

Internationalism and globalization as contexts for international education

James Cambridge* & Jeff Thompson

University of Bath, UK

A problem with the construction of an inclusive definition of international education is that the word 'international' has a variety of connotations. It is proposed that the term 'international education' is ambiguous because it appears to refer to contrasting usages in educational studies. International education is frequently discussed in the context of the related field of comparative education, but a different sense of the term has also developed in the context of the theory and practice of education in international schools and other institutions. This paper compares and contrasts the different usages of the term 'international education'. It also discusses internationalism and globalization as contexts for international education, as practised in international schools and other institutions, particularly with reference to the history and programmes of the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO).

Keywords: *Globalization; International education; Internationalism*

Introduction

'International education' is an ambiguous term because it is used in a variety of ways. When coupled in the string 'international and comparative education', it refers to an academic discipline involved with making international comparisons between educational systems. More recently, the term has been used to denote an ideology of education oriented towards 'internationalism' and 'international-mindedness' and the education offered by international schools. Nonetheless, there has been overlap historically between the two approaches to the definition of international education. This paper concentrates on the second approach to international education and proposes that it takes on contrasting forms in response to ideologies of internationalism and globalization. These variants are identified as 'internationalist international education' or 'education for international-mindedness', and 'globalist international education'. The international marketplace is varied because clients have contrasting expectations and needs. The values of these ideological variants are in contradiction and therefore the practice of international education involves the reconciliation of the dilemma between the two approaches.

This paper begins with a discussion of the different meanings associated with the

*Corresponding author: International Baccalaureate Research Unit, Department of Education, University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath BA2 7AY, UK. Email: jimc@ibo.org

term 'international education'. Various interpretations of the ideology of internationalism are explored as contexts for the practice of international education. This is followed by a discussion of the ways in which contrasting interpretations of globalization may also be understood as contexts for international education. In conclusion, the 'internationalist' and 'globalist' interpretations of international education are compared and contrasted.

What is international education?

International education is often discussed in the context of the related field of comparative education, but a different sense of the term has also developed in the context of the theory and practice of education for 'international-mindedness' in international schools and other institutions. Comparative education emerges from a strong theoretical tradition of academic studies making comparisons between national systems, but international education is 'more explicitly applied and action-oriented' (Crossley, 1999, p. 255). This places international education in the context of international development aid and the transfer of expertise between national systems of education. Watson (1999) similarly identifies comparative education with theoretical studies and international education with application and practice, but also recognizes a distinctive ideology of internationalism that seeks to develop international attitudes and awareness. This distinction is also recognized by Lowe (1998, pp. 18–19) who argues that the definition of international education 'in common currency ... in universities has largely derived from a practical involvement in education in developing countries', but he adds that, in the University of Bath particularly, the term 'has become established in a less common sense in the context of ... involvement with the International Schools movement'. The use of the term to describe the work—and study—of international schools is acknowledged by Crossley and Watson (2003), who identify the role of international schools in the preparation of students for 'employment anywhere in the world' and the development of 'an understanding of different countries, as well as good relations with people of different nationalities and languages' (p. 14). However, there is no direct correspondence between international education and the curriculum and assessment arrangements offered by international schools because it has been argued that an international school may offer an education that makes no claims to be international, while an international education may be experienced by a student who has not attended a school that describes itself as international (Hayden & Thompson, 1995).

The International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) has been central to the development of international education in a practical context. The IBO was founded in Geneva, Switzerland in 1968 as a non-profit educational foundation. Its original purpose was to facilitate the international mobility of students preparing for university by providing schools with a curriculum and diploma qualification recognized by universities around the world. Since then its mission has expanded, and it now seeks to make an IB education available to students of all ages. The IB Diploma Programme aims to provide students with a truly international education that encourages an understanding and appreciation of other cultures, languages and

points of view. To this end, students are required to select a balanced range of options from six subject groups and complete a core programme comprising the theory of knowledge (TOK) course, an extended essay and the creativity, action, service (CAS) component. Schools that first offered the IB diploma were predominantly private international schools, but they included some private national institutions and schools belonging to state education departments. This has changed over the years, and now 43% of all diploma schools may be identified as state schools. In 1994 the IBO added the Middle Years Programme (MYP), a curriculum for students aged 11–16, and in 1997 it adopted the Primary Years Programme (PYP) for students aged 3–11. As with the Diploma Programme, the MYP and PYP seek to provide students with an international perspective and critical thinking skills.

The history of the development of the IBO, as related by Leach (1969), Peterson (1987), Goormaghtigh (1989), Blackburn (1991), Renaud (1991), Fox (1998), Hill (2002) and others, may be interpreted as an attempt to create a novel curriculum intended to develop international attitudes and awareness, with foundations in the academic, research-based, interdisciplinary tradition of comparative education. Peterson (1977) underlined this view by describing the IB Diploma Programme as ‘applied comparative education’.

