

# **Toward a Postcolonial Securities Critique of Higher Education Leadership: Globalization as a Recolonization in Developing Countries like the UAE**

Eugenie A. Samier

University of Strathclyde

Abstract

This article examines the intersection of three concepts in education – cultural security, globalization and the postcolonial critique – are related in order to advance the application of cultural security studies in educational administration and leadership. The first section discusses constructivist security studies as they apply to socio-cultural and political aspects of educational values, identity formation and cultural norms in non-Western contexts can be viewed as securitized. The second section presents connections between security studies and globalized education by demonstrating how the latter can be defined as a cultural security problem. The next section shows similarities between cultural security and postcolonial critiques as they relate to foreign curriculum and pedagogy for educational leadership as a form of re-colonization that can undermine the integrity of other cultures, using the United Arab Emirates as an example. The final section discusses this critique in relation to an illustrative country, the United Arab Emirates. The conclusion discusses the implications for educational administration as a field of study, research and practice.

Key words: globalized education, cultural security, postcolonial critique, educational administration, educational leadership, public policy

## **Introduction**

Even though issues with education on an international level have been examined through critiques of neoliberalism such as neoimperialism (Quist, 2001), postcolonialism through recolonization (Brock-Utne, 2000), the colonization of mind (Thiong'o, 1986), and the subaltern (Spivak, 1987), sustainable development and social justice (Holsinger & Jacob, 2010) using a broad range of disciplinary approaches, security studies has not yet received much attention for its cultural security implications particularly for recipient countries under globalization. However, the scale of globalisation's effect on the cultures and societies in those countries affected by foreign curricula and teaching poses, what the European schools of security studies call, an "existential threat" to the continuation of many aspects of culture like values, languages and mores as well as on other social institutions. The focus here is the effect that globalized educational administration and leadership has on the values, cultural and social dimensions, and political and economic individual and organizational structures and practices that can be seen as highly disruptive or even damaging, and what a constructive security studies approach brings.

The main thesis of this paper is to advance a new theoretical framework for the critique of educational leadership in globalized higher education as a cultural security issue for administrative and curricular leadership of those working in the 'developing world,' a topic which is only quite recently receiving attention in the field (Samier, 2015). While globalization as a neoliberal transnational economic movement has been criticized for

commercializing education - altering the nature of knowledge, the role of students and faculty, and the nature of curriculum and pedagogy - little attention has been paid to its role as a power and ideological force in the non-Western or developing world as a threat to culture carried out by non-state actors (e.g., Kirchner & Sperling, 2010), in this case foreign faculty and universities delivering educational leadership curriculum, although many with state support for example, RAND corporation activities (Abella, 2008). The problem formulated here is that globalization consists of four major dynamics: 1) a threat to culture from foreign goods, including images, text and teaching practices can constitute a threat to culture (Dresch, 2013); 2) a fragmentation and disintegration of governmental authority and societal cohesion (Mandel, 1994); 3) fostering clashes between the regional and global levels and an autonomy of individual political units (Mandel, 1994); and 4) an increased hegemony of major powers (Ripsman & Paul, 2010) in ideational, symbolic and ideological forms. Little of the globalization literature covers this level of potential cultural threat of foreign education, tending instead to focus on more conventional issues (Hale & Held, et al., 2017; Held & McGrew, 2000).

The main purpose of this theoretical paper is to apply security studies theory by using theory and model-building methods using relevant security studies, postcolonial and educational development literature from an illustrative country, the United Arab Emirates, to demonstrate that security studies, like many other theories and models from political science, sociology, psychology and other fields, has relevance in educational administration. To achieve this, the theory-building design process draws on the three main constructivist security theories – the Copenhagen, Aberystwyth and Paris schools – which each bring a different level of analysis and which in more recent literature are used collectively because of their compatibility and use for non-military topics like health, human, agricultural, water, economic, and other types

of security, allowing them to be easily extended to culture, social structures, and role constructions. Theory-building, applied here, is primarily a design process taking into consideration context, different parts of a phenomenon, interactions among the levels of analysis, and supported by existing empirical evidence and cases (Lynham, 2002; Van de Ven, 1989; Whetten, 1989).

The first section of this article identifies the main characteristics of constructivist approaches to security studies that lend themselves to the topic – the Copenhagen, Paris and Aberystwyth schools - including human (e.g., Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy, 2007; Tehranian, 1999), societal (e.g., Buzan, 1983) and cultural security (e.g., Friedman & Randeria, 2004) in combination. These approaches provide other lenses through which a broader range of social dynamics and structures can be examined (see Huysmans, 2002) as they relate to educational leadership, especially in policy development and the teaching of educational leadership. The argument draws on the issues discussed by Williams (2007) in the symbolic forms of power that shape the cultural security problem, by drawing in part on Bourdieu's concepts of the interplay between culture and strategy in his critique of Western domination.

The second section redefines globalized education as a cultural security problem, through its core values and the impact it has had on education in the developing world. This is followed by a comparison of postcolonial and decolonizing educational concerns with that of cultural security, using the United Arab Emirates as an example of a country with a heavily modernized and Westernized system of higher education particularly in the educational administration and leadership field that neglects cultural traditions, conceptions of traditional political institutions, an Islamicized worldview, and national identity as well as the rich and long intellectual heritage of the region. A number of Arab scholars have criticized the

teaching of management and leadership in the Gulf Region for its general foreign character and lack of relevance, application, and accommodation of values, culture, developmental issues and transition requirements (e.g., Abdalla & Al-Homoud, 2001; Ali, 1995), however, the examination of educational leadership in this respect is sparse.

The next two sections examine the similarities between cultural security and postcolonial critiques as they relate to foreign curriculum and pedagogy for educational leadership as a form of re-colonization that can undermine the integrity of other cultures followed by a discussion of the United Arab Emirates as an illustrative case. The conclusion discusses the implications for educational administration as a field of study, research and practice.

