

Designing Public Administration Curriculum for the United Arab Emirates: Principles for Graduate Programmes for a Modernising Arab Islamic State

Eugenie A. Samier
The British University in Dubai

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the approach, structure and content of a graduate Public Administration curriculum suitable for an Islamic Arab state, focussing on the United Arab Emirates, but which may have broader implications for other Islamic states as well as for international dimensions of multicultural non-Islamic states. The approach draws on Weberian comparative historical sociology, Habermasian concepts of legitimacy, domination and colonisation, comparative management, post-colonial critiques and Islamic administrative scholarship. There are three main sections to this paper: 1) the nature of the problem including a discussion of globalisation, a critique of international, comparative, development, internationalised and indigenous public administration, and expatriate academic labour and their recolonising effects; 2) general curricular principles upon which an appropriate curriculum can be built, including internationalisation and programme criteria that include indigenous content; and 3) a course level discussion that includes course criteria and examples of more appropriate content.

Keywords: Islamic Public Administration, Public Administration curriculum, Indigenous Public Administration, United Arab Emirates.

1. Introduction

This paper explores the approach, structure and content of a graduate Public Administration (PA) curriculum suitable for an Islamic Arab state, focussing particularly on the United Arab Emirates in the Arabian Gulf, but which may have broader implications for other Islamic states as well as for international dimensions of non-Islamic states, especially those that are highly multicultural and inclusive. The overall intent of this paper is to combine international and Western scholarship that has relevance to the Gulf and UAE with Islamic and Arab scholarship that informs PA, by having either a broad international scope or one that can be extended into an Islamic and/or Arab context, including a consideration of internationalised, com-

parative and Islamic principles of education and curriculum. The purpose of this paper is twofold: to more realistically problematise the challenges as complex, multidimensional, embedded and contradictory; and to determine the curricular principles and guidelines for designing educational management graduate programmes that prepare students adequately for the Emirati context, including both content and pedagogical aspects of curriculum.

The United Arab Emirates, while unique in many respects as a country and society, also provides a natural experiment in all of the current challenges associated with international trends in development. It is an intense microcosm of globalisation, nationalisation, modernisation, democratisation, industrialisation, urbanisation, technologisation, secularisation and multiculturalisation. While these are not necessarily wholly negative or positive, many of them are in opposition to values and societal structures that are important in providing societal continuity and which are also embedded in the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (UNESCO 2001) as the right to ensure that culture is conserved and developed. This applies to traditional cultural practices, family structure and religion. Other developments are problematic internationally, like the market model accompanying globalisation, or intellectual colonisation through the adoption of “Western curricula” in the developing world (see Abdalla and Al-Homoud 2001; Ayoob 1995; Sharfuddin 1987). The main question for graduate professionalisation programmes is, What kind of leadership can deal with these complex, dynamic and contradictory forces? What curriculum requirements are there in both equipping Emiratis for a globalised world, and, at the same time, helping them protect and preserve their cultural heritage? What analytical, interpretive and critical skills do they need, and what knowledge is required? What place is there for Islamic and Arabic educational traditions and scholarship? The educational development problem for the UAE here is, What is the curricular model of an internationally recognised educational management and leadership programme that is appropriate for an Islamic and Arabic context, that is, one that does not destroy language, culture, and religion?

The approach taken theoretically here is informed in part by Weberian comparative historical sociology grounded in valuational terms in combination with Habermasian Critical Theory concepts of legitimacy, domination and colonisation as they influence curricular design, as well as additional considerations that have arisen in comparative educational management (e.g. Dimmock and Walker 2000) studies regarding culture. Critical issues will also be explored predominantly through post-colonial writings, such as those of Edward Said, and other critiques that have been raised in the social sciences and PA studies from the developing world and informed by Islamic scholarship.

There are three main sections to this paper: 1) a discussion of the nature of the problem that includes examining the impact of globalisation, a critique of international, comparative, global and indigenous PA, the first two of which have advanced Westernisation, creating a form of colonisation, and problems of expatriate academic labour and their recolonising effects; 2) the general curricular principles upon which an appropriate curriculum is built, including internationalisation and programme criteria that include indigenous content; and 3) a course level discussion that includes course criteria and examples of more appropriate content.

2. The nature of the problem

This section of the paper identifies the nature of the problems associated with developing an indigenous PA tradition and curriculum. It examines ways of addressing issues of globalisation which marginalise indigenous intellectual capital, as well as the limitations in development and comparative PA that have both delayed indigenous development and contributed to colonising processes, and conditions in the Gulf region due to large influxes of expatriate labour that contributes to the underdevelopment of indigenous administration due to their strong tendency to bring their own foreign institutional experience and knowledge in unaltered form.

2.1. Globalisation

The relevance of one country's PA curriculum for other jurisdictions has been questioned for a considerable period of time since the emergence of PA as an independent discipline. John Adams (1958), who taught in the mid-1950s at the University of Beirut and the University of Bologna, made a number of interesting observations about the ability of an American curriculum in PA to travel over such large political and cultural gaps. The major limitation of American professors educated in an American curriculum, Adams argues, is fourfold: 1) a lack of knowledge of public law and fiscal policies of local relevance as well as that of the general local jurisdiction; 2) a lack of common cultural heritage that prevents a common language from forming; 3) a natural antagonism of students to imported foreign material; and 4) a sometimes unfamiliar pragmatic theoretical framework that often has unstated assumptions and a case rather than deductive method. The results are that students in other countries do not know how to interpret American texts within the society from which they are derived causing meaninglessness or misinterpretation (1958, 126), and these must be translated in some form into their experience. Implicit in Adams' discussion is an effect of globalisation that marginalises indigenous cultural and intellectual capital when foreign curriculum is commodified and exported abroad.

The international and economic arm of neo-liberalism is globalisation, essentially an economic process that consists of mostly Western export of goods that encompasses culture and education as commodities for developing countries. As Maringe and Foskett (2010, 1) point out, though, globalisation demands a "greater homogenization of fundamental political, ideological, cultural and social aspects of life across different countries of the world", potentially compromising sovereignty, identity, religion, etc. Some studies of the effects of globalisation on the Middle East, such as Guazzone and Pioppi (2012) focus mostly on its effects on authoritarian regimes that were unstable prior to the Arab Spring, and which in part fuelled the dynamics of political change, however, these cases do not apply well to the UAE where a much more open and responsive political system is evolving. More relevant to Gulf countries is Dresch and Piscatori's (2013) study of the impact of globalisation on political systems and national identities, demonstrating how much globalisation shapes the society, culture, and national identity (see also Henry and Springborg 2001). Many dimensions of this impact have been explored in essays in Schaebler

and Stenberg's (2004) *Globalization and the Muslim World*, that include the trivialisation of religion, the need to indigenise knowledge, the impact of secularisation and effect on identity, all of which have implications for the structure and function of social institutions and a style of administrative nation-building that serves the core values and traditions of a Muslim state.

One issue that has arguably more impact on a developing state is the shift from a "legalistic, rule-driven, and bureaucratic form to one that focusses on performance management and market-based standards" (Newswander and Newswander 2012, 288) that characterises the post-1980 New Public Management ideology. New states need the heavy investment in building administrative infrastructure that efficiency could compromise, and which could also impair the building of an adequate security system in a region that poses for all countries threats to stability and safety.

