Scholarly Essay

OJED
OPEN JOURNALS IN EDUCATION

Volume 15, Issue 1 (2023), pp. 61-75
Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education
DOI: 10.32674/jcihe.v15i1.4506 | https://ojed.org/jcihe

Global Liberal Arts Colleges and Universities: A Source of Critical Hope

Renee L. Bowling
ORCID https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5447-8806

The Ohio State University, USA

*Corresponding author: Email: bowling.187@osu.edu

Address: Dept. of Educational Studies, 122 Ramseyer Hall, 29 W. Woodruff Ave., Columbus, OH 43210, USA

Abstract

Global liberal arts colleges and universities are an understudied trend in international education. This scholarly essay incorporates practitioner knowledge and scholarship to explore what, who, and where these global liberal arts colleges and universities are. Moreover, these institutions are situated within wider competing internationalization ideologies. The author applies a critical internationalization studies lens and a mapping framework to analyze their underlying motivations and discover whether global liberal arts colleges and universities might present a source of critical hope.

Keywords: critical hope, global liberal arts, internationalization, motivations, trend

Received December 23, 2021; revised March 20, 2022; accepted May 25, 2022

"All the benefits of a liberal arts college: small discussion-based classes, getting to know your professors, the freedom to mix subjects, in a community with other international students. At half the cost of a U.S. degree!" I heard the first part of this pitch repeatedly from visiting admission colleagues, but within the past decade I increasingly heard the latter refrain as well. Colleges and universities from non-Western contexts marketed their own version of the liberal arts, highlighting their multiculturalism, lower fees, and proximity to students' home countries. As a college counselor working in an international school in Asia, I bore witness to the proliferation, popularity, and competition of global liberal arts colleges and universities in the decade 2010-2020. My practitioner knowledge motivated me to recount

the rise of global liberal arts colleges and universities and to situate them within competing narratives of higher education internationalization. I propose global liberal arts colleges and universities are a trend that offers a source of critical hope for imagining new possibilities for the internationalization of higher education.

The liberal arts education on which global liberal arts campuses are modeled is attributed to a Western tradition rooted in Greek philosophy (Nussbaum, 2002). This tradition focused on interdisciplinary, holistic education and personal development underpinned the historic universities of Europe where privileged elites studied culture, the arts, and languages (Rothblatt, 2003; van der Wende, 2017). Today, the liberal arts tradition is associated primarily with U.S. campuses (Godwin, 2015b) that blend a commitment to undergraduate multidisciplinary general education with subject specialization (Peterson, 2012), and emphasize critical thinking and holistic views of the curriculum and co-curricular experiences (Mou, 2021). Recent authors, however, have demonstrated innovative (Jung et al., 2016; Nishimura & Sasao, 2019; Yang, 2016) and historically-rooted approaches similar to the liberal arts (Godwin, 2017; Godwin & Altbach, 2016) originating from the non-Western world. Liberal arts education has become a transnational (Rothblatt, 2003) philosophy with the potential to "both reinforce and resist neoliberal practices" (Godwin, 2015a, p. 223).

Global liberal arts colleges and universities (GLAC&U) embrace an interdisciplinary curriculum and are committed to developing internationally-minded students, often for stated purposes of education for peace, global citizenship, or solving global problems. They are established in countries with historic academic reputations such as the Netherlands and Germany and in emerging higher education markets across the world including South Korea and India (Godwin & Altbach, 2016). Some are affiliated with national universities, such as Yuanpei College of Peking University, China, (Sharma, 2017) and Mahidol University International College of Mahidol University, Thailand (Jianvittayakit, 2012), while others were founded independently to increase access or contribute to sustainability, such as Ashesi University in Ghana (Maguire, 2010) and Ashoka University in India (Chakraborty et al., 2021).

It surprised me to discover that the GLAC&U I understood to be common practitioner knowledge in international counseling and admission are nearly absent from the literature, unlike other forms of internationalization such as international branch campuses (IBCs), joint universities, and American Universities Abroad (Altbach et al., 2019; Escriva-Beltran et al., 2019; Knight, 2020; Long, 2018; Wilkins, 2021; Wilkins & He, 2020).

Categorizations of international higher education that focus on delivery methods and structures (Knight, 2020) miss commonalities of ethos, pedagogy, and curricula shared across institutional types that are the core characteristics of global liberal arts institutions (Boyle, 2022). GLAC&U are thus overlooked in the literature as an approach to higher education that spans across delivery methods. Much of their expansion is taking place in the Global South without Western partners (Godwin, 2017), which I suggest is another reason for the observed gap in scholarship: Western scholars may be unaware of the growth of the phenomenon in practice. This complicated my guiding question of how GLAC&U fit into broader ideological conversations around internationalization.

Yet global liberal arts programs outside of North America expanded by 59% in the preceding decade (Godwin, 2015b) and practitioners confirm continued expansion. Though an understudied and relatively small minority within international higher education (Boyle, 2022), higher education ministries, national universities, and private enterprise have all demonstrated interest in this approach to

internationalization. I intend to demonstrate that GLAC&U in Non-Western contexts merit attention by scholars probing the means and goals of internationalization and particularly by educators and administrators interested in advancing epistemic justice and decolonial approaches. I ground my analysis of this trend in practitioner knowledge buttressed by emerging scholarship to provide a snapshot of what, who, and where global liberal arts colleges and universities are located geographically. I discuss how this trend interacts with competing motivations, the "why" of internationalization, and probe whether GLAC&U might serve as a source for critical hope.

