Journal of EDUCATIONAL IMPACT

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

From Internationalization to Decolonization: Reframing Global Higher Education Through Social Justice Leadership

Gvantsa Dzidziguri[1]✉, Tamta Antidze[2]

[1] School of Arts and Humanities, The University of Georgia

[2] College of Education and Human Development, The University of Massachusetts Boston

✉ Correspondence: Gvantsa Dzidziguri — gvancadzidziguri9@gmail.com

Keywords: Internationalization of Higher Education, Decolonization, Epistemic Injustice, Social Justice Leadership, Knowledge Production

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70617/jedi2026022

Abstract

Research on internationalization in higher education was conducted from the perspective of various theories and concepts, including theories of decolonization and epistemic injustice, and leadership based on principles of social justice. Although internationalization is frequently promoted as a way of achieving advancement in global collaboration, innovation and dialogue, the study maintains that in most cases internationalization does not eliminate the structural inequality prevailing in global knowledge systems. The research makes use of qualitative method and critical literature review where such concepts as Western dominance in knowledge production, English language hegemony and inequality in mobility, publishing and collaboration in research are being discussed and analyzed. One of the key findings of the research is that internationalization process is influenced by colonial past, economic interests and unequal relations of power, therefore marginalizing non-western epistemologies. At the end of the study several recommendations have been made in order to promote social justice leadership with an aim of developing multilingual academic works, equitable partnerships and epistemic diversity.

CC BY 4.0

Journal of
EDUCATIONAL IMPACT

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

Introduction

Internationalization has emerged as a central defining factor in higher education during the past years and has been instrumental in shaping the policies of universities, mobility of students and academics, cooperation in research and knowledge production. Universities focus on their global role and become important players on the international stage by establishing partnerships and recruiting international students. Proponents of internationalization argue that this process is positive and helps provide societies with new opportunities and options for opening up new perspectives (Knight, 2004). Nevertheless, there is an increasing number of scholars who criticize this vision, showing that internationalization is anything but neutral and may, in fact, be beneficial only to certain groups of people (Stein, 2016) (Wit & Altbach, 2020).

One major issue is the continuation of Western supremacy in global knowledge-making. Even if participation in global higher education is becoming widespread, the significance of intellectual authority continues to lie in North America and Europe, dictating research agendas, publication regulations, and criteria of evaluation (Wit & Altbach, 2020) (Marginson, 2011). Knowledge produced from different areas is often undermined and undervalued or needs to conform to the dominant paradigms to be accepted. Therefore, many questions arise regarding which perspectives are represented in global academia.

English helps to illustrate this example of inequity since it is prevalent in scholarly publication, conferences, and cooperation, which facilitates knowledge transfer but leaves non-speaking natives aside (Flowerdew, 2015). Scholars incur additional expenses as well as obstacles in publishing their works in highly impactful journals, while literature in other languages is marginalized (Phillipson, 1992) (Canagarajah, 2002).

Such dynamics tie into more encompassing forms of epistemic injustice, defined as forms of wrong done to a person or community in their capacity as knowers (Fricker, 2007). Such an epistemic injustice takes shape in international higher education through standards for publishing, citation practices, and systems for evaluating research product of the unfavorable governing view of the scholars from countries in the Global South or a non-English-speaking background (Canagarajah, 2002). A hierarchical order of global knowledge is privileged toward particular forms of knowledge while rendering others credibly invisible.

It is significant to note that these inequalities are further reinforced by mechanisms of internationalization. In the Global South, student mobility is primarily from the Global South to the Global North, thereby instilling the idea of Western academic superiority and cementing resources in preferred areas (UNESCO, 2005). Global university ranking as well as funding systems are geared towards old institutions, which have capital of prestige and money, making the situation worse (Hazelkorn, 2015). Academic publishing, especially peer review and editorial decisions, is often biased towards those frameworks and methods of research that have become dominant in terms of theory (Tennant & al, 2017).

Both postcolonial and decolonial approaches provide critical lenses for addressing these inequalities while highlighting how colonial histories and power inequalities shape the system of

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

knowledge globally, this being referred to as the "coloniality of knowledge" (Quijano, 2000) (Mignolo, 2011). They call for adopting approaches based on epistemic diversity which will challenge the governing paradigms (Stein et al., 2019).

The decolonization process in higher education means to reconsider and rethink the various educational institutions practices, structures, and ideas, which is more than just a mere change of the studied disciplines or a rise of the number of represented people (Connell, 2020). In order to carry such an aim, it is important to achieve the presence of social justice leadership, that involves promotion of equity and social justice issue (Theoharis, 2007) (Khalifa, 2018). So, in terms of globally changing higher education it means we need to face the important structures and propose such changes in educational practices that will challenge the hierarchy present in higher education sphere, the diversity of ideas promoted in education, and respect the equal relationships between countries.

The research in question reinterprets the notion of internationalization in line with decolonization theories and social justice leadership. The present practice in internationalization promotes global exchange of knowledge, but it functions within the definitions of severe structural and epistemological inequality. Through the analysis of factors such as Western superiority, English monopoly, and epistemological injustice, the research shows that traditional approaches have certain limitations. The aim of this paper is to examine the structural factors that contribute to the inequalities and provide recommendations for international collaboration in higher education.

To achieve this aim, the study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How does internationalization in higher education reproduce Western dominance in global knowledge production?
2. In what ways does the hegemony of the English language contribute to epistemic inequality in academia?
3. How are processes of internationalization linked to forms of epistemic injustice within global higher education systems?
4. What role can social justice leadership play in challenging these inequalities and promoting decolonial transformation?
5. What alternative models of internationalization can support epistemic diversity, equity, and reciprocity in global higher education?

By addressing these questions, the article contributes to ongoing debates on the future of internationalization and offers a conceptual foundation for reimagining global higher education as a more just, inclusive, and epistemically diverse system.