Globalisation also has had a fundamentally transforming effect on higher education, evidenced in both the changes that have been made to university funding and their modification into a market-model for domestic and foreign "markets", and in the large body of literature that has accumulated internationally (e.g. Donn and Al Manthri 2010; Maringe and Foskett 2010; Wildavsky 2010). Authors have focussed on the commodification of programmes and students, and turning faculty into industrial-style workers (e.g. de Bary 2010; Molesworth et al. 2011) and on significantly reducing its value in human and moral terms as a contributor to the common good (see Altbach 2002). The main substance of this literature is a record of how the university has changed in its nature and purpose, administration, teaching and curriculum, roles and the character of knowledge and knowing and styles and topics of research. Among the implications of globalised education for a developing country like the UAE are two that are most important for this paper: commodified education is not designed to support nation-building, and a predominantly foreign curriculum that does not provide the values, knowledge, and skills appropriate to an Islamic and Arab state.

2.2. Development, comparative, global and indigenous PA

Much of the literature on international, comparative or development administration, particularly done in the US and UK, which has dominated the field, has been from the perspective of US and UK interests. These approaches have followed a path of development that reflects the foreign policy of world powers and the growth of globalised economic activity. Comparative PA dominated the 1960s and 1970s (e.g. Dwivedi and Henderson 1990; Farazmand 1991; Heady 1994; Van Wart and Cayer 1990; Waldo 1968), later giving rise to internationalisation and indigenisation (Henderson 1995; Kim 2012) and development administration that Riggs (1970) described as serving the administration of development programmes and strengthening of administrative capabilities in developing countries, based most often on American models (see also Brinkerhoff 2008; Jaeger 1990). Not only, though, have these models dominated, but developing countries are advised to adopt them and are under pressure to do so while their own belief systems and values are viewed as constraints in modernising (Kanungo and Jaeger 1990), assumptions based on a deterministic and uni-causal view of history that makes modernisation dependent upon the soci-

etal characteristics of the exporter. During this period, development administration has also benefitted from expanding its disciplinary base from American PA towards a multi- and interdisciplinary foundation that includes political science, sociology and economics (Jreisat 2005).

A number of authors have argued for a more developed and broader representation of PA internationally because of increasing cross-border influences that are unintended, such as environmental degradation and increasing interdependence due to trans-boundary agreements requiring, in the case of the US, American bureaucrats adopting a more global perspective and the general demands of globalisation (Newswander and Newswander 2012; Ryan 1994).

In some of this literature, the countries under discussion are those that emerged from colonisation, whether achieving independence from a Western imperialist power (e.g. Henderson 1995) or from Soviet colonisation (e.g. Dangor 2005; König 1992; Roeder 1994), or are attempting to indigenise their PA after the imposition of Western, usually American, practice through the World Bank or other development agency (e.g. Henderson 1995). Generally, though, foreign influences have left structural changes that are very difficult to remove entirely, such as in the UAE, where British colonisation changed the leadership and governance structures from competency-based shaikhly leadership that could change from individual to individual and family to family into a permanent monarchy that still retains some of its traditional features of practice (Rugh 2007), but structurally is now permanent. There are also two forms of differentiating administrative developments: firstly, the recapturing of traditional practices prior to colonisation (e.g. Ayittey 1991); and secondly, an independent form of public sector development that comes through the transition from a traditional society to a modernised one, as is evident in the UAE and other Gulf states.

To date, at least in American PA, Rimer (1992) has argued there have been three distinctive rationales for comparative administration. The first is an imperialist-missionary imperative, that dominated the immediate post-WW II period, that intended on extending the US model to other nations (see also Hughes 2003; Turner and Hulme 1997). Secondly, there is an anti-ethnocentric and anti-parochial movement initiated by Robert Dahl quite early in 1947) and later by Riggs (1991). Finally, there is an interdependence argument accompanying a perception of the world as one that is characterised by a spread of democracy and “economic well-being”, altering former international hierarchical relationships on the international policy-making stage, a view promoted by Ryan (1990) and Tucker (1990). However, despite the potential in the last two, I would argue, as many have in examining the effects of globalisation, that there may have to be other options. Due to both the proliferation of the New Public Management and increasing activities by international organisations like the World Bank and the OECD, coupled with globalisation through both government policy in countries like the US, the UK and Australia and the strengthening of transnational corporations, a new formulation of development administration has emerged in the form of “development management” that examines the roles of states in relation with non-state actors (see Brinkerhoff 2008; Hughes 2003). An additional limitation that Peters (1994) notes, is that American scholars tend to ascribe particularity to other countries but generality for the US (see also Jreisat 2001).

The major problem has been that of assuming that a Western approach to management should be appropriate to other countries, a critique raised by Heady (1994) with respect to developing countries. Research on countries outside the “West” has been heavily criticised for its treatment of non-English-speaking or Western countries, such as Hofstede (1981), who has been criticised for contributing to ethnic stereotyping (Jreisat 2001). An example of this in the Gulf region is that of Behery and Paton (2008), who apply Western management models in a superficial manner, with virtually no discussion of Islamic values or the indigenous culture and political system of the UAE, in part due to a positivistic orientation of the study. Bjur and Zomorrodian (1986) attribute the problems to a transfer of dissonant theories and practices in the West, predicated upon an “ideology of contemporary scientific research underlying the development of Western-oriented theoretical explanations of administration thought and practice [that] has systematically down-played ‘values’ as being idiosyncratic and therefore not amenable to a science which searches for general or universal truths” (399).

Contributing to the inappropriateness of some Western administrative practices are characteristics that Jaeger (1990, 134-135) describes developing countries often adopting that produce a socio-cultural dissonance for imported administrative concepts and models: organisational behaviour is more context-dependent; there is often a more fixed conception of human potential (in contrast to the usual notion of unlimited creative potential assumed in Western countries); they are more past- and present-oriented; they are more being-oriented than action-oriented; success is measured by how it contributes to maintaining the well-being of the group; and contextual factors may more often override abstract principles.

Gulrajani and Moloney (2012) advocate the term “global public administration” to capture the changing nature of all states currently and provide an inclusiveness to the field that should reduce the hierarchy of states that have characterised them in the past. They also argue that it promises a form of international generalising without losing empirical grounding and greater international collaboration. The problem, though, with this approach is that it does not ensure that hierarchies will not ineffectively form or that it will do anything to stop the spread of a hegemonic administrative model through the strong international forces associated with globalisation, foreign policy activities of powerful states.

There are a number of reasons why a broader view is necessary for any state, particularly a small state, where impact can be magnified. One aspect is what Ventriess (1989, 900) calls “interconnectedness”, for which he identifies four conditions: 1) power is disbursed and shared by multiple public, domestic and international policy actors; 2) inability of a government or policy actor to act unilaterally; 3) organisations and states are increasingly vulnerable to unintended or indirect consequences outside one’s view; and 4) policy choices and actions have far-ranging and delayed consequences and have indirect or hidden costs.

An alternative to these approaches is that of indigenised PA that serves each jurisdiction (see Bjur and Zomorrodian 1986; Ismailova 2004) – sometimes called nationalisation (e.g. Alatas 2010). In UAE terms, an “Emiratisation” policy was initiated that incorporates many aspects of national culture in the country’s political and social institutions (see Al-Ali 2008; Mashood et al. 2009), a policy initiative that has

been adopted in most Arabian Gulf states, however, it does not fully integrate culture in a foundational sense in PA teaching. In a context like the UAE this should involve a form of Arabisation and Islamisation of PA relevant to the cultural, legal and political traditions of the country. However, a solely indigenised approach, while critically valuable to the needs of a country (see further discussion below), does not adequately incorporate international scholarship that has broad relevance – a balance that the UAE is trying to achieve. There are other limitations to a solely indigenised approach that need to be considered, especially one that tries to recapture a “traditional”, as in historical, form of administration: societies evolve and the conditions in which they operate change.