What, Who, and Where

Global liberal arts colleges and universities offer an internationally-minded and composed undergraduate education that is intentionally liberal arts in nature. While campuses worldwide may be either domestic or international in focus, this analysis centers those located outside of the U.S., the region typically associated with liberal arts education, that share a focus on global liberal arts education. Many of these campuses have 30% or greater international student bodies (Times Higher Education, 2022). Being international is foundational to their recruitment, their mission, and their curricula, and it is critical to their reputations. While global liberal arts campuses share common characteristics, they represent more of a philosophical approach than "a prescriptive model" (Boyle, 2022, p. 14).

Curricular breadth has long been observed to be the hallmark of a liberal education (Rothblatt, 2003) via exposure to diverse perspectives (Godwin & Altbach, 2016) and by combining general study with specialization (Peterson, 2012). The liberal arts tradition is historically attributed to the West, specifically the U.S. expression of liberal arts colleges (Godwin & Altbach, 2016), "despite historical roots in Greek, Chinese, Indian, and Egyptian traditions" (Godwin, 2017, p. 88).

In contrast to research universities, GLAC&U prioritize an interdisciplinary undergraduate education that fosters fluidity between quantitative skills, the social sciences, and humanities (Nishimura & Sasao, 2019). These campuses are characterized by student-centered pedagogies, high-quality student-faculty interaction, small class sizes (Mou, 2021), and the development of critical thinking skills (Boyle, 2022). English is their dominant language of instruction (Godwin, 2015b). Curricula are conceptualized holistically, often encompassing residence life and incorporating high impact practices (Kuh, 2018) such as first-year seminars (Nishimura & Sasao, 2019) around global themes. Degree lengths vary and programs are typically recognized by national education ministries (Van der Wende, 2017). Boyle (2022) noted that global liberal arts institutions are marked by both convergence to regional patterns and by differentiation of pedagogies, emphases, and institutional types. Their function within international higher education is to provide tertiary education focused on the multidisciplinary education and development of undergraduates, not to climb the world-class university rankings charts through a focus on graduate research. Their missions are global in the sense of being intentionally international in their faculty and admissions, the internationalization of their curricula, and the development of intercultural competencies and global problem-solving skills in their graduates.

Who and where are these universities? The difficulty in answering precisely lies in the absence of well-defined boundaries. Global liberal arts campuses are self-labelling: they assert their global composition, mission, and curricula. They have existed underneath the structure of historic "research universities (Hong Kong, the Netherlands), emerged as a pilot project within existing state structures (Argentina, China), grew out of religious traditions (Indonesia, Israel), or began independently (Ghana,

Italy)" (Boyle, 2022, p. 14). Independent examples include Franklin University, Switzerland, Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Ecuador, Al Akhawayn University, Morrocco, Quest University, Canada, and FLAME University, India, which began as the Foundation for Liberal and Management Education but has since abandoned its acronym and joined the Global Liberal Arts Alliance (GLAA, n.d.). Unlike university types externally defined by Carnegie classifications or global rankings (Estera & Shahjahan, 2019), GLAC&U are in constant need of reputation maintenance to remain both global and liberal arts in the public's perception, particularly in the shadow of research universities (McCormick & Zhao, 2005). An example is New York University's Abu Dhabi campus styling itself as "the world's honors college" (Redden, 2010, para. 3), foregrounding its liberal arts undergraduate college identity over its parent's classification as a doctoral research university (Shulman, 2001).

In 2013, the Global Liberal Education Inventory (GLEI; Godwin, 2013) represented the first scholarly effort to create a comprehensive database of global liberal arts programs located outside of the United States. The count is now over 200 schools and programs in over 60 countries (Boyle, 2022), half of which were established since 2000 (Godwin, 2013). All regions have experienced growth since then with Asia in the lead (Boyle, 2022, Godwin, 2015b). The programs are equally as likely to be found at public or private institutions (Godwin, 2015b) and the vast majority are located near urban centers (Godwin, 2017). Two-thirds are affiliated with an existing university which may include IBCs, joint university or degree programs, and semi-autonomous undergraduate colleges, but fewer than half exemplify the international program and provider mobility (Knight & Motala-Timol, 2021) characterized by multinationalization (Altbach, 2016, p. 84), where an institution from one country begins offering its programs or qualifications in another country. Most partnerships are domestic, and only one-third of global liberal arts programs partner with a U.S. college (Godwin, 2017). Some programs affiliated to research universities refer to themselves "university colleges", such as Underwood International College of Yonsei University, Korea, and Leiden University College The Hague, Netherlands. The GLEI is, to date, the only existing database of non-U.S. global liberal arts programs, not all of which exist as their own college or university campus. While not currently publicly accessible, the GLEI is due for updating, which will be a significant undertaking given the rise in liberal arts programs in the interim.

Authors lament a scarcity of research (Godwin, 2013; Peterson, 2012; Van der Wende, 2012), noting that liberal arts campuses are marginalized due to their much smaller enrollment and relative impact in contrast to world-class universities in comparative international scholarship. In practice, however, school counselors increasingly distinguish between worldwide categories of liberal arts and research universities as a heuristic in our work with students (NACAC, 2021). In recent years, case study compilations of global liberal arts colleges have appeared (Chakraborty et al., 2021; Jung et al., 2016; Nishimura & Sasao, 2019) that highlight examples in and connections between the Global South. These dynamics suggest that GLAC&U fall within the new transnationalism (Altbach, 2016) characterized by South-South and South-North patterns of transmission.

In summary, global liberal arts colleges and universities are found throughout the world. They may be supported by governments, private investors, or university partners. Despite their proliferation, GLAC&U remain an understudied approach to internationalization in tension with isomorphic pressures to conform to the research university model (Altbach et al., 2009; Godwin, 2017; Peterson, 2012). The massification of higher education requires differentiation of university types and missions (Altbach et al., 2009) and can lead to a diversity of structures such as the observed emergence of undergraduate-focused

colleges (Teichler, 1998). Many regions now experiment with liberal arts education (Peterson, 2012), and in the next section I introduce conceptual frameworks to explore their reasons why.