Contrasting interpretations of the term ‘international education’, as not only a practical development of comparative education but also a philosophy of education informed by an ideology of international understanding, appear to have been recognized as early as the nineteenth century. Sylvester (2002) cites an article discussing ‘International Education’ published in 1864 by the novelist Charles Dickens in his weekly periodical *All the Year Round*. Sylvester also relates that an international school with students of many nationalities was established near Isleworth, Middlesex in 1866 under the patronage of free trade Radicals who included Richard Cobden, a founder of the Anti-Corn Law League, among their number. It is evident that the dual aspirations for international understanding and global free trade have formed the ideology of international education since its inception.

Leach (1969) observed that the *Year book of education 1964*, on education and international life, contained a chapter that discussed international schools, using the International School of Geneva as an example. That school was founded in 1924 to serve the needs of the employees of the League of Nations (Peterson, 1987; Walker, 2000). The League of Nations was seen at its foundation as an ambitious experiment in internationalism and the promotion of international understanding. At that time, many saw internationalism as a harbinger of greater fraternity, more tolerance and secure peace. ‘This remains the classic view behind international education as it arose out of the ashes of World War I’ (Goodings & Lauwerys, 1964, p. 78). The ‘classic view’ may also be recognized in the assertion by Leach (1969), who taught history at the International School of Geneva, that ‘nationalism serves as the greatest divider of human kind’ (p. 5). It appears that this was the prevailing view in the United World Colleges movement, too. Robert Blackburn, a former deputy headmaster of the United World College of the Atlantic and Deputy Director General of the IBO, proposed that ‘education must be used as a tool to break down the barriers of race, religion and class which separate our students’ (Jonietz, 1991, p. 222).

However, a dilemma was recognized between pragmatism, expressed in terms of the development of an academic qualification that would be widely accepted for university entrance throughout the world, and ideological principles of peace and international understanding. Peterson (1987) observed that the International Baccalaureate had been criticized as being 'too dominated by the demands of university entrance, not genuinely international enough, too Western-oriented and too academic' (p. 199). He suggested that 'it would have seemed natural that such criticisms should have come mainly from the United World Colleges. They have, in terms of their foundation, the more positive commitment to international action'. This view of the United World Colleges as a cadre of ideologically internationalist institutions was amplified by Blackburn, who stated that they 'were not set up for any practical need but to further a particular educational and international philosophy that educational barriers can be broken down and that internationalism can be made effective at the 18 + age. There is a different motive between the UWC and many of the other schools' (Jonietz, 1991, p. 220).

We propose that international education, as currently practised, is the reconciliation of a dilemma between ideological and pragmatic interests. The ideological 'internationalist' current of international education may be identified with a progressive view of education that is concerned with the moral development of the individual by attempting to influence the formation of positive attitudes towards peace, international understanding and responsible world citizenship. The pragmatic 'globalist' current of international education may be identified with the processes of economic and cultural globalization, expressed in terms of satisfying the increasing demands for educational qualifications that are portable between schools and transferable between education systems, and the spread of global quality standards through quality assurance processes such as accreditation.

Internationalism and international education

Leach (1969) identifies internationalism with the maintenance of relations between different countries, and describes three approaches to its application in the field of education:

- unilateral internationalism, such as a country concerned chiefly with the education of its own personnel away from home in a different country;
- bilateral internationalism, such as exchange between and among students of two countries, chiefly at university level; and
- multilateral internationalism, requiring funding from at least three national sources, no one of them dominant.

The presence of British and American community schools in various countries may be identified with the practice of unilateral internationalism. The opportunities for expatriate students to meet members of the host country community may be restricted for linguistic, cultural or political reasons. It may be argued that the unilateral approach promotes international relations in a very limited sense because it leads to the development of schools with an 'encapsulated' mission of delivering

the curriculum of one country transplanted in a different national context (Sylvester, 1998). They provide some globally mobile expatriates with a 'cultural bubble' (Pearce, 1994a) by isolating their children's educational environment from exposure to local culture. Leach (1969) notes that such schools 'are devoted to preparing their students for rapid integration into the life of the nation of origin at whatever point their clientele goes home' (p. 9).

Bilateral internationalism creates opportunities for exchange visits between students in different countries. One example is the Rhodes scholarship, established in the will (1899) of Cecil Rhodes to bring to Oxford University young men from the British Commonwealth and the USA, and first awarded in 1903. Rhodes hoped to establish close ties among an Anglo-Saxon elite to 'secure the peace of the world' (Aydelotte, 1946). Another example is the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) programme that brings university graduates from other nations to work throughout Japan in state schools and government offices. However, bilateral internationalism may also be limited in its scope; the outcome of the JET programme has been criticized as being 'differential internationalisation' because 'to achieve greater international status, the Japanese feel they must concentrate on their relations with Western countries' (McConnell, 2000, p. 51).