The model I advance here is a hybrid internationalised/indigenised PA. In the case of the UAE this includes both Arabising and Islamicising the curriculum, but not at the expense of understanding comparative and international PA, given the active role that the UAE plays in the region and more broadly, and covering the regional context, given the heavy influence it plays on its member states. This means that a PA curriculum needs to provide understanding of a robust and grounded international and comparative PA because of globalisation and regional and international political and economic relationships and an indigenous one for state-building that remains true to the country’s vision, its history and culture and its religion.

2.3. The expatriate labour problem and recolonisation

A complicating factor for the UAE is its high level of multiculturalism, due in part to its dependence on foreign labour and tourism, and its location in a strategically important part of the world that is also undergoing considerable levels of internal and external disruption. In 2012, 88% of the population was expatriate, a proportion that is steadily increasing. The major problem of professional expatriate labour that has administrative influence, primarily from the US, the UK and Australia, is that it tends to bring its own foreign institutional experience and, in Bourdieuan terms, “reproduces” itself when working for or consulting to UAE organisations, and in teaching administration in the country. A related problem, even for those from the UAE who study abroad and return home, is that of US and UK programmes that do not fit the country’s jurisdictional features, leading to a lack of fit and a potential Westernisation of social institutions.

How much knowledge students in foreign programmes acquire about other jurisdictions is also important for those countries relying on expatriates from countries like the US, where little comparative or developmental administration is covered (Farazmand 1996, 1999; Heady 1994) and where quite often students foreign to the US acquire their graduate degrees and then return to their home countries or regions. This problem has been discussed by Ryan (1994), who reports that international content on PA is usually isolated to a “comparative” or “development administration” course. Maintaining sovereignty in developing states, where not just the structures and practices of PA may be imported through consultants and other expatriate staff, but also through foreign curricula delivered virtually unchanged, can compromise their social institutions since, as Ryan (1994) argues, the foreign domestic concerns will still be embedded and dominant. The cumulative effect is a re-coloni-

sation of the UAE and other developing countries, as Alatas points out (2003; 2010), through intellectual and cultural capital, a concern explored in depth by Bourdieu over his long scholarly career (see Bourdieu 1991, 1992, 1993, 1998; Goodman and Silverstein 2009; Wacquant 2005).

3. General curricular principles

This section discusses two aspects of curriculum relevant to a country in the Arabian Gulf like the UAE that need to be addressed: 1) principles of curricular internationalisation that are not “Western”-hegemonic in character and which include post-colonial, critical theory and hermeneutic considerations as well as geo-political and jurisdictional characteristics; and 2) the overall structure of a programme that has features different from programmes in other jurisdictions reflecting the nature, requirements, and challenges of the UAE.

3.1. Curricular internationalisation

Internationalisation of curriculum assumes that adequate transfer of a cross-cultural nature can take place as part of the globalisation process. Rodwell (1998) developed a model for curricular transfer that recognises many of the contextual factors and barriers involved, where context consists of cultural, socio-economic, technical-operational, psychological and political (and ideological) factors and barriers include these factors applied to content, process, methods, delivery and presentation dimensions of curriculum. One of the purposes of her study was to determine whether transfers were desirable and what the strengths and limitations are of options that exist, although she does not explicitly deal with colonisation issues. As she notes in examining the literature on international educational management literature, even though many of the barriers or problems and alternatives have been identified in imported curriculum and pedagogy, internationalisation cannot account for all the national differences involved, nor can it “escape the hegemony of American managerialism” (see Atiyah 1992). Internationalisation has tended to examine what may be easily packaged for export rather than developing the suitable curriculum for individual jurisdictions. Work in this area can be guided by Bourdieu and Passeron’s (2000) writings on education as a reproductive field in society, where the nature of knowledge, the structure of the field and individuals’ habitus reproduce themselves – in this context, a large influx of foreigners can import not only knowledge but the nature and functioning of social institutions that they build, reproducing their foreign world into another society.

Indigenising curriculum generally means creating a PA discipline that incorporates local jurisdictional features and challenges as well as thinking. Bjur and Zomorrodian (1986) offer a disciplinary framework that informs scholarship in the field, but it is also one that can be used as a foundation for curricular development. They propose three levels to a model of cultural values from which administrative systems and models derive. Level 1 consists of cultural values and traditional explanations of national identity, vision and goals from which the major social institu-

tions of the political, economic, social and cultural derive and which confer legitimacy. In the context discussed in this paper, the values are Islamic and represent a number of mostly Arab cultures that operate under Islamic law and are influenced by Muslim historical role models, and many centuries of caliphal administrative traditions. Level 2 is composed of institutional values that shape the administrative systems and subsystems of a country and, through their symbolic power, promote foundational values. For Islamic countries this varies considerably on religious, political and cultural grounds, however, there are also a number of connections that have unifying potential such as language, religion, and a shared level of “Arab” identity (or “Arabism”, as discussed by Phillips 2013) for those predominantly Arab. Level 3 includes the instrumental values of administrative and management models and techniques that reflect the hierarchies of responsibility and accountability and the norms governing organisational relationships. On this level Islamic and Arab culture play a very strong role in determining the norms of practice, the nature of relationships, decision-making and planning, and how reward and discipline are carried out, and all other structural and functional aspects of organisational life and the principles of professional practice. All of these levels need to be addressed in a curriculum programme, although the elements’ incorporation may vary in programme and course structure, reflecting institutional arrangements and internal and external dynamics across sectors and development over time and changing conditions.

Ismailova (2004) examines indigenising curriculum in a more post-colonial way, defining it as “a political, social and cultural process, emerging as a response to long-term domination, neglect and denigration by the colonial regimes” in the context of Kyrgyzstan as well as former colonies in Africa and indigenous peoples in the Americas that is necessary for identity and nation-building. Indigenisation, as she notes, ranges from political and economic decolonisation to nationalisation, self-determination and self-government, depending on the context, consisting of the following themes: “nationalization of the economy; transfer and redistribution of administrative power and functions previously held by colonizers to the indigenous people; reclamation and rehabilitation of the colonized past; struggle against economic and cultural dependency; revival and incorporation of previously suppressed indigenous language, culture, literature and traditional values into the contemporary educational curriculum” drawing on the work of mostly African and Aboriginal authors and their experiences (248). For Muslim and Arab populations, the terms “Arabisation” and “Islamisation” are used.

For two reasons Said’s work is important in the context of the Arabian Gulf – one of the most threatened aspects of these countries is their culture, knowledge and traditions that were marginalised by colonisation (see 1978, 1993; Burney 2012), and secondly, under globalisation and its effects through expatriate labour and exported curriculum, the conventional notion of colonisation through political and military subjugation does not apply. Arabisation and Islamisation of PA can be viewed as a form of cultural nationalism, which Ismailova (2004) describes as aiming “to reclaim and reassert the culture, knowledge, and traditions and customs that were victimized by the opposition between traditional and modern, advanced and backward” (249). In curricular and pedagogical terms this means not just the incorporation of tradi-

tional knowledge, but of the values and mental constructs that allow one to make sense of the world, meeting the needs of indigenous peoples in conserving their culture, and in removing “exclusivist and ethnocentric features of colonial or dominant mainstream education by an inclusive curriculum and ‘culturally responsive’ pedagogy” (Ismailova 2004, 251) in a pervasive sense, that is, not just compartmented sections of curriculum and pedagogy (although one could also add here culturally responsible curriculum).

