has produced colonised higher education; decolonising curriculum and pedagogy; and decolonising research design and practices. This critique also is important for national and ethnic identity, values and beliefs that respect and affirm indigenous thought and senses of identity as well as the socio-cultural structures of society (Msila, 2017).

The knowledge theory assuming that foundations are developed in a Western country, for example, dating the beginning of sociology with Comte and Weber, has been challenged with examples of authors like Ibn Khaldun (1967) who developed an equally complex and comprehensive approach in the 14th century. This marginalisation has instilled an epistemological amnesia resulting in the structuring of social institutions predicated upon imitation and establishes a value set and conception of identity construction that can be at odds with the social and cultural systems of many countries. This emulation of some Western systems is evident in the international accreditation regimes used broadly to legitimise higher education (Altbach, 2003; Noori & Anderson, 2013), that also disadvantages those transferring credits, migrating to different styles of programme and certification systems (Wildman et al., 2014). These Western conceptions are also highly secularised promoting societal structures and practices that devalue other national traditions in countries where education is a primary means of sustaining national cultures and social institutions. To some extent, as Bagader (1997) argues in relation to the Middle East, this resulted from colonial periods and large numbers of Arabs going abroad to gain their degrees, a practice also of other parts of the world.

Many of the recent books in the field present their content as universally applicable, often implicitly, such as Bush's (2011) *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management* which is primarily reflective of Anglo-American experiences, Bush and Middlewood's (2013) *Leading and Managing People in Education*, which mostly deals with Anglo-American countries in depth while recognising the importance of globalisation and international comparison, and Leithwood and Hallinger's (2012) *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, heavily oriented towards Anglo-American contexts. Three that have had more success in representing different countries and diverse cultures, values and practices are Dimmock and Walker's (2005) *Educational Leadership: Culture and Diversity*, Clarke and O'Donoghue's (2015) *School Leadership in Diverse Contexts*, and Foskett and Lumby's (2003) *Leading and Managing Education: International Dimensions*, reflecting a 'parochial mindset' (Paige & Mestenhauser, 1999). The field is still in early stages of internationalising, however, a number of authors have begun to recognise indigenous knowledge systems, religious beliefs and values that contribute to styles of administration and leadership and how they shape educational ideals, policies, structures and practices, deeper levels of identity and forms of social interaction.

Leask (2009) has suggested a definition that includes an internationalising interculturalism in 'preparation, delivery and outcomes' (p. 209) that is widely being accepted (Green & Whitsed, 2015), and consistent with other sources involving a global perspective, intercultural competence, and responsible global citizenship for all students that requires learning much more about the conditions and social institutions in other societies (Williams & Lee, 2015). In other words, parochialism is no longer sufficient even for local students. For foreign students or those where the faculty are expatriate teaching abroad there is much more emphasis that needs to be placed on a hybrid curriculum that covers international literature, but reserves at least a third of the time and sources on the countries in which the students are located (e.g., ElKaleh 2019b; Samier & ElKaleh, 2019). Some of the causes of an un- or under-developed internationalisation are due to faculty having to change how they think and work, assumptions made about graduate student characteristics, little emphasis on curriculum in higher education teaching, and the ability to engage in different traditions of understanding, knowledge, and learning practices (Green & Whitsed, 2015). Increasingly, though, is a literature that aims at internationalising university administration, curriculum and pedagogy, reflecting knowledge and conditions in many non-Western states and requiring

reorientations of the university mission, aims and values overcoming dichotomies (e.g., Adamson, Nixon & Su, 2012).

Internationalisation of Foundational Disciplines

One of the problems for educational studies is an inadequate inclusion of recent developments in the foundational disciplines they draw from that have been undergoing significant internationalisation, such as organisational psychology where cross-cultural content has been used to expand understanding of motivations and management practices in other cultures and among minority groups (Griffith & Armon, 2014) and the many postcolonial critiques that have become established. Griffith and Armon (2014) attribute part of the problem to not expanding curriculum to include non-local knowledge and organisational practices. All of the primary disciplines that could inform the field have been internationalising and developing postcolonial critiques to guide practice, including philosophy, sociology, psychology, history, political science, and law.

In sociology, Bhambra (2007) examines how many sociological constructs reflect Western societal experience that do not transfer well to many other societies, including models of modernisation which needs to be replaced with multiple modernities conceptions. Abdul-Jaber (2014) itemises some of the problems associated with using a Western-style sociology in Arab countries, such as different conceptions of individuality, different societal stratifications, differing approaches to epistemology and ideology, limited use paradigms, underlying subject-object dichotomies that reflect Western cultures and knowledge traditions, grounding in nationalist frameworks, and are derived from some philosophical traditions that are not shared in Arab intellectual history.

Several areas of political science and economics (viewed together as political economy) have also been subject to decolonisation critiques, such as international relations which is viewed as having promoted colonialism, imperialism, race hierarchies and dispossession (e.g., Gryffydd Jones, 2006) and economic development studies (Mehmet, 1999) as well as security studies (Bilgin, 2020) that also has many implications for educational administration.

The decolonisation of law is critically important in countries with different legal traditions, particularly those engaged in nation-building where social institutions are being constructed, often with the assistance of expatriate professionals who do not take into account the legal systems that govern organisations, their policies and programmes, including those of education. International law also has been problematic for the non-Western world, defining 'development' in Western terms and justifying interventions that serve the interests of others (Pahuja, 2011).