### **Constructivist Security Studies**

In order to apply a security studies critique to education, security studies itself has to be defined in broader terms than military and intelligence and concerning only state actors, a development in the field that has taken place fairly recently. Four substantive dimensions of national security are identified by Mandel (1994) as military, economic, resource and environmental, and the political and cultural. The last includes the preservation of government, its political ideology and sovereignty, the preservation of distinctive identities that include culture and religion, and the maintenance of social and political values. Unlike realist and neo-realist schools of security studies, the newer ones are distinguishable by the following: drawing on more disciplines like sociology, history, and anthropology in addition to political science; deriving from constructivist and critical intellectual traditions; being more focused on societal security concerned with identity related to cultural traditions; being more relevant for these reasons to developing countries and those on the receiving end of

globalization; and being more consistent with some postcolonial critiques that draw on critical, constructivist and identity analysis (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde, 1998; Krause & Williams, 1997; McDonald, 2008; Peoples & Vaughn-Williams, 2010). And, mostly importantly for this paper's argument, is that they shifted to societal security, focused on other social institutions than state and military (Hama, 2017). Relevant to a critique of globalized education, is that the constructivist approaches do not restrict themselves to state actors (like the traditional realist schools), broadening the range to corporate bodies, Non-Governmental Organisations, international organisations, and movements that may be loosely organized but which have an impact on their target populations (Barkawi & Laffey, 2006; Bilgin, 2018; Booth, 1997), a major feature of these security studies approaches.

Securitizing globalized education makes it much more critical to the continuation of societies in many respects than is covered in other critiques like that of globalisation, as well as emphasizing the depth of the problem and its possible negative consequences. There are a number of reasons for securitizing a problem: 1) the problem as a critical issue can be better defined this way; 2) it moves the problem to a higher priority on the public policy agenda; 3) it can make more urgent action that needs to be taken and can free up resources that might be necessary; and 4) it can also bring into play a broader range of community and public sector organizations. And, perhaps most importantly, using a non-Western securitization approach, the contextual factors in the society and issues of the problem can be formulated through an indigenous set of conditions rather than relying upon Western concepts that reflect a very different society and conditions (see Bilgin, 2005). Conventional critiques of globalized education do not have this power.

The intent here is to present these three security approaches because they are distinctive, yet compatible, and collectively provide a more comprehensive and greater depth of critique than used in isolation for the type of complex problem presented in this article. The first is the ‘Copenhagen’ school of security studies using discourse analysis represented by Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde whose writings (e.g., Buzan, 1983; Buzan & Wæver, 2003; Buzan, Wæver & de Wilde, 1998) have contributed conceptually to the idea of ‘securitization’, sector analysis distinguishing the differences in societal sectors, and ‘security complexes’ that considers how security issues form regionally. The Copenhagen group also draws heavily on discourse analysis from Searle (1969) in examining securitization and de-securitization processes using speech act theory critiquing the altered and negativized nature of securitizing referent ‘objects’ such as environment and identity (see Wæver, 2004a). One of their major impacts was in extending the range of referent objects of security to include political, economic, environmental and societal objects including the threats to them and an evaluation of responses that may ameliorate or mitigate threats (Krause, 1996). This paper regards society and culture as referent objects of security in their own right, and their ability to maintain ethno-national identities (Roe, 2010). Securitization, defined by Buzan and Wæver (2003, p. 491), is “the discursive process through which an intersubjective understanding is constructed within a political community to treat something as an existential threat to a valued referent object, and to enable a call for urgent and exceptional measures to deal with the threat”. This type of analysis can be applied to education and identity as parts of cultural construction that can have existential threats arising from historical forces like globalization such as leadership role identity and the development of school curriculum that contributes to national identity formation.

The Copenhagen school has also contributed a regionalizing approach to security studies – regional security complex theory - recognizing that the threats to security and security interrelationships have a regional character not necessarily shared in other parts of the world, and in expanding these views to economic, environmental and societal threats (see Buzan & Wæver, 2003). In this way, regions of the developing world can experience a security threat to identity and culture through external forces like globalization. For Bilgin (2016), the “words and images” of education carried through globalization are a form of colonization embedded in exported curriculum, teachers, branch campuses, and educational policy.

A post-Copenhagen critique has also developed that focusses on features central to education: those that form identity. McSweeney’s (1999) “ontological security” consists of self, social capacities and confidence in dealing with others that rest upon one’s national values and identity which inform authority roles in administration and leadership. This approach explores the order and continuity in the intersubjective and inter-relational dimensions of people’s lives that are evident in social, cultural and religious traditions based on the recognition of identity as a source of security, a growing subject in security studies (Bilgin, 2010). Katzenstein (1996) focusses on the norms of a socio-cultural context that both influence and are influenced by national identity. In this way foreign curriculum could be examined as a security threat to the integrity of the cultural/identity construction if the socio-cultural content of curriculum and its pedagogy as well as its administrative and leadership systems contradict or are inconsistent with indigenous norms and values, an early form of which can be found in Freire’s (1985) critique of colonization through language teaching.

The Aberystwyth school of critical security studies embraces an emancipatory agenda that extends beyond the state to other social institutions and community (e.g., Booth, 2005; Jones,

1999; Krause & Williams, 1997; Williams, 2007), including its effects on shaping identity. The main focus of their work is on the normative emancipation of individuals by analyzing the social construction of threats and self-other relations that have a high degree of application to non-Western contexts. Grounded in Habermas's (1992) communicative action (1992), this approach stresses equality across communication that, in an international globalized context of higher education, would require recognizing moderate Islamic values and Arab cultures. Krause (1996, p. 6) argues that the principal actors are social constructs that include actors other than states, who are shaped by historical processes in socio-political, material and ideational dimensions, the shared social and political understandings that provide identities and interests. Applied to education, actors include a range from macro to micro: international actors like NGOs and foreign educational providers, national education systems, organizations like universities, groups within an organization, and individuals. In developing Muslim countries, for example, this includes the intellectual traditions of Islam covering hermeneutic and other interpretive methods, such as the administrative discussed in Al-Buraey (1988) and Shah (2015), curricular materials reflecting political theory (e.g., Black, 2011; Watt, 1998), social and cultural values (Alam, 2003), administrative roles embedded in cultural and religious values and norms (e.g., Branine, 2011; Meijer, 2009), and Islamic leadership models (e.g., Beekun & Badawi, 1999; ElKaleh & Samier, 2013).

The third major approach to emerge is the Paris school, grounded in the critical sociological of Foucault and Bourdieu, examining relationships between power and knowledge, the relationship between internal and external national factors, and applying concepts of field, habitus, capital, interests, strategies and reproduction (e.g., Bigo & Tsoukala, 2008). This includes the concept of "insecuritization": when elites and governments lower thresholds of acceptance of others, for example, transferring practices from the military to the political or

cultural spheres, or the economic to the educational, the roles of hidden transnational networks, the role of higher education in creating unequal security statuses like privileging Western education and the discursive power to produce images of the “enemy.”

