

Kennesaw State University

DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University

Faculty Publications

Summer 6-2021

Considering the state and status of internationalization in Western higher education

Brian Culp

Kennesaw State University, bculp1@kennesaw.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/facpubs>



Part of the [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#), [Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#), [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#), [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#), [Social Justice Commons](#), and the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Culp, Brian, "Considering the state and status of internationalization in Western higher education" (2021). *Faculty Publications*. 5700.

<https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/facpubs/5700>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@kennesaw.edu.

Introduction

Internationalization is among the top strategic priorities of universities and colleges globally, with emphasis given in academic literature and policy agendas to international engagement by Western societies. In Canada, for instance, internationalization has been found to be among the top three priorities of over 90% of university strategic plans (Canadian Bureau for International Education, 2016). In the context of the United States (US), a survey conducted by the American Council on Education (2017) reported that 47% of postsecondary institutions list internationalization as a strategic priority.

Higher education internationalization can be understood to be such a top strategic priority because it is a method for achieving a number of important outcomes, many of which extend beyond the borders of postsecondary institutions to the nation-state. In particular, within the global market context of the knowledge economy, education - via internationalization - has become a key tool of national governments to realize broader state goals for economic well-being (Author 3). Thus, viewing the internationalization of higher education as a neutral, universal goal warrants caution, as internationalization priorities are deeply steeped in economic and political rationales (e.g., nation building and identity) in addition to sociocultural and academic goals (e.g., developing intercultural understanding and improving upon international academic standards; Knight, 2004).

Although internationalization has long been a priority in postsecondary education, emphasis and action on this priority has increased exponentially in recent years. In 2014 Universities Canada found that the pace of internationalization activities had accelerated at 89% of Canadian universities in the prior three-year period. Indicators of the prevalence of internationalization processes in higher education can be seen in the following figures. As it

relates to students, in 2015 the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization reported that over five million postsecondary students were studying abroad. As it relates to faculty, in 2019 the British Council evidenced that approximately 55% and 35% of the total research collaborations in Canada and the US, respectively, were international in nature.

Like Western scholars in all disciplines, kinesiologists are inundated with opportunities, expectations, and/or pressures to internationalize many aspects of their multifaceted work and, consequently, internationalization processes abound in the discipline. For example, Western kinesiology scholars integrate international perspectives into curricula; facilitate study-abroad programs; recruit and host international students and faculty; and engage in research collaborations and partnerships with international scholars, journals, and associations, and much more. Given the considerable, and increasing, influence of internationalization on all aspects of the Western kinesiology discipline, critical consideration of the state and status of the phenomenon is needed. Thus, this paper first provides a primer on internationalization in higher education, including how the phenomenon has come to be defined as well as key contemporary critiques associated with it. Presented next is a review of the Western kinesiology literature that is explicitly focused on internationalization. The results of a pilot survey into the internationalization views and experiences of National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education (NAKHE) members, and other Western kinesiology scholars, is reported next, with the findings interpreted through the foundational and critically-oriented internationalization scholarship described in the primer. The paper concludes with recommendations as to how NAKHE, an American organization with international members from primarily Western nations, and the broader community of Western kinesiology scholars might best navigate internationalization moving forward.

Understanding Internationalization in Higher Education

The term internationalization is used to describe many policies, programs, and initiatives within postsecondary education. Jane Knight, a globally renowned scholar of higher education internationalization, has suggested a broad scope for the term across national, sector, and institutional levels. For Knight (2015), the internationalization of higher education is defined as “the process of integrating an *international*, *intercultural*, or *global* dimension into the *purpose*, *functions* or *delivery* of postsecondary education” (p. 2, emphasis added). This definition emphasizes the breadth of internationalization as a concept and practice across levels, but also the scope of the dimensions and various means involved. While Knight's definition of higher education internationalization is not the only one, it is by far the most dominant. We have chosen to use Knight's framing in this paper as it allows for an appreciation of the many dimensions and means by which kinesiology scholars engage in internationalization.

