

## Internationalization for All: Disrupting Inequitable Trends in Global Spheres

Peters, Michael, Simon Marginson, and Peter Murphy, eds. 2010. *Global Creation: Space, Mobility, and Synchrony in the Age of the Knowledge Economy*. New York: Peter Lang.

Pusser, Brian, Ken Kempner, Simon Marginson, and Imanol Ordorika, eds. 2012. *Universities and the Public Sphere: Knowledge Creation and State Building in the Era of Globalization*. New York: Routledge.

### Reviewed by James O'Meara, National Louis University

At a time when the future of internationalization is being questioned, these two books provide a means for those who want to disrupt the negative trends that support such claims. In *Global Creation: Space, Mobility, and Synchrony in the Age of the Knowledge Economy*, Peters, Marginson, and Murphy (2010) use recent and historical examples from around the globe to prime the reader to adopt a critical position when responding to the dynamic nature of internationalization activities typically involving the flow of students and ideas across a global higher education landscape. They suggest that part of this response should represent a challenge to expectations of synchrony and convergence within this space. The contributors, in particular Marginson (2010), hint at the need to review past practices and disrupt trends that reinforce continuing power imbalances, inequalities of access and ongoing maldistribution of resources in global higher education spaces. As a reader I was drawn to the idea that globalization could either result in an extension of or a disruption to the status quo. As an academic working in the internationalization sphere, the notion of disruptive internationalization being a driver behind an institution's response to a globalization problem was appealing. I expect those who read *Global Creation: Space, Mobility, and Synchrony in the Age of the Knowledge Economy* will also find a motivation to disrupt the negative impacts of globalization problems that confront their institution.

If the Peters, Marginson, and Murphy text provides academics with a motivation for a disruptive internationalization program, then *Universities and the Public Sphere: Knowledge Creation and State Building in the Era of Globalization* by Pusser, Kempner, Marginson, and Ordorika (2012) provides guidance on a purpose for disruptive internationalization programs. Among all the chapters, Marginson in Chapter 2 provides some key concepts to guide those seeking to disrupt the status quo at their institution. Specifically he describes a role for 'egalitarian' universities that seek to maintain global higher education spaces as a 'public sphere' characterized by access and opportunity. Marginson describes this work as a 'public good' or a public service provided by such institutions to their students and other stakeholders engaging in global higher education spaces. These concepts of a 'public sphere' and a 'public good' represent foundational ideas for universities seeking to disrupt the status quo and promote internationalization for all. Marginson reminds us of the potential of 'egalitarian' to reestablish the 'public' dimension of a sphere of global higher education. He considers those who choose to work toward this purpose to distinguish their institution from others who chose to reinforce internationalization rationales based on economic return or relative position on global ranking tables. Marginson's chapter can serve as a challenge to review past practices and evaluate the existing rationale of an internationalization program. Those who choose to accept such a challenge could serve as disrupters who work to shape the attributes and define the outcomes of an equitable internationalization program. Their work could lead to the increase of access and participation rates in international experiences that

refute claims that internationalization is reaching its end. The cases from Angola, Japan, Mexico, South Africa, and the United States provide examples of possibility and, more importantly, reinforce the potential for generating disruptive responses to the local problems of globalization. Smaller or minority colleges currently facing similar challenges at their institutions may benefit from reading about the experiences as they plan their disruptive responses to the issues impeding the institutionalization of the international initiatives.

Collectively, the authors in these two texts provide universities and colleges representing the marginalized within international education with a mission and a vision for equitable and meaningful internationalization programs. *Global Creation: Space, Mobility, and Synchrony in the Age of the Knowledge Economy* challenges us to critique current practices for the purpose of creating disruptive responses to imbalances in power, access, and resources, i.e. an internationalization mission. The cases from Angola, Japan, Mexico, South Africa, and the United States in *Universities and the Public Sphere: Knowledge Creation and State Building in the Era of Globalization* complement the contributions of Peters, Marginson, and Murphy via a selection of real-world disruptive responses, i.e. internationalization visions. Those who read both texts, and are open to adopting a more egalitarian response to globalized higher education spaces, are likely to take away valuable insights from the missions and visions of the internationalization programs highlighted in these books.

While these insights can help guide planning, they do not represent ‘the’ action plan for what Pusser refers to as a failure to pass the public good test. His suggestion of deconstructing the forces stopping universities providing a public good to a global public sphere provides only part of the solution. Universities that are able to make sense of how their state, policies, institutions, and certain individuals reinforce existing barriers to their internationalization initiatives still may need guidance on how to design, implement, and evaluate their disruptive internationalization responses. The significance of this issue is reflected in the frequency of questions raised about implementing and /or institutionalizing internationalization programs that have tangible outcomes for the participants and significant impacts for the collaborating partners.

At a time when scholars are suggesting that internationalization has reached its “end,” these two texts provide both the motivation and a framework to critique and disrupt the negative impacts of a globalized higher education space. University faculty and staff who draw on this work should be well positioned to shape global education spaces through the design, evaluation, and dissemination of the impact of their internationalization programs. The critical approach promoted through these texts should assist academics in providing a public good through internationalization programs that promote access and development for all. The texts also provide useful strategies for individuals, departments, institutions, and governments that want to promote change through continuous evaluation of the internationalization models that are dominating global higher education spaces. Finally, the case studies within Pusser, Kempner, Marginson, and Ordorika highlight the importance of disseminating the results of disruptive activities to others struggling to make sense of internationalization at their own institutions.

As some universities question their capacity to engage with countries and colleagues beyond their borders, there is an increased need for inclusive policies that promote beneficial outcomes for all institutions connected to a global consortium. These two texts provide a useful summary of the issues and the way forward for those wanting to disrupt past practices and move their institution to a place where all their students can reap the benefits of public access to their global education environment.