Critically Framing Internationalization

Internationalization as Westernization has been written about extensively including in this publication (Sperduti, 2017) as linguistic dominance, privileging Western epistemologies, and reinforcing an inequitable pattern of global centers and peripheries (Altbach, 2016). Scholars have aptly called attention to the depoliticization and romanticization (Buckner & Stein, 2020; Stein, 2021) of internationalization rhetoric that contrasts with practice (Tight, 2021). Internationalization's public good is no longer assumed. It is now questioned (Fabricius et al., 2017; Tight, 2021) by critical perspectives increasingly accepted in the mainstream (Stein, 2021).

Stein (2021) credits Dr. Amy Metcalfe with coining *critical internationalization studies* as an umbrella term for the study of ethics and power dynamics involved in internationalization from critical perspectives. I adopt this lens for its relevance to contemporary internationalization and alignment with my paradigm as a critical realist (Maxwell, 2012). In doing so, I assume that internationalization efforts including GLAC&U engage with power both as products of and contributors to globalization narratives (Tight, 2021; Zapp & Lerch, 2020) and that they are embedded in global policyscapes (Carney, 2009) and geopolitical contexts.

My concern is thus not only with the power between individuals but also within systems and structures, which includes epistemic injustice. *Epistemic injustice* was introduced by contemporary philosopher Fricker (2007) to refer to injustices that relate to ways of knowing. These can be hermeneutical, such as when a group's ways of knowing have historically been excluded or underrepresented (Anderson, 2012; Fricker, 2007). The privileging of Western epistemologies in the internationalization of higher education is an example of epistemic injustice. Anderson (2012), writing on the ethical duties of social institutions, famously commented, "structural injustices call for structural remedies" (p. 171), which in our field may involve seeking approaches to internationalization that can serve as systemic correctives.

I apply a critical internationalization lens in search of sources of critical hope for international education. *Critical hope* pairs the "realistic appraisal of conditions grounded in an equity and justice lens" (Dugan & Humbles, 2018, p. 18) with "envisioning the possibility of a better future" (Bishundat et al., 2018, p. 91). Critical hope is neither wishful thinking nor a denial of reality; it is an imaginative ability equity-minded leaders cultivate to create and sustain social justice in practice (Dugan & Humbles, 2018). Bishundat (2018) described the values of "love, anger, community, and struggle" (p. 94) as allies of critical hope that can be developed and leveraged to motivate social justice work.

Organizing Frameworks

GLAC&U fall within broader competing global imaginaries (Stein, 2017, 2021). A critical international studies lens prompts me to interrogate the ideological underpinnings of internationalization instead of its structures or practices (George Mwangi & Yao, 2020). Several scholars have attempted to organize the competing motivations for internationalization (de Wit & Altbach, 2021; Stein, 2021; Tight, 2021). Van der Wende (2012) identified the main drivers as epistemological, economic, and moral/social, while Stein (2021) introduced a social cartography matrix that framed multiple theories of

internationalization. These range from the neoconservative and neoliberal to the liberal, anti-oppressive, and decolonial, with layers of intervention at the methodological, epistemological, and ontological levels. Her framework captured the drivers Van der Wende identified and the prominent global imaginaries vying for the future of internationalization. Additionally, it drew attention to how each vantage point conceptualizes the public good differently. What is at stake is the future of higher education internationalization in the process of being created and reproduced in the present (Shahjahan & Edwards, 2021).

Internationalization Embodied

Practitioners like myself in the field of international education are inextricably embedded in these ideologies. Our involvement is complicated, in a way that we who are part of the systems should sit with and interrogate. As a White American administrator working transnationally, I call attention to my shifting positionality, privilege (Torres-Olave & Lee, 2020), and complicity in systems that uphold Western supremacy even as I seek to raise awareness of and decenter them.

As a school counselor, I wrestled with my role representing Western education, unequal access to it, and its perceived superiority over other higher education options. I worked to make college counseling more globally inclusive and accessible, decentering the West from guidance curricula, counseling, college fairs, and counselor training, hiring, and promotion. As an IB Theory of Knowledge teacher, I also challenged my students to critically examine the IB curriculum and the Western ways of knowing enshrined in it. Often, these efforts felt too small to stem the tide of coloniality inherent in international schools, something that students (ODIS, 2022) and a recent Bloomberg article (Obiko Pearson, 2022) have drawn attention to.

Stein (2021) reminds us that a victim/villain/victor understanding is too simplistic: humility is required. For me, this looks like a practice of ongoing learning, faith practice, self-reflexivity, and dialogue through reading, engagement in critical professional networks, and autoethnographic examination of my own work. I am more reformer than revolutionary, which informs how I show up and work for change within systems. The construct of critical hope resonates with me as I seek to cultivate and sustain more equitable international education. It reminds me to view injustices and my own role in them realistically but with hope and agency.

Why Global Liberal Arts Colleges & Universities

I am interested in the broader stories we tell about internationalization and how non-Western global liberal arts colleges and universities fit into them. I analyze the public good implications of the economic, moral/social, and epistemological motivations identified by Van der Wende (2012) as mapped to Stein's (2021) framework, to explore possible sources of critical hope.

Economic Drivers: Neoconservative and Neoliberal Motivations

These motivations prioritize national interests from an interstate view (Zapp & Lerch, 2020) of a competitive global economy. The dominant neoliberal ideology offers students benefits such as access to expat faculty, the English language, and job markets. The fact that the idea of the liberal arts college has traction globally even absent a Western partner is a testament to its power.