Methods

This study adopts a qualitative, interpretive research design grounded in critical and conceptual analysis. It aims to examine how internationalization reproduces epistemic inequalities and to explore the transformative potential of social justice leadership. A qualitative

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

approach is appropriate for this purpose because it enables the examination of complex power relations, discursive patterns, and structural dynamics within global higher education (Creswell, 2014). Specifically, the research employs a critical literature review combined with conceptual synthesis to analyze existing scholarship and develop an integrated analytical framework.

The study draws on peer-reviewed literature, policy reports, and theoretical works from higher education, postcolonial and decolonial theory, critical internationalization, and educational leadership. Using purposive sampling, sources relevant to Western dominance, English hegemony, epistemic injustice, and social justice leadership were selected through databases including Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and seminal field texts (e.g., (Fricker, 2007) (Mignolo, 2011) (Stein, 2016). Priority was given to recent publications (post-2000) while also incorporating foundational theoretical contributions.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) informs the analytical approach adopted in this study. It provides a framework for examining how power relations, knowledge hierarchies, and inequalities are constructed and reproduced in academic and policy discourse (Fairclough, 2010). This approach is particularly relevant to the study because it enables a critical examination of how internationalization practices may reproduce existing epistemic inequalities.

Through an iterative process of reading, comparison, and conceptual analysis of the selected literature, four interconnected analytical categories were developed: (1) Western dominance in global knowledge production; (2) English language hegemony and epistemic exclusion; (3) structural inequalities in internationalization practices; and (4) social justice leadership as a pathway towards institutional transformation. These categories were informed by the theoretical perspectives discussed in the paper, particularly postcolonial and decolonial theory, epistemic injustice, critical approaches to internationalization, and social justice leadership. They provide the conceptual structure for examining the relationship between internationalization, the reproduction of epistemic inequalities, and possibilities for transformative change.

Furthermore, this study brings together several theoretical perspectives to develop a conceptual framework connecting colonialism, internationalization, epistemic injustice, and social justice leadership. Specifically, postcolonial and decolonial theories provide a basis for examining the historical and structural persistence of Western dominance in global knowledge production. The concept of epistemic injustice helps explain how unequal power relations affect the recognition and legitimacy of different forms of knowledge. Critical approaches to internationalization situate these inequalities within contemporary practices of international academic cooperation, while social justice leadership offers a perspective for considering how institutional structures and practices might be transformed.

The conceptual synthesis involved comparing and connecting ideas from these theoretical perspectives to identify their areas of convergence, complementary contributions, and implications for understanding inequalities in higher education. This approach draws on the concept-building methodology discussed by (Jabareen, 2009). The resulting framework serves as an analytical lens through which the relationships between colonial legacies,

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

internationalization practices, epistemic inequalities, and possibilities for institutional transformation can be examined. To enhance the rigor of the study, triangulation was achieved through the use of diverse sources and interdisciplinary perspectives. Reflexivity was also maintained throughout the research process, with attention to the researcher's positionality and the normative assumptions underlying critical and decolonial approaches (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Overall, this methodological approach enables a comprehensive and theoretically grounded analysis of internationalization as a site of epistemic inequality while identifying pathways for transformative change through social justice leadership.

Literature Review

Western Dominance in Global Knowledge Production

Existing scholarship has extensively examined the structural inequalities shaping global knowledge production, particularly the continuing influence of Western academic institutions, epistemologies, and standards of knowledge validation (Wit & Altbach, 2020). These inequalities are historically rooted in the development and international dissemination of higher education systems, through which particular academic traditions and institutional models have acquired global authority. Although higher education has become increasingly internationalized, the recognition and legitimacy of knowledge continue to be distributed unevenly across regions. This raises important questions about whose knowledge is recognized, whose perspectives shape academic standards, and whose intellectual contributions remain marginalized.

According to historical records, modern higher education systems originated and developed in Europe and North America, and their forms of organization, curricula, and academic standards spread all over the world. It is believed that this factor contributed to the strong role of Western approaches and standards currently present in higher education systems (Wit & Altbach, 2020). Missionary education has played a significant role in spreading European languages and traditions of intellectual thought and in suppressing local knowledge systems (Brock & Cammish, 1997). Gradually European intellectual thought has become the norm since it was perceived as the basis for academic knowledge even though it has lost its context.

The aforementioned patterns have carried on through present-day institutional structures. For instance, contemporary global university rankings take into consideration citation success and popular name recognition that seem to disproportionately favor the institutions found in the Global North (Hazelkorn, 2015). It is also noteworthy that research funding is still heavily concentrated in wealthier nations, despite attempts to work towards more inclusion of different voices in the academic realm (Arocena & Sutz, 2010). English-language, Western-based journals dominate citation networks, reinforcing Western scholarly authority (Mongeon & Paul-Hus, 2016). High-impact journals act as gatekeepers privileging Western theoretical frameworks and methodological norms (Canagarajah, 2002), while editorial boards and peer review processes reproduce implicit biases (Tennant & al, 2017).

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

The implications of these dynamics, however, are considerable. For instance, brain drain contributes to global inequalities as talented researchers migrate to Western institutions (Docquier & Rapoport, 2012). Academia dependency leads to lack of intellectual independence (Alatas, 2003), and epistemic extractivism describes utilization of knowledge from the Global South for the benefit of Northern countries (Grosfoguel, 2019). Together, all these aspects constitute a global knowledge system that is inherently unequal.

English Language Hegemony in Academia

The dominance of English in global academia is not simply a consequence of the practical need for a shared language; it is also a reflection of historical and geopolitical inequalities that continue to shape the production, circulation, and recognition of knowledge. Although a common language facilitates international cooperation and scholarly exchange, the privileged position of English cannot be separated from the historical processes through which it acquired global authority. (Pennycook, 1998) demonstrates how British colonial expansion and colonial education policies contributed to the institutionalization of English, associating its use with education, authority, and social advancement. According to (Crystal, 2003), the event of the development of English into a global language is directly linked to the political and economic hegemony of the US. The events that took place after the Second World War further legitimated the role of English as the leading language in the field of scientific communication. These historical facts can be seen in the context of its prevalent position in the sphere of academic publishing, international conferences, and professional networks. From the point of view of critical and decolonial theories, the important issue is not the fact that scholars across the world are united by the same academic language, but that this language is characterized by an unequal power structure. When one language is established as the necessary tool for global academic credentials, linguistic superiority becomes a tool for distributing intellectual power.