An important dimension of exploring globalized education is what Bourdieu (1977, 1993) calls the symbolic level, with the potential for symbolic violence. In representational terms, it is embedded in the cultural and political situatedness of the viewer, and carries many levels of conscious and unconscious conceptual categories that can include negative stereotypes. Bourdieu’s approach is complex and requires the use of all concepts to avoid under- and misrepresentation. The first is that of “field” which consists of the groups and institutions that authorize themselves to constitute an activity and its definition, forming social networks and consisting of the rules and goals that form the relations of power. This includes not only governmental agencies with economic, foreign policy, and other interests that the educational sector serves, but also think tanks, research institutes, foundations, and other organizations in which intellectuals work and interrelate through colloquia, conferences, publications and joint projects. In addition to these, though are also advanced education programs that take place in the military/intelligence sector, both public and private, that also interconnect and participate in the budgeting for higher education and research. All of these involve themselves in research and directly or indirectly in curriculum development, in some countries now heavily privatized. Individuals often move between these creating personal networks of influence. In education under globalization this consists of Western elite organizations with cultural precepts in administration and leadership reflecting for the developing world foreign jurisdictional characteristics and the transmission of these models of authority, leadership and political legitimacy. “Habitus” consists of the “ethos” or orientation in one’s social position, the semi-conscious dispositions from which people act and react, and is carried out through

the “games” played in the dynamics of the field, shifting its boundaries. In higher education this is expressed through structural and subjective conventions and practices, which through neoliberalism has shifted the boundaries for many towards the competitive market place in developing countries, and which tends to replicate a foreign field and habitus orientation.

Operating within the field and habitus is “Capital,” the valued intellectual, cultural and social resources that provide power and confer legitimate status and authority as symbolic forms of knowledge systems (Bennell & Pearce, 2003), and which also determine what kind of knowledge and skills are valued. In much of the developing world, Western degrees are a form of capital that excludes indigenous forms of knowledge. “Interests” are those things that come from within the field that provide motivation, such as recognition, social status and material rewards. In higher education these can range from status as a scholar, love for knowledge and love of teaching. In developing countries these are seen as attaining a foreign degree that leads to greater benefits and the resources that are applied to achieving higher rankings in the global education system, such as a foreign accreditation for a university and school level orientation towards PISA rankings. How one pursues interests, Bourdieu calls “strategies” that arise from the field, habitus and capital, often carried out unconsciously, for example, activities that are discussed by Giroux and Purpel (1983) in the “hidden curriculum.” In education this is seen in the adoption of values, decision-making practices, and styles of social interaction imported through foreign educational administration and leadership programs socializing students out of indigenous practices into theories and models derived from different jurisdictions as well as foreign consultants shaping regulatory agencies, and often enforced through foreign accreditation regimes (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

Collectively, these constructivist approaches allow for an examination of threats to culture, including social and political values, conceptions of power and authority, and the role of family and community in education that can reduce the purpose of the social institution of education in maintaining cultures consistent with their traditions and particularly in managing modernization and development processes that protect the integrity of the indigenous society. What underlies the arguments is that power, including colonizing power, is not only expressed through weapons and force, but through ideas, perspectives, values and interpretations that can distance people through education from their own heritage and societies, and place their own cultures at risk of survival.

### **Redefining Globalized Education as a Cultural Security Problem**

As a cultural security problem, globalization has a profound impact on the developing world that reaches much more deeply than the economic sector. Farazmand (1999) has identified a number of changes in the public sector of developing countries that issue from globalization:

1. Reinforced supraterritorial governance organizations (e.g., IMF, World Bank) affecting national systems
2. Increased interdependence affecting administrative systems
3. “Information age” capability disparities coupled with increased hegemonic powers (e.g., US)
4. Increased public-private sector partnerships creating favorable corporate “environments”; shifting from “civil administration to non-civil administration” that used to balance public interests with corporate elite interests (p. 517)

5. Shift of welfare to a corporate (“shadow” or “contracting”) state (pp. 515, 517)  
reducing the “public sphere” for citizens
6. Downsizing that puts pressure on the civil service to do more with less (pp. 517-518)  
in addition to a global “professionalization” that affects moral and ethical standards  
(p. 518)
7. Increased privatization of public services that allows for more corruption reducing  
public trust, and puts individual interests above that of the community and society (p.  
518)

All of these changes affect the educational sector, particularly public education systems, by moving them from the public sector at least partially into the private sector, requiring different values, organizational cultures, professional roles and the very knowledge and skills that used to serve a cultural-political purpose into that of the market place. When these are exported to non-Western states, as happens with globalized neoliberalism, five main features for these countries emerge: 1) the exports of “Western” goods to the developing world; 2) the homogenization of societal structures and practices (e.g., dissolving the traditional differences between the public and private sectors; 3) compromise sovereignty, personal and national identity, culture, religion and other social institutions; 4) the adoption of the New Public Management ideology which can impair nation-building infrastructure creation and security systems; and 5) a privatization imperative that places individual interest over that of community and society (Farazmand, 1999). Changes brought about through the New Public Management ideology of neoliberalism are the same in education as they are in other public sector areas: private sector style managerialism in administrative practice; defined and explicit standards and measurements of performance, preferably in quantitative terms, accompanied with targets and indicators of success; linking resource allocation and rewards

to performance as a form of output control; restructuring of agencies into corporatized units around “products”; competitive values and practices (e.g., term contracts); and parsimony in resource use (e.g., cutting costs) (Hood, 1991). Neocleous (2008) argues more explicitly that the university is an instrument of neoliberal security capitalism whose interrelationships with the security industry affect the development of many disciplines.

In more political and critical form, globalization creates global monopolism, what Banerjee (2008) calls “necrocapitalism” which produces a dispossession termed “social” or “cultural” death. From this perspective, in the cultural sphere, the process spawns cultural and intellectual colonies, commodifies the cultural sector (while secularizing it), and reproduces foreign socio-cultural and educational structures, governance, roles and responsibilities and practices. In the form of “educational borrowing,” this has meant the adoption of an increasingly standardized Western model of leadership preparation programs that side-line and ignore contextual influences (Harris, Jones & Adams, 2016). Countries in the Middle East are more vulnerable than in other regions, since national identity that is inclusive and representative has, at least since the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, failed to form due to a number of factors such as postcolonialism, grounding the state in Islam in a way that excludes non-Muslims, dynastic political systems that are often dissociated from large parts of the population, an expansionist policy modelled on prior imperial structures, and the pursuit of transnational identity by some through pan-Arabism (Kumaraswamy, 2006).