One of the most influential is cross-cultural management studies, pioneered by Hofstede (1980) and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997), the GLOBE studies (Dorfman et al., 2012) and many later contributors from many parts of the world (e.g., Rohmetra and Gupta, 2015) where role, power, authority and other key concepts in administration and leadership are discussed. Other influences include the development of organisational culture and aesthetic studies (e.g., Morgan, 2006; Strati, 1999) that allow for a better study of local contextual factors, cultural psychology (e.g., Kitayama & Cohen, 2007), global perspectives on leadership (e.g., Western & Garcia, 2018) including historical studies (Afsaruddin, 2002), and public administration (e.g., Farazmand, 2001) and public policy (e.g., Bice, Poole & Sullivan, 2018) since education in many countries is largely a public sector system.

Research methods literature has also come into question for its colonising and mis- or underrepresentations of non-Western cultures. A major text foundational to a rapidly increasing literature is Smith's (1999) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* that provides a rationale for questioning foreign research methods and providing guidelines for research methods that more authentically and morally work in indigenous cultures. Some have focussed on qualitative research methods that better capture cultural data, such as Denzin and Giardinia (2007) who examine moral issues and problems with colonising forms of research and more morally acceptable practices. Others promote particular qualitative methods that can be more culturally appropriate like Archibald, Lee-Morgan and De Santolo (2019) on storytelling, Windchief and San Pedro (2019) on storytelling for indigenous communities, and Andersen and O'Brien (2017) describing various historiographical principles. In quantitative methods, Walter and Andersen (2013) critique naïve positivism for its distortion of indigenous data and proffer more sensitive and accurate methods. Other authors have examined the relationships between researcher and subject that respect indigenous values and social interaction (Wilson, 2015).

Internationalisation of Higher Education Organisations

In order to internationalise curriculum, other structures and functions within universities and colleges also have to be modified to accommodate and support such goals. For the internationalisation process to be effective and sustainable, it should be viewed as a dynamic cyclical process that is embedded in the institution's mission, planning, policy, and culture and should reflect authentically different perspectives, knowledge traditions, experiences, cultural values, and practices. Many sources have addressed these by offering different theoretical frameworks, models, approaches, and country cases that can inform decisions on the internationalisation of administration and leadership curriculum and avoid cultural imperialism models where primacy or superiority is given to Anglo-American standardised curricula. In the last few years, many examples for developing balanced and critically reflective international curricula that respect different traditions of knowledge and cultural norms of diverse groups of administrators, faculty and students have emerged (e.g., ElKaleh, 2019a; Samier, 2014). This is often represented as a cross-cultural aim that affects teaching and learning, as well as other activities like research (e.g., Palfreyman & McBride, 2007) and using quality standards that are appropriate to non-Western countries rather than importing quality frameworks that are derived from different values, purposes and conditions (e.g., Numan, 2015).

Internationalisation is defined in various ways by authors, depending on which aspects they are focussing on. For example, Maringe (2009), in a review of UK universities examined three dimensions: how is it conceptualised including perceived benefits to the organisation; what internationalisation organisational and management models are used; and what do the universities perceive to be the risks and challenges in the process of internationalisation? Wildman et al. (2014) takes a broad international comparative perspective of how other systems are organised and function as well as grounded in differing educational philosophies and cultural norms, identifying how they can combine or coordinate activities and how organisational and administrative approaches can affect curricular content, student education, and research collaborations. A fairly comprehensive model is one proposed by Chin and Ching (2009) consisting of twelve dimensions of internationalisation: institutional commitments, strategic planning, funding, institutional policy and guidelines, organizational infrastructure and resources, academic offerings and curriculum, performance evaluation and

accountability, internet presence, faculty and faculty development, international students and scholars, study abroad, and campus life. These can be used in evaluating individual universities, for example, by Ching and Chin (2012) with a university in Taiwan, recognising that in the recent decades much of internationalisation is measured economically. Universities in China have also been evaluated for their internationalisation developments, using a similar set of criteria (Wang, 2009).

Other authors like Knight (2004) differentiates internationalisation undertaken at home, focussed primarily on attracting foreign students, preparing home students to operate in a globalised world, and meet international standards, and encourage comparative and international studies in a number of fields. Internationalisation for abroad is primarily oriented toward delivering programmes successfully abroad and forming collaborations and networks. In comparing advanced country and African state educational internationalisation, Oyewole (2009) found that the former tend towards enhancing international reputation, while the latter are focussed on national and institutional development.

The models vary considerably, affecting how internationalisation of curriculum and pedagogy can develop. Wildman et al. discuss five of these: the US 'scientist-practitioner' model that emphasises a pragmatic and positivistic orientation, and degree structures with common lengths of study; the European, under the Bologna Accord, with a highly standardised higher education (although individual disciplines may have different philosophical orientations) using a 'student-centered learning' model following the general tier structure of the American, but with an emphasis on critical thinking skills (often with a strong critical theory or interpretive character) and acquiring a deeper understanding of curricular content (e.g., Elkaleh, 2019a; Samier, 2019); the United Arab Emirates' model defined as a 'transmission, practice, and emancipatory' one where elements of other systems are combined, consisting of varying degrees and approaches to curriculum development and mobility related practices with foreign students or delivering their programmes abroad (many of which are shaped by neoliberalism and globalisation), some of which have sparked postcolonial reactions. Bahrain's model is also affected by the neoliberal ideology, with a great emphasis on obtaining international accreditation and preparing students to compete effectively in a global market. Little attention has been given to collaborative partnerships and faculty practices (Alhalwaki & Hamdan, 2019).

De Witt (2013) explores many examples of higher education internationalisation to identify the rationales used, aspects selected for change, and the manner of implementation, demonstrating that it has changed to at least some degree from a static condition to a large scope of practices internationally shaped by contextual factors. One approach is the use of the large cross-cultural management and leadership literature as it applies to higher education: Miller (2017) defines this as a shift from the imposition of 'Western' languages and a 'Eurocentric' worldview (although in actuality it is predominantly Anglo-American) towards an intercultural exchange of knowledge following principles of equal value, respect and dignity.