Within an *international* dimension, relationships between and among nations, cultural groups, or countries is the focus. Attention is on forming partnerships that bridge nation-state boundaries and systems, thus, national context matters. In an *intercultural* dimension, focus is given to fostering diversity through recognition of knowledge within cultural groups so as to bridge connections and ideas. Here, nation-state boundaries themselves do not matter as much as the diversity of cultural artifacts and contributions to knowing across cultural groups. A *global* dimension focuses on a broader, worldwide scope of engagement. Nation-state contexts matter here in so far as they contribute toward a more globally located harmony.

Internationalization efforts may focus on shifting the *purposes*, or roles and objectives, of postsecondary institutions, with the aim to integrate education across international, intercultural, or global dimensions. Altering the teaching, research, and service *functions* of higher education

is another means by which internationalization can be achieved. Examples include internationalizing curriculum with activities or knowledges that span intercultural boundaries, forging international research partnerships, and collaborating on international boards of academic or community service. Internationalization via higher education *delivery* involves curricular models and systems that transform pedagogical activities, such as online programs that of transnational education and student mobility programs that involve international internships.

Contemporary Critiques of Internationalization in Higher Education

Critical scholars of higher education have identified some problematic tensions in internationalization processes, as well as generated lenses for revealing and challenging such tensions. Foundationally, de Wit and Hunter (2015) have argued for Knight's (2015) definition of higher education internationalization to be expanded to:

the intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society. (p. 3)

Their efforts here are aimed at bringing attention to the educative quality - rather than economic rationality - of internationalization, the inequities in mobility, and the phenomenon's societal impacts.

Relatedly, earlier work by Beck (2012) has highlighted the need for criticality, as she has argued the “uncritical pursuit of internationalization can result in a reproduction of the economic dimensions of globalization” (p. 133). Therefore, she has called for attention to the complex intersections between globalization and internationalization, with an aim to “critique harmful influences and...realign internationalization towards ethical and principled practices” (p. 134).

To inform such a critique, Beck has theorized higher education internationalization as an “eduscape,” a novel way of expressing the “flow of educational theories, ideas, programs, activities and research in and across national boundaries” (p. 142). This work draws on cultural studies scholar Appadurai’s (1990) theory of the five ‘scapes’ through which cultural flows of globalization occur and ultimately functions to situate “the university in a larger flow of internationalizing forces and elements rather than seeing it as [the] point where activity begins and ends” (Beck, 2012, p. 142).

Critiques of the internationalization of higher education have also addressed the dominance of Western knowledges, including that internationalization has been primarily shaped by large English-speaking nations who have historically provided the most services related to international higher education (Altbach & Knight, 2007). In this way, internationalization has been a project steeped in dimensions of entrepreneurialism and market-oriented engagements (Beck, 2012). Situating internationalization within the agendas of the knowledge economy, which is embedded in policies of neoliberalism, allows for interrogation of the extent to which efforts toward internationalization are merely focused on economic gain, with little concern for shifts in cultural hegemony and the epistemic dominance – and perpetuating colonial relations – of Western education systems (Gyamera & Burke, 2018). Given this, there have been calls for more considerations of internationalization in higher education that go beyond the instrumental and pragmatic, toward critique that makes visible the inequities and marginalization that can underpin international engagement. To do so, Khoo, Taylor, and Andreotti (2016) have recommended attention to the principles of *intelligibility*, *dissent*, and *solidarity*:

Seen through this lens of ethics, intelligibility refers to efforts to make injustices and inequities visible and understandable. Accordingly, dissent refers to critical questioning

of neoliberal orders and solidarity involves practical responsibilities to stand together, in a public manner, even as we acknowledge our problems and differences. (p. 90)

A critical reading of internationalization is needed to resist neoliberal orders for morphing higher education institutions into systems that are valuable only for the extent to which they build the national knowledge economy or provide return on investment for individuals. Intelligibility involves recognizing systemic structures in higher education that devise international engagement through neoliberal lenses, and dissent is the call to question the impacts of such structures on learning and knowing in higher education, provoking us to, as a form of ethical response, publicly resist by standing in solidarity with those treated unjustly. Interpreting internationalization processes through the ethical principles of intelligibility, dissent, and solidarity calls attention to the ways in which higher education “can become conscripted by power” (p. 89) as scholars act with complicity, rather than a sense of epistemic justice, in their international engagements.