One form that globalization of higher education takes is a colonization of universities in developing countries. Altbach (2015) has criticized American accreditation organizations for intellectual hubris in furthering this colonization in countries where intellectual traditions and context differ from those in the US, requiring foreign universities to conform to American

values and practices. He (2004) has also argued that globalized education reinforces inequalities that already exist between the developed and developing world and erects new barriers, particularly financial, with those universities in the West dominating production and distribution of knowledge, occupying leadership roles in research and teaching thereby affecting the organizational structures and aims of universities. The domination takes many forms, from imposing English as the language of knowledge, causing migration among students producing “brain drains” reducing the possibilities of developing countries becoming centers of research, and curricular development for fields like educational leadership being driven by Western countries.

While local society and culture do have a modulating influence on externally sourced university practices, the process of homogenization has been well underway for a number of decades as Western countries have used the Arabian Gulf (among other regions) as a destination for globalized higher education, supported by aid programs, and locally as a legacy of 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century imperialism, continuing what Henry and Springborg (2001) describe as the “dialectics of globalization” that function as a “dialectics of colonization”. Education systems are also permeable to a number of other societal forces that reinforce a number of educational practices and goals: media, foreign goods, and increased travel. All of these affect identity construction, thought processes, values and the patterns of interaction from which social institutions are formed. The curriculum they offer and the scholarship they shape can be seen as constituting “cultural imperialism” that need to be challenged (see Nader, 2013) and which have served on an international level as hegemonic forces (see Shaw, 1993), for example in the Gulf region where little Arab and Islamic scholarship is incorporated (Donn & Al Manthri, 2010).

Altbach (2013) has identified a number of results of what he terms the “iron laws” of massification in higher education internationally: a decrease in quality, a great inequality across systems of universities, greater differentiation creating variability serving different student and country needs, a reduced quality in the academic profession with many who do not have advanced degrees, and a large proportion of higher education now provided in the private sector. In addition, globalization advantages traditional academic centers in the West, particularly in the English-speaking countries in knowledge networks drawing students to them and producing a “brain drain” from much of the developing world.

For Vandewalle (2000) globalisation is not just technological development and the diversification of economy that are goals for oil producers in their national development, but also keeping the state politically relevant for its citizens and fostering a sense of national community and culture for which a humanistic education carries a large part of the responsibility requiring suitable educational policies to address their vulnerability culturally. Al Abbar (2000) makes an even stronger case linking the preservation of culture to freedom in a globalizing world where globalized cultures are vulnerable to “demise”, referencing the World Commission on Culture and Development (UNESCO, 1995) report on creative diversity, arguing that education is responsible for transmitting culture and providing for its continued renewal while instilling in students an understanding and openness to others’ cultures, histories and shared humanity as a necessary part of national development that must be conceived as part of economic development.

An additional external pressure is the activity of IGOs like the World Bank, IMF, the OECD and UNESCO promoting neoliberalism through their global educational influence resulting in a lack of national autonomy. Dale (2005, p. 131) has argued that “it can no longer be taken

for granted that the power to set agendas for national education systems is held or exercised exclusively at a national level,” evident in the convergence of educational systems through various means of policy influence cause countries to set international testing like PISA as a standard by which measurement and evaluation takes place (Rutkowski, 2007). Education policy is now largely a transnational process that is an asymmetric exercise of power internationally with opaque procedures in which developing countries have little influence but heavy participators in “educational borrowing” (Moutsios, 2009). This problem has also been acknowledged in the comparative education field on educational borrowing by Steiner-Khamsi and Quist (2000) who argue that in the transfer process of educational curriculum and pedagogy a recontextualization, “indigenization” or “local adaptation” has to accompany the transfer instead of commonly accepting curriculum unmodified.

### **Postcolonial and Decolonizing Critiques**

But, how closely related are these security approaches to postcolonial and decolonizing critiques? This literature consists of a range of perspectives and critiques originating in communities that have been colonized either politically or culturally by Western powers. One of the earliest is Said’s (1978) *Orientalism* that explored the relationship between colonial knowledge and imperialist power, consisting of the often negative assumptions made about many non-Western countries in terms of development and knowledge, demonstrating an assumed superiority in these respects of Western countries which effectively presents a potential threat to the continuity of other knowledge traditions. A number of related approaches that investigate the impact of foreign education and culture on non-Western states is Guha and Spivak’s (1988) and Spivak’s (1987) subaltern identity critique examining how colonizers’ discourse socially constructs signifiers reflective of foreign societies in a culture,

thereby silencing other and indigenous perspectives and experiences. This means that in globalized education students are enculturated into a language and value system that may be foreign and make it difficult for them to remain part of their local culture. For educational leadership this is even more important – a subaltern professional identity will reflect itself not only on social interaction, but in values, a sense of identity that may not be consistent with national identity and involvement in policy that may reflect interests and a material reality that is not part of their own society. In security terms, the traditional or conventional culture of the society are placed at risk through the existential threat of a foreign culture replacing identity, values, and practices, the mechanism for which could be seen as a foreign “imagined community” replacing that to which they belong by culture and nationality (see Anderson, 2006).

Kanu (2006) has described what a postcolonial perspective can be in curriculum studies, adopting a hybrid model for recognizing a multiplicity of knowledges where the negotiation of culture and authority can take place, in contrast to curriculum as an ideological construction intended to pursue a civilizing mission, attitudes of power and superiority, and with neoliberalism, greed, that shape people’s view of the world and their concepts of self, role and community. Such a colonial view is one that confers legitimacy by determining what the corpus of knowledge will be and how will be implemented through curriculum and pedagogy. In educational leadership this means that in a Muslim context, for example, curriculum cannot only be constructed on the Western literature but must give due emphasis to the worldview, values, role constructions and knowledge of the Islamic tradition and the customs and social institutions of the country in which the teaching is located, as well as the complex and strong intellectual traditions of knowledge, reasoning and interpretation.

Educational administrators and leaders themselves become the instrument of colonization if

their knowledge, values, and goals are shaped to conform to a different society, and they will replicate the “other’s” world accordingly in policy, organizational design, social relations, and curricular content and management.