Multilateral internationalism in education may be identified in schools 'founded by joint action of two or more governments or national groupings' (Leach, 1969, p. 9). Examples of such institutions are the international schools associated with the United Nations Organisation (Walker, 2000) and the European schools founded as a result of multilateral action of members of the European Union. However, the European schools 'draw a sharp distinction between themselves and international schools. This is partly due to their position as pioneers in achieving inter-state financial backing and partly because they do not pretend to be more than European' (Leach, 1969, p. 9). Nonetheless, 'these schools do not allow everybody to benefit from them. They were founded for the children of parents working for European [Union] institutions, and only when there are places available can other children be enrolled' (Jonckers, 2000, p. 46).

An 'international' school may serve a clientele from a variety of countries, but to what extent does it encourage education for international understanding? Röhrs (1970, p. 125) identifies international education with education for international-mindedness, having the aim of producing students 'willing and able to understand other nations'. Hill (1994) argues that schools may promote an international ethos by 'preparing students for global citizenship by building on the principles of tolerance, international co-operation, justice and peace'. Leach's (1969) approach to internationalism appears to be informed by the context of international relations, which is understandable because he was writing as a teacher in an international school associated with the United Nations Organisation in the 1960s. He points out a distinction between the outlooks of 'international' and 'internationally minded' schools. Many schools in national systems serve students of a variety of nationalities but they are not necessarily internationally minded, whereas there are 'a number of privately financed and some state-operated schools of an élite order in most developed countries which pride themselves on being internationally minded' and

are 'usually composed of students of one nationality, or mostly of one' (Leach, 1969, p. 7).

How are Leach's three categories of internationalism to be interpreted critically? It may be argued that they represent different approaches to the management of international relations. Unilateral internationalism, in which an expatriate community imports its own educational culture to serve its needs, is the expression of a lack of confidence in the indigenous educational system of the host country (Pearce, 2003). The reasons for this position are varied and may include language, religious, cultural and political differences. Members of an expatriate community may see no value accruing from their engagement with the cultures of the host country. Kadel (2002) discusses the concept of contamination as a social construction in the context of international relations and development aid projects. It may be the case that the expatriates do not wish their young to be 'contaminated' by the culture of education system of the host country. On the other hand, the indigenous community may not wish to be 'contaminated' by the expatriates, so that the international school might be confined within the perimeter fence of an expatriate compound. This may be interpreted not only as a strategy that is a product of suspicion and misunderstanding between nations, but also as one that is likely to breed such feelings.

What if the members of one community wish to engage with the culture of another country? A strategy informed by bilateral internationalism would encourage cultural exchanges between communities. International exchanges are a means not only of importing knowledge of the cultures of other countries, but also of exporting knowledge of one national culture to another. This may not be entirely benign because it is evident that bilateral internationalism has been deployed as a Cold War weapon. Peterson (1987) relates that he had experience in psychological warfare against communist insurgency in Malaya that contributed to the formation of his ideas about citizenship and 'patriotic education'. Sutcliffe (1991, p. 27) discusses a role of the United World Colleges as 'fighting the Cold War by other means'. A rich country could earn—or buy—the support of the ruling class of a poor country by educating the children of its political and economic elite. Such a perspective is criticized by Röhrs (1970, p. 125) as 'the negative aspect of nationalistic interests camouflaged as internationalism and ... the abuse of international education for nationalistic missionarying'.

What of multilateral internationalism? The majority of international schools operate in a variety of local contexts. Usually students do not travel very far to attend an international school because they reside with their parents, who are expatriates working in a country that is not their home, and attend an international school in their locality or in a nearby city. In the case of a small state an international school might serve a whole country. It may be argued that the only schools offering an international education that really operate in a multilateral context are some of the United World Colleges, particularly those institutions that are wholly residential. These colleges have a policy of student recruitment from all countries in the world, and the students are often funded by scholarships raised from charitable donations to national committees (Sutcliffe, 1991; Wilkinson, 1998). In this case, the students do not attend a school because they happen to reside in that particular country with

their parents but, instead, they leave home and move to another country specifically to attend a school offering an international education. These institutions have a global catchment area for student recruitment. However, while the market for most international schools is confined to the locality of each, it may be argued that the curricula they offer are global because they are also available to students of many nationalities in other schools in different countries.