Henderson (1995, 17) describes indigenisation as “native patterns which are neither imposed nor copied from the West” for all or part of an administrative system including the education and training of civil servants. Henderson, though, sees two main forms emerging – a “fragmentation” of forms in each global region or country; or a “context-based administrative science grounded in cultural values, with indigenous concepts which avoid ethnocentrism and international exchange of ideas,” some of which are “hostile to internationalization – designed to counter the ‘captive mind’ and ‘colonized curriculum’” (22, 23; see also Clifford and Marcus 1986). Ismailova (2004, 258) also notes a number of problems with indigenisation of curriculum: marginalisation of indigenous people, lack of intellectual capital to succeed in the broader society, and indifference and scepticism in the indigenisation process. I would argue here, though, that there is at least one alternative to these two options: the internationalised indigenised curriculum. Armstrong (n.d.) makes a strong case for using a narrative and story-telling approach that provides the details that allow for greater universalisation of content because it is presented in a form that is grounded in conceptions of common humanity and for making differences more comprehensible in much the same way that great literature is able to transcend differences of time and culture.

Islamisation has two dimensions to it, one critical and the other programmatic. The first is what Dangor (2005) calls a “bifurcation” in education in which the “dominance of the Western system of education” has marginalised “Islamic norms and values”, and the simple “fix” of introducing separate curricular pieces does not “bridge the chasm between two systems that differ in respect of origin, worldview, objectives, methodology, and epistemology” (520). In Dangor’s argument, three dimensions of education are examined: the aims and objectives, where Western education has become more utilitarian, focussed on the material needs of careers and the marketplace, and Islamic including as a high priority moral and spiritual development (although previously the Idealist Western tradition did address these issues); secularisation that has come to dominate Western education combining rationalism, empiricism and induction drawn only from “fact and experience”, where Islamic epistemology revelation has a fundamental place with “reason, sensory perception, intuition and experience (including experimentation and observation)”; and values in education consisting in the West of values that are generally constructed and in Islam they are given. These differences also implicate the role of the teacher, who in Islam is expected to be not only a person of learning but also of virtue and piety and responsible for the formation of personality as well as knowledge and skills. The Islamisation of knowledge therefore is a revisiting of its intellectual heritage, synthesising it into a more inclusive model that examines both differences and commonalities.

3.2. Programme Criteria

There are a number of criteria that need to be considered in designing a graduate PA curriculum for the UAE. The first is that it must reflect the country's history, context and external relations and influences. This includes the historical forces that shape its political system, society and government such as traditional Bedouin, coastal and mountain tribes, Islamic and caliph traditions, its colonial periods and more recent international, regional and globalisation dynamics. History, as Madansky (2008) discusses, has a number of uses in the management and administration fields, although he restricts the view to history within one's own country: it provides a context for understanding current "events, affairs, and trends"; it is valuable in establishing causal relations for both understanding, planning and decision-making; it has an even clearer value in the foreign policy field; and it serves to support the case method. Extending the argument to other cultures, history provides an understanding for expatriates as well as locals of how systems evolve, their values and a framework within which structures and functions need to be located. Countries can also be seen as continuations of traditions that shape social institutions and, in the case of Muslim countries, legal and administrative principles grounded in the Quran and Sunnah and understood through the Islamic legal, interpretive and hermeneutic scholarly traditions. An additional value to history for a country like the UAE is in determining when analogies in public policy may be inappropriate. Appropriate material would reflect the nature of the political system and the state-building process to serve the vision and goals of the country as established by its leaders and made legitimate by its citizens, and that reflect the values inherent in its society and culture. This includes relevant transition, development and institution-building literature and practices that serve the unique characteristics of the UAE as a modernising Islamic and Arab state. Comparative PA needs to expand beyond the US, the UK and Australia, the most often promoted models to examine jurisdictions that may have more in common with the UAE like Singapore (e.g. Drechsler 2013). Implicated here are also many "reform" models that may suit Western countries far more than Middle Eastern countries like the UAE.

On a theoretical level, a programme and its courses should include foundational material from Arab and Islamic scholarship, for example the social theory of Ibn Khaldun (Mahdi 1964), al-Mawardi, Al-Ghazali, al-Din Tusi, Ibn Rushd, Ibn Taymiyya and other relevant literature beginning with the early Islamic period, up through its "golden age" of scholarship that informs Islamic political and social thought, through the medieval period into modern times, for example the post-colonial critique from Edward Said (see 2004). From Western scholarship there are a number of authors whose critiques are more suitable for a small country facing powerful influences from the non-Islamic world, such as Weber, Habermasian Critical Theory, Bourdieu on social, cultural and intellectual capital theory, Foucault, Friere, and Giroux and Passeron on hidden curriculum, many of whose scholarship already draws from non-Western sources that include Islamic scholarship that was transmitted through the Renaissance and subsequently to Europe. To support more interpretive and especially hermeneutic studies, Gadamer is particularly important. The argument that is made here is not based on a "clash of civilizations" notion promul-

gated by Lewis (1990) and Huntington (1997), a view that has received considerable criticism (e.g. Achcar 2006). Instead, the argument made here is that the Islamic and Western scholarly traditions share a broad range of foundations (see Küng 2007), including such critically important ideas as those of Immanuel Kant (Tampio 2012), but these must be selectively used in ways that are not antithetical and damaging to the traditions and social institutions of an Islamic state.

In addition to appropriate Western scholarship there is a long Islamic tradition that consists of three main bodies of literature relevant here: the comprehensive and complex traditional (ca. 7th to 13th centuries, Western calendar) Islamic scholarship representing all pure and applied sciences, social sciences, applied “sciences” and humanities (see Freely 2009; Lyons 2009; Morgan 2007); the Islamic administration and leadership literature throughout the caliphal period (e.g. Al-Farabi 1997; Al-Ghazali 1964); and modern and contemporary Islamic scholarship on politics, the state, administration and law, as well as the application of Islamic traditional sociology and other disciplines (e.g. Ali 1975; Asad 1999; Al-Buraey 1988; Sherwani 1981).

Research traditions need to reflect a better balance among positivist, critical and interpretive approaches given the importance of values and culture, and to examine how external and internal influences shape the formation of the state and its administrative system and pay close attention to researcher bias and bias in the research texts used, given many of the assumptions made in Western texts. Traditional research methods that come from Islamic scholarship, like hermeneutics and a strong interpretive tradition, should play a strong role (see also Alatas 2003, 2010). Research methodology also needs to be more critically approached for the ways in which it perpetuates imperialist concepts and practices, requiring, as Smith (2012) argues, a decolonisation making it more sensitive to indigenous knowledge and ways of being.

The curriculum should also approach topics through both public service values and be oriented towards providing continuity and preserving the society and culture it serves instead of “colonising” the country into dependency on Western countries for its intellectual capital and transforming it into an outpost of Western powers. This requires some attention to the history of the country and region, and the use of biographical sources that are important in Islamic thought as well as embedding itself in the ethics and values that typify the UAE to reduce unintended consequences of “Westernisation”.

The principles and guidelines for a national UAE curriculum that meet the needs, challenges and aspirations of the UAE include the following:

1. Synthesises the Western curriculum with Arab and Islamic intellectual tradition
2. Contains UAE material relevant to the institutional framework and tradition of the UAE
3. Addresses the country’s developmental stage and needs, including its security needs (defined broadly as societal and cultural security as well as environmental, economic, political and military), without cultural erosion.

