Western University

Scholarship@Western

Education Publications

Education Faculty

2019

Framing International Education in Global Times

Paul Tarc
Western University, ptarc2@uwo.ca

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/edupub

Part of the Education Commons

Framing International Education in Global Times – WORKING PAPER
by Paul Tarc, PhD
ptarc2@uwo.ca

International education (IE) is a complex and historically-inflected term, which means that its meanings and uses shift in relation to larger geopolitical, economic and social conditions. Indeed, the ebb and flow of IE somewhat mirrors or follows the larger historical conditions of conflict, war, resolution, nationalisms, internationalisms and protectionisms as energized by the most powerful nation-states and blocs. In the 20th Century, in parallel with internationalist