The linguistic supremacy acts like a filtering system. Leading academic journals impose rigid requirements regarding the use of the English language, meaning that non-native speakers are automatically stopped at the gates (Flowerdew, 2015). Scholars incur high costs and face numerous obstacles establishing contacts with NGOs that assist in editing texts, while publication companies like Elsevier and Springer Nature sustain the superior status of the English language due to their monopoly position and regulations (Larivière et al., 2015). A study by (Hanauer et al., 2019) shows that those scholars who are non-native English speakers may have issues when it comes to academic merit as they are subject to particular expectations regarding their language. This brings up a serious question about the merit of academic works: are they subjected to assessment based on their intellectual value or their way of expressing themselves. The close association of language skills with the prestige of an academic work blurs the line between good arguments and good language use. As a result, researchers have varied chances of being published, visible, and involved while having very important contributions.

Knowledge diversity has far-reaching implications. English medium instruction sidelines indigenous languages (Dearden, 2016) thus leading to epistemic homogenization (Thiong'o, 1986). Phillipson's (1992) theory of linguistic imperialism creates an understanding of how institutional favoritism toward English can create unequal relationships between language users.

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

The current article takes this perspective further to argue that the predominance of English causes epistemic inequality reflected by the lack of recognition given to knowledge obtained through local and Indigenous languages in global academic discussions. This is not to say that academic communications in English are problematic by themselves. Instead, it questions the widespread belief that there can only be one dominant language in international academic dialogues. In this sense, decolonizing internationalization has to do with straightening out matters such as whose knowledge is acknowledged, what languages are considered relevant, and those who have the right to define academic excellence (Phillipson, 1992).

Internationalization as a Site of Epistemic Injustice

Globalization has been regarded as a primary strategy in higher education often representing global partnerships and educational excellence. The existing critical literature indicates that globalization may have a role to play in creating rather than eradicating inequalities (Stein, 2016). The migration of students underlines these inequalities as flows from the Global South to the Global North constitute the majority of global migration and contribute to the image of the intellectual superiority of the Western world (UNESCO, 2005). Programs such as Erasmus+ promote exchange and collaboration (European Union, 2023), but participation often reflects pre-existing institutional inequalities. The mobility configuration compounds that process of knowledge mobility, reinforcing the specific primacy of Western theories and methodologies over locally grounded knowledge.

Similarly, curriculum internationalization is exposed to Eurocentrism as proven by the predominance of Western theories and classic works in various disciplines, despite insistence on the need to diversify them (Connell, 2020) (Stein, 2016). Traditional knowledge systems are usually pushed aside or used as mere supplements, upholding epistemic power structures. Education across borders usually propagates Western education with little modifications fitting local realities (Knight, 2015) (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). Collaborative research projects appear to be mutually enriching, yet they can act as channels for the new colonialism through the unequal distribution of authorship, funding, and data extraction (Boshoff, 2009) (Patel, 2014) (Smith, 2012). These social practices highlight the essential role of internationalization in generating epistemic injustice in higher education.

Social Justice Leadership as a Decolonial Response

To address these issues, it has been observed that researchers advocate for the concept of leadership in the push for epistemic justice. In light of this concept, Social Justice leadership has been defined as a basic principle of equality, participation, and structural change in higher education (Theoharis, 2007). This concept places emphasis on the redistribution of institutional power, acknowledgment of neglected knowledge traditions, and implementation of participatory governance (Khalifa, 2018).

Scholarship that is connected demonstrates the importance of initiatives like enhancing multilingual publishing, encouraging just research partnerships, and promoting decolonizing

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

syllabuses as effective tools against epistemic power dynamics (Lillis & Curry, 2010) (Smith, 2012).

More importantly, institutional reform is an essential factor. Changes in promotion policies, creating hiring diversity as well as promoting Indigenous knowledge can facilitate the implementation of epistemic variety in higher education (Battiste, 2013). Moreover, empirical examples such as youth movement in South Africa demonstrate how leadership and institutional changes can cause decolonial transformation (Heleta, 2016).

Toward a Decolonial Model of Internationalization

Critical perspectives about the internationalization process question the assumption that global engagement is largely motivated by competition and institutional economic considerations. Knight (2012) notes that the increasing commercialization of internationalization leads to the growing impact of competition and market-oriented motives on academic collaboration. However, in contrast to these arguments, Stein (2016) suggests that a call to ethics is necessary in order to analyze the colonial power relations surrounding the process of internationalization and question the values of equity and reciprocity therein. Therefore, based on these considerations, the author of this paper argues that the process of internationalization should be shifted from a primarily market-oriented process to a socially just one. In order to make this transition one needs to do more than improve partnerships all over the world: one should also rethink the role of knowledge, interests shaping international collaboration, and power relations in the field of global higher education.

The key principles of decolonial internationalization include epistemic pluralism, linguistic justice, equitable partnerships, and community engagement (Connell, 2020). These principles challenge certain dominant practices by favoring the ways of inclusive knowledge systems and reciprocity.

The recent conceptual frameworks claim the significance of critical reflexivity and leadership for changes in internationalization practices (Stein et al, 2019). This changing process is represented as continuous and involving committed leadership and structural changes in institutions.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Many possible recommendations have been made in the research literature for promoting epistemic justice. At the institutional level, universities are advised to implement internationalization strategies based on equity and employ diverse faculty, and to modify their curricula (Ahmed, 2012) (Leask, 2015). On the global level, international organizations should correct the ways of ranking universities and also support knowledge systems that would function in a more inclusive way (Hazelkorn, 2015).

Reforming the system of academic publishing is important as well. For example, using the inclusive process of peer review, providing diversified editorial boards, and employing

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

multilingual approaches in academic publications can help to deal with structural biases and increase access to the production of knowledge (Lillis & Curry, 2010) (Tennant & al, 2017).