The general field of research in internationalisation of higher education is now an established body of literature covering a broad range of topics affecting the teaching, research and service dimensions of higher education (Hudzik, 2014) such as approaches and challenges relating to branch campuses, foreign students, affiliations and partnerships, and online teaching and marketing (Law & Hoey, 2017; Streitwieser, 2014). Many challenges also face international schools operating in countries where strong contextual factors differ from the

international school's structures and processes, such as those in Saudi Arabia where gender segregation, Saudi laws, values and cultural norms, and parent expectations required significant adjustment (Hammad & Shah, 2018), for which training in a Western country would not prepare them. Some focus on the structural changes involved globally (Hartmann, 2014), and others on more appropriate theoretical frameworks, the alignment of assessment policy and practice across partner institutions, and the development of student learning communities (Bell, 2009). Some examine the neoliberal conflict of economic versus educational values and rationales (Al-Youssef, 2010).

There are also a number of country and regional studies from European practices, often quite different from that in Anglo-American contexts, such as Germany (e.g., Bremer, 2018), the Netherlands (Van der Wende, 1996), Norway (Gornitzka & Langfeldt, 2010), Malaysia (Yean, 2013), South Africa (Ojo, 2010), China (Ryan, 2013), Japan (Stigger et al., 2018), Hong Kong (Cheng, Cheung & Ng, 2015), and Viet Nam (Tran & Marginson, 2019). The signs are that internationalisation of higher education will continue to develop (Fardoun, Downing & Mok, 2019) and will influence many fields to continue addressing the needs of many countries and the related issues of globalised education.

Internationalisation of Curriculum

Studies on the internationalisation of curriculum in educational administration and leadership are scarce, only recently emerged in the literature, some with a global focus (du Plessis, 2017), however, there are a number of frameworks and strategies for internationalising curriculum that have been proposed, such as Dimmock and Walker's (1998, 2005), and Goh's (2009) Confucian-based model for Singapore where collectivism, social harmony, face-saving, modesty, and modernisation are primary values.

There are also many studies on the internationalisation of curriculum generally or have multidisciplinary relevance that can serve as models for educational administration and leadership. Some have examined how faculty and students respond to cultural and linguistic diversity in the classroom (e.g., Beetson, 2010) including their importance in research methods pedagogy (Singh & Han, 2017), intercultural learning involving cross-cultural roles, relationships and classroom activities for the large numbers of mobile university students (Croese, 2011; Leask, 2015), global perspectives that need to inform curriculum design, delivery, assessment (Ching & Chin, 2012) and evaluation (Brown & Jones, 2007; Ninnes & Hellstén, 2005), and varying perspectives challenging neoliberal and globalised approaches that focus instead on academic, socio-cultural, ethical and political factors (Kreber, 2009). There is also a growing literature on fields related to educational administration, like general management and leadership studies where initiatives have been taken in internationalising curricular content to prepare students for a globally interconnected world and in better serving the diversity of individual national and cultural contexts (e.g., Green & Whitsed, 2015). Some approaches focus on a greater coverage of cross-cultural context that includes context and educational administration and leadership practices. Others examine higher education leadership (e.g., Merckx, Nolan & Ward, 2015), and how internationalising educational policy can have negative and positive impacts on national systems and development (Martens, Knodel & Windzio, 2014), demonstrating the complex dynamics of values and forces involved in the process of internationalising.

There have been a number of approaches such as cross-cultural management, which, while bringing in conceptions of diversity can also be overgeneralised and essentialist such as in

Hofstede (1980) and to a lesser degree Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) and the GLOBE studies led by Robert House (Dorfman et al., 2012) generating leadership types based on cultural qualities. However, the categories in many of these systems of comparison of underlying social structures still do not capture in a detailed and comprehensive way how individual cultures function and what social and cultural norms are practiced, and which, according to Collard (2007) is built upon positivistic fallacies. There are now many cross-cultural texts from other countries that more accurately represent the cultures from which they write and provide a more detailed account of the values and practices that need to be used in a complementary way with the types of categorisations these use (e.g., Aycan, Kanungo & Medonca, 2014; Branine, 2011; Rohmetra & Gupta, 2015; Singh, 2012). To some degree these studies also reflect problems with research methods that contain Western assumptions that have been challenged by a recent research methods literature that is culturally sensitive and reflect indigenous cultural qualities (e.g., Liamputtong, 2008; Smith, 1999) and which reflects long-standing research methods from non-Western traditions (e.g., Ahmed, 2014).

The modernisation process in many countries often takes the form of Westernisation or Americanisation (Goh, 2009), and ignores the multiple modernities critique from Eisenstadt (2002) and others who demonstrate that many of these changes are only superficially similar. There is also the hybridisation thesis which Goh (2009) argues leads to a 'melting pot' even though it recognises a plurality of cultures, however, this is an appeal to the American approach which is not followed by some other countries operating in a multicultural model, or those transcultural approaches involving cross-cultural and cross-nation understanding where hybridisation may be used, particularly at the graduate level in acquainting students with a broad overview of international literature that is not homogeneous while also covering regional and national knowledge and practices (Samier, 2014).