Internationalization in Western Higher Education Kinesiology

With a primer on understandings and critiques of internationalization now provided, in this section an overview of the state and status of internationalization in Western higher education kinesiology is presented by: (a) reviewing Western kinesiology literature on internationalization processes; and (b) reporting on a pilot survey of Western kinesiology scholars’ internationalization views and experiences.

Kinesiology Literature on Internationalization

The kinesiology literature on internationalization is growing, but is still relatively limited in quantity when compared to the magnitude of the phenomenon (Author 1 & Author 2, 2019). In this section we present our review of this relatively modest literature collected by searching

multiple databases for English-language literature on the topic. Our review revealed that while most of this literature has focused on specific aspects of internationalization, particularly in the form of empirical investigations related to international students, some conceptual works have focused on the phenomenon more broadly by discussing approaches to internationalization. Our review has also revealed that while most of this literature has not taken an explicitly critical approach, many of these works still include acknowledgements of tensions within internationalization processes. Representative examples of works falling under these two major themes in the Western kinesiology internationalization literature are reviewed in the following sections.

International Kinesiology Students

International students, especially their recruitment and experience, have been a major focus of empirical investigations of internationalization in kinesiology (e.g., Bennett et al., 2011; Danylchuk et al., 2015; Yan & Cardinal, 2013). In regard to recruitment, US-based scholars Braga and Zuest surveyed 49 American kinesiology departments about their engagement in the recruitment of international graduate students. Their investigation revealed that international graduate student enrollment was stable in these departments despite few deliberate efforts to recruit such students. Also revealed were a number of items at the faculty member, institutional, and global levels that, depending on their manifestation, participating departments described as facilitators or barriers to recruitment. One major item identified as a recruitment barrier at the global level was the contemporary political climate in the US, which has seen a considerable increase in anti-immigration discourses. Participants explained this political climate meant that students from particular countries have inequitable access to visas and report feeling unwelcome in the country.

In regard to the experience of international students, US-based scholars Sato and Hodge have published various studies, especially as it relates to kinesiology students from Asian countries. Two of these studies, specifically a 2009 study of Asian international doctoral students' experiences and a 2015 study of the experiences of Japanese undergraduate exchange students, revealed a common issue related to power differentials. That is, in both of these studies Asian international students reported perceiving "a hierarchical relationship with White cohorts, where, at least in the minds of the Asian students, they were perceived by some White peers as positioned below them" (2009, p. 142-143). Consequently, the authors highlighted the need for faculty to be aware of unequal power relationships between international and domestic students, as these can often make international students' voices harder to hear.

Internationalization Approaches

The approaches taken to internationalization have been a major focus of the conceptual kinesiology literature on internationalization (e.g., Cardinal, 2019; Dyreson, 2019; Roberts, 2006). In particular, both Danylchuk's (2011) and Author 1b's analyses have urged kinesiology scholars to be more intentional in their internationalization activities. For her part, Canadian-based scholar Danylchuk has emphasized internationalization "as a way of thinking" (p. 3) and has differentiated between the types of approaches individuals can take. For instance, she argued approaches such as the inclusion of international content into courses via international resources (e.g., readings, films, case studies, guest lecturers) might be considered "'add-on approaches,' and may be criticized for not actually rethinking the core of the course from different perspectives" (p. 4) when compared to more "in-depth" (p. 4) approaches such as the addition of international courses.

US-based scholar Author 1b has argued that kinesiology scholars must attend to the notions of spatiality and justice in their internationalization efforts. To do so he recommends thirdspace thinking (Soja, 1996), which is rooted in postcolonial discourse and has been applied to the re-negotiation of boundaries and cultural identity. In Author 1b's view, a true application of thirdspace thinking allows for traditional geographic and political boundaries to be renegotiated such that new authority structures, initiatives, and culture can exist freely. In allowing for hybrid approaches to problem-solving and decision-making, thirdspace thinking entails critical thought on spatial awareness and conceptualizations of cultural construction, while investigating the concepts of disruption, proxemics, chronemics, reflexivity, intersectionality, biopower, reclamation, and reconciliation. Through this thirdspace lens Author 1b has highlighted examples of how internationalization efforts within kinesiology might become more just:

publications could be multilingual and represented by reviewers from different locales... International students could be given opportunities that are not only career enhancing but socially empowering. Study abroad and exchange experiences could not just involve immersion, but constructive activism around the promotion of movement and the means to catalog these efforts. (p. 10)