For Mignolo (2011), also, colonization is not only political and economic, but includes subjectivity and knowledge requiring the imagining of other peoples’ worlds. A number of writers have typified globalized education in this way. Naidoo (2007, p. 11), for example, identifies as one of the main negative impacts of imported globalized commodified education is the erosion of higher education as a “reservoir of national culture,” including indigenous values, that results in “cultural imperialism” in developing countries.

Decolonizing critiques take a step further in proposing ways of repairing of colonized peoples. Smith (2012), for example, defines decoloniality as “long term processes involving the bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic, and psychological divesting of colonial power” (p. 101) and Thiong’o’s (1986) decolonizing the mind which seeks a “quest for relevance” in placing at the center indigenous literatures that have been relegated to the periphery by intellectuals, academics and journalists of the “neo-colonial establishment” (2) that has used a “cultural bomb” to

... annihilate a people’s belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland. It makes them want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves; for instance, with other

peoples' languages rather than their own. ... Amidst this wasteland which it has created, imperialism presents itself as the cure. (3)

While their arguments are not expressed in security studies terms, the requisite features of a threat to the existence and viability of indigenous education and culture are evident in the way that critical aspects of culture, upon which the continuity and stability of indigenous social institutions rely, can be easily replaced through “modernizing” a system of education to meet primarily Western “standards”. Recent and ongoing development in higher education in the Arabian Gulf is a case in point. It is important to distinguish between those oil principalities of the Arabian Gulf that have a “high human development” ranking on the UN scale, like Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates (UAE), from those oil-rich states with a “medium human development” like Iran, Oman, and Saudi Arabia and those at the low end like Sudan and Yemen (Henry & Springborg, 2001, p. 2). However, high levels of development that are tied to imported knowledge, practice and staff brings its own security issues for the society and culture when there is an unaltered importation of curriculum and pedagogy with sometimes little, if any, incorporation of the local culture such as an Islamic work ethic, social and cultural values, and Islamic law. This produces a high level of dependency on foreign knowledge that may not be consistent with the constitution, legal system and governmental policies.

#### The UAE as an Illustrative Case

The UAE, as a former political and economic colony of the UK, similar to the colonial heritages of other Gulf States, is again subject to threats, but of a different kind. Where in the past threats were military, economic and political causing severe hardship (see Al-Fahim,

1995), the new form of imperialism under globalized education, and related intellectual “products” through imported consulting, management and leadership programs, collectively have a potential eroding, if not destructive, effect on cultural traditions, traditional political institutions, an Islamicized worldview, and national identity. The country is undergoing a significant nation-building transition towards a highly modernized Arab state, whose evolution relies more heavily than its neighbors on expatriate labor including professionals to help build the higher education system with an estimated population just over nine million of which 87 percent was expatriate in 2014 (Arabianbusiness.com, 2014). However, the cost in cultural security terms is a neocolonisation that Kirk and Napier (2009) discuss. There are also many pressures issuing from the international level in all sectors that originate in external pressures of globalisation, demands made to participate in regional and international organizations, and the location of the UAE at the center of a geo-political region with resources desired by many large and powerful countries, and political tensions and violence in the region that bring many external forces and entities and which draw local organizations and policies into their sphere of influence. In educational terms, there is legitimacy pressure from the OECD through PISA scores, requirements by foreign organizations setting accreditation standards, and a rapid building of an educational system that requires the use of large numbers of expatriate professionals who often bring and impose their own values about knowledge and skills. There are inescapable pressures from the international order, but these bring a cost as well in terms of language loss, values changes, shifts in the structures of social institutions, and changing customs and norms.

There are many challenges facing the UAE as it progresses in its extraordinarily rapid development including territorial security as a site of considerable interest for foreign powers and their influence, security of its evolving economic and political system, and protecting its

social and cultural heritage. Education is recognized in the country's strategic plans as a necessary and critical part of its nation-building process (Kazim, 2000), supported by a rapid building of its school and higher education systems, an Emiratization human resources policy, and foundations that provide scholarships and research support. This involves two interrelated processes at work: nation-building and state-building, the former consisting of shared identity, community, and bonds of belonging, while the latter are the country's governmental structures that consist in part of rational bureaucratic-state like organizations and elite structures (Berezin, 2009) and in part of traditional society structures and practices. Decisions made on a structural, functional and symbolic level during this period can have long-lasting effects on the future of social institutions through both processes when Western expatriates take leading roles in designing and building organizations and in teaching and research.

However, the educational practices are often at odds with a cultural conservationist policy expressed in policy documents like the UAE 2021 (Al Maktoum, 2010) vision statement which includes among its national development themes grounding the nation's development in its heritage (including the Arabic language) and moderate Islamic values, maintaining strong families through which cultural values are protected and maintained, and maintaining its traditions through social institutions. This is most clearly seen in educational leadership curricula which use almost exclusively UK and US content.

Ulrichsen (2011) proposes an integrated, holistic and constructivist approach to security studies for the Gulf that includes the impact of globalization, the factors in the region causing change in all societal dimensions as well as the inter-linkages of social institutions, and both "material and ideational" forms that views these as social constructions as well as survival

mechanisms. What I would add to the discussion is a more explicit development of resources in the form of intellectual and cultural capital. In the constructivist approach adopted by Ulrichsen, one has to consider the “role of beliefs and norms as social constructs shaping approaches to questions of power and security” as well as ascribing “value to the location and distribution of nodes of power within society as well as the relationships between knowledge, power and interests” (2011, pp. 6, 7). In addition, security does not have to be tied to the state, but can focus on a particular referent group in society, in this case here the small minority of the UAE population that is Emirati.

### **Conclusion**

Examining the security of society and culture, including the educational institution, has to be done within the context in which it is embedded. Security issues and problems are part of the societal fabric in which social institutions are interrelated and interconnected – problems in one sphere such as education affect others. And they have historical dimension, in the Gulf a centuries old succession of European influence, that culminated in the last hundred years in mostly British and American activities involving “an ability to project force” into the region that have contributed to shaping the formation of states, their interrelations, their economies and political systems, and in contemporary form professional and business work conducted primarily in English motivated in part by safeguarding a passage through the area for trade as well as ensuring that other regional and European powers do not overrun smaller political units (Macris, 2010, pp. 2-3, 247) All of these external parties have vied for “commercial, cultural, or strategic influence and establishing beach-heads through the various local communities” (Henry & Springborg, 2001, p. 9).