A corollary to this discussion is what is meant by sufficiently understanding other cultures. One criticism raised by Collard (2007) is that cross-cultural and intercultural knowledge may simply produce or reinforce stereotypes if not approached with an adequate depth of knowledge. Expatriate faculty may come to have a deep understanding of another country's culture and social institutions while remaining un-immersed, or may allow themselves to effectively be assimilated enough to experience from the inside of the culture how values, practices, roles and the social institutional norms function and are performed. Conversely, while cultures may be expressed in different ways, this does not mean that underlying principles and values are not shared, for example in Muslim communities having Islamophobia imposed on them. Empathy, compassion and humanism can be shared across wide expanses while expressed differently. This depth of understanding does require some hermeneutic and phenomenological experience conjoined with bracketing or some other form of self-awareness and what Geertz (1973) called 'thick description.'

One solution to this problem is that proposed by Su and Wood (2017): that academics in higher education need to acquire a cosmopolitan perspective, integrated into the values and identity that one acquires that influence the central functions of 'teaching and learning, research and service' (p. 1). Cosmopolitanism requires not only a much broader knowledge of other countries and cultures, but also an understanding of how one's knowledge and skills are connected to a national or cultural context. This also requires a critical review of past stereotypes of other cultures, even prejudice and denigration of other cultures' values, social arrangements, and knowledge towards an authenticity of other life worlds and ways of structuring societies. For some authors like Brinker-Gabler (1995), this means a willingness

to encounter in an empathetic and humanistic way, the life of the 'other'. For Crossley and Watson (2003) the tasks are multiple: becoming culturally competent in cross-cultural communication, becoming reflexive in what one accepts as knowledge, attaining a greater historical and cultural knowledge of other nations, recognising in a deeper and more complex way contextual factors that produce systems of knowledge and education, and appreciating the many power relations that can exist in imposing one's own national and cultural traditions on others. One example of this are the many ways that concepts of social justice are understood. Arar, Beycioglu and Oplatka (2016) examine differences in its social construction in Turkey and Israel, demonstrating that both similarities of conception and practice exist and at the same time there are differences in the structures of systems, where authority is located, how roles are conceived, and sources of the ethics of social justice in different religions. There are also student supports necessary for many foreign students in the West, found by Igwe et al. (2020) to consist of using techniques and approaches of integration and engagement that produces a sense of belonging that they require for a more successful postgraduate experience.

For many academics, the requirement of internationalising has produced feelings of undersupport from the organisation, unpreparedness and underconfidence that some universities have responded to with organised professional development programmes (Green & Whitsed, 2012). Internationalising one's teaching also requires self-reflection on one's own values, assumptions, and lack of knowledge in order to provide a classroom culture and curriculum for a diversity of students that builds sufficient trust among them instead of learning in an environment characterised by fear of being judged, of aggression, and of the unknown. The techniques Barnett (2011) identifies as necessary in supporting negotiations of differences such as sufficiently developed intellectual skills, forming a commitment to foundational values, time dedicated to the discussion that needs to take place, ground rules for classroom interaction, and knowledge that can reduce prejudice and projection used in transferring one's own limitations onto others that has been carried in racism traditions and objectification of others. Also helpful is practicing a method like hermeneutic bracketing (Van Manen, 1990) to bridge differences more accurately by reducing one's bias.

Chapter Overviews

This collection is organised into two sections. The first is a theoretical foundation and critiques section that includes the use critical and postcolonial critiques, and internationalisation models and strategies. The second section, 'Country Cases', examines new national frameworks for educational leadership in Oman, in Turkey, and to international students in Australia, and explores the implications and effects of internationalising educational administration and leadership curriculum in Greece and UK, Sweden, and the US and UK.

The first section, 'Theoretical Foundations and Critiques', includes four chapters that use critical and postcolonial critiques, and internationalisation models and strategies. The first contribution is Samier and Hammad's chapter on humanistic knowledge traditions and their role in informing educational administration and leadership curricula. The authors argue that humanist traditions such as European, Islamic, Confucian, and Buddhist humanisms have implications for the conceptions, values and practices that should be part of the educational administration and leadership curricula taught to graduate students, yet they are often overlooked by curriculum designers. The first section of the chapter sheds light on the origins, nature and definitions of humanism. The following sections discuss European,

Islamic, Confucian, and Buddhist humanist traditions and explore how they can inform educational administration and leadership curricula.

The next chapter by Samier calls attention to the challenges associated with the domination of Anglo-American knowledge traditions in the field of educational leadership and administration and highlights the need to develop internationalisation models that are based on a much broader range of perspectives from outside the 'Western' hemisphere. The author draws on critiques of the existing internationalisation models that privilege Western foundational knowledge. She then proposes an analytical model that consists of a matrix identifying three dimensions of societal and jurisdictional characteristics for sustainability in the literature: context, knowledge traditions, and issues and challenges.

In the final chapter in this section, Elkaleh develops a model for the internationalisation of educational administration and leadership curriculum. The chapter starts with a discussion of the definition of internationalisation in higher education and its rationales and forces in some countries. The next section discusses the challenges facing universities during the internationalisation process and the various internationalisation models and strategies adopted in higher education institutions worldwide. This is followed by a discussion of the factors facilitating or inhibiting internationalisation. The chapter concludes with a conceptual framework that can inform the internationalisation of educational administration and leadership curriculum.

The last chapter in this section by Milley and Dulude discusses maladministration behaviours as they manifest themselves in internationalised higher education contexts. The authors stress the importance of exposing such troubling behaviours if the full benefits of internationalisation are to be realised. The chapter starts with a discussion of higher education internationalisation and associated pressures and assumptions. The next section deals with the concept of maladministration and its manifestations in the higher education sector. The concluding section presents a hypothetical educational administration curriculum designed to address maladministration issues.