Use of the principles of equity, diversity, and reciprocity in the process of policy and practice provision is a collective conclusion of the research literature.

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

Postcolonial and Decolonial Theory

According to postcolonial and decolonial theorists, colonialism is not limited to political independence but continues to shape today's systems of knowledge, culture, and power. In this regard, Edward Said's theory of Orientalism is evidence of Western scholarship creating the "Other," which is seen as inferior and exotic to justify imperial power (Said, 1978). As pointed out by Said, knowledge production is connected to power relations, and academic disciplines can serve as means of control. This idea is picked up by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, who introduces into academic discourse the notion of epistemic violence against subaltern groups; according to her, colonial and postcolonial discourses deprive the subaltern of the right to speak (Spivak, 1988). Her work underscores that even well-intentioned scholarship can reproduce marginalization when it speaks for, rather than with, historically excluded communities.

Decolonial theorists take these findings a step further by looking into lasting colonial structures. The coloniality of power proposed by Anibal Quijano shows how modern global processes still operate independently from the only legitimate base of this knowledge, namely Western epistemology, thus creating hierarchies in race, labor, and knowledge (Quijano, 2000). The coloniality of knowledge described by Walter D. Mignolo reinforces this notion by stating that Western epistemology is the only valid way of knowing, thus sidestepping all local, indigenous, and non-Western traditions (Mignolo, 2011). These scholars imply that coloniality exists beyond the formal colonial period, thus influencing modern-day academic institutions and knowledge hierarchies.

Epistemic Injustice

The theory of epistemic injustice helps to understand how the relations of power influence the way the knowledge is understood, recognized, and treated as credible. Fricker (2007) lists two types of epistemic injustice: testimonial injustice and hermeneutical injustice. Testimonial injustice exists when somebody's credibility is reduced unjustly because of prejudice, whereas hermeneutical injustice appears when marginalized groups do not have access to resources necessary for interpreting experience. In this context, the author suggests that in the case of global higher education, epistemic injustice is not only related to individual acts of prejudice but also arises as a result of the influence of institutional mechanisms that regulate the process of knowledge production. According to Canagarajah (2002), academics encounter numerous challenges in dealing with both power disparities in disciplines and language issues. Such obstacles affect not only the chances of publication, but also who receives recognition for their research. They influence who is listened to in debates concerning specific

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

disciplines, or which types of traditions are considered authoritative. Citation methods may further reinforce the existing hierarchies as, for instance, research done in prestigious institutions in the West gets a lot of exposure and is cited often. The central argument, therefore, is that epistemic injustice in global academia is both interpersonal and structural: it operates through judgments about individual scholars' credibility and through institutional systems that determine the legitimacy, visibility, and circulation of knowledge. From this perspective, addressing epistemic injustice requires not only challenging individual biases but also transforming the academic practices and evaluative structures that reproduce unequal relations of knowledge and authority.

Critical Internationalization Studies

Critical scholarship has increasingly questioned the assumption that internationalization in higher education is inherently beneficial or politically neutral. While internationalization is commonly understood as the integration of international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the purposes and functions of higher education (Knight, 2004), critical perspectives draw attention to the economic and political conditions in which these processes take place. (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2009), through their analysis of academic capitalism, demonstrate how market-oriented practices and competition increasingly shape higher education institutions. These developments can be observed in institutional efforts to attract international students, improve positions in global rankings, and strengthen international research partnerships. At the same time, the growing influence of international rankings and dominant academic publishing systems raises questions about whose research, institutional models, and knowledge traditions receive international recognition. In relation to curriculum internationalization, (Leask, 2015) emphasizes the need to engage critically with the assumptions and practices that reproduce ethnocentric perspectives. Taken together, these contributions suggest that internationalization should be examined not only as a process of intercultural cooperation but also in relation to the economic interests, institutional hierarchies, and unequal structures of knowledge production that shape it.

Social Justice Leadership

Social justice leadership is a theoretical and practical framework for addressing inequities in educational institutions. The social justice leadership defines that leadership should not be looked upon as administrative management, but as an ethical and political practice focused on equity, inclusion, and structural transformation. By George Theoharis, social justice leadership is advocacy to challenge marginalization, deconstruction of oppressive policies and practices within educational systems. This implies resource redistribution, uplifting the voices of oppressed individuals, and counteracting institutional biases (Theoharis, 2007). Muhammad Khalifa advocates for culturally responsive leadership, which focuses on the heritage, knowledge, and cultural resources of historically marginalized people. He argues that leaders should not stop with mere acts of symbolic diversity in their diversity efforts but push for systematic transformations that look at how racist systems and epistemic oppression systems work (Khalifa, 2018). In higher education, social justice leadership entails reconsidering how governance is executed, assessing research, and designing curricula so that epistemological diversity becomes acknowledged. Social justice leaders ought to take on a critically reflexive

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

perspective and enact transformational change in institutions instead of making incremental changes (Theoharis, 2007) (Khalifa, 2018).

Integrated Conceptual Framework

Building on the theoretical perspectives discussed above, this study develops an integrated conceptual framework connecting postcolonial and decolonial theory, critical internationalization studies, epistemic injustice, and social justice leadership. Each perspective contributes a distinct analytical dimension to the examination of inequalities in global higher education. Postcolonial and decolonial theories provide a basis for understanding how historical colonial structures continue to influence academic institutions and systems of knowledge production. Critical approaches to internationalization help examine how contemporary practices, including international rankings, academic publishing, and student mobility, may reproduce existing institutional and geopolitical inequalities. The concept of epistemic injustice further explains how these inequalities affect the recognition, representation, and legitimacy of knowledge produced by scholars and communities in different parts of the world.

Within this framework, social justice leadership provides a perspective for examining how higher education institutions can respond to these inequalities through changes in governance, curriculum development, research practices, and institutional decision-making. The framework therefore connects the historical and structural dimensions of epistemic inequality with contemporary internationalization practices and the potential for institutional transformation.