What is the solution to the problem? Culture and identity could be examined from a security perspective that regards the nature of globalized university in both tangible (objective) and intangible (subjective) terms as a security threat to the integrity of indigenous culture and identity. This includes examining intellectual “products” through imported consulting, university structures and leadership practices, and educational leadership programs that collectively have a potential eroding effect on cultural traditions, traditional political institutions, an indigenous worldview, and national identity:

1. Imported curriculum and teaching that privileges a secularized, if not material, worldview and foreign cultural values;
2. Western cultural precepts in administration and leadership that reflect their jurisdictional characteristics and transmit foreign models of authority, leadership, and political legitimacy;
3. Cultural practices of foreign staff in policy and management levels, as well as classrooms in higher education, who bring a foreign interaction and pedagogical style that re-enculturates others;
4. Potential higher education impact on other societal sectors such as the economy, politics, the family, culture and religion (e.g., Katzenstein, 1996); and
5. The neglect and exclusion of a vast, rich, and varied indigenous bodies of knowledge like that of the Islamic and Arab scholarly tradition, that, ironically, formed a large part of the European/Western scholarly tradition from the Renaissance onwards in pure and applied disciplines – a view that dominates the knowledge transfer conceptions and values currently underway.

Using the UAE as an example, culturally competent educational management and leadership (e.g., Beekun & Basawi, 2005; Yousef, 2000) requires a curriculum of professional practice that takes into account the country's geo-political position, security requirements, social institutions and economic development including the use of relevant classical Arab/Islamic scholars (e.g., Ibn Khaldun, Al-Tabari), modern Arab/Islamic scholars (e.g., Ali, 2005), academic literature on the UAE, Gulf and broader region, cross-cultural administration (e.g., Branine, 2011), Islamic values related to leadership and education, and jurisdictional characteristics of the country as well as teaching methods and activities that incorporate regional case studies and culturally sensitive research methods. Just as each Western country has its own administrative tradition that serves its national goals, non-Western states need their own. Education has a vital role to play in the developing world in nation-building where citizenship and national identity are critical to the creation and maintenance of social institutions and issues related to globalized education (see Zajda, Daun & Saha, 2008)

In order to conceptualize societal and cultural security issues arising from globalized higher education, a number of sociological and political theory ideas and theories need to be considered, particularly those associated with "nation". One of the foundational ideas is that of Weber's (1978, pp, 389-390) "political community" ideal type, that is extensive enough to examine social institutions and culture as they relate to politics. It consists of not only economic or market activity and politics, as in controlling one's territory, but also of cultural and social associations, and a "belief in group affinity" formed out of an emotional foundation of feelings of solidarity, "ethnic honor", and "sentiments of likeness" that create the social actions, and thereby the social institutions, of national sovereignty and power that is also characterized by the willingness to sacrifice for one's community (see Berezin, 2009).

Securitizing relevant educational fields, in this case, leadership studies requires broadening security theory so that education and intellectuals can be seen as security actors:

“Internationally (and increasingly in other contexts), the meaning of “security” is what it does: someone (a securitising actor) points to a development or potentiality claiming that something or somebody (the referent object) with an inherent right to survive is existentially threatened and therefore extraordinary measures (most likely to be wielded by the securitising actor himself) are justified” (Wæver, 2004b, p. 56). As Hyde-Price (2001) points out, securitizing an issue means removing it from the regular political discourse and “signal[ing] a need for it to be addressed urgently and with exceptional means” (38), effectively moving the policy from the educational and cultural sphere into the political.

As optimistic as some may be that an educational system can both import foreign curriculum and instruction and preserve traditional cultures aiming at a hybrid educational system, this can produce dilemmas of modernization such as the reconciliation of “neocolonialism and independence” termed “edu-colonialism” that is used to describe the rapid importation of foreign education and faculty that makes an indigenized workforce highly unlikely (Kirk & Napier, 2009, p. 134). Education has also been affected by the introduction of quality definitions and regimes of neoliberalism grounded in accounting standards that emphasize quality control and assurance for monetary return purposes, which Numan (2015) points out, shifts the aims of education from serving a broader society to fulfilling competitive corporate and neoliberal government interests. In Muslim countries in particular, where rapid development is accompanied by the opening of branch campuses of and importing curriculum from Western countries and the use of foreign accreditation agencies, the adoption of foreign quality and benchmarking standards that are not adapted to local values and culture. This causes, according to Numan (2015), a dislocation from Islamic values and conceptions of

quality that are grounded in Islamic principles and theories, and an historical development of participatory needs assessment and self-governance, as well as quality standards in their interpretation may be at odds with the underlying principles of the legal systems of these countries.

There are several levels of cultural security implications for educational administration and leadership, a few of which are highlighted here. First, curriculum needs to not only provide knowledge and skills of international value, but also content and types of interactions and skills that reflect regional relations and local values and norms. Pedagogy also has to be in a form that strengthens and models cultural values and styles of interaction, for example, in the UAE emphasizing the value of the extended family, of the social good, and achieve and collectivist and individualist balance that the society is based on. Of increasing consideration is the multiple modernities thesis (Eisenstadt, 2005) which maintains that one form or type of modernization that may apply in a Western society is neither necessary nor suitable for countries that need and can construct a form of modernization consistent with local culture, which can also have an effect of requiring a different system of evaluation for quality and ranking purposes. In the UAE for example, Davidson (2011) explains how the country consists of unique and hybrid formations of political and state structures have been forming that reflect both characteristics of modern administration and traditional structures and practices, although some of the “modern administration” practices referenced derive originally from Egyptian and other influences in the development of Gulf societies, as well as conceptions of authority and power that originate in the centuries old history of Islamic administration and political leadership (see Heard-Bey, 2004; Kazim, 2000; Rugh, 2007). Therefore, the evolving social institutions are complex combinations of tribal traditions, colonial heritage, post-unification sheikdom qualities, effects of regional destabilisation and

security concerns, a vigorous western style education, consultancy, and expatriate organisational membership, and, increasingly, the impact of millions of tourists each year.

One important implication is in the field of research methods, which has been undergoing considerable challenge in the last couple of decades by the indigenous and culturally sensitive research methods literature, maintaining not only that some forms of Western research methods are not suitable for collecting accurately and meaningful data for interpretation, but that some forms are damaging to the cultures they study and produce erroneous results (e.g., Chilisa, 2012).