Survey of Western Kinesiology Scholars' Internationalization Views and Experiences

Given the limits in the quantity, focus, and orientation of the existing Western kinesiology internationalization literature, we conducted a broad pilot survey via Qualtrics to gather and critically analyze NAKHE members', and other Western kinesiology scholars', internationalization views and experiences so as to provide further critically-oriented commentary on the state and status of the phenomenon. Following approval from the lead

author's Institutional Review Board, participants were recruited between April and July 2019 via: NAKHE's membership listserv, the listserv of participants registered for the 2019 NAKHE Leadership Development Workshop on the topic of internationalization, the NAKHE website, as well as NAKHE's Twitter account¹. Following demographic questions (i.e., age, race, gender, professional role, sub-disciplinary affiliation, and location), participants were asked likert, ranked, or open-ended questions related to their view/experience of the: meaning; function; geography; priority level; strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats; as well as ethical tensions and considerations of internationalization². Likert and ranked questions were analyzed through basic descriptive statistics, and open-ended questions were analyzed through thematic content analysis. The findings of these analyses were then interpreted through the foundational (i.e., Knight, 2015) and critically-oriented (i.e., Beck, 2015; de Wit & Hunter, 2015; Khoo et al., 2016) internationalization scholarship described earlier.

Fifty-four individuals participated. Ages ranged from 23-78 years (average = 50.8). Of those participants who reported a race construct, the majority (i.e., 72.7%) identified as White, and a small number identified as Black, Asian, or Hispanic. Of those participants who reported a gender construct, just over half (57.9%) identified as female and just under half identified as male. Of those who reported a professional role, the majority (63.6%) indicated they were professors, with a fairly even spread from assistant through to full professor, and a smaller number of participants indicated they were doctoral students, emeritus professors, and instructional staff. Of those who reported their sub-disciplinary affiliation, 55% identified with

¹ This NAKHE-focused recruitment approach was taken because this survey was also intended to inform the 2019 NAKHE Leadership Development Workshop on internationalization, which was co-facilitated by authors one and two.

² Due to space limitations the survey is not reported on in its entirety, however, the findings reported here are representative of the larger dataset.

physical education/sport pedagogy, while others identified with physical therapy, exercise physiology, public health, health promotion, motor development, sport psychology, and the leadership/administration of kinesiology. Nearly all participants (90.4%) were from the US or its territory of Puerto Rico, the small number of remaining participants were from Brazil, Canada, and Spain.

Findings

Descriptions of Internationalization. When asked to describe what internationalization in kinesiology entails, some participants described this as the incorporation of international components to *various* aspects of the discipline. This view is exemplified in one participant's statement that internationalization entails "expanding our reach globally... research among various international organizations... recruitment and integration of international students... teaching domestic students about the world," and another participant's description that internationalization entails "integration in curriculum (sports and games from other countries). Studying research conducted in other countries. Student and instructor exchanges (international). Attendance at multi-nation conferences." Somewhat parallel to this was some participants' views that internationalization meant that one's perspective or philosophy towards one's work was international in nature. For example, one participant described, "internationalization involves the integration of attitudes, values, standards, and opinions of [international] others into one's own sense of identity or sense of self as a professional."

Many more of the respondents, however, described internationalization in kinesiology more narrowly and focused on singular aspects/processes of internationalization. One such thematic view of internationalization was as sharing or interacting internationally (e.g., "increasing interactions among professionals and disciplinary scholars to further the science of

our field and promote professional interactions that lead to improved programs”). Another such thematic view was specific to the conduct and dissemination of research (e.g., “cooperating with colleagues from other countries through presentations, conferences, and journal reading/scholarship”). A third thematic view was specific to students and curriculum (e.g., “preparation of future professionals in our field with a globally-minded knowledge, ready to... have success in the field regardless where in the world they are working” and “inclusion of cultural approaches [dance, martial arts, netball, rugby, cricket, rounders]”). Finally, some participants spoke of internationalization as outreach or helping others (e.g., “increasing involvements and/or developing products that can be adapted which may aid/assist users in other countries and across many cultures”).