The proposed framework can be understood as an analytical sequence linking colonial knowledge structures, contemporary internationalization practices, and the reproduction of epistemic marginalization, while identifying social justice leadership as a potential mechanism for decolonial transformation. Rather than presenting these relationships as empirically established causal effects, the framework offers a conceptual lens for examining how inequalities are sustained and how institutional practices might be transformed.

Findings

The findings of this research indicate that internationalization in higher education is a complicated and inconsistent event that frequently reinforces pre-existing inequalities instead of changing them. Reference to internationalization as a driver of international cooperation, cultural exchange, and knowledge circulation is rather typical, but the study shows that internationalization continues to be a process affected by existing inequalities.

Persistence of Western-Centric Knowledge Structures.

A major conclusion is that Western knowledge systems are still mainstream in setting international norms and standards in academia. Universities across the planet have to comply with theories, principles, and methodologies evolved in Western countries. This creates the idea of what knowledge is worth having, which research topics are important, and how success is evaluated in academia.

Journal of EDUCATIONAL IMPACT
ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

Thus, knowledge is created in a distorted manner since Western countries, as economically developed and influential ones, have a great impact on knowledge production. Scholars living beyond these centers of knowledge are influenced and compelled to produce their research adhering to the established norms, which diminishes the visibility of their alternative ways of acquiring knowledge. Local knowledge systems including indigenous and community-based knowledge systems are usually disregarded or addressed as secondary rather than main sources of knowledge.

Table 1 provides an overview of the key dimensions of inequality observed in the internationalization of higher education (See Table 1). These dimensions illustrate how entrenched structural patterns continue to shape global academic hierarchies.

Table 1
Key Dimensions of Inequality in Internationalization

Dimension	Description	Key Implication
Knowledge Production	Dominance of Western theories, methods, and research agendas	Marginalization of non-Western and local knowledge systems
Language	English as the primary language of academia	Barriers for non-native speakers; reduced visibility of others
Research Collaboration	Unequal partnerships between institutions	Dependency and limited agency for less-resourced institutions
Academic Publishing	Concentration of journals and indexing systems	Narrow definitions of academic excellence
Student Mobility	Predominantly South-to-North movement	Reinforcement of global talent and knowledge concentration

Note. Developed by the authors based on the literature on Western dominance in knowledge production (Connell, 2007; Quijano, 2000; Mignolo, 2011; Wit & Altbach, 2020), language inequality (Phillipson, 1992; Canagarajah, 2002; Flowerdew, 2015), unequal research collaboration (Boshoff, 2009; Patel, 2014; Smith, 2012), academic publishing (Larivière et al., 2015; Mongeon & Paul-Hus, 2016), and international student mobility (Docquier & Rapoport, 2012; UNESCO, 2005).

Linguistic Inequality and the Dominance of English

Language plays a significant role in determining academic differences. English has emerged as the lingua franca of academia and higher education regarding research, publishing, and international communication. While this facilitates some degree of international communication, it also creates considerable obstacles for academics who are not proficient in English.

Academics whose native language is not English face additional issues such as the need for funding and time for language editing and translation and altering their writing to fit the expectations of English journals. As a result, such academics may experience delays in publishing their work, lower rates of acceptance, and troubles with being included in international academic circles. Moreover, the dominance of the English language influences the

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

dissemination of information. Research disseminated in other languages receives little to no attention in the international research arena leading to the sidelining of various perspectives in the global discourse.

Asymmetries in International Collaboration and Mobility

The patterns of student mobility and international collaborations highlight the disparities that persist in various spheres. Such international cooperation often involves asymmetries in power, resources, and decision-making. Thus institutions from wealthier countries oversee research objectives, funding distributions, and project management, while those from poorer nations assume limited or dependent roles.

The student mobility system preferentially channels students to higher education systems where there are more developed higher learning institutions. This creates disproportionate distribution of knowledge and skills and maintains inequalities that exist in the global educational field.

Table 2 highlights the main structural drivers of these patterns and their resulting effects (See Table 2). These drivers show that the inequities observed are not incidental but deeply embedded in institutional structures, global ranking systems, and economic pressures.

Table 2
Structural Drivers and Their Effects

Structural Driver	Manifestation in Higher Education	Resulting Effect
Global Rankings	Emphasis on prestige and measurable outputs	Reinforces institutional hierarchies
Marketization	Competition for international students and funding	Prioritization of revenue over equity
Funding Inequality	Unequal access to research resources	Limited participation of Global South scholars
Language Hegemony	Preference for English-language publications	Exclusion of diverse epistemologies
Institutional Norms	Promotion and evaluation based on Western standards	Pressure to conform to dominant academic practices

Note. Developed by the authors based on research concerning global university rankings (Hazelkorn, 2015), marketization of higher education (Knight, 2012), funding inequalities (Arocena & Sutz, 2010), language hegemony (Phillipson, 1992; Canagarajah, 2002; Flowerdew, 2015), and the influence of coloniality on institutional and academic structures (Quijano, 2000; Mignolo, 2011; Wit & Altbach, 2020).

Marketization and Competitive Pressures in Higher Education

According to the results, internationalization depends on the marketization process in higher education. Universities operate within a competitive global landscape that necessitates taking into account ranking assessments, reputation, and financial sustainability. University

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

policy involves welcoming international students, cooperating with well-known universities, and publishing in reputable journals rather than focusing on social equality or relevance.

The application of principles of market economy magnifies the concentration of resources and prestige among the universities that possess structural advantages. Research that fits in line with globally accepted paradigms is easier to fund, publish, and cite, while socially relevant or alternative research has little value. Therefore, the contradiction of global competitiveness and social relevance makes achieving equity in the process of internationalization quite difficult.

Emerging Responses and Transformative Pathways

Even though there exist persistent inequalities, there are indications of emerging strategies aimed at enabling a fairer internationalization. Some institutions have begun to develop curricula that incorporate indigenous and local viewpoints, support multilingual dissemination of research, and create partnerships based on mutual interests. Leadership that is oriented toward social justice and equity can initiate these changes through resource distribution, setting priorities, and promoting inclusive decision-making practices.