4. Respects its political, legal and religious jurisdictional character
5. Pursues relevant policies like Emiratisation that are essential for sovereignty, national identity formation and indigenous capacity-building.

4. Course-level discussion

The following notes for courses represent how the above principles can be implemented in course design.

4.1 Political and state theory

For the UAE, as for all Gulf states, nationhood evolved out of prior colonisation, which had a structural as well as a substantive impact on the nature of political systems and governments that formed as a combination of centuries-old tribal practices, colonial structures and the rapid formation of sovereign states when Britain retreated from control of the region at a time that oil wealth emerged. As Davidson (2011a) argues, this produced a type of political system and government that are hybrid in nature, consisting in part of traditional societies, colonially-influenced monarchies and a seemingly modern apparatus of legal-rational government agencies and its own evolving character to civil society, although it has a significant charismatic character to its style of political leadership (see also Rugh 2007). Leadership, power and authority should be covered in curriculum, integrating Islamic and cultural values (e.g. Beekun and Badawi 1999) as well as current leadership patterns and practices in the Gulf region (e.g. Metcalfe and Mimouni 2011). Relevant also to the building of a PA curriculum are sources from political and state theory that address the UAE context (e.g. Black 2001; Davidson 2011b; Hashmi 2002; Schlumberger 2007). It also operates under Islamic law, which requires that the Islamic legal tradition be covered (e.g. Ibn Rushd 1994; Zubaida 2003). In addition, economic factors like a heavy reliance on natural resources, the current diversification of the economy and its economic relations on a regional and international level should be examined. The political system is also evolving to include an electoral governing body, and it is a federated nation that requires attention to Emirate governments in addition to the national government.

4.2 Administrative studies

Suitable foundations for administrative studies, such as interpretive comparative historical sociology (e.g. Weber 1968), comparative administration (e.g. Bekke, Perry and Toonen 1996), development PA (e.g. Jaeger and Kanungo 1990) and interdisciplinary approaches to PA (e.g. Raadschelders 2013) are required. In addition to Western texts there are sources on contemporary Islamic principles of administration and Arab administration (e.g. Al-Buraey 1988; Beekun 2006; Jabnoun 2008; Sharfuddin 1987) and historical sources (Majdalawi 2002) that are important in providing a foundation theoretically and conceptually, such as Al-

Mulk's (2002) *The Book of Government or Rules for Kings*, Al-Mawardi's (1996) *The Ordinances of Government*, and political and administrative practices presented in the Islamic Mirrors of Princes tradition (e.g. Boroujerdi 2013; Ibn Zafar 2003). An important feature of this literature is the consideration of professionalism and professional ethics that derives from these sources and the large biographical literature from Islamic states that still informs Arab and Islamic administrative practice, increasingly important to the UAE since social responsibility has become a policy issue. The implications for expatriate staff, particularly from the West, is not clear, but a principle from Weber of "living for the state" rather than "from the state" is relevant.

In addition to principles of administrative practice, there are larger considerations that distinguish PA in the UAE from many Western countries. The role of PA is larger in a state that operates to some degree on a welfare-state model, consistent with the servant-leadership aspects of Islamic leadership (see ElKaleh and Samier 2013) and a distribution of oil and gas wealth throughout the citizenry as part of development and modernisation. It also reflects the style of a shaikhly monarchy that plays an active rulership and governance role in all social institutions, including a regular "majlis", in which residents of the country have direct access to rulers, and a different separation of public and private, where the state needs to manage the country's economic development, although many management scholars bred on American-style administrative theory regard these as impediments rather than legitimate alternatives in government (e.g. Mansour 2008). Important factors in examining state structures are the influences of globalisation (e.g. Guazzone and Pioppi 2012), internal country dynamics and history (Ayubi 1995) and the traditions of Islamic political scholarship (e.g. Abu-Rabi 2010; Belkeziz 2009; Bowering 2013; Hashmi 2002; Sherwani 1981).

4.3 Intergovernmental, regional and international systems

The UAE is a member of the GCC and the Arab League, which involves intergovernmental relations and activities, including not only the economic and political sectors (e.g. Fox et al. 2006), but the security sector (Almezzaini 2011). Also important are public-private agreements with local, regional and transnational corporations that influence the development of economic and administrative systems (e.g. Richards and Waterbury 2008) and more recent models of international relations that reflect the interests of non-Western states (e.g. Adler-Nissen 2013; Halliday 2005; McSweeney 1999; Shilliam 2011; Tickner and Blaney 2012) or which focus on the Gulf region (e.g. Gause 2010; Legrenzi 2011). Of more recent relevance are interstate and societal relations that have emerged from what is generally called the "Arab Spring" and its many implications for many public-sector organisations and activities (e.g. Althani 2012; Dabashi 2012; Talani 2014).

4.4 Organisation studies

Organisation studies needs not only to cover structural-functional approaches and rational choice theory, but have a heavy emphasis on organisation culture and

politics that covers multicultural organisations and cross-cultural dimensions, given the diversity of values, ideas of power and authority, communication styles and epistemic frameworks. In addition to many of the cross-cultural texts available like Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (2004, 2012; see also Guirdham 2011; Hofstede 1980; Lewis 2006; Mead 1998) that have superseded Hofstede's limited and biased work, and sources with large sections on Arab and Islamic countries like Branine (2011) need to be included. Given the overgeneralisation of much of this literature and its contribution to perpetuating stereotypes, much more empirical literature from individual countries, social classes and ethnic groups needs to be used in supplement. An additional dimension to organisation studies is a recent literature developing on Arab and Islamic identity that informs professional and organisational roles (e.g. Abdalla and Al-Homoud 2001; Hughes 2013; Phillips 2013; Suleiman 2011), including aspects of a colonised persona (e.g. Mannoni 1991; Oliver 2004).

4.5. Security administration

One major responsibility of government in the Gulf is shared security concerns in the military and security sectors because of aggression from Iran and earlier Iraq and extremist groups in a number of other nearby states like Yemen and Saudi Arabia as well as the strong presence of the US military and security establishment. There are a number of sources now available on Gulf security, like Legrenzi (2011), Gause (2010), Askan (2013) and Sick and Potter (2002), that are beginning to produce a security literature that reflects a regional perspective, although this still has a long way to go. There are many other forms of security concerns, including environmental, economic, social and cultural ones (e.g. Buzan et al. 1998; Tschirgi et al. 2010), and new forms of security studies that are based on regional views (e.g. Adler and Barnett 1998; Bilgin 2010; Buzan and Waever 2003) and which focus on security in the Arab world (e.g. Korany et al. 1993) and in the Arabian Gulf (e.g. Potter and Sick 2002). A complicating factor that should be considered from the perspective of Islamic countries is the recent "securitization" of Islam that is developing in a number of Western countries (e.g. Croft 2012).

4.6. Policy studies

Policy studies is another critical area that requires rethinking in the UAE context. Given the stage of state-building, sovereignty and societal and cultural security issues, much more emphasis has to be placed on policy transfer (e.g. Evans 2004) that involves the appropriate modification and adaptation of policy and its programmes to the UAE. This can also be improved by the use of critical policy studies, a more comprehensive study of regional dynamics, and some historical understanding. Perhaps equally important is the indigenous social-science and PA literature and colonial critiques and related criticisms (see Alatas 2003, 2010 for an overview) that is required to ask more fundamental questions of the assumptions upon which policy studies is based.