GLAC&U are pitched as preparing students with employable skills for the knowledge economy (Van der Wende, 2012). From this perspective, graduates who are adaptive thinkers with intercultural competencies to lead on a global stage are considered a public good that builds national capacity. Supranational NGOs such as the World Bank began a decade ago to promote liberal arts in the Global South as nation-building (Peterson, 2012), demonstrating that even a relatively small trend has the potential to be promoted as transnational ideology. Widespread neoliberal logics (Shahjahan, 2014), however, run the risk of enshrining the purpose of liberal arts education as national human resource development for competitive advantage. This is in direct opposition to the oft-touted development of students as global citizens. Furthermore, it is unclear how graduates are to be retained locally after being primed for international competitiveness.

In practice, there exists strong pressure to conform to a "West is best" mentality from parents, students, fellow educators, and the education industry. As a college counselor I acknowledged that people come to international education from varied walks of life and with different goals than I do, many seeking opportunities I had by privilege. For high achieving low income students (HALI) who can begin to see and question these dynamics, knowledge is power. I came to view myself as responsible for the opportunities I presented and how I framed them, including the assumptions I kept hidden or exposed, but not for the choices or motivations of others.

Moral and Social Drivers: Anti-Oppressive Motivations

Moral and social drivers, on the other hand, aim to foster global solidarity. Institutions operating primarily from this motivation are more likely to focus on educating collaborative global problem-solvers and on their campus' global social responsibilities (Jones et al., 2021; Marginson, 2011). They seek to instill in students a vision of rooted cosmopolitanism (Appiah, 2006; Nixon, 2011), a mutual sense of belonging locally and globally that leads to collective responsibility for global challenges. International Higher Education for Society (Jones et al., 2021; Leask & de Gayardon, 2021) efforts often rely on this framing. The rise of liberal arts programs at public campuses worldwide which increase access to a liberal arts undergraduate education (Godwin, 2017) signifies the power of this motivation in the current global higher education landscape.

Moral and social motivations have been appealed to throughout the history of internationalization (Stein, 2021), however past efforts have served national interests and reproduced colonial patterns (Altbach, 2016). Unexamined, this rationale can cloak complicity with good intentions. Scholars have critiqued global liberal arts campuses for their coziness with neoliberalism, their potential to spread Western cultural hegemony, and the inequitable power relationships of partnerships (Godwin, 2015b). It is worth asking whether GLAC&U are merely reproducing a legacy of Whiteness (Shahjahan & Edwards, 2021) in global higher education. Absent intentionality to "decenter ourselves in a world of others" (Center for Global Citizenship Education, 2021), the project of developing global citizens runs the risk of developing Western citizens.

Examples include prioritizing individual versus cooperative critical thinking (Tan, 2017) and Western scientific and academic conventions. Historically, there has been thin inclusion and "little effort to adapt...to the needs or traditions of the country in which the programs are offered" (Altbach, 2016, p. 126). However, this need not be the case, and there are emerging case studies from the Global South

which seek to right these historical imbalances. They are examples of critical hope, blending aspiration and imagination with an eyes-wide-open assessment of the legacy of cultural imperialism in education.

Epistemological Drivers: Decolonial Motivations

Decolonial theorists in the traditions of Said (1978) and Bhabha (2012) are interested in "undoing colonialism" (Shahjahan et al., 2021, p. 10). Specifically, authors seek to decenter Western epistemology, cultivate an ecology of knowledges (Santos, 2007; Stein, 2021), and imagine alternatives (Dutta, 2018) to the colonized relations between centers and peripheries (Altbach, 2016; Galtung, 1971). This work seeks to address epistemic injustice, and calls have gone forth to imagine new futures for scholarship and practice "without Global North epistemic dominance" (Takayama et al., 2017, p. S16) A recent JCIHE article on the decolonization of higher education (Lin et al., 2021) exemplifies this lens. The authors introduce an Indigenous Knowledge Model to shift the paradigm in international higher education. A decolonizing perspective suggests it is possible for a global liberal arts approach to not reify Ameri- and Eurocentric ways of knowing, but instead be grounded in indigenous knowledges.

While liberal arts education has "long been considered a distinctly American tradition" (Godwin, 2015b, p. 2), holistic traditions that marry specialization with general education in fact pre-date American liberal arts in China, India, and Africa (Godwin, 2017; Godwin & Altbach, 2016; Jung et al., 2016; Lewis, 2018). Confucian academies integrated subjects, reconciled diverse perspectives through dialogue, and emphasized ethical development for society (Cao, 2016; Yang, 2016). In South Asia, the Buddha taught alongside scholars from other disciplines at Nalanda University (Nussbaum, 2010). The curriculum of the world's "oldest continually operating" (Godwin & Altbach, 2016, p. 10) university, Al-Azhar University in Cairo, included study of the sciences and the arts alongside religion, and in Sub-Saharan Africa, Arab scholars taught language, law, literature, astronomy and mathematics as companion subjects for generations (Lilford, 2017).

Widespread ignorance about global models of holistic learning can be attributed to Ameri- and Eurocentrism in the academy and the romanticization of Western colonial history. Despite nearly all contemporary universities having now patterned themselves on the Western model (Altbach, 2016), a global interdisciplinary program of study that is indigenous in character is not only possible but may, in fact, be rooted in the soil from which global liberal arts campuses spring. Reviving these histories can serve as inspiration for reclaiming and reimagining non-Western global liberal arts traditions.