Educational administration and leadership also needs to be relevant and effective in the context in which it operates, which includes constitution, legal, economic, cultural and social requirements. There is also the problem of assuming that Western models of leadership and management are neutral when in fact they are value laden, particularly in ways that are contradictory to maintaining culture and national identity such as secularity, materialism, an emphasis on individuality and many other factors that have been identified in the very large cross-cultural management and leadership literature that now exists (e.g., Chhokar, Brodbeck & House, 2007). One could also add here that it is the responsibility of the educational sector to provide cultural continuity, a large part of which involves national identity, and which suitable forms of administration and leadership are required in terms of knowledge, skill, understanding and the capacity to mentor and role model.

## **References**

- Abdalla, I., & Al-Homoud, M. (2001). Exploring the implicit leadership theory in the Arabian Gulf States. *Applied Psychology*, 50(4), 506-531.
- Abella, A. (2008). *Soldiers of reason: The RAND corporation and the rise of the American empire*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt.
- Al Abbar, M. (2000). Culture and Sustainable Development. In Cross-Roads of the New Millenium, Proceedings of the Technological Education and National Development Conference, April, Abu Dhabi.
- Alam, Z. (2003). *Islamic education: Theory and practice*. New Delhi: Adam Publishers.
- Al-Buraey, M. (1988), *Administrative development: An Islamic perspective*. London: Kegan Paul.
- Al-Fahim, M. (1995). *From rags to riches: A story of Abu Dhabi*. New York: I. B. Tauris.
- Ali, A. (1995). Cultural discontinuity and Arab management thought. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 25(3), 7-30.
- Ali, A. (2005). *Islamic perspectives on management and organization*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Al Maktoum, M. (2010). Vision 2021. Available online: [www.dubai.ae](http://www.dubai.ae) (accessed 24 August 2014).
- Altbach, P. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10, 3-25.
- Altbach, P. (2013). *The international imperative in higher education*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Altbach, P. (2015). Academic colonialism in action: American accreditation of foreign universities. *International Higher Education*, 32, 5-7. Available online: <https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/view/7373> (accessed 10 March 2017).

- Altbach, P. & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 290-305.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities*, London: Verso.
- Arabianbusiness.com (2014). Population melting pot: Expats v. locals across the Gulf. Available online: <http://www.arabianbusiness.com/photos/population-melting-pot-expats-v-locals-across-gulf-555330.html> (accessed 14 June 2017).
- Barkawi, T. & Laffey, M. (2006). The postcolonial moment in security studies. *Review of International Studies*, 32, 329-352.
- Beekun, R. & Badawi, J. (1999). *Leadership: An Islamic perspective*. Beltsville, MD: Amana.
- Beekun, R., & Badawi, J. (2005). Balancing ethical responsibility among multiple organizational stakeholders. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 60, 131-145.
- Bennell, P. & Pearce, T. (2003). The internationalisation of higher education: Exporting education to developing and transitional countries. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 23(2), 215-232.
- Berezin, M. (2009). *Illiberal politics in neoliberal times: Culture, security and populism in the new Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bigo, D. & Tsoukala, A. (Eds.). (2008). *Terror, insecurity and liberty: Illiberal practices of liberal regimes after 9/11*. London: Routledge
- Bilgin, P. (2005), *Regional Security in the Middle East: A Critical Perspective*. Abingdon: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Bilgin, P. (2010). Identity/security. In P. Burgess (Ed.). *The Routledge handbook of new security studies* (81-89). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bilgin, P. (2016). Thinking postcolonially about the Middle East: Two moments of anti-Eurocentric critique, Center for Mellemøststudier. Available online: [www.sfu.dk/middle-east/](http://www.sfu.dk/middle-east/) (accessed 19 June 2016).

- Bilgin, P. (2018). Security the postcolonial. In O. Rutazibwa & R. Shilliam (Eds.). *Routledge handbook of postcolonial politics* (48-57). London: Routledge.
- Black, A. (2011). *The history of Islamic political thought*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Booth, K. (Ed.). (1997). *Critical security studies and world politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production*. Polity Press.
- Branine, M. (2011). *Managing across cultures*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Brock-Utne, B. (2000). *Whose education for all? The recolonization of the African mind*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Buzan, B. (1983). *People, states and fear: The national security problem in international relations*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Buzan, B., & Wæver, O. (2003). *Regions and powers: The structure of international security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buzan, B., Wæver, O. & de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A new framework for analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Chhokar, J., Brodbeck, F. & House, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Culture and leadership across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous research methods*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Dale, R. (2005). Globalisation, knowledge economy and comparative education. *Comparative Education*, 41(2), 117-150.
- Davidson, C. (2011). Introduction. In C. Davidson (Ed.). *Power and politics in the Persian Gulf monarchies* (1-6). London: Hurst & Co.

- Donn, G., & Al Manthri, Y. (2010). *Globalisation and higher education in the Arab Gulf states*. Oxford: Symposium.
- Dresch, P. (2013). Introduction: Societies, identities and global issues. In P. Dresch & J. Piscatori (Eds.). *Monarchies and nations: Globalisation and identity in the Arab states of the Gulf* (1-33). London: I. B. Tauris.
- Eisenstadt, S. (2005). *Multiple Modernities*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- ElKaleh, E. & Samier, E.A. (2013). The ethics of Islamic leadership: A cross-cultural approach for public administration, *Administrative Culture*, 14(2), 188-211.
- Farazmand, A. (1999). Globalization and public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 59(6), 509-522.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power and liberation*. Westport, CN: Berin & Garvey.
- Friedman, J. & Randeria, S. (Eds.). (2004). *Worlds on the move: Globalization, migration and cultural security*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Guha, R. & Spivak, G. (1988). *Selected subaltern studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giroux, H., & Purpel, D. (1983). *The hidden curriculum and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Habermas, J. (1992). *The theory of communicative action*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
- Hale, T., Held, D. et al. (2017). *Beyond Gridlock*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hama, H.H. (2017). State security, society security, and human security. *Jadavpur Journal of International Relations*, 21(1), 1-19.
- Harris, A., Jones, M. & Adams, D. (2016). Qualified to lead? A comparative, contextual and cultural view of educational policy borrowing, *Educational Research*, 58(2), 166-178.
- Heard-Bey, F. (2004). *From Trucial States to United Arab Emirates: A society in transition*. Dubai: Motivate Publishing.