The second section, 'Country Cases', includes seven chapters that examine new national frameworks for educational leadership as well as the implications and effects of internationalising educational administration and leadership curriculum in a number of countries. In the first chapter, Hammad and Al-Harhi discuss the idea of using international standards when developing national educational administration and leadership programmes. The chapter starts with a brief discussion of the existing international literature on the importance of context in developing educational administration and leadership programmes, followed by a discussion of international standards and their appropriateness in developing national leadership preparation programmes. The third part addresses the current context of educational administration and leadership preparation in Oman, focusing on a Masters' programme offered by a national university. It also considers how the alignment of the programme's scope, curriculum and pedagogy with the National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) standards was approached in order to make the programme better reflect Omani values and interests.

In the next chapter, Beycioglu, Kılınç and Er describe the current provisions related to preparing educational leaders in Turkey. The chapter discusses contextual issues affecting the preparation of educational leaders in Turkey from a historical perspective. It also examines leadership preparation programmes provided by both the Ministry of National Education and university departments and considers their effectiveness as well as their suitability for the

Turkish context. The following contribution by Dimopoulos, Papaloi and Koutsambelas examines how the interplay between the broader social and policy context and postgraduate studies in educational administration and leadership affect the way school administrators recognise their role and mission. Using Bernstein's theory, the authors identify and compare the characteristics of school administration and leadership in Greece and the UK in order to understand how these two dimensions influence consciousness about the role and mission of school leadership. This is followed by Rogers' chapter discussing the issue of knowledge hierarchies in teaching educational administration and leadership to international students. Reflecting on her experience with a Masters' programme in educational leadership and management in an Australian university, she identifies the problematic nature of teaching Western educational administration and leadership models to international students representing various cultural backgrounds. The chapter highlights the need for *context dependent* hierarchies of knowledges, rather than a single, universal hierarchy.

The next chapter by Haake discusses how to attain gender equality in higher education leadership positions, taking as a case Swedish higher education institutions. The chapter draws on findings from three research studies exploring leader identity development processes and gender equality strategies in the Swedish higher education context. These studies point out issues and challenges associated with gender differences among the leaders of higher education institutions in Sweden. As Haake argues, these issues and challenges need to be discussed and rectified in order to increase gender equality in academic leadership identity development in these institutions.

Taysum investigates why the traditional MBA model borrowed by the UK from the US has led to both economic and management failure. Using Gale's (2001) approach for policy analysis, Taysum analyses policy documents including primary sources, government documents, research studies, and media releases. The author discusses what she perceives to be a crisis of character development in contemporary culture. She also examines the implications this policy borrowing has for other nation states' Higher Education Policy. The chapter concludes with a proposed innovation approach based on principles of inclusion and equity as well as human flourishing in order to replace the traditional MBA model.

In the last chapter, Ebot Ashu explores how indigenous African philosophies of education can contribute to improving school leadership in African societies. The chapter begins with a review of relevant literature on African philosophies of education, trying to identify their characteristics and limitations. The author then examines the relevance of these philosophies to the field of school leadership in Africa and discusses ways in which they could inform the field and improve the education system as a whole.

References

- Abdul-Jabar, F. (2014). Reflections on Arabs and sociology: Insights into sociological schools of thought in the Arab world – challenges and issues. *Contemporary Arab Affairs*, 7(4), 499-509.
- Adamson, B., Nixon, J., & Su, F. (Eds.) (2012). *The Reorientation of higher education: Challenging the East-West dichotomy*. Hong Kong: Springer.
- Afsaruddin, A. (2002). *Excellence and precedence: Medieval Islamic discourse on legitimate leadership*. Leiden: Brill.

- Ahmed, F. (2014). Exploring halaqah as research method: A tentative approach to developing Islamic research principles within a critical 'indigenous' framework. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 27(5), 561-583.
- Alhalwaki, H., & Hamdan, A. M. M. (2019). Factors affecting the implementation of internationalisation strategies in higher education institutions: evidence from Bahrain. *International Journal of Management in Education*, 13(1), 1-27.
- Ali, A., & Camp, R. (1995). Teaching management in the Arab world: Confronting illusions. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 9(2), 10-17.
- Al-Rodhan, N. (Ed.) (2012). *The role of the Arab-Islamic world in the rise of the West*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Altbach, P. (2003). American accreditation of foreign universities: Academic colonialism in action. *International Higher Education*, 32, 5-7.
- Al-Youssef, J. (2010). *The internationalisation of higher education institutions: Meanings, policy and practice*. Riga: VDM Verlag.
- Amann, W., & Stachowicz-Stanusch, A. (Eds.) (2013). *Integrity in organizations: Building the foundations for humanistic management*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Andersen, C., & O'Brien, J. (Eds.) (2017). *Source and methods in indigenous studies*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Arar, K., Beycioglu, K., & Oplatka, I. (2016). A cross-cultural analysis of educational leadership for social justice in Israel and Turkey. *Compare*, 47(2), 192-206.
- Arar, K., Oplatka, I., Turan, S., & Barakat, M. (2017). The global-local nexus and the challenges of educational leadership in the three Middle Eastern nation states: A comparison between Egypt, Turkey and Israel, paper presented at the ECER annual conference, Copenhagen.
- Archibald, J.-A., Lee-Morgan, J., & De Santolo, J. (Eds.) (2019). *Decolonizing research: Indigenous storywork as methodology*. London: Zed Books.
- Arday, J., & Mirza, H. (Eds.) (2018). *Dismantling race in higher education: Racism, whiteness and decolonising the academy*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ateyat, K., & Gasaymeh, A. (2015). A study of faculty members' perceptions of the effect of the globalization on higher education: The case of Jordan. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(2), 15-21.
- Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R., & Medonca, M. (2014). *Organizations and management in cross-cultural context*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Bagader, A. (1997). The state of Arab sociology as seen by an Arab sociologist. In A. Zghal & A. Ouederi (Eds.), *Questions from Arab societies, Proceedings of the Arab Regional Conference of the International Sociological Association* (pp. 61-72). Madrid, Spain.
- Bajunid, I. (1996). Preliminary explorations of indigenous perspectives of educational management: The evolving Malaysian experience. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34, 50-73.
- Barnett P. (2011). Discussions across difference: addressing the affective dimensions of teaching diverse students about diversity. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16(6), 669-679.
- Bell, M. (2009). *Internationalising the higher education curriculum: Study abroad and global learning*. Riga: VDM Verlag.
- Beetson, P. (2010). *The internationalisation of higher education: Perspectives from the classroom*. Riga: Lambert.
- Bevilacqua, A. (2018). *The Republic of Arabic letters: Islam and the European enlightenment*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bhabra, G. (2007). *Rethinking modernity: Postcolonialism and the sociological*