Counternarratives

Perhaps, then, a global liberal arts college or university could be a decolonizing force. To become so, campus leaders would need to actively resist the "isomorphic tendencies and global neoliberal frames…[that] increase the risk of cultural hegemony and…intellectual imperialism" (Godwin, 2015a, p. 239). Shahjahan (2014) advanced *transformational resistance* as a method for imagining and creating new ways of knowing and being, for which Godwin (2015a) suggested global liberal arts might offer a counternarrative to disrupt neoliberalism. This strategy of telling minority stories to contest dominant ideologies (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) and "supply alternative sense-making structures" (Kraehe, 2015, p. 201) emerged from critical race theory, a movement grounded in the critical legal studies work of Crenshaw (1994), Bell (2008), Delgado (1989) and others (Crenshaw et al., 1995; West, 1995). Counternarratives illumine experiential knowledge to advance social justice (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002),

as I seek to do by sharing practitioner knowledge of non-Western GLAC&U. Reclaiming these liberal arts traditions is an approach to centering marginalized voices that has the potential to serve as a counternarrative and source of critical hope.

GLAC&U are uniquely positioned to capitalize on their locations and composition, thus creative responses and thought leadership may arise from within the campuses themselves. There has been an attempt (Mou, 2021) to de-center the U.S. as the reference point for liberal arts by exploring the values-based contributions of other regions of the world. Yang (2016) expressed a desire for the fusion of complementary East-West epistemologies and texts in the worldwide liberal arts canon. Jung et al. (2016) drew attention to these curricular experiments at GLAC&U, and to the higher prioritization of internationalization by Asian compared to U.S. liberal arts colleges. They highlighted two key aspects of the task in East Asia as "re-defining the meaning of liberal arts education in the educational and socio-cultural context" and "balancing both excellence and access in liberal arts education" (p. 183). A professor at Ashoka University (Majumdar, 2021) has drawn attention to the need to sustainably integrate liberal arts institutions in local communities and national dialogues to avoid their perception as elite, foreign islands. Increasingly, calls for coherent, integrated cross-cultural frameworks for global liberal arts are being voiced (Jung et al., 2016) with scholars highlighting epistemologies of the South (de Souza Santos & Meneses, 2019; Lin et al., 2021). There are few Western scholars engaging with GLAC&U, perhaps because the West is not centered or a beneficiary of the phenomenon. However, the seeds of critical internationalization studies are being planted amongst a new generation of scholars at a moment when equity and social justice are at the forefront, as evidenced by themes in recent editions of JCIHE.

Some global liberal arts campuses themselves contain the seeds of new imaginaries that may yet come full circle. Case studies of GLAC&U edited by scholars from the Global South (Chakraborty et al., 2021; Jung et al., 2016; Nishimura & Sasao, 2019) are chronicling institutions' innovations and providing the field with early examples. Sunkyunkwan University, a Korean institution founded in the 14th century "with the goal of whole-person development" (Jung et al., 2016, p. 181), is an example of a national university that has reclaimed earlier Confucian ideals by reintroducing a humanities-based liberal arts education for its undergraduates (Nussbaum, 2010). Models such as this which can point to a history of holistic education predating the U.S. liberal arts tradition have a strong foundation for creating a counternarrative.

The imagining of new futures (Shahjahan & Edwards, 2021) in international higher education is an essential ingredient of the critical hope necessary to sustain vision and action. If internationalization presents institutions with a choice between competition and social responsibility (de Wit & Altbach, 2021), some may find a third way. GLAC&U grounded in non-Western onto-epistemologies are poised to serve as a third way. If students can adopt a rooted cosmopolitan outlook, perhaps so, too, may institutions. Certainly, global liberal arts colleges and universities are uniquely situated learning environments from which to explore glonacal agency (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002) and justice. The self-asserted nature of GLAC&U and their prioritization of internationalization present an opportunity to reimagine the liberal arts contextually for a more socially just future. Whether or not they embrace their decolonizing potential depends on leaders' and faculties' willingness to explore their campus' motivations and heritage, and to critically examine their role in the Westernization of international higher education.

Implications for Practice and Scholarship

A relevant question is how GLAC&U might "attend to the complexities and complicities of internationalization, instead of seeking simplistic narratives and solutions" (Stein, 2021, p. 1782). Globally rising nationalisms, refugee displacements, and America's racial reckoning coincident with the COVID-19 pandemic have prompted introspection and conversations on racism, colorism, and Westernization in many international education spaces. True transformation will require courageous, equity-minded leadership and critical hope to imagine and work for a different future.

Administrators are encouraged to begin by learning the history of interdisciplinary education in their region and networking with like-minded colleagues. The allies of hope are often best fostered in community. Discerning the motives and power dynamics at play is critical to inform equity-minded leadership (George Mwangi & Yao, 2020; Malcom-Piqueux & Bensimon, 2017) that can transform practice (Bystydzienski et al., 2017; Kezar, 2020). Analyses may reveal a lack of alignment between institutions' stated missions and stakeholders' motivations. The Integrated Model of Leadership Development (Dugan & Humbels, 2018) offers a roadmap for leaders wishing to grow in threading equity-minded leadership throughout priorities and operational concerns, and research has shown that a comprehensive approach to internationalization led from the top is most likely to be successful (George Mwangi & Yao, 2020). Depending on workflow constraints, it may make sense to distribute leadership to an interdisciplinary task force or to bring in an international education consultant from a critical internationalization studies perspective who can guide an institutional audit and work with leadership to identify strategic priorities.