4.7. Research methodology

While research methods may appear to be “objective” and non-political, many concerns have been raised about those that promote a secular worldview – as in the case of behaviourist type methods (Walter and Anderson 2013) – and those that do not adequately encompass belief systems, values, and forms of knowledge that are characteristic of traditional societies (whether modernising or not) and the intent through selection and design. Several sources on research methods that embed research in cultural and historical contexts have been published that can form a syllabus more supportive of indigenous nation-building and knowledge construction that do not undermine or replace societal traditions and represent foreign agendas. Chilisa (2012) presents a methods text that does so while deconstructing colonial epistemologies and pursuing a transformative paradigm (see also Brown and Strega 2005; Denzin et al. 2008; Kovach 2009; Moore-Gilbert 2009). There are also sources, like Bentz and Shapiro’s (1998) *Mindful Inquiry in Social Research*, that draw both on Western forms of research that are sensitive to cultural norms (see also Four Arrows 2008) and those that encompass a broader international epistemology and Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992), who provide a means by which the researcher can use reflexivity to bring into question foreign assumptions. There is also an emerging literature of research methodology specifically oriented to an Islamic context in disciplines foundational to PA from which administration-research methodology can be developed (e.g. Humphreys 1991; Moten 1996; Thomas 2008).

5. Conclusion

Dependency on foreign intellectual capital in the developing world continues despite a decades-old critique of Western, mostly US and UK, and to a lesser extent French, domination in PA internationally. Too complex and lengthy to represent here is a broader social science problem of academic colonisation and intellectual imperialism that Alatas (2003, 2010) summarises, consisting of the critique of colonialism, academic imperialism, decolonisation, Orientalism, the “captive mind”, pedagogical theories of modernisation and Eurocentrism (although this is to a large extent a misnomer, given the hegemony of American theory involved), producing in reaction a broad range of alternative discourses representing the many voices and traditions that have been marginalised or excluded. To a large extent the domination is a consequence of the positivist capture of leadership, administration and management studies, represented in the New Public Management ideology that excludes context and the valuational, experiential and perceptive qualities of the individual and equates modernisation with only political and economic structures in Western states and the domination of economic values that are highly materialist.

The reversal of dependence, Alatas (2003) argues, requires changes in the elements that are captured in academic dependency theory: dependence on Western ideas and theories; on their publishers, journals and websites; many dependent on Western aid to finance scholarship and teaching; foreign investment in education;

and being “on demand” in Western academia producing a brain drain. This paper primarily addresses the first point – for teaching purposes and implicating the other indirectly. There are, of course, other values issues to consider that respect the legitimacy of culture, religion and sovereignty, including those of an appropriate pedagogy. One major aspect of PA curriculum that is not often acknowledged is that the programmes do not only have the purpose of transmitting knowledge, but also in preparing graduate students to create knowledge – a purpose that is severely diminished if they are fed only a (highly positivist) Western diet that often has little to do with nourishing the Islamic and cultural soul.

REFERENCES

- Abdalla, I. and M. Al-Homoud. 2001. “Exploring the Implicit Leadership Theory in the Arabian Gulf States.” *Applied Psychology* 50(4), 506-531.
- Abu-Rabi, I. (ed.). 2010. *The Contemporary Arab Reader on Political Islam*. London: Pluto Press.
- Achcar, G. 2006. *The Clash of Barbarisms: The Making of the New World Disorder*. London: Saqi Books.
- Adams, J. 1958. “On the Teaching of Public Administration Abroad.” *Public Administration Review* 18(2), 124-128.
- Adler, E. and M. Barnett (eds). 1998. *Security Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Adler-Nissen, R. (ed.). 2013. *Bourdieu in International Relations: Rethinking Key Concepts in IR*. London: Routledge.
- Al-Ali, J. 2008. “Emiratisation: Drawing UAE Nationals into their Surging Economy.” *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 28(9/10), 365-379.
- Alatas, S. 2010. “The Definition and Types of Alternative Discourses.” *Estudos Históricos* 23(46), 225-245.
- Alatas, S. 2003. “Academic Dependency and the Global Division of Labour in the Social Sciences.” *Current Sociology* 51(6), 599-613.
- Al-Buraey, M. 1988. *Administrative Development: An Islamic Perspective*. London: Kegan Paul International.
- Al-Farabi, A. 1997. *On the Perfect State: Mabadi Ara Ahl Al-Madinat Al-Fadilah*. Chicago: Kazi Publications.
- Al-Ghazali, A. 1964. *Book of Counsel for Kings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ali, S. 1975. *Administrative Ethics in a Muslim State*. Lahore: Publishers United.
- Al-Mawardi, A. 2000. *The Ordinances of Government: Al-Ahkam as-Sultaniyyah w'al-Wilayat al-Diniyya*. Reading: Garnet Publishing.
- Al-Mawardi, A. 1966. *The Ordinances of Government*. Reading: Garnet.
- Almezaini, K. 2011. *The UAE and Foreign Policy: Foreign Aid, Identities and Interests*. Abingdon: Routledge.

- Al-Mulk, N. 2002. *The Book of Government or Rules for Kings: The Siyar al Muluk or Siyasat-nama of Nizam al-Mulk*. London: Routledge.
- Altbach, P.G. 2002. "Knowledge and Education as International Commodities: The Collapse of the Common Good." *Journal of International Higher Education* 28, 19-36.
- Althani, M. 2012. *The Arab Spring & the Gulf States: Time to Embrace Change*. London: Profile Books.
- Armstrong, H. (n.d). "Indigenizing the Curriculum: The Importance of Story." Paper presented at the Manitoba Education Research Network Conference. Available at <http://www.mern.ca/> (accessed 12 April 2014).
- Asad, M. 1999. *The Principles of State and Government in Islam*. Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust.
- Askan, H. 2013. *Conflicts in the Persian Gulf: Origins and Evolution*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Atiyah, H. 1992. "Designing Management Training Programmes in a Developing Country: A Case Study." *Management Education and Development* 23, 123-130.
- Ayittey, B. 1991. *Indigenous African Institutions*. New York: Transnational Publishers.
- Ayoob, M. 1995. *The Third World Security Predicament: State Making, Regional Conflict, and the International System*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Ayubi, N. 1995. *Over-stating the Arab State: Politics and Society in the Middle East*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Beekun, R. 2006. *Strategic Planning and Implementation for Islamic Organizations*. Washington: International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Beekun, R. and J. Badawi. 1999. *Leadership: An Islamic Perspective*. Beltsville, ML: Amana.
- Behery, M. and R. Paton. 2008. "Performance Appraisal-Culture Fit: Organizational Outcomes within the UAE, Education, Business and Society." *Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues* 1(1), 34-49.
- Bekke, H., J. Perry and T. Toonen. 1996. *Civil Service Systems in Comparative Perspective*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Belkeziz, A. 2009. *The State in Contemporary Islamic Thought: A Historical Survey of the Major Muslim Political Thinkers of the Modern Era*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Bentz, V. and J. Shapiro. 1998. *Mindful Inquiry in Social Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bilgin, P. 2010. *Regional Security in the Middle East: A Critical Perspective*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Bjur, W. and A. Zomorrodian. 1986. "Towards Indigenous Theories of Administration: An International Perspective." *International Review of Administration Sciences* 52, 397-420.
- Black, A. 2001. *The History of Islamic Political Thought: From the Prophet to the Present*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Boroujerdi, M. (ed.). 2013. *Mirror for the Muslim Prince: Islam and the Theory of Statecraft*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