- imagination*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bhambra, G., Gebrial, D., & Nişancıoğlu, K. (Eds.) (2018). *Decolonising the university*. London: Pluto Press.
- Bice, S., Poole, A., & Sullivan, H. (Eds.) (2018). *Public policy in the 'Asian century'*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bilgin, P. (2020). Opening up international relations, or: How I learned to stop worrying and love 'non-Western IR'. In S. Roach (Ed.), *Handbook of critical international relations* (pp. 12-28). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage.
- Branine, M. (2011). *Managing across cultures: Concepts, policies and practices*. London: Sage.
- Bremer, U. (2018). *Internationalization strategies of German universities*. Cham: Springer.
- Brinker-Gabler, G. (Ed.) (1995) *Encountering the other(s)*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Brown, S., & Jones, E. (Eds.) (2007). Introduction: Values, valuing and value in an internationalised higher education context. In E Jones and S. Brown (Eds.), *Internationalising higher education* (pp. 1-6). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management*. London: Sage.
- Bush, T., & Middlewood, D. (2013). *Leading and managing people in education*. 3rd Edn. London: Sage.
- Bustamante, R., Nelson, J., & Onwuegbuzie, A. (2009). Assessing schoolwide cultural competence. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(5), 793-827.
- Cheng, Y., Cheung, A., & Ng, S. (2015). Internationalization of higher education: The case of Hong Kong. Singapore: Springer.
- Chin, J., & Ching, G. (2009). Trends and indicators of Taiwan's higher education internationalization. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 18(2), pp. 185-203.
- Ching, G., & Chin, J. (2012) Managing higher education institution internationalization: Contemporary efforts of a university in Taiwan. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management*, 1(1), 3-16).
- Clarke, S., & O'Donoghue, T. (Eds.) (2015). *School leadership in diverse contexts*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cline, E. (2014). 1177 B.C.: The year civilization collapsed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Collard, J. (2007). Constructing theory for leadership in intercultural contexts. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 45(6), 740-755.
- Costanza, R., McGlade, J., Lovins, H., & Kubiszewski, I. (2014). An overarching goal for the UN sustainable development goals. *Solutions*, 5(4), 13-16.
- Cröse, B. (2011). Internationalization of the higher education classroom: Strategies to facilitate intercultural learning and academic success. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23(3), 388-395.
- Crossley, M., & Watson, K. (2003). *Comparative and international research in education: Globalisation, context and difference*. Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Cupples, J., & Grosfuguel, R. (Eds.) (2019). *Unsettling eurocentrism in the westernized university*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Dede, S., & Baskan, G. (2011). Theoretical basis of comparative education and suggestion of a model. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 3536-3542.
- Denzin, N., & Giardinia, M. (Eds.) (2007). *Ethical futures in qualitative research: Decolonizing the politics of knowledge*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2016). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. London: Routledge.

- De Sousa Santos, B. (2017). *Decolonizing the university: The challenge of deep cognitive justice*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- De Wit, H. (2013). Internationalisation of higher education, an introduction on the why, how and what. In H. De Wit (Ed.), *An introduction to higher educational internationalisation* (pp. 13-46). Milan: Centre for Higher Educational Internationalisation.
- Dierksmeier, C., Amann, W., von Kimakowitz, E., Spitzbeck, H., & Pirson, M. (Eds.) (2011). *Humanistic ethics in the age of globality*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2005). *Educational leadership: Culture and diversity*. London: Sage.
- Dorfman, P., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., Dastmalchian, A., & House, R. (2012). GLOBE: A twenty year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. *Journal of World Business*, 47, 504-518.
- Eisenstadt, S. (Ed.) (2002). *Reflections on multiple modernities*. Leiden: Brill.
- ElKaleh, E. (2019a). A Critical Approach to Developing Culturally Relevant Leadership Curricula for Muslim Students, in E. Samier and E. ElKaleh (Eds), *Teaching Educational Leadership in Muslim Countries: Theoretical and Cultural Foundation* (pp. 39-54). Singapore: Springer.
- ElKaleh, E. (2019b). Leadership Curricula in UAE Business and Education Management Programs: A Habermasean analysis within an Islamic context. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(6), 1118-1147.
- Fanon, F. (1965). *The wretched of the earth*. London: McGibbon & Kee.
- Farzmand, A. (Ed.) (2001). *Handbook of comparative and development public administration*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Fardoun, H., Downing, K., & Mok, M. (Eds.) (2019). *The future of higher education in the Middle East and Africa*. Cham: Springer.
- Fomunyan, K. (Ed.) (2019). *Decolonising higher education in the era of globalisation and internationalisation*. Cape Town: Sun Press.
- Foskett, N., & Lumby, J. (2003). *Leading and managing education: International dimensions*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Freire, P. (1954). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Freiburg: Herder and Herder.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Global University Network for Innovation (2017). *Towards a Socially Responsible University: Balancing the Global with the Local, Higher Education in the World series Vol. 6*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Goh, J. (2009). Parallel leadership in an 'unparallel' world – cultural constraints on the transferability of Western educational leadership theories across cultures. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 12(4), 319-345.
- Gornitzka, A., & Langfeldt, L. (eds) (2010). *Borderless knowledge: Understanding the 'new' internationalisation of research and higher education in Norway*. Cham: Springer.
- Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (2012) Reflections on an alternative approach to continuing professional learning for internationalization of the curriculum across disciplines. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(2), 148-164.
- Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (2015). Introducing critical perspectives on internationalising the curriculum. In W. Green & C. Whitsed (Eds.), *Critical Perspectives on Internationalising the Curriculum in Disciplines* (pp. 3-24). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Griffith, R. & Armon, B. (2014). Preface. In R. Griffith, L. Thompson & B. Armon (Eds.), *Internationalizing the curriculum in organizational psychology* (pp. v-xi). Cham: Springer.
- Gryffydd Jones, B. (Ed.) (2006). *Decolonizing international relations*. Lanham, NC: Rowman