These data suggest that, while a minority of participants appreciated internationalization in a multifaceted manner (i.e., in level, dimension, and means) as Knight (2015) has suggested, most seemed focused on internationalization only as it relates to research functions and instructional delivery, especially via outbound mobility.

Internationalization Priority Levels. When asked to indicate how central internationalization was to their work (on a four-point scale of “not a priority,” “a moderate priority,” “a high priority,” “a top priority”), just under half of the respondents to this question (i.e., 43.75%) indicated internationalization was a high priority, followed by 25% of respondents who felt internationalization to be a moderate priority, 18.75% felt it was not a priority, while the remaining 12.5% felt it was a top priority.

Academic Areas of Priority for Internationalization. When asked to rank, in order of priority, the academic areas their internationalization work pertained to, participants most commonly ranked: university classes/courses first (e.g., add international perspectives or courses

to course curriculum); university departments/academic units second (e.g., sending students/faculty abroad and/or recruiting/hosting international students and faculty); university programs second or third (e.g., teaching/coordinating study abroad programs); research fourth (e.g., international research collaborators, partners, data gathering); academic journals fifth (e.g., editor seeking international contributions); and scholarly associations sixth (e.g., outreach to international scholars, groups).

These data suggest that the internationalization of teaching functions – to use Knight’s (2015) framing – were participants’ highest priorities, followed by the internationalization of research functions and then service functions.

The Geography of Internationalization. Participants were asked to indicate those parts of the world their internationalization work connected with. Europe was the most frequently indicated continent (27.51% of respondents to this question), with the Czech Republic, England, Ireland, Germany, Scotland, and Wales listed as specific countries participants engaged with. Second was the continent of North America (25.58% of respondents to this question), with Canada, Mexico, and the US listed as examples. Asia was indicated third (18.6%), with Japan and South Korea listed as examples. Australasia/Oceania and South America were both indicated by 11.63% of responding participants, with Australia and New Zealand, and Argentina, Brazil, and Colombia listed as examples respectively.

These data suggest that the participating Western kinesiology scholars were primarily engaged in activities with other Western countries/cultures, demonstrating that internationalization is predominantly carried out with commitments to upholding Western knowledge systems (Beck, 2012; Hoppers, 2009). This is a trend which is seen more broadly in

the internationalization practices of Western scholars across disciplines (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

Motivations for Internationalization. Four themes can be seen in the participants' responses to an open-ended question about motivations for internationalization. One theme related to the betterment of oneself and/or one's students. For example, participants described being motivated by the benefit of learning from others through internationalization work and subsequently being more effective in their work. Another theme was that participants were drawn to internationalization work due to curiosity and enjoyment. For example, one participant described that they engaged in internationalization work because "the research questions I ask are international in nature," while others described "liking" or having much "in common" with their international colleagues, sometimes more so than colleagues in their own department. A third theme related to the impact of internationalization work. For instance, one participant highlighted the opportunity to treat more patients in their role as a physical therapist, while another highlighted the opportunity to discover "new and different ideas to solve common problems." Finally, some participants indicated their motivations stemmed from the realities of the 21st Century world. For example, one participant described that "in an increasingly globalized world, we need to be aware of international perspectives held on our particular issue(s) of interest," while another suggested that "all policies in [physical education today] require support of all countries."

These data suggest that participants' motivations originate from and centre Western or Westerner's interests. As such, participants' motivations seem disconnected from Knight's (2018) call for "knowledge diplomacy" (p. 8), which envisions international educational relations premised upon the values of collaboration and mutuality, and which reflect a two-way

reciprocity. The participants' reflections also illustrate that they are engaged with a certain level of intelligibility (Khoo et al., 2016), aimed at understanding their own practice and examining their position within it. However, there was little depth in terms of their engagements with considerations of how their own location as subjects in globalization enables a privileged position. They did not engage in questioning inequities or injustices as motivations for their internationalization work, rather they seem to be driven by a purpose of improving their own practice while learning about others.