Those seeking to lead decolonization efforts may look to Shahjahan et al.'s recent article that summarized the work as "(a) recognizing constraints, (b) disrupting, and (c) making room for alternatives" (2021, p. 13). It described decolonizing curriculum and pedagogy as inclusive work, actively critiquing the positionality of knowledge, and enacted, through collaborative, relational learning that is connected to the community and to wider social and political issues. Practically, this involves reflexivity, interrogating disciplinary assumptions around the universality of knowledge, engaging in decolonizing curriculum work, training faculty in culturally responsive instruction and learner-centered inquiry (Godwin, 2015a), and honoring diverse of ways of knowing and being. Stein et al.'s (2021) decolonizing workbook is an excellent resource for educators wishing to build capacity to engage in this work.

Scholars can support these transformational efforts by continuing to explore how emerging GLAC&U fit within the new transnationalism's (Altbach, 2016) "move away from internationalization as a Western concept" (de Wit & Altbach, 2021, p. 31). Authors can include GLAC&U in internationalization studies and forecasts and work toward updating a public global inventory. Global scholars and practitioners are particularly welcome to help determine the future of internationalization. Those whose positionality affords them perspective on the complexities and complicities can suggest ways forward for global liberal arts as International Higher Education *for* Society with emphases on global learning, equity, and epistemic justice. These may include recommended practices and next steps, as well as frameworks or rubrics that are contextually adaptable. Editorial teams should prioritize publishing these scholars' research, especially around the areas of emerging GLAC&U models, pedagogies, and curricula that champion Indigenous knowledges. It is time to develop the counternarratives and contextually coherent frameworks Godwin (2015a) and Jung et al. (2016) called for. Western scholars, too, have roles to play amplifying these voices, advocating for an ecology of knowledges (de Souza Santos, 2007), and calling partner institutions toward more equitable partnerships.

Finally, an ethic of minimizing harm epistemically and ontologically might find a home in the public good mission (Marginson, 2011; Shaker & Plater, 2016) of GLAC&U. I can think of no better way to acknowledge complexity than for leaders to invite their learning communities into a reflexive and critical examination of the foundations of the very project itself. It will not be easy for existing institutions to do the self-examination necessary to lead to contextually-based meaningful action, but it is often the hard things that are most worth doing.

A Source of Critical Hope

This analysis has demonstrated that there is merit to examining an internationalization trend on the basis of its motivations. I have introduced global liberal arts campuses as a trend in international higher education and recounted their rise in the past decade according to practitioner knowledge and developments in scholarship. Further studies would do well to further delimit GLAC&U, to update and make public a global inventory, and to provide examples of epistemic justice from the Global South.

While there can be a mix of motivations underlying any endeavor, I echo Godwin (2015a) in advocating for decolonization to become central to the purpose of GLAC&U. These campuses embrace an international mission, stand in relief to world-class research universities, and purport to be agents of International Higher Education *for* Society. They carry the potential to serve as counternarratives to the forces of neoliberalism and Westernization in international higher education. Global liberal arts colleges and universities represent a growing, influential trend of worldwide experimentation with the liberal arts at the undergraduate level and are uniquely positioned to offer a source of critical hope for transformative resistance to dominant internationalization narratives.

References

Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (2016). *Global perspectives on higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2019). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. Brill.

Anderson, E. (2012). Epistemic justice as a virtue of social institutions. *Social Epistemology, 26*(2), 163-173. https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2011.652211

Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. W. W. Norton.

Bell, D. (2008). *And we are not saved: The elusive quest for racial justice*. Basic Books.

Bhabha, H. K. (2012). *The location of culture* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203820551

Bishundat, D., Phillip, D. V., & Gore, W. (2018). Cultivating critical hope: The too often forgotten dimension of critical leadership development. *New Directions for Student Leadership, 159*. https:/doi.org/10.1002/yd.20300

Boyle, M.-E. (2022). Global Liberal Education: Contradictory Trends and Heightened Controversy. *International Higher Education*, *109*, 13–15. https://doi.org/10.36197/IHE.2022.109.06

Buckner, E., & Stein, S. (2020). What counts as Internationalization? Deconstructing the internationalization imperative. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *24*(2), 151–166. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315319829878

Bystydzienski, J., Thomas, N., Howe, S., & Desai, A. (2017). The leadership role of college deans and department chairs in academic culture change. *Studies in Higher Education*, *42*(12), 2301–2315. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1152464

Cao, L. (2016). The significance and practice of general education in China: The case of Tsinghua University. In W. Kirby & M. Van der Wende (Eds.), *Experiences in liberal arts and science education from America, Europe, and Asia*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Carney, S. (2009). Negotiating policy in an age of globalization: Exploring educational "policyscapes" in Denmark, Nepal, and China. *Comparative Education Review*, *53*(1), 63–88. https://doi.org/10.1086/593152

Chakraborty, A., Kumar, S., Shashidhara, L. S., & Taneja, A. (2021). Building sustainable societies through purpose-driven universities: A case study from Ashoka University (India). *Sustainability*, *13*(13), 7423. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13137423

Crenshaw, K. (1994). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. In R. K. Bergen, J. L. Edleson, & C. M. Renzetti (Eds.), *Violence against women: Classic papers (2005)*. Pearson Education New Zealand.

Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K. (Eds.). (1995). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. The New Press.