& Littlefield.

- Haigh, M. (2009). The Sattvic curriculum: A three-level, non-western, superstructure for undergraduate education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 118, 61-70.
- Hall, B. & Tandon, R. (2017). 'Decolonization of knowledge, epistemicide, participatory research and higher education. *Research for All*, 1 (1), 6-19.
- Hammad, W., & Shah, S. (2018) Dissonance between the 'international' and the conservative 'national': Challenges facing school leaders in international schools in Saudi Arabia. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(5), 747-780.
- Hartmann, E. (Ed.) (2014). *The internationalisation of higher education*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hopson, R., Hotepm, U., Schneider, D., & Turenne, I. (2010). What's educational leadership without an African-centered perspective? *Urban Education*, 45(6), 777-796.
- Huang, F. (2007). Internationalization of higher education in the developing and emerging countries. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11 (3/4), pp. 421-432.
- Huber, S., & West, G. (2002). Developing school leaders: A critical review of current practices, approaches and issues and some directions for the future. In K. Leithwood & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 1071-1101). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Hudzik, J. (2014). *Comprehensive internationalization*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hwang, K. (2016). From cultural rehabilitation to cultural renaissance. In C. Chou & J. Spangler (Eds.), *Chinese Education Models in a Global Age* (pp. 87-101). Singapore: Springer.
- Ibn Khaldun, (1967) *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Igwe, P., Rahman, M, Ohalehi, P., Amango, A. & Anigbo, J. (2020). Responsible education: What engages international postgraduate students – evidence from UK, *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 11(4), 363-376.
- Jones, E. & Killick, D. (2013) Graduate attributes and the internationalized curriculum: Embedding a global outlook in disciplinary learning outcomes. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(2), 165-182.
- Jung, J., Horta, H. & Yonezawa, A. (Eds.) (2018). *Researching higher education in Asia*. Singapore: Springer.
- Keohane, R. (2002). *Power and governance in a partially globalized world*. London: Routledge.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodelled: Definitions, rationales and approaches. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(10), pp. 5-31.
- Knight, J. (2013) The changing landscape of higher education internationalisation – for better or worse? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 17(3), 84-90.
- Kreber, C. (2009). Different perspectives on internationalization in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 118, 1-14.
- Law, D. & Hoey, M. (Eds.) (2017). *Perspectives on the internationalisation of higher education*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(2), 205-221.
- Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the curriculum*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Leithwood, K. and Hallinger, P. (Eds.) (2012). *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration*. Dordrecht: Springer.