- Bourdieu, P. 1998. *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1992. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. and J.-C. Passeron. 2000. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. and L. Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bowering, G. (ed.). 2013. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Islamic Political Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Branine, M. 2011. *Managing Across Cultures: Concepts, Policies and Practices*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Brinkerhoff, D. 2008. "The State and International Development Management: Shifting Tides, Changing Boundaries, and Future Directions." *Public Administration Review* 68(6), 985-1001.
- Brown, L. and S. Strega (eds). 2005. *Research as Resistance: Critical, Indigenous and Anti-Oppressive Approaches*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Burney, S. 2012. *Pedagogy of the Other: Edward Said, Postcolonial Theory and Strategies for Critique*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Buzan, B. and O. Waever. 2003. *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buzan, B., O. Waever and J. de Wilde. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. London: Lynne Rienner.
- Chilisa, B. 2012. *Indigenous Research Methodologies*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Clifford, J. and G. Marcus (eds). 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Croft, S. 2012. *Securitizing Islam: Identity and the Search for Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dabashi, H. 2012. *The Arab Spring: The End of Postcolonialism*. New York: Zed Books.
- Dahl, R. 1947. "The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems." *Public Administration Review* 7, 1-11.
- Dangor, S. 2005. "Islamization of Disciplines: Towards an Indigenous Educational System." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 7(4), 519-531.
- Davidson, C. 2011a. "Introduction." In C. Davidson (ed.). *Power and Politics in the Persian Gulf Monarchies*. London: Hurst & Company, 1-6.
- Davidson, C. 2011b. "The United Arab Emirates." In C. Davidson (ed.). *Power and Politics in the Persian Gulf Monarchies*. London: Hurst & Company, 7-29.
- De Bary, B. (ed.). 2010. *Universities in Translation: The Mental Labor of Globalization*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Denzin, N., Y. Lincoln and L. Smith (eds). 2008. *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dimmock, C. and A. Walker. 2000. "Developing Comparative and International Educational Leadership and Management: A Cross-Cultural Model." *School Leadership & Management* 20(2), 143-160.

- Donn, G. and Y. Al Manthri. 2010. *Globalisation and Higher Education in the Arab Gulf States*. Oxford: Symposium.
- Drechsler, W. 2013. "Three Paradigms of Governance and Administration: Chinese, Western and Islamic." *Society and Economy* 35(3), in press.
- Dresch, P. and J. Piscatori (eds). 2013. *Monarchies and Nations: Globalisation and the Identity in the Arab States of the Gulf*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Dwivedi, O. and K. Henderson (eds). 1990. *Public Administration in World Perspective*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- ElKaleh, E. and E.A. Samier. 2013. "The Ethics of Islamic Leadership: A Cross-Cultural Approach for Public Administration." *Administrative Culture* 14(2), 188-211.
- Evans, M. (ed.). 2004. *Policy Transfer in Global Perspective*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Farazmand, A. 1999. "Globalization and Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 59(6), 509-522.
- Farazmand, A. 1996. "Development and Comparative Public Administration: Past, Present, and Future." *Public Administration Quarterly* 20(3), 343-364.
- Farazmand, A. (ed.). 1991. *Handbook of Comparative and Development Administration*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Four Arrows (aka Don Trent Jacobs). 2008. *The Authentic Dissertation: Alternative Ways of Knowing, Research and Representation*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Fox, J., N. Mourtada-Sabbah and M. Al-Mutawa (eds). 2006. *Globalization and the Gulf*. London: Routledge.
- Freely, J. 2009. *Aladdin's Lamp: How Greek Science Came to Europe through the Islamic World*. New York: Vintage.
- Gause, F. 2010. *The International Relations of the Persian Gulf*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodman, J. and P. Silverstein. 2009. *Bourdieu in Algeria: Colonial Politics, Ethnographic Practices, Theoretical Developments*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Guazzone, L. and D. Pioppi (eds). 2012. *The Arab State and Neo-Liberal Globalization: The Restructuring of State Power in the Middle East*. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press.
- Guirdham, M. 2011. *Communicating across Cultures at Work*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gulrajani, N. and K. Moloney. 2012. "Globalizing Public Administration: Today's Research and Tomorrow's Agenda." *Public Administration Review* 72(1), 78-86.
- Halliday, F. 2005. *The Middle East in International Relations: Power, Politics and Ideology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hashmi, S. 2002. *Islamic Political Ethics: Civil Society, Pluralism, and Conflict*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Heady, F. 1994. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Henderson, K. 1995. "Reinventing Comparative Public Administration: Indigenous Models of Study and Application." *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 8(4), 17-25.

- Henry, C. and R. Springborg. 2001. *Globalization and the Politics of Development in the Middle East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hofstede, G. 1981. "Culture and Organizations." *International Studies of Management & Organizations* 10, 15-41.
- Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hughes, A. 2013. *Muslim Identities: An Introduction to Islam*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hughes, O. 2003. *Public Management and Administration: An Introduction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Humphreys, R. 1991. *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Huntington, S. 1997. *The Clash of Civilizations: And the Remaking of the World Order*. London: Simon & Schuster.
- Ibn Rushd. 1994. *The Distinguished Jurist's Primer*. Reading: Garnet.
- Ibn Zafar, M. 2003. *The Just Prince: A Manual of Leadership*. London: Saqi.
- Ismailova, B. 2004. "Curriculum Reform in Post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan: Indigenization of the History Curriculum." *The Curriculum Journal* 15(3), 247-264.
- Jabnoun, N. 2008. *Islam and Management*. Riyadh: International Islamic Publishing House.
- Jaeger, A. 1990. "The Applicability of Western Management Techniques in Developing Countries: A Cultural Perspective." In A. Jaeger and R. Kanungo (eds). *Management in Developing Countries*. London: Routledge, 131-145.
- Jaeger, A. and R. Kanungo (eds). *Management in Developing Countries*. London: Routledge
- Jreisat, J. 2005. "Comparative Public Administration is back in, Prudently." *Public Administration Review* 65(2), 231-242.
- Jreisat, J. 2001. "Organizational Perspective in Comparative and Development Administration." In A. Farazmand (ed.). *Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration*. New York: Marcel Dekker, 23-31.
- Kanungo, R. and A. Jaeger. 1990. "Introduction: The Need for Indigenous Management in Developing Countries." In A. Jaeger and R. Kanungo (eds). *Management in Developing Countries*. London: Routledge, 1-19.
- Kim, P. 2012. "A Historical Overview of Korean Public Administration: Discipline, Education, Association, International Cooperation and Beyond Indigenization." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 78(2), 217-238.
- König, K. 1992. "The Transformation of a 'Real-Socialist' Administrative System into a Conventional Westerner European System." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 58(2), 147-162.
- Korany, B., P. Noble and R. Brynen (eds). 1993. *The Many Faces of National Security in the Arab World*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kovach, M. 2009. *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Context*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Küng, H. 2007. *Islam: Past, Present and Future*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications.
- Legrenzi, M. 2011. *The GCC and the International Relations of the Gulf: Diplo-*