Delgado, R. (1989). Storytelling for oppositionists and others: A plea for narrative. *Michigan Law Review*, *87*(8), 2411. https://doi.org/10.2307/1289308

de Souza Santos, B. (2007). Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledges. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, *30*(1), 45–89.

de Sousa Santos, B., & Meneses, M. P. (Eds.). (2019). *Knowledges born in the struggle: Constructing the epistemologies of the global south*. Routledge.

de Wit, H., & Altbach, P. G. (2021). Internationalization in higher education: Global trends and recommendations for its future. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, *5*(1), 28–46. https://doi.org/10.1080/23322969.2020.1820898

Dutta, U. (2018). Decolonizing "community" in community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *62*(3–4), 272–282. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12281

Escriva-Beltran, M., Muñoz-de-Prat, J., & Villó, C. (2019). Insights into international branch campuses: Mapping trends through a systematic review. *Journal of Business Research*, *101*, 507–515. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.12.049

Estera, A., & Shahjahan, R. A. (2019). Globalizing whiteness? Visually re/presenting students in global university rankings websites. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *40*(6), 930–945. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2018.1453781

Fabricius, A. H., Mortensen, J., & Haberland, H. (2017). The lure of internationalization: Paradoxical discourses of transnational student mobility, linguistic diversity and cross-cultural exchange. *Higher Education*, *73*(4), 577–595. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9978-3

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.

Galtung, J. (1971). A structural theory of imperialism. *Journal of Peace Research*, *8*(2), 81–117.

George Mwangi, C. A., & Yao, C. W. (2020). US higher education internationalization through an equity-driven lens. In L. W. Perna (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research: Volume 36* (pp. 1–62). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-43030-6_11-1

GLAA. (n.d.). *Home*. Global Liberal Arts Alliance. Retrieved October 2, 2021, from https://liberalartsalliance.org/

Godwin, K. A. (2013). *The global emergence of liberal education: A comparative and exploratory study* [Dissertation, Boston College]. http://hdl.handle.net/2345/bc-ir:104384

Godwin, K. A. (2015a). The counter narrative: Critical analysis of liberal education in global context. *New Global Studies*, *9*(3). https://doi.org/10.1515/ngs-2015-0033

Godwin, K. A. (2015b). The worldwide emergence of liberal education. *International Higher Education*, *79*, 2–4. https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2015.79.5835

Godwin, K. A. (2017). Précis of a global liberal education phenomenon: The empirical story. In P. Marber & D. Araya (Eds.), *The evolution of liberal arts in the global age* (pp. 87–105). Routledge.

Godwin, K. A., & Altbach, P. G. (2016). A historical and global perspective on liberal arts education: What was, what is, and what will be. *International Journal of Chinese Education*, *5*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1163/22125868-12340057

Jianvittayakit, L. (2012). Motivation factors of international students in choosing a foreign university: A case study on Mahidol University International College. *Interdisciplinary Studies Journal*, *12*(2), 172–189.

Jones, E., Leask, B., Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2021). Global social responsibility and the internationalisation of higher education for society. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *25*(4), 330–347. https://doi.org/10.1177/10283153211031679

Jung, I., Nishimura, M., & Sasao, T. (2016). *Liberal arts education and colleges in East Asia: Possibilities and challenges in the global age*. Springer.

Kezar, A. (2020, January 29). *Transformational change is needed for campuses to adequately serve a diverse new student body*. Inside Higher Ed. https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2020/01/29/transformational-change-needed-campuses-adequately-serve-diverse-new-student-body

Knight, J. (2020). The internationalization of higher education scrutinized: International program and provider mobility. *Sociologias*, *22*(54), 176–199. https://doi.org/10.1590/15174522-97865

Knight, J., & Motala-Timol, S. (2021). Tertiary education in Mauritius: Increasing access through international program and provider mobility. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *25*(3), 207–227. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315320932321

Kraehe, A. M. (2015). Sounds of silence: Race and emergent counter-narratives of art teacher identity. *Studies in Art Education*, *56*(3), 199–213. https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.2015.11518963

Kuh, G. (2018). Whither holistic student development: It matters more today than ever. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *50*(3–4), 52–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2018.1509590

Leask, B., & de Gayardon, A. (2021). Reimagining internationalization for society. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *25*(4), 323–329. https://doi.org/10.1177/10283153211033667

Lewis, P. (2018). Globalizing the liberal arts: Twenty-first-century education. In N. W. Gleason (Ed.), *Higher education in the era of the fourth industrial revolution* (pp. 15–38). Palgrave Macmillan.

Lilford, G. (2017). The African liberal arts: Heritage, challenges, and prospects. In *The evolution of liberal arts in the global age*. Routledge.

Lin, J., Stoltz, A., Aruch, M., & Rappeport, A. (2021). Decolonization and transformation of higher education for sustainability: Integrating indigenous knowledge into policy, teaching, research, and practice. *Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education*, *13*(Summer), 134–156. https://doi.org/10.32674/jcihe.v13iSummer.3255

Long, K. A. (2018). *The emergence of the American university abroad* (Order No. 10809696) [Columbia University]. ProQuest.

Maguire, K. (2010, January). A new model of leadership for Africa. *Swarthmore College Bulletin*. https://www.swarthmore.edu/bulletin/archive/wp/january-2010_a-new-model-of-leadership-for-africa.html

Majumdar, S. (2021, November 25). Is the honeymoon period over for liberal arts in Asia? *Times Higher Education (THE)*. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/depth/honeymoon-period-over-liberal-arts-asia

Malcom-Piqueux, L., & Bensimon, E. M. (2017). Taking equity-minded action to close equity gaps. *Peer Review*, *19*(2), 5–8.

Marginson, S. (2011). Higher education and public good. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *65*(4), 411–433. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2011.00496.x

Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education*, *43*, 281–309. https://doi-org /10.1023/A:1014699605875

Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *A realist approach for qualitative research*. Sage.

McCormick, A. C., & Zhao, C.-M. (2005). Rethinking and reframing the carnegie classification. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *37*(5), 51–57. https://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.37.5.51-57

Mou, L. (2021). Exploring liberal arts education in the twenty-first century: Insights from East Asia, North America, and Western Europe. In A. W. Wiseman (Ed.), *International Perspectives on Education and Society* (pp. 127–147). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-367920210000040009

NACAC. (2021). *Guide to international university admission* (2021st–2022nd ed.). National Association for College Admission Counseling. https://www.nacacnet.org/news--publications/publications/international-admission/

Nishimura, M., & Sasao, T. (Eds.). (2019). *Doing liberal arts education: The global case studies*. Springer.