- Liamputtong, P. (Ed.) (2008). *Doing cross-cultural research: Ethical and methodological perspectives*. Singapore: Springer.
- Lo, M. & Haron, M. (2016). Introduction: Africa's Muslim institutions of higher learning, moving forward. In M. Lo & M. Haron (Eds.) *Muslim Institutions of Higher Education in Postcolonial Africa* (1-11). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lopez, A. (2016). *Culturally Responsive and Socially Just Leadership in Diverse Contexts: From Theory to Action*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Maringe, F. (2009). Strategies and challenges of internationalisation in HE: An exploratory study of UK universities. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 23(7), 553-563.
- Martens, K., Knodel, P. & Windzio, M. (Eds.) (2014). *Internationalization of education policy*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McKinley, E. & Smith, L. (Eds.) (2019). *Handbook of Indigenous Education*. Singapore: Springer.
- Mehmet, O. (1999). *Westernizing the third world: The eurocentricity of economic development theories*. London: Routledge.
- Memmi, A. (2003). *The colonizer and the colonized*. London: Earthscan.
- Merkx, G., Nolan, R. & Ward, D. (Eds.) (2015). *Internationalizing the academy: Lessons of leadership in higher education*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.
- Mhango, N. (2018). *Decolonising colonial education: Doing away with relics and toxicity embedded in the racist dominant grand narrative*. Bamenda and Buea, Cameroon: Langaa RPCIG.
- Mignolo, W. (2011). *The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, W. (2018). *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Miller, P. (2017). Cultures of educational leadership: Researching and theorising common issues in different world contexts. In P. Miller (Ed.) *Cultures of educational leadership: Global and intercultural perspectives* (pp. 1-22). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Msila, V. (2017). *Decolonising knowledge for Africa's renewal: Examining African perspectives and philosophies*. Johannesburg: KR Publishing.
- Ninnes, P. & Hellstén, M. (2005). *Internationalizing higher education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Nkrumah, K. (1965). *Neocolonialism: The last stage of imperialism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Noori, and Anderson, (2013). Globalization, governance, and the diffusion of the American model of education: Accreditation agencies and American-style universities in the Middle East. *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, 26, pp. 159-172.
- Numan, R. (2015). Assuring quality outcomes: Best practices for higher education in Islamic countries. *IIUM Journal of Educational Studies*, 3(1), pp. 92-111.
- Ojo, E. (2010). *Internationalisation of higher education in South Africa*. Riga: VDM Verlag.
- Oyewole, O. (2009) Internationalization and its implications for the quality of higher education in Africa. *Higher Education Policy*, 22, pp. 319-329.
- Pahuja, S. (2011). *Decolonising international law: Development economic growth and the politics of universality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paige, R., & Mestenhauser, J. (1999). Internationalizing educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(4), 500-517.
- Palfreyman, D., & McBride, D. (Eds.) (2007). *Learning and teaching across cultures in higher education*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Quist, H., (2001). Cultural issues in secondary education development in West Africa: Away from colonial survivals, toward neo-colonial influences? *Comparative Education*, 37(3), 297-314.
- Rohmetra, N., & Gupta, A. (Eds.) (2015). *Cross-cultural management: Practice and research*. Delhi: Primus Books.
- Rowney, J., & Taras, V. (2008). Crosscultural differences in perceptions of justice: consequences for academia. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 36(3), 104-123.
- Ryan, J. (2013). *China's higher education reform and internationalisation*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Saliba, G. (2007). *Islamic science and the making of the European renaissance*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Samier, E. A. (2014). Designing public administration curriculum for the United Arab Emirates. *Administrative Culture*, 15(2), pp. 222-246.
- Samier, E. A. (2019). The humanist roots of Islamic administration and leadership for education: Philosophical foundations for intercultural and transcultural teaching, in E. Samier and E. ElKaleh (Eds), *Teaching Educational Leadership in Muslim Countries: Theoretical and Cultural Foundation* (pp. 23-38). Singapore: Springer.
- Samier, E.A., & ElKaleh, E. (2019). Educational administration and leadership curricula for modern nation-building in Muslim countries. In E.A. Samier & E. ElKaleh (Eds.), *Teaching educational leadership in Muslim countries* (pp. 93-112). Singapore: Springer.
- Sawir, E. (2013) Internationalisation of higher education curriculum: The contribution of international students. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 11(3), 359-378.
- Shapiro, J. (2013). *Ethical educational leadership in turbulent times*. New York: Routledge.
- Singh, M., & Han, J. (eds) (2017). *Pedagogies for internationalising research education*. Singapore: Springer.
- Singh, N. (2012). *Eastern and cross-cultural management*. New Delhi: Springer.
- Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Stigger, E., Wang, M., Laurence, D., & Bordilovskaya, A. (2018). *Internationalization within higher education: Perspectives from Japan*. Singapore: Springer.
- Strati, A. (1999). *Organization and aesthetics*. London: Sage.
- Streitwieser, B. (Ed.) (2014). *Internationalisation of higher education and global mobility*. Oxford: Symposium.
- Su, F., & Wood, M. (Eds. (1995). *Cosmopolitan perspectives on academic leadership in higher education*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Takayama, K., Sriprakash, A. & Connell, R. (2016). Toward a postcolonial comparative and international education. *Comparative Education Review*, 61(S1), S1-S24.
- Thiong'o, N. (1986). *Decolonizing the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Tran, L., & Marginson, S. (Eds.) (2019). *Internationalisation in Vietnamese higher education*. Singapore: Springer.
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1997). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business*. London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Van der Wende, M. (1996). *Internationalising the curriculum in Dutch higher education*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Walter, M., & Andersen, C. (2013). *Indigenous statistics: A quantitative research methodology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

- Wang, J. (2009) The internationalisation of higher education in China: The case of one university. R. Coverdale-Jones & P. Rastall (Eds.), *Internationalising the university: The Chinese context* (pp. 57-71). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Western, S., & Garcia, É-J. (Eds. (2018). *Global leadership perspectives*. London: Sage.
- Wildman, J., Qureshi, R., Salazar, M., & Salas, E. (2014). Educational approaches across cultures. In R. Griffith, L. Thompson & B. Armon (Eds.), *Internationalizing the curriculum in organizational psychology* (pp. 59-78). Cham: Springer.
- Williams, R., & Lee, A. (2015). *Internationalizing higher education: Critical collaborations across the curriculum*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Wilson, S. (2015). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Halifax: Fernwood.
- Windchief, S., & San Pedro, T. (Eds.) (2019). *Applying indigenous research methods: Storying with peoples and communities*. New York: Routledge.
- Yang, R. (2018). Foil to the West? Interrogating perspectives for observing East Asian higher education. In J. Jung, H. Horta & A. Yonezawa (Eds) *Researching Higher Education in Asia* (37-50). Cham: Springer.
- Yang, R. (2019). Riddled with gaping wounds: A methodological critique of comparative and international studies in education. In L. Suter, E. Smith & B. Denman (Eds.), *SAGE handbook of comparative studies in education* (pp. 63-78). London: Sage.
- Yean, T. (Ed.) (2013). *Internationalizing higher education in Malaysia*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Yudkevich, M., Altbach, P. G., & de Wit, H. (Eds.). (2020). *Trends and Issues in Doctoral Education: A Global Perspective*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Zajda, J., Majhanovich, S., & Rust, V. (2006). Introduction: Education and social justice. *Review of Education*, 52(9), 9-22.