Table 3 summarizes these emerging approaches and their intended outcomes (See Table 3). These initiatives indicate that while internationalization currently reinforces inequality, alternative models are possible. They highlight the potential for structural and cultural changes that create more equitable participation and recognition across global higher education.

Table 3
Emerging Responses and Transformative Pathways

Area of Reform	Example of Practice	Intended Outcome
Curriculum Reform	Inclusion of indigenous and local knowledge	Epistemic diversity and inclusivity
Multilingual Practices	Publishing and teaching in multiple languages	Reduced linguistic barriers
Equitable Partnerships	Co-designed research agendas and shared governance	Balanced collaboration and mutual benefit
Leadership Approaches	Social justice-oriented institutional strategies	Structural and cultural transformation
Evaluation Reform	Broader criteria for academic success	Recognition of diverse forms of scholarship

Note. Developed by the authors based on literature addressing decolonizing curriculum reform (Battiste, 2013; Leask, 2015), multilingual academic practices (Canagarajah, 2002; Lillis & Curry, 2010), equitable research partnerships (Boshoff, 2009; Patel, 2014; Smith, 2012), social justice leadership (Theoharis, 2007; Khalifa, 2018; Stein et al., 2019), and more inclusive approaches to academic evaluation (Ahmed, 2012; Hazelkorn, 2015).

Synthesis of Findings

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

In conclusion, the results signify that internationalization leads to gaps being established and widened, with variable power dynamics between newer developments. In effect, western countries form a large part of the core of internationalization processes. There seems to be a shift in the general outlook on internationalization, with a stronger emphasis being placed on social justice and systems of reform. But the mechanisms that utilize this knowledge to assist students in improving their efforts towards understanding remain rudimentary, if not absent altogether.

Discussion

The research explored the concept of internationalization in higher education and how internationalization could either reinforce or challenge global epistemic inequalities. The issue of vested interests stems from the Western culture and the dominance of the English language. The results indicate that internationalization is still strongly influenced by historical power relations despite the growing tendency towards collaboration. Nevertheless, social justice leadership can be a tool for creating a new more equitable and decolonized model of internationalization.

Initially, it must be stated that the persistence of Western domination in producing global knowledge serves as evidence for maintaining the significance of postcolonial and decolonial critique. In accordance with the works (Quijano, 2000) (Mignolo, 2011), the findings demonstrate that coloniality governs modern academic institutions above all, regarding Western epistemologies as the standard ones and pushing other ways of knowing to the periphery. The evidence of this is that Western theories, methodologies and research agendas are dominating in science, as well as the evaluation systems based on ranks and citation indexes that determine high quality and relevance in academic circles. Thus, the results add weight to (Wit & Altbach, 2020) who claim that global higher education is characterized by asymmetry, namely the concentration of intellectual authority in the Global North.

It is critical to note that these dynamics are not only historical remnants but are recreated through contemporary institutions. Academic publishing, the distribution of funding and research collaboration are all systems that reinforce epistemic inequalities. The epistemic extractivism framework enables the interpretation of these dynamics of the production and dissemination of knowledge primarily created in the Global South, but acknowledged and circulated by Northern institutions (Grosfoguel, 2019). This revelation also supports broader criticism of academic capitalism, which points out how market logics contributed to existing inequalities (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2009). Thus, internationalization is not seen as disrupting colonial structures but rather functioning in their context and reinforcing them.

Secondly, this research recognizes the dominance of English language as a form of epistemic gatekeeping. While English allows people to communicate worldwide, the dominance of English has negative consequences for non-native speakers and for knowledge produced in languages other than English. In line with Phillipson's theory of linguistic imperialism, it becomes evident that language can be mentioned not only as a tool of communication but also

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

seen as a means of inclusion/exclusion influencing scholars' publication, participation and visibility (Phillipson, 1992).

In addition, the results indicate that linguistic hegemony leads to epistemic homogenization. According to Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, language determines thought, and giving priority to English limits the range of conceptual schemes and intellectual traditions present in international scholarship (Thiong'o, 1986). The growing use of English as a language of instruction intensifies this process, usually at the expense of indigenous languages and knowledge systems (Dearden, 2016). From the perspective of epistemic justice, this indicates a type of hermeneutic injustice, whereby some meanings are intentionally excluded from prevalent academic discourse (Fricker, 2007).

The evidence shows that there are significant discrepancies in the internationalization process, especially regarding the patterns of student mobility, research cooperation, and formation of transnational education programs. South North student mobility increases the impression of the superiority of the Western type of education and leads to accumulation of talents and resources in the regions that are already successful (UNESCO, 2005). Moreover, research collaboration also confirms the inequality in this regard because institutions of the Global North are involved in budgeting, agenda formation, and authorship (Boshoff, 2009) (Patel, 2014). These patterns are illustrative of what Stein calls the "colonial entanglements" of internationalization whereby global connections restore rather than change established hierarchies (Stein, 2016).

The commercialization of higher education is reinforcing these forces. The competing universities may seek prestige, money, international students, etc., frequently ignoring equity concerns. In this regard, it is worth mentioning Jane Knight's statement that internationalization has been increasingly commercialized and transformed from a process involving academic collaboration to a process characterized by mutual competition among the universities (Knight, Concepts, Rationales, and Interpretive Frameworks in the Internationalization of Higher Education, 2012). As a result, universities may favor cooperation with famous Western universities and spend money on English programs instead of lessening the existing level of inequality.

In addition to the obstacles, the conclusions indicate new possibilities for progress, particularly in regard to social justice leadership. It utilizes the work of (Theoharis, 2007) and (Khalifa, 2018), and it asserts that leaders are key players in transforming institutions' reactions to global inequities. The work of leaders who follow the principles of social justice includes contesting the long-established standards within higher education systems, redistributing the resources, making space for the voice of the marginalized people. The activity of social justice leaders requires not only the symbolic support of diversity but also real changes in the areas of governance, curriculum, and assessment.