- macy, *Security and Economic Coordination in a Changing Middle East*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Lewis, R. 2006. *When Cultures Collide: Leading Across Cultures*. Boston: Nicholas Brealey.
- Lewis, B. 1990. "The Roots of Muslim Rage." *Atlantic Monthly*. Available at <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1990/09/the-roots-of-muslim-rage/304643/> (accessed 28 August 2014).
- Lyons, J. 2009. *The House of Wisdom: How the Arabs Transformed Western Civilization*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Madansky, A. 2008. "Teaching History in Business Schools: An Outsider's View." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 7(4), 553-562.
- Mahdi, M. 1964. *Ibn Khaldūn's Philosophy of History: A Study in the Philosophic Foundation of the Science of Culture*. Kuala Lumpur: The Other Press.
- Majdalawi, F. 2002. *Islamic Administration under Omar Ibn Al-Khattab*. Amman: Majdalawi Masterpieces Publications.
- Mannoni, O. 1991. *Prospero and Caliban: The Psychology of Colonization*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Mansour, A. 2008. "The Impact of Privatization on the United Arab Emirates (UAE) Federal Public Sector." *International Public Management Review* 9(2), 66-89.
- Maringe, F. and N. Foskett. 2010. "Introduction: Globalization and Universities." In F. Maringe and N. Foskett (eds). *Globalization and Internationalization in Higher Education: Theoretical, Strategic and Management Perspectives*. London: Continuum, 1-13.
- Mashood, N., H. Verhoeven and B. Chansakar. 2009. "Emiratisation, Omanisation and Saudisation – Common Causes: Common Solutions?" Proceedings of the 10th International Business Research Conference, April 2009, Dubai, United Arab Emirates. Available at: <http://wbiconpro.com/17.%20Helen-UAE.pdf> (accessed 10 August 2014).
- McSweeney, B. 1999. *Security, Identity and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mead, R. 1998. *International Management: Cross-Cultural Dimensions*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Metcalf, B. and F. Mimouni (eds). 2011. *Leadership Development in the Middle East*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Molesworth, M., R. Scullion and E. Nixon (eds). 2011. *The Marketization of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Moore-Gilbert, B. 2009. *Post-Colonial Life Writing: Culture, Politics and Self-Representation*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Morgan, M. H. 2007. *Lost History: The Enduring Legacy of Muslim Scientists, Thinkers, and Artists*. Washington DC: National Geographic Society.
- Moten, A. 1996. *Political Science: An Islamic Perspective*. Houndmills: Macmillan.
- Newswander, L. and C. Newswander. 2012. "Encouraging Cognitive Flexibility and Interdisciplinarity in Public Administration Programs." *Administration & Society* 44(3), 285-309.
- Oliver, K. 2004. *The Colonization of Psychic Space*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Peters, B. 1994. "Theory and Methodology in the Study of Comparative Public Administration." In R. Baker (ed.). *Comparative Public Management: Putting US Public Policy and Implementation in Context*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 67-91.
- Phillips, C. 2013. *Everyday Arab Identity: The Daily Reproduction of the Arab World*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Potter, L. and G. Sick (eds). 2002. *Security in the Persian Gulf: Origins, Obstacles, and the Search for Consensus*. New York: Palgrave.
- Raadschelders, J. 2013. *Public Administration: The Interdisciplinary Study of Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, A. and J. Waterbury. 2008. *A Political Economy of the Middle East*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Riggs, F. 1991. "Public Administration: A Comparativist Framework." *Public Administration Review* 51(6), 473-477.
- Riggs, F. 1970. "The Idea of Development Administration." In E. Weidner (ed.). *Development Administration in Asia*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 25-72.
- Rimer, E. 1992. "Early Lessons on Teaching Comparative Public Policy in an Interdependent World." *SPAE Forum* 3(1), 4-5.
- Rodwell, S. 1998. "Internationalisation or Indigenisation or Educational Management Development? Some Issues of Cross-Cultural Transfer." *Comparative Education* 34(1), 41-54.
- Roeder, P. 1994. "Varieties of Post-Soviet Authoritarian Regimes." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 10(1), 74-78.
- Rugh, A. 2007. *The Political Culture of Leadership in the United Arab Emirates*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ryan, R. 1994. "The Importance of Comparative Study in Educating the US Public Service." In R. Baker (ed.) *Comparative Public Management: Putting US Public Policy and Implementation in Context*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 23-35.
- Ryan, R. 1990. "The Internationalization of Domestic Policy Issues: Will Public Affairs/Administration Respond?" *International Journal of Public Administration* 13(1-2), 127-153.
- Said, E. 2004. *Humanism and Democratic Criticism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Said, E. 1993. *Culture & Imperialism*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Schaebler, B. and L. Stenberg (eds). 2004. *Globalization and the Muslim World: Culture, Religion, and Modernity*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Schlumberger, O. (ed.). 2007. *Debating Arab Authoritarianism: Dynamics and Durability in Nondemocratic Regimes*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Sharfuddin, I. 1987. "Toward an Islamic Administrative Theory." *American Journal of Islamic Social Science* 4(2), 229-244.
- Sherwani, H. 1981. *Muslim Political Thought and Administration*. New Delhi: Munhshiram Manoharlal.
- Shilliam, R. (ed.). 2011. *International Relations and Non-Western Thought: Imperi-*

- alism, Colonialism and Investigations of Global Modernity*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Sick, G. and L. Potter (eds). 2002. *Security in the Persian Gulf: Origins, Obstacles and the Search for Consensus*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, L.T. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Suleiman, Y. 2011. *Arabic, Self and Identity: A Study in Conflict and Displacement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Talani, L. 2014. *The Arab Spring in the Global Political Economy*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tampio, N. 2012. *Kantian Courage: Advancing the Enlightenment in Contemporary Political Theory*. Bronx, NY: Fordham University Press.
- Thomas, A. 2008. "Focus Groups in Qualitative Research: Culturally Sensitive Methodology for the Arabian Gulf?" *International Journal of Research and Method in Education* 31(1), 77-88.
- Tickner, A. and D. Blaney (eds). 2012. *Thinking International Relations Differently*. London: Routledge.
- Trompenaars, F. and C. Hampden-Turner. 2012. *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business*. London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Trompenaars, F. and C. Hampden-Turner. 2004. *Managing People across Cultures*. Chichester: Capstone Publishing.
- Tschirgi, N., M. Lund and F. Mancini (eds). 2010. *Security & Development: Searching for Critical Connections*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Tucker, R. 1990. "A World Transformed: 1989 and All That." *Foreign Affairs* 69(4), 93-114.
- Turner, M. and D. Hulme. 1997. *Governance, Administration and Development: Making the State Work*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- UNESCO. 2001. "Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity." Available at http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13179&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html (accessed 28 August 2014).
- Van Wart, M. and N. Cayer. 1990. "Comparative Public Administration: Defunct, Dispersed or Redefined?" *Public Administration Review* 50(2), 238-248.
- Ventriss, C. 1989. "The Internationalization of Public Administration and Public Policy: Implications for Teaching." *Policy Studies Review* 8(4), 898-903.
- Wacquant, L. 2005. *Pierre Bourdieu and Democratic Politics: The Mystery of Ministry*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Waldo, D. 1968. *Comparative Public Administration: Prologue, Problems, and Promise*. Washington DC: American Society for Public Administration.
- Walter, M. and C. Anderson. 2013. *Indigenous Statistics: A Quantitative Research Methodology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Weber, M. 1968. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Wildavsky, B. 2010. *The Great Brain Race: How Global Universities are Reshaping the World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zubaida, S. 2003. *Law and Power in the Islamic World*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Eugenie A. Samier

EUGENIE A. SAMIER is Associate Professor of Administrative and Leadership studies at the British University in Dubai. Her current research is on Islamic and Arab administrative traditions, globalised education as a cultural security problem and curricular development in PA suitable for Islamic contexts. Correspondence: Eugenie A. Samier, Faculty of Education, The British University in Dubai, 1st & 2nd Floor, Block 11 Dubai International Academic City (DIAC), PO Box 45015, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; E-mail: eugenie.samier@gmail.com