International education may be viewed as a means of changing the world by increasing international understanding through bringing together young people from many different countries. This approach is associated with the educational philosophy of Kurt Hahn, the founder of Schule Schloss Salem, Germany, and Gordonstoun School, Scotland, who inspired *Outward Bound* and the United World Colleges movement. Hahn was profoundly influenced by his involvement in the conduct of the peace negotiations on the German side in Versailles at the end of the Great War (McLachlan, 1970; Peterson, 1987; Sutcliffe, 1991). His vision of education was based on a strong commitment to service, with an emphasis on experiential learning and ‘character building’ (Price, 1970). Skidelsky (1969) interprets Hahn’s philosophy in the context of English progressive education because of its emphasis on experiential learning and an existentialist appeal to the moral development of the person. As Bacon (1993, pp. 98–99) explains:

Hahn was less concerned with the academic achievements of his students than with their attitudes, ambitions and perceptions; instead he focused his energies on the kinds of people who would emerge from his schools. He perceived youth to be surrounded by the decay of care and skill, the lack of enterprise and adventure, and the loss of compassion. He believed that ‘the aim of education is to impel people into value forming experiences ... [and] to ensure the survival of these qualities: an enterprising curiosity, an undefeatable spirit, tenacity in pursuit, readiness for sensible self-denial, and above all, compassion.’ In addition, his pupils were challenged by the physical stresses of athletics, by the exercise of patience in tasks of craftsmanship, and by an expedition on land and water.

This view of education emphasizes the personal development of the individual in affective rather than cognitive terms. It also sees education in terms of being a process rather than as a product. This interpretation appears to be borne out in a case study of the United World College of the Atlantic (Rawlings, 2000, p. 365) that proposes that international education is ‘a transformative discourse which locates all fields of enquiry in a supra-national frame of reference and upholds the cause of peace’. This style of internationally minded education, with its foundations in service and global citizenship, may be interpreted as a response to the existence of poverty and political oppression in the world. The influence of Hahn’s educational thought persists to the present day in the IB Diploma Programme in terms of its compulsory core components; the Theory of Knowledge (TOK), the Extended Essay, and Creativity, Action, Service (CAS)—a programme that creates a context for learners to contribute to the community through their actions (Thompson *et al.*, 2003). Nonetheless, the practice of international education may also be interpreted as a response to emerging affluence and entry into the global consumer economy. Pasternak (1998, p. 257) identifies social distribution of power as an important

factor in the definition of international education as ‘an open system in the global village created by those elements in power positions in their societies in order to perpetuate their values’. This is qualified by the observation that the concept of an open system ‘suggests some interaction with local communities but the knowledge, skills and attitudes models delivered are nearly always western European or North American in origin’. This is a theme that will be explored in the discussion of globalization and international education that follows.

Globalization and international education

An alternative to Leach’s perspective is to explain international education in a global sociological context that takes into account ‘economic, political and cultural-ideological transnational practices’ (Sklair, 1991). Sklair identifies an ideology that is ‘inclusively internationalist, and promotes the common human characteristics of all who share the planet’ (p. 24), and which is ‘best labelled’ democratic socialist feminism; ‘its ideal of human comradeship is based on the belief that the survival of humanity is incompatible with capitalist exploitation, imperialism and the patriarchal nation-state’. However, Sklair observes that ‘global capitalism produces the material conditions for socialism, but closes down the political and cultural-ideological space for it’. From this perspective, it is evident that the practice of international education will be shaped by the transnational practices that are identified with the processes of globalization. Arguments about internationalism are explicit about the values they promote, whereas arguments about globalization are often claimed to be value-free, although they too are laden with implicit values. Jones (1998, p. 143) recognizes this tension between globalization and internationalism, arguing that

Globalisation is seen as economic integration, achieved in particular through the establishment of a global marketplace marked by free trade and a minimum of regulation. In contrast, internationalism refers to the promotion of global peace and well-being through the development and application of international structures, primarily but not solely of an intergovernmental kind. Despite important conceptual difficulties in formulating the case for internationalism and despite the world’s patchy record of putting its principles into effect, the essentially pro-democratic logic of internationalism stands in sharp contrast to the logic of globalisation.

The history of international schools and international education appears to support Jones’ perspective. As was noted above, some of the earliest international schools, such as the International School of Geneva and the United Nations International School New York, were founded in connection with the League of Nations and its successor the United Nations Organisation (Walker, 2000). Internationalism in international education does appear to spring from international relations and the explicit need to foster an aspiration for world peace and understanding between nations. However, it may be argued that, besides harbouring such internationalist aspirations, international education is also part of the process of economic globalization. International schools are ‘a free market response to a global need’ (Pearce, 1994b, p. 28). Not only is international education influenced by globalization but it also facilitates the spread of free market values. Indeed, the presence in a country of a

school offering international education may introduce competition with the national educational system. Thus, the ideological underpinning of international education as currently practised constitutes the reconciliation of a dilemma between the contrary trends of cooperation through international relations and competition through economic globalization. On the other hand, such a view may present a false dichotomy between internationalism and globalization because proponents of globalization see the process as a force for world peace. Take, for example, the doctrine of 'the Golden Arches theory of conflict prevention' that no two countries, both of which have at least one McDonald's franchise, have ever gone to war (Friedman, 1999, pp. 248–275). The bombing by NATO forces of Belgrade, which has at least one McDonald's outlet, forms an exception to this theory (Lloyd, 1999), but in general the globalization of trade has led to an unprecedented period without armed conflict—at least for some regions.

Globalization has been described in terms of 'the widening, deepening and speeding up of world-wide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life' (Held *et al.*, 1999, p. 2). It is 'a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions—assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact—generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power' (Held *et al.*, 1999, p. 16). Three contrasting currents in globalization are identified by this source; the sceptical, hyperglobalist and transformationalist theses.

Globalization sceptics draw a distinction between globalization and the internationalization of trade. They argue that historical evidence indicates that the world is not becoming a single market but that it is the development of regional economic blocs and the facilitation of trade between countries that has extended. For the sceptics, the economic era in which the Gold Standard between national currencies prevailed represents a far more globalized economic system than exists today. Internationalization and globalization are contradictory trends, since international trade is strengthened by the existence of nation states whose policies actively regulate and promote it. The formation of regional trading blocs results in two classes of countries; 'insiders' which are members of the blocs, and 'outsiders' which are not. The increasing internationalization of trade between some countries has led to the marginalization of others, notably the poor economies of the Southern Hemisphere. Against this analysis, the diffusion of international schools as encapsulated outposts of 'other' national cultures has led to the development of international education as a pragmatic response to economic circumstances where an institution serving a single national grouping is unviable. Globally mobile communities of workers from different countries must pool their educational resources.

For the hyperglobalists, history and economics have come together at the end of the twentieth century to create a new order of relations in which states are either converging economically and politically, or are being made irrelevant by the activities of transnational business. Sklair (2001) describes this in terms of 'the establishment of a borderless global economy, the complete denationalization of all corporate procedures and activities, and the eradication of economic nationalism' (p. 3). Economic policies are determined more by markets than by governments and, in the

economically developed portions of the world at least, the telecommunications media have facilitated the spread of globalized mass culture. We wear the same fashions and watch the same television shows while grazing on the same fast foods—‘the equalising promise of the logo-linked globe’ (Klein, 2000, p. xvii). The hyperglobalist trend towards the formation of one single world order is represented in international education by the aspiration for a system of education that transcends national frontiers. When the needs of a mobile clientele with a high rate of turnover are considered, it is evident that international education should provide continuity in terms of portability between schools and transferability between national systems of education. International education has been interpreted as the equivalent of ‘a Big Mac and a Coke’—a globally branded product that conforms to the same quality standards in all countries (Cambridge, 2002). Like the providers of other globally branded products, schools offering international education must provide a reliable service throughout the world. This is supported by the quality assurance conferred by participation in such curriculum and assessment organizations as the IBO, Cambridge International Examinations (CIE) and the US-based College Board, and through accreditation by various US-based accrediting agencies and by international schools organizations such as the European Council of International Schools (ECIS). Murphy (1998) proposes that being found worthy of accreditation by experienced colleagues is a source of satisfaction to schools, and that ‘peripatetic parents are becoming familiar with the process of accreditation and are beginning to feel that placing their children in an unexamined school is a risk they do not wish to take’ (p. 223).

To adherents of the transformationalist thesis of globalization, reference to the hyperglobal spread of markets throughout the world or economic marginalization of whole countries is unjustifiable because ‘the familiar core-periphery hierarchy is no longer a geographic but a social division of the world economy ... North and South, First World and Third World are no longer “out there” but nestled within all the world’s major cities’ (Held *et al.*, 1999, p. 8). Globalization is a process that involves both integration and fragmentation. In many less developed countries, schools offering international education provide opportunities for the children of the socio-economic elite of the host country to turn their backs on their own educational system and embrace the values of the economically developed world. Many of these people may be identified as members of the transnational capitalist class (TCC) who ‘see their own interests, and/or the interests of their nation, as best served by an identification with the interests of the capitalist global system, in particular the interests of the countries of the capitalist core and the transnational corporations domiciled in them. The TCC holds certain transnational practices to be more valuable than domestic practices’ (Sklair, 1991, p. 8). International education may be identified as one of these ‘transnational practices’ assisting in the maintenance of the privileged position of the transnational capitalist class, both locally and globally. Lowe (2000, pp. 24–25) interprets the high rate of increase in the number of schools offering international qualifications as ‘a response by local élites to a stiffening of the local positional competition on the one hand and a globalisation of that competition on the other’. He explains that ‘as more people gain local qualifications, those who

can afford to do so seek a new competitive edge by taking qualifications that they hope will give them a local advantage. At the same time, it is hoped that these international qualifications will give access to a labour market that is becoming increasingly globalised'.

This has important implications for comparative educational studies. Watson (1999) observes that, whereas the unit of study for comparative education up to now has been the national system, it may be more appropriate to make comparisons involving other categories in an age of accelerating globalization. As a consequence, there is a continuing need for an understanding of the economic aspects of education. This may be in terms not only of the public and private financing of education, but also the impact of vocational education and training upon labour markets. Nonetheless, Watson argues that there is a need to look beyond the economic thinking that has 'dominated approaches to education in terms of policies, funding, curriculum development, planning and the like' on the grounds that 'the cultural, moral, religious and idealistic dimensions' (p. 242) have been overlooked.

Jones (1998) discusses three patterns of globalization comprising economic, political and cultural globalization. Among other attributes, 'a deterritorialised religious mosaic' and 'deterritorialised cosmopolitanism and diversity' are identified as features of cultural globalization, alongside 'global distribution of images and information'. As a feature of political globalization, Jones identifies 'an absence of state sovereignty and multiple centres of power at global, local and intermediate levels'. International education, and those schools in which it is practised, may be interpreted as contributing to this 'deterritorialised cosmopolitanism and diversity' in which students in geographically dispersed schools share common experiences mediated through a common curriculum which is independent of the country within which they are presently located. Indeed, it appeared to be on the grounds of erosion of national sovereignty that Dr Nick Tate, then Chief Executive of the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority in England, described the International Baccalaureate as 'pushing globalisation one big step further forward' in an interview in *The Times* newspaper in January 2000.

It is evident that schools where international education is practised are frequently sites of cultural pluralism and multiculturalism, either because of the diversity of nationalities represented among the students or because of the synthesis of a 'third culture' from the collision between expatriate and host country cultures (Useem, 1976; Langford, 1998). It may be argued that schools in different countries that share a common international curriculum will also share common values. Teachers and students in schools offering international education may have plural national origins, which they express and celebrate in terms of national costumes, food and festivals but they may also show convergence in their educational values. Mattern (1991, p. 214) describes this as 'the mix-and-stir approach to international education'. In the memorable phrase of Zaw (1996, p. 128), multiculturalism in education can be 'a substantial monoculturalism as to values, mitigated by tolerance of exotic detail'. In other words, diversity in some aspects of the practice of international education is decreased by the global diffusion of quality standards but enhanced and celebrated in other areas of practice (Cambridge, 2003). The problem may be that international education enhances and celebrates cultural diversity only

in its exotic and peripheral ‘saris, samosas and steel bands’ components (Pasternak, 1998, p. 260). This is an idea that appears to have wider currency because, in the context of international business, Klein (2000, p. 117) describes the tendency of global branding of commodities to promote cultural homogeneity as ‘mono-multi-culturalism’. It may be argued that an outcome of globalist international education is global cultural convergence towards the values of the ‘transnational capitalist class’. Participants in international education may show cultural convergence either as members of that class or as its servants. Cambridge (1998) argues that the staff recruitment policies of an international school may be expected to reinforce convergence between the values of the teachers and its normative organizational culture.

‘Internationalist’ and ‘globalist’ international education

International education is a contested field of educational practice involving the reconciliation of economic, political and cultural/ideological dilemmas. One current identifies international education with international development aid and the transfer of expertise between national systems of education. Another identifies international education with the development of international attitudes, international awareness, international-mindedness and international understanding. However, competing ‘globalist’ and ‘internationalist’ perspectives may be identified within this view.

International education may be identified with:

- a transplanted national system serving expatriate clients of that country located in another country;
- a transplanted national system serving clients from another country;
- a simulacrum of a transplanted national educational system, for example the programmes of the IBO, serving expatriate clients and/or host country nationals; and
- an ideology of international understanding and peace, responsible world citizenship and service (Cambridge & Thompson, 2001).

International education is ambiguous and contradictory. Forms of international education offer ways of having more intimate contact with the world whilst insulating oneself from it. It celebrates cultural diversity whilst tending towards the development of monoculture. International education provides a framework for existential, experiential learning whilst providing a framework for global certification of educational achievement, further extending the ‘diploma disease’ (Dore, 1976). It encourages positive attitudes to community service, global citizenship and meritocratic competition whilst it is used as a means of enhancing positional competition and personal economic advancement. The dual aspirations for international understanding and global free trade appear to have been part of the ideology of international education from its inception. The aspirations seen in international education, as it is currently practised, were also found in its nineteenth-century antecedents.

The globalist approach to international education is influenced by and contributes

to the global diffusion of the values of free market economics. These are expressed in international education in terms of an ideology of meritocratic competition combined with positional competition with national systems of education. This is accompanied by quality assurance through international accreditation and the spread of global quality standards that facilitate educational continuity for the children of the globally mobile clientele. Globalized international education serves a market that requires the global certification of educational qualifications. This facilitates educational continuity for the children of the host country clientele with aspirations towards social and global mobility. An outcome of globalist international education is global cultural convergence towards the values of the transnational capitalist class.

The internationalist approach to the practice of international education is founded upon international relations, with aspirations for the promotion of peace and understanding between nations. It embraces a progressive existential and experiential educational philosophy that values the moral development of the individual and recognizes the importance of service to the community and the development of a sense of responsible citizenship. Internationalist international education celebrates cultural diversity and promotes an international-minded outlook.

The 'internationalist' and 'globalist' approaches are rarely seen in their pure forms. International education as it is practised in international schools is the reconciliation of these contrasting approaches. Schools that offer international education appear to be heterogeneous because each reconciliation is unique to the historical, geographical and economic circumstances of each institution.

References

- www.ibo.org/
www.jetprogramme.org
- Aydelotte, F. (1946) *The American Rhodes scholarships: a review of the first forty years* (London, Geoffrey Cumberledge).
- Bacon, S. (1983) *The conscious use of metaphor in Outward Bound* (Denver, CO, Outward Bound School).
- Blackburn, R. (1991) The International Baccalaureate: a curriculum at upper secondary level and a university entrance examination, in: P. Jonietz & D. Harris (Eds) *World yearbook of education 1991: international schools and international education* (London, Kogan Page).
- Cambridge, J. C. (1998) Investigating national and organizational cultures in the context of the International School, in: M. C. Hayden & J. J. Thompson (Eds) *International education: principles and practice* (London, Kogan Page).
- Cambridge, J. C. (2002) Global product branding and international education, *Journal of Research in International Education*, 1(2), 227–243.
- Cambridge, J. C. (2003) Identifying the globalist and internationalist missions of international schools, *International Schools Journal*, XXII(2), 54–58.
- Cambridge, J. C. & Thompson, J. J. (2001) Internationalism, international-mindedness, multiculturalism and globalisation as concepts defining international schools. Unpublished paper. Available online at: <http://staff.bath.ac.uk/edsjcc/intmindedness.html> (accessed 22 September 2003).
- Crossley, M. (1999) Reconceptualising comparative and international education, *Compare*, 29(3), 249–267.

- Crossley, M. & Watson, K. (2003) *Comparative and international research in education: globalisation, context and difference* (London, RoutledgeFalmer).
- Dore, R. (1976) *The Diploma Disease* (London, George Allen & Unwin).
- Fox, E. (1998) The emergence of the International Baccalaureate as an impetus for curriculum reform, in: M. C. Hayden & J. J. Thompson (Eds) *International education: principles and practice* (London, Kogan Page).
- Friedman, T. (1999) *The Lexus and the olive tree* (London, HarperCollins).
- Goodings, R. F. & Lauwerys, J. A. (1964) Education and international life, in: J. A. Lauwerys (1968) *Ideals and ideologies* (London, Evans Brothers).
- Goormaghtigh, J. (1989) From the Collegium Lucis to the International Baccalaureate. The Peterson Lecture, November (Geneva, International Baccalaureate Organization).
- Hayden, M. C. & Thompson, J. J. (1995) International schools and international education: a relationship reviewed, *Oxford Review of Education*, 21(3), 327–345.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. & Perraton, J. (1999) *Global transformations* (Oxford, Polity Press).
- Hill, I. (1994) *The International Baccalaureate: policy process in education*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Tasmania.
- Hill, I. (2002) The history of international education: an International Baccalaureate perspective, in: M. C. Hayden, J. J. Thompson & G. Walker (Eds) *International education in practice* (London, Kogan Page).
- Interview with Nick Tate (2000, January 5) *The Times*, p. 38.
- Jonckers, R. (2000) The European school model part II, *International Schools Journal* XX(1), 45–50.
- Jones, P. (1998) Globalisation and internationalism: democratic prospects for world education, *Comparative Education*, 34(2), 143–155.
- Jonietz, P. (1991) A philosophy of international education—an interview with Robert Blackburn, Deputy Director of the International Baccalaureate Office, London, 25 September 1989, in: P. Jonietz & D. Harris (Eds) *World yearbook of education 1991: international schools and international education* (London, Kogan Page).
- Kadel, E. (2002) Contamination: crossing social borders, *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(1), 33–42.
- Klein, N. (2000) *No logo* (London, Flamingo).
- Langford, M. (1998) Global nomads, third culture kids and international schools, in: M. C. Hayden & J. J. Thompson (Eds) *International education: principles and practice* (London, Kogan Page).
- Leach, R. (1969) *International schools and their role in the field of international education* (Oxford, Pergamon Press).
- Lloyd, J. (1999) Like a Dallas Cowboys cheerleader, *London Review of Books*, 21(7), 11–14.
- Lowe, J. (1998) International and comparative education, *International Schools Journal* XVII(2), 18–21.
- Lowe, J. (2000) Assessment and educational quality: implications for international schools, in: M. C. Hayden & J. J. Thompson (Eds) *International schools and international education* (London, Kogan Page).
- Mattern, W. G. (1991) Random ruminations on the curriculum of the international school, in: P. Jonietz & D. Harris (Eds) *World yearbook of education 1991: international schools and international education* (London, Kogan Page).
- McConnell, D. (2000) *Importing diversity: inside Japan's JET program* (Berkeley, CA, University of California Press).
- McLachlan, D. (1970) Hahn, in: H. Röhrs (Ed.) *Kurt Hahn* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- Murphy, E. (1998) International school accreditation: who needs it? In: M. C. Hayden & J. J. Thompson (Eds) *International education: principles and practice* (London, Kogan Page).
- Pasternak, M. (1998) Is international education a pipe dream? A question of values, in: M. C. Hayden & J. J. Thompson (Eds) *International education: principles and practice* (London, Kogan Page).

- Pearce, R. (1994a) International schools: the multinational enterprises' best friends, *CBI Relation News*, 32, 8–9.
- Pearce, R. (1994b) Globalisation: learning from international schools, *Mobility*, November, 27–29.
- Pearce, R. (2003) Cultural values for international schools, *International Schools Journal*, XXII(2), 59–65.
- Peterson, A. D. C. (1977) Applied comparative education: the International Baccalaureate, *Comparative Education*, 13(2), 77–80.
- Peterson, A. D. C. (1987) *Schools across frontiers* (La Salle, IL, Open Court Books).
- Price, T. (1970) Some aspects of character-building, in: H. Röhrs (Ed.) *Kurt Hahn* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- Rawlings, F. (2000) Abstract of doctoral thesis: globalisation, curriculum and international communities: a case study of the United World College of the Atlantic, *International Journal of Educational Development*, 20, 365–366.
- Renaud, G. (1991) The International Schools Association (ISA): historical and philosophical background, in: P. Jonietz & D. Harris (Eds) *World yearbook of education 1991: international schools and international education* (London, Kogan Page).
- Röhrs, H. (1970) Responsibilities and problems of international education, *Comparative Education*, 6(2), 125–135.
- Skidelsky, R. (1969) *English progressive schools* (Harmondsworth, Pelican Books).
- Sklair, L. (1991) *Sociology of the global system* (London, Harvester Wheatsheaf).
- Sklair, L. (2001) *The transnational capitalist class* (Oxford, Blackwell).
- Sutcliffe, D. (1991) The United World Colleges, in: P. Jonietz & D. Harris (Eds) *World yearbook of education 1991: international schools and international education* (London, Kogan Page).
- Sylvester, R. (1998) Through the lens of diversity, in: M. C. Hayden & J. J. Thompson (Eds) *International education: principles and practice* (London, Kogan Page).
- Sylvester, R. (2002) The 'first' international school, in: M. C. Hayden, J. J. Thompson & G. Walker (Eds) *International education in practice* (London, Kogan Page).
- Thompson, J. J., Hayden, M. C. & Cambridge, J. C. (2003) Towards a structural typology for Baccalaureate-style curricula, in: T. Pound & G. Phillips (Eds) *The Baccalaureate: a model for curriculum reform* (London, Kogan Page).
- Useem, R. (1976) Third culture kids, *Today's Education*, 65(3), 103–105.
- Walker, G. (2000) Connecting the national to the global, in: M. C. Hayden & J. J. Thompson (Eds) *International schools and international education* (London, Kogan Page).
- Watson, K. (1999) Comparative educational research: the need for reconceptualisation and fresh insights, *Compare*, 29(3), 233–248.
- Wilkinson, D. (1998) International education: a question of access, in: M. C. Hayden & J. J. Thompson (Eds) *International education: principles and practice* (London, Kogan Page).
- Zaw, S. K. (1996) Locke and multiculturalism: toleration, relativism and reason, in: R. K. Fullinwider (Ed.) *Public education in a multicultural society* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Copyright of Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education is the property of Carfax Publishing Company and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.