For instance, encouraging multilingual publications practices could assist in dealing with language inequities. In addition, changing the criteria for promotion, so that various types of scholarship are valued, may neutralize the influence of western-centred criteria. In the same way,

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

establishing equitable research partnerships that are based on the principles of equality, involvement of parties in the decision-making process, and acknowledgment of local knowledge may help solve the problems mentioned (Smith, 2012). The approaches described are evidence of transition from transactional to relational models of internationalization that rest on the notion of reciprocity and epistemic pluralism.

This debate underscores the significance of transformation in the curriculum as a decolonial approach. According to (Leask, 2015), meaningful internationalization goes beyond the incorporation of international knowledge and necessitates a rethinking of the question of who comes to knowledge and in what way. Infusion of local and indigenous ways of knowing into the curriculum can help break down Eurocentric assumptions about knowledge and create more inclusive educational experiences. However, the inclusion of diverse ways of knowing should not be merely tokenistic but also address the structural determinants of knowledge production and validation.

In summary, these results reinforce the central argument of the present study that conceptualizing internationalization as an act of globalization should be reconsidered. Instead, the shift from the market-oriented approach to the justice-oriented one should occur, as suggested by (Stein et al., Pluralizing Frameworks for Global Ethics in the Internationalization of Higher Education in Canada, 2019). Decolonial internationalization is not a fixed model but an ongoing process that involves critical reflexivity, institutional commitment, and sustained engagement with issues of power and inequality.

However, it must be recognized that there are several challenges involved in transformation. Decolonizing internationalization is bound to face opposition from established interests within the institution itself as well as from the global system of higher education. Also, it is possible that decolonial discourse might be misappropriated while being adopted into major institutional policies. Thus, it is crucial that social justice leadership continues to pay attention to these challenges as it strives for active engagement.

In conclusion, this paper advances scholarship critiquing the inequalities of global higher education while also proposing avenues for transformative revolution. This paper links internationalization, epistemic injustice, and leadership to provide a coherent framework for comprehending both the recent persistence of global academic hierarchies and the possibilities of overturning them. It is finally established that reaching a just and inclusive global knowledge system requires structural reforms accompanied by a radical rethinking of the core ideas and concepts which serve as the basis of higher education in the globalized world.

Conclusion

This paper has examined the relationship between internationalization, decolonization, epistemic injustice, and social justice leadership in global higher education. Drawing on postcolonial and decolonial perspectives, critical scholarship on internationalization, and the concept of epistemic injustice, it has questioned the assumption that international academic engagement necessarily produces equitable knowledge exchange. The analysis suggests that,

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

although internationalization creates opportunities for collaboration and the circulation of knowledge, it continues to operate within historical and institutional power relations that privilege particular regions, languages, and knowledge systems. The central argument is that internationalization requires more than expanding cross-border participation: it requires a fundamental reconsideration of who produces knowledge, whose knowledge is recognized, and who has the authority to shape global academic priorities.

In response to the first research question, the analysis shows that Western institutions, theories, research priorities, publication processes, and university evaluation systems continue to impact Global North's intellectual property. Nevertheless, this concentration of intellectual authority and resources has implications for the status of knowledge generated in other regions. Knowledge from these regions might be ignored or require adherence to mainstream methodology to receive international recognition. In this way, internationalization might further entrench existing hierarchies rather than change them.

The second research question concerned the ways in which the hegemony of the English language contributes to epistemic inequality in academia. The analysis showed that the preeminence of English in academic publishing, conferences and international collaborations gives rise to unequal conditions for scholars working in non-English-speaking environments or other languages. While the English language certainly helps with international communication, its position can also be considered as a type of gatekeeping tool. It is influential as to what research is presented publicly, who academics are able to connect with, and what forms of knowledge are recognized at the international level. Therefore, it is necessary to understand linguistic justice as an important aspect of the decolonization of internationalization.

The third research question addressed the relationship between internationalization and epistemic injustice in global higher education. The critical synthesis shows that epistemic injustice is carried on through many interconnected institutional and academic practices, one of which is marginalizing the local and indigenous knowers. Other practices also include the course design that is dominated by Western theoretical frameworks, unequal student mobility, and asymmetrical international cooperation in research. Moreover, different patterns of funding allocation, co-authorship, agenda-setting, and the availability of research resources impact whose knowledge is being created, disseminated, and accepted. Thus, The findings reveal that epistemic inequality should not be perceived as an individual bias; rather, it is deeply rooted in the institutional forms and evaluation mechanisms that bring forth academic legitimacy.

In relation to the fourth research question, the role of social justice leadership in challenging these inequalities and promoting decolonial transformation, the paper identifies social justice leadership as an important conceptual and institutional framework for change. Its contribution lies in connecting the critique of epistemic hierarchies with practical responsibilities for institutional leadership. Social justice-based leadership is a tool that assists in redistributing the resources of institutions and powers to make decisions, ensuring the development of governance systems, recognizing marginalized forms of knowledge, and fighting against educational assessment approaches that tend to focus on the narrow interpretation of academic excellence. This kind of leadership should not only declare the commitment to diversity but

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

should also bring about effective changes in the institution in terms of its policies, curricula, research, and assessment.

The fifth research question considered which alternative models of internationalization can support epistemic diversity, equity, and reciprocity in global higher education. In line with practical analysis, a socially just approach built upon four interconnected principles was identified, namely epistemic pluralism, linguistic justice, equitable partnership, and reciprocal relations. The practical implementation of these principles means that Indigenous and local knowledge is to be brought into curricula as legitimate contributors to knowledge production; multilingual academic publishing and communication are to be supported; collaborative research is supposed to include setting a joint agenda, fair authorship, and mutual benefit; and institutional evaluation criteria are to be extended to include various forms of knowledge production.

In conclusion, the answers to the proposed research questions signify the central argument of the paper: The internationalization of higher education cannot, in itself, be considered a decolonial or socially just phenomenon. Instead, its role in the global higher education is determined by power relations, resource allocation, and the degree of agency in international academic relations. In this respect, achieving a fairer model would imply structural changes instead of mere expansion of internationalization. Social justice leadership offers a modality to facilitate such structural changes by enabling the link between university leadership and epistemic acknowledgment, participation, and accountability.