- Held, D., & McGrew, A. (Eds.). (2000). *The global transformations reader*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Henry, C., & Springborg, R. (2001). *Globalization and the politics of development in the Middle East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holsinger, D. & Jacob, W. (2010). *Inequality in education: Comparative and international perspectives*. New York: Springer.
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, 69, 3-19.
- Huysmans, J. (2002). Defining social constructivism in security studies: The normative dilemma of writing security. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 27(1), 41–62.
- Hyde-Price, A. (2001). “Beware the Jabberwock!” Security studies in the twenty-first century. In H. Gärtner, A. Hyde-Price & E. Reiter (Eds.). *Europe's new security challenges* (27-54). Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Jones, R. W. (1999). *Security, strategy, and critical theory*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Kamola, I. (2014). US universities and the production of the global imaginary. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 16(3), 515-533.
- Kanu, Y. (2006). Curriculum as cultural practice: Postcolonial imagination, *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 1(1), 67-81.
- Katzenstein, P. (Ed.). (1996). *The culture of national security: Norms and identity in world politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kazim, A. (2000). *The United Arab Emirates A. D. 600 to the present: A socio-discursive transformation in the Arabian Gulf*. Dubai: Gulf Book Centre.
- Kirchner, E. & Sperling, J. (Eds.). (2010). *National security cultures: Patterns of global governance*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Kirk, D. & Napier, D. (2009). The transformation of higher education in the United Arab Emirates: Issues, implications and intercultural dimensions. In J. Zajda, H. Daun & L.

- Saha (Eds.). *Nation-building, identity and citizenship education: Cross-cultural perspectives* (131-142). New York: Springer.
- Krause, K. (1996). Critical Theory and Security Studies, YCISS Occasional Paper Number 33.
- Krause, K., & Williams, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Critical security studies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kumaraswamy, P. (2006). Who am I? The identity crisis in the Middle East. *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, 10(1), 63-73.
- Lynham, S. (2002). The General Method of Theory Building Research in Applied Disciplines. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 4(3), 221-241.
- Macris, J. (2010). *The politics and security of the Gulf: Anglo-American hegemony and the shaping of a region*. London: Routledge.
- Mandel, R. (1994). *The changing face of national security: A conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- McDonald, M. (2008). Constructivism. In P. Williams (Ed.). *Security studies: An introduction* (59-72). Abingdon: Routledge.
- McSweeney, B. (1999). *Security, identity and interests*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meijer, W. (2009). *Tradition and future of Islamic education*. Münster: Waxmann Verlag.
- Mignolo, W. (2011). *The darker side of Western modernity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Moutsios, S. (2009). International organisations and transnational education policy. *Compare*, 39(4), 467-478.
- Nader, L. (2013). *Culture and dignity: Dialogues between the Middle East and the West*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Naidoo, R. (2007). Higher education as a global commodity: The perils and promises for developing countries. The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, London.  
Available online:  
[https://www.academia.edu/1250298/Higher\\_education\\_as\\_a\\_global\\_commodity\\_The\\_perils\\_and\\_promises\\_for\\_developing\\_countries](https://www.academia.edu/1250298/Higher_education_as_a_global_commodity_The_perils_and_promises_for_developing_countries) (accessed 22 July 2015).
- Neocleous, M. (2008). *Critique of security*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Numan, R. (2015). Assuring quality outcomes: Best practices for higher education in Islamic countries. *IIUM Journal of Educational Studies*, 3(1), 92-111.
- Peoples, C. & Vaughn-Williams, N. (2010). *Critical security studies: An introduction*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Quist, H., (2001). Cultural issues in secondary education development in West Africa: Away from colonial survivals, toward neo-colonial influences? *Comparative Education*, 37(3), 297-314.
- Ripsman, N., & Paul, T. (2010). *Globalization and the national security state*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2006). Edward Said and the cultural politics of education. *Discourse*, 27(3), 293-308.
- Roe, P. (2010). Societal security. In A. Collins (Ed.). *Contemporary security studies* (202-217). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rugh, A. (2007). *The political culture of leadership in the United Arab Emirates*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rutkowski, D. (2007). Converging us softly: How intergovernmental organizations promote neoliberal educational policy. *Critical Studies in Education*, 48(2), 229-247.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.

- Samier, E.A. (2015) Is the globalization of higher education a societal and cultural security problem? *Policy Futures in Education*, 13(5), 683-702.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shah, S. (2015). *Education, leadership and Islam: Theories, discourses and practices from an Islamic perspective*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Shaw, T. (1993). Introduction. In T. Shaw (Ed.). *The many faces of national security in the Arab world* (1-24). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies*. New York: Zed Books.
- Spivak, G. (1987). *In other worlds: Essays in cultural politics*. New York: Methuen.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G., & Quist, H. (2000). The politics of educational borrowing: Reopening the case of Achimota in British Ghana. *Comparative Education Review*, 44(3), 272-299.
- Tadjbakhsh, S. & Chenoy, A. (2007). *Human security: Concepts and implications*. London: Routledge.
- Tehrani, M. (Ed.). (1999). *Worlds apart: Human security and global governance*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Thiong'o, N. (1986). *Decolonizing the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Ulrichsen, K.C. (2011). *Insecure Gulf: The end of certainty and the transition to the post-oil era*. London: Hurst & Co.
- Van de Ven, A.H. (1989). Nothing is quite so practical as a good theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 486-489.
- Vandewalle, D. (2000). Higher education and development in Arab oil exporters: The UAE in comparative perspective. In Emirates Center for Security Studies and Research

- (Ed.). *Cross-roads of the new millenium: Proceedings of the technological education and national development conference*. Abu Dhabi: ECSSR.
- Wæver, O. (2004a). Aberystwyth, Paris, Copenhagen: new 'schools' in security theory and their origins between core and periphery, paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Montréal, 17-20 March 2004.
- Wæver, O. (2004b). Peace and security: Two concepts and their relationship. In S. Guzzini & D. Jung (Eds.). *Contemporary security analysis and Copenhagen peace research* (53-65). London: Routledge.
- Watt, W. (1998). *Islamic political thought*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Weber, M. (1978), *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Whetten D.A. (1989) What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 490-495.
- Williams, M. (2007). *Culture and security: Symbolic power and the politics of international security*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- World Commission on Culture and Development. (1995). *Our Creative Diversity*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Yousef, D. (2000). Organizational commitment as a mediator of the relationship between Islamic work ethic and attitudes toward organizational change,” *Human Relations*, 53(4), 513-537.
- Zajda, J., Daun, H., & Saha, L. (Eds.) (2008). *Nation-building, identity and citizenship education: Cross cultural perspectives*. Paris: Springer.