SWOT Regarding Internationalization. Participants were asked open-endedly about the SWOT of their internationalization work. Two major themes were apparent across all four SWOT areas: the presence or absence of funding and interest/support. In terms of funding, responding participants indicated that the presence of funding was a strength and/or opportunity as it allowed for costly international travel and initiatives to be possible. Conversely, the absence of such funding was a weakness and/or threat as it precluded such travel and initiatives. One participant explained that “lack of funding and the high cost of travel to work with others causes us to become siloed in our own universities.” Related to this, most participants reported having no funding to support their internationalization pursuits.

In terms of interest/support, participants listed personal interest, university support (e.g., international student exchange and visiting faculty programs) and other sector/institutional support (e.g., international scholarly organizations and journals) as key strengths and/or opportunities for their internationalization work. In contrast, lack of interest and support from university administrators, colleagues, and students were listed as weaknesses and/or threats. One participant shared,

I was able to take students abroad for a week. It was an incredible experience for everybody. However, the university would not support the class unless it "makes" ...there is incredible pressure to recruit for the class rather than the institution actively promoting and supporting the class... rather than actively finding ways for the faculty member to be supported, the institution makes it the responsibility of the faculty member to go beyond their normal role.

Beyond these two themes that fell across all four SWOT areas, there were also some themes specific to a particular area. In terms of opportunities, participants highlighted the diversification of scholarly organization leadership as well as learning from the experiences of other countries. In terms of weaknesses, participants indicated the practical challenge of working across time-zones as well as the challenge of working through differences in language, terminology, policies, politics, and/or cultural norms. Finally, in terms of threats, some respondents listed concerns about "narrow" or "arrogant" viewpoints such as: (a) "nationalism," for which one participant provided the example of "Trump's 'Muslim Ban;'" or (b) "cultural egotism," which one participant described as the "tend[ency] to focus on what is good for USA only."

Considered within Beck's (2012) view, these data suggest that finanscapes are a primary flow shaping the eduscape of internationalization for these Western kinesiology scholars. These data further suggest that the participants recognize, with a level of intelligibility (Khoo et al., 2016), the existence of some inequities and injustices inherent in their eduscape. Here, we see the participants' reflections resonating in a binary of awareness: on the one hand, they recognize with intelligibility the injustices and inequities that do exist (Khoo et al., 2016) while, on the other hand, they are concerned with their own ability to deal with logistical issues related to the

function of internationalization (Knight, 2015), such as navigating different time zones and workload issues.

Ethical Tensions and Considerations Related to Internationalization. When asked about the ethical tensions and considerations in their internationalization work, most simply responded that this was “not applicable.” A few participants did identify tensions, however, such as “the fact that international students...pay an exorbitant fee compared to domestic students,” or that sometimes they were not “able to finish a[n international] project due to support issues.” Others indicated examples of the ethical considerations they have taken in their internationalization work, such as “focus[ing] on values – that means the values of other cultures as well;” “be[ing] open to different ideologies, different ideas, different cultures;” and “offering educational opportunities regardless of religion, gender, race, and ethnicity.” Some specific ways these ethical stances have manifested in participants’ internationalization work include focusing on “marginalized populations, such as women in sport, especially in Middle Eastern countries,” or “trying to include scholars from historically marginalized parts of the world (e.g., Global South) in some research projects.”

These data suggest that some participants have a deep, complex view of what it means to engage in internationalization work. While not using the language of Western privilege or hegemony, these few participants appeared concerned not just with the practicalities of internationalization, but with how to critique and bring dissent to neoliberal order within internationalization processes as well as how to stand in solidarity with students and colleagues across the globe to challenge Western hegemony (Khoo et al., 2016).