Nixon, J. (2011). *Higher education and the public good: Imagining the university*. Continuum.

Nussbaum, M. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *21*(4/5), 289–303. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1019837105053

Nussbaum, M. C. (2010, August 13). What we could learn from India and Korea. *The New Republic*. https://newrepublic.com/article/76997/what-we-could-learn-india-and-korea-education-poverty

Obiko Pearson, N. (2022, March 4). Elite international schools have a racism problem. *Bloomberg Businessweek + Equality*. https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2022-03-04/elite-international-school-education-runs-on-systemic-racism

ODIS. (2022, March 3). *Organisation to decolonise international schools (ODIS)*. ODIS. https://odis.carrd.co

Peterson, P. M. (2012). *Confronting challenge to the liberal arts curriculum: Perspectives of developing and transitional countries*. Routledge.

Redden, E. (2010, June 22). *'The world's honors college?'* Times Higher Education. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/the-worlds-honors-college/412177.article

Rothblatt, S. (2003). *The living arts: Comparative and historical reflections on liberal education. The academy in transition*. Association of American Colleges & Universities. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED478297

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism: Western concepts of the Orient*. Pantheon.

Shahjahan, R. A. (2014). From 'no' to 'yes': Postcolonial perspectives on resistance to neoliberal higher education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *35*(2), 219–232. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2012.745732

Shahjahan, R. A., & Edwards, K. T. (2021). Whiteness as futurity and globalization of higher education. *Higher Education*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00702-x

Shahjahan, R. A., Estera, A. L., Surla, K. L., & Edwards, K. T. (2021). "Decolonizing" curriculum and pedagogy: A comparative review across disciplines and global higher education contexts. *Review of Educational Research*, 003465432110424. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543211042423

Shaker, G. G., & Plater, W. M. (2016). The global public good: Students, higher education, and communities of good. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, *6*(2), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v6i2.332

Sharma, Y. (2017, December 8). *Why China wants 'Western-style' liberal arts education*. University World News. https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20171202052059445

Shulman, L. S. (2001). *The Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education*. Carnegie Publication.

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *8*(1), 23–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/107780040200800103

Sperduti, V. R. (2017). Internationalization as westernization in higher education. *Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education*, *9*(Spring), 9–12.

Stein, S. (2017). The persistent challenges of addressing epistemic dominance in higher education: Considering the case of curriculum internationalization. *Comparative Education Review*, *61*(S1), S25–S50. http://doi.org/0010-4086/2017/61S1-003

Stein, S. (2021). Critical internationalization studies at an impasse: Making space for complexity, uncertainty, and complicity in a time of global challenges. *Studies in Higher Education*, *46*(9), 1771–1784. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1704722

Stein, S., Ahenakew, C., Jimmy, E., Andreotti, V., Valley, W., Amsler, S., Calhoun, B., & Gesturing Towards Decolonial Futures Collective. (2021). *Developing stamina for decolonizing higher education: A workbook for non-indigenous people* [Working draft]. https://higheredotherwise.net/resources/

Takayama, K., Sriprakash, A., & Connell, R. (2017). Toward a postcolonial comparative and international education. *Comparative Education Review*, *61*(S1), S1–S24. https://doi.org/10.1086/690455

Tan, C. (2017). Thinking critically about liberal arts education: Yale-NUS college in Singapore. In *The evolution of liberal arts in the global age* (pp. 127–140). Routledge.

Tight, M. (2021). Globalization and internationalization as frameworks for higher education research. *Research Papers in Education*, *36*(1), 52–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2019.1633560

Times Higher Education (2022). *Most international universities in the world 2022*. The Student. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/student/best-universities/most-international-universities-world

Torres-Olave, B., & Lee, J. J. (2020). Shifting positionalities across international locations: Embodied knowledge, time-geography, and the polyvalence of privilege. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *74*(2), 136–148. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12216

van der Wende, M. (2012). *Trends towards global excellence in undergraduate education: Taking the liberal arts experience into the 21st Century*. [Occasional Paper Series CSHE: 18.12] University of California, Berkeley: Center for Studies in Higher Education. https://cshe.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/publications/rops.wende.excellenceugeducation.12.3.2012.pdf

van der Wende, M. (2017). The emergence of liberal arts and sciences education in Europe: A comparative perspective. In *The evolution of liberal arts in the global age* (pp. 106–126). Routledge.

Wilkins, S. (2021). Two decades of international branch campus development, 2000–2020: A review. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *35*(1), 311–326. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-08-2020-0409

Wilkins, S., & He, L. (2020). Student mobility in transnational higher education: Study abroad at international branch campuses. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 102831532096428. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315320964289

West, C. (1995). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. The New Press.

Yang, R. (2016). The east-west axis? Liberal arts education in East Asian universities. In I. Jung, M. Nishimura, & T. Sasao (Eds.), *Liberal arts education and colleges in East Asia* (pp. 27–37). Springer.

Zapp, M., & Lerch, J. C. (2020). Imagining the world: Conceptions and determinants of internationalization in higher education curricula worldwide. *Sociology of Education*, *93*(4), 372–392. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040720929304

RENEE L. BOWLING, MA, is a PhD candidate at The Ohio State University, USA. Her research interests include comparative international education, critical internationalization, educational leadership, worldview diversity, religious literacy, and global education policy. bowling.187@osu.edu