Nevertheless, decolonizing internationalization is neither a straightforward nor a completed process. Established institutional interests, unequal global funding environment, predominate publishing practices, and the potential uses of decolonial language devoid of actual reform may serve as barriers to transformation. The challenges that accompany that show the importance of maintaining constant self-reflection, commitment of institutions, and accountability. They point to the necessity of engaging knowledgeable individuals who have been excluded historically in making decisions connected with research priorities, formation of curricula, and assessment of academic performance.

As a conceptual and critical literature-based contribution, this paper does not claim to provide empirical evidence of the implementation or effectiveness of particular institutional reforms. Rather, it develops an analytical framework that can facilitate better understanding of the way internationalization can reproduce epistemic inequalities and identify the principles that can help implement more equitable practices. Further research can investigate the manner in which the identified principles are being interpreted and applied in various countries and institutions, including the impact of multilingual scholarship, reciprocal research partnerships, inclusive curricula, and socially just governance.

Ultimately, the shift from internationalization to decolonization requires a rethinking of the purpose and organization of global higher education. The international academic cooperation is important for social justice only when it embraces different forms of knowledge, confronts the inequalities of advisory leadership in academia, and builds cooperation relations

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

based on reciprocity rather than hierarchy. Decolonial internationalization can be interpreted through the principles of social justice leadership not as an established model of activity, but rather as a continuous process of critical thinking and structural reforms.

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

References

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life.* Duke University Press.

Alatas, S. F. (2003). Academic dependency and the global division of labour in the social sciences. *Current Sociology, 51*(6), 599–613. https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921030516003

Arocena, R., & Sutz, J. (2010). Weak knowledge demand in the South: Learning divides and innovation policies. *Science and Public Policy, 37*(8), 571–582. https://doi.org/10.3152/030234210X12767691861137

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing Education: Nourishing the Learning Spirit.* Purich Publishing.

Boshoff, N. (2009). Neo-colonialism and research collaboration in Central Africa. *Scientometrics, 81*(2), 413–434. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-008-2211-8

Brock, C., & Cammish, N. (1997). *Factors affecting female participation in education in seven developing countries.* Department for International Development (DFID).

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing.* University of Pittsburgh Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt5hjn6c

Connell, R. (2020). *Southern Theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science.* Routledge. HYPERLINK "https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003117346" \t "_blank" https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003117346

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.).* SAGE Publications.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language (2nd ed.).* Cambridge University Press.

Dearden, J. (2016). *English as a medium of instruction: A growing global phenomenon.* https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.12079.94888.

Docquier, F., & Rapoport, H. (2012). Globalization, Brain Drain, and Development. *Journal of Economic Literature, 50*(3), 681–730. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.50.3.681

European Union. (2023). *Erasmus+ Annual Report (2022).* Publications Office of the European Union.

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language (2nd ed.).* Routledge.

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

Flowerdew, J. (2015). Some thoughts on English for research publication purposes (ERPP) and related issues. *Language Teaching, 48*(2), 250–262. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000523

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing.* Oxford University Press.

Grosfoguel, R. (2019). Epistemic Extractivism. In B. d. Santos, & M. Meneses, *Knowledges born in the struggle: Constructing the epistemologies of the global South.* Routledge.

Hanauer, D. I., Sheridan, C. L., & Englander, K. (2019). Linguistic Injustice in the Writing of Research Articles in English as a Second Language: Data From Taiwanese and Mexican Researchers. *Written Communication, 36*(1), 136–154. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088318804821

Hazelkorn, E. (2015). *Rankings and the reshaping of higher education: The battle for world-class excellence.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Heleta, S. (2016). Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa. *Transformation in Higher Education, 1*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.4102/the.v1i1.9

Jabareen, Y. (2009). Building a Conceptual Framework: Philosophy, Definitions, and Procedure. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800406

Khalifa, M. (2018). *Culturally Responsive School Leadership.* Harvard Education Press.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8*(1), 5–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315303260832

Knight, J. (2012). *Concepts, Rationales, and Interpretive Frameworks in the Internationalization of Higher Education.* SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452218397.n2

Knight, J. (2015). Transnational Education Remodeled: Toward a Common TNE Framework and Definitions. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315315602927

Larivière, V., Haustein, S., & Mongeon, P. (2015). The Oligopoly of Academic Publishers in the Digital Era. *PLoS ONE, 10*(6). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127502

Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the Curriculum.* Routledge.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic Writing in a Global Context: The Politics and Practices of Publishing in English.* Routledge.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry.* SAGE Publications.

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

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

Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options.* Duke University Press.

Mongeon, P., & Paul-Hus, A. (2016). The journal coverage of Web of Science and Scopus: a comparative analysis. *Scientometrics, 106*, 213–228. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1765-5

Patel, S. (2014). Afterword: Doing global sociology: Issues, problems and challenges. *Current Sociology*, 62(4), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392114524514

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the Discourses of Colonialism.* Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism.* Oxford University Press.

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South, 1*(3), 533–580.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism.* Pantheon Books.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2009). *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education.* Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples (2nd ed.).* Zed Books.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), Marxism and the interpretation of culture (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.

Stein, S. (2016). Rethinking the ethics of internationalization: Five challenges for higher education. *InterActions UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies, 12*(2). https://doi.org/10.5070/D4122031205

Stein, S., Andreotti, V. D., & Susa, R. (2019). Pluralizing frameworks for global ethics in the internationalization of higher education in Canada. Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 49(1), 22–46. https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v49i1.188244

Tennant, J. P., & al, e. (2017). A multi-disciplinary perspective on emergent and future innovations in peer review. F1000Research, 6. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.12037.3

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(2), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X06293717

Thiong'o, N. w. (1986). Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature. James Currey.

UNESCO. (2005). *Towards knowledge societies: UNESCO world report.* UNESCO.

ISSN: 3065-1298
pp. 15–38

Wilkins, S., & Huisman, J. (2012). The international branch campus as transnational strategy in higher education. *Higher Education, 64*(5), 627–645. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9516-5

Wit, H. d., & Altbach, P. G. (2020). 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