**Charting a Path Forward: Driving Internationalization in Western Kinesiology through
Inclusive Leadership**

To inform future planning for internationalization within Western kinesiology, this paper critically considered the state and status of the phenomenon via a review of kinesiology literature on the topic as well as a pilot survey of kinesiology scholars' experiences and perspectives. While this investigation was limited in scope, our analysis reinforces the notion that internationalization is a vibrant priority and practice for many Western kinesiology scholars. Our analysis also suggests that internationalization practices in Western kinesiology appear to be in line with internationalization trends of other Western scholars, including an emphasis on pragmatism and Western dominance. However, what was also made clear through our analysis was that internationalization is approached by some Western kinesiology scholars from a more critical standpoint. These scholars engage in efforts to make intelligible the ethical tensions in internationalization processes and, in response, approach internationalization in a more multifaceted, democratic, bidirectional, and globally-balanced way that includes some actions of dissent and solidarity.

Looking to the future, as Western kinesiology scholars continue to fulfill their interests and expectations to internationalize, we argue that more of the latter, complexity-informed and principle-driven approach is needed if the Western contingent of the discipline is to contribute to, rather than stunt, the pursuit of cognitive justice in the 21st Century (Hoppers, 2009). While we recognize that such an approach is "neither simple nor easy...[and] that much of the ethical knowledge we need to face is essentially *difficult knowledge* (Khoo et al., 2016, p. 88), it is our view that such an approach is possible as it is already beginning to grow within the discipline and could flourish and become widespread if intentionally cultivated. As evidence of this burgeoning, principled approach we point to, for example, the other papers in this special issue. There we see: US-based scholars Block and Tietjen-Smith (In Press) outlining a virtue-based

approach for the internationalization of scholarly kinesiology associations such as NAKHE; Ireland and Australia-based scholars MacPhail and Luguetti (In Press) advocating for the internationalization of research practices in kinesiology to be considered a moral practice grounded in solidarity; and Canadian-based scholars Mandigo, Corlett, and Sheppard (In Press) outlining suggestions for how to carry out study-abroad programs within kinesiology in a way that fosters global citizenship competencies. We also suggest that recent efforts from NAKHE members, such as Russell in his 2019 NAKHE Delphine Hanna lecture on inclusive excellence, have adeptly primed us for this endeavor. While there are many definitions that convey what leadership is, *inclusive leadership* is an approach that emphasizes participation, community, empowerment, and respect for different identities (Blessinger & Stefani, 2017). We contend that inclusive leadership should be a core value of NAKHE and approached intersectionally.

In a diverse global world, intersectionality provides a conceptual frame through which to explore how family, class, ethnicity, gender, religious affiliation, sexuality, and nationality intersect and are positioned in relation to power dynamics. Understanding the importance of intersectionality means that we must be prepared to cultivate inclusive leadership. While NAKHE has been relatively progressive in addressing issues of inclusion, equity, and justice within internationalization, more work remains to be done within the association and across kinesiology and higher education more broadly. Some in kinesiology may feel that such an approach is risky, but “diversity and social justice issues will continue to proliferate and reflect an imperfect society” (Author 1a, 2016). We can no longer define kinesiology as the study of human movement and its impact on our health and wellbeing if we fail to acknowledge that justice plays a role in how this is realized for numerous groups. It is our view that NAKHE can play a significant role in helping Western kinesiology scholars recognize if their institution's

policies, practices, programs, and standards are restrictive and marginalizing for particular populations. One such way NAKHE could do this is by leading the development of an accord on internationalization in kinesiology. Such development could entail bringing kinesiology scholars together for discussion on, and ultimately commitment to, the application of an intersectional frame to internationalization efforts to ensure more inclusive, equitable, and socially just international engagements across the discipline. With a public increasingly skeptical of higher education, kinesiology scholars' internationalization efforts should not be approached without intentionality and principle, and NAKHE's leadership in the thoughtful establishment of an inclusive internationalization accord could help to not only develop sustainable public policy efforts but also instil public confidence. A focus of this sort has great potential in helping global institutions, including kinesiology and related disciplines, to meaningfully transform society.

References

- American Council on Education. (2017). *Mapping internationalization on US campuses*.
www.acenet.edu/Research-Insights/Pages/Internationalization/Mapping-Internationalization-on-U-S-Campuses.aspx
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of studies in international education*, 11(3-4), 290-305.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. In M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global culture: Nationalism, globalization and modernity*. London: Sage.
- Author 3.
- Beck, K. (2012). Globalization/s: Reproduction and resistance in the internationalization of higher education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 35(3), 133-148.
- Bennett, G., Ballouli, K., & Sosa, J. (2011). "Sometimes good, sometimes not so good": Student satisfaction with a sport management exchange program. *Sport Management Education Journal*, 5(1), 14-31.
- Block, B.A. & Tietjen-Smith, T. (In Press). Moving towards the internationalization of a professional society: 21st Century perspectives and collaborations. *International Journal of Kinesiology in Higher Education*.
- Braga, L., & Zuest, G. (2019). Insights on the recruitment of international students for graduate programs in kinesiology. *International Journal of Kinesiology in Higher Education*, 1-15.
- British Council. (2019). *The shape of global higher education: International comparison with Europe*.

https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/k006_02_the_shape_of_global_higher_education_in_europe_final_v5_web.pdf

Canadian Bureau of International Education. (2016). *A world of learning: Canada's performance and potential in international education*. <https://cbie.ca/research/11-2016>"
<https://cbie.ca/research/11-2016>

Cardinal, B. J. (2019). The National Academy of Kinesiology's unmet potential in terms of international impact. *Kinesiology Review*, 8(2), 81-85.

Author 1a

Author 1b

Author 1 & Author 2

Danylchuk, K. (2011). Internationalizing ourselves: Realities, opportunities, and challenges. *Journal of Sport Management*, 25(1), 1-10.

Danylchuk, K., Baker, R., Pitts, B., & Zhang, J. (2015). Supervising international graduate students in sport management: perspectives of experienced advisors. *Sport Management Education Journal*, 9(1), 51-65.

de Wit, H., & Hunter, F. (2015). The future of internationalization of higher education in Europe. *International Higher Education*, 83, 2-3.

Dyreson, M. (2019). The origins of the National Academy of Kinesiology: An American society for a global crusade. *Kinesiology Review*, 8(2), 78-80.

Gyamera, G. O., & Burke, P. J. (2018). Neoliberalism and curriculum in higher education: A post-colonial analyses. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(4), 450-467.

Khoo, S., Taylor, L., & Andreotti, A. (2016). Ethical internationalization, neoliberal restructuring and 'beating the bounds' of higher education. In L. Shultz and M. Viczko

- (Eds.), *Assembling and governing the higher education institution: Democracy, social justice and leadership in global higher education* (pp. 85-109). London, UK: Palgrave.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
- Knight, J. (2015). Updated definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, (33).
- Knight, J. (2018). *Knowledge diplomacy: A bridge linking international higher education and research with international relations*.
<https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/kno.pdf>
- MacPhail, A., & Luguetti, C. (In Press). Nurturing solidarity: Considering the internationalization of research activities in kinesiology as a moral practice. *International Journal of Kinesiology in Higher Education*.
- Mandigo, J., Corlett, J., & Sheppard, J. (In Press). Encouraging global citizenship amongst kinesiology students in higher education: A Canadian perspective. *International Journal of Kinesiology in Higher Education*.
- Odora Hoppers, C. A. (2009). Education, culture and society in a globalizing world: Implications for comparative and international education. *Compare*, 39(5), 601-614.
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of action research*. London, UK: Sage.
- Roberts, G. (2006) The international perspective of AAKPE: Does the academy have an international perspective?, *Quest*, 58(1), 32-40,
- Russell, J. (2019). Achieving inclusive excellence in kinesiology: Insights, strategies, and perspectives. *Quest*, 71(4), 349–360.

- Sato, T., & Hodge, S. R. (2015). Academic and social experiences of exchange students from Japan attending an American university. *College Student Journal*, 49(1), 78-92.
- Sato, T., & Hodge, S. R. (2009). Asian international doctoral students' experiences at two American universities: Assimilation, accommodation, and resistance. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 2(3), 136.
- Soja, E. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Stefani, L., & Blessinger, P. (Eds.) (2017). *Inclusive leadership in higher education: International perspectives and approaches*. London: Routledge.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. (2015). *Draft preliminary report concerning the preparation of a global convention on the recognition of higher education qualifications*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000234743>
- Yan, Z & Cardinal, B. J. (2013). Promoting physical activity among international students in higher education: A peer-education approach. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 84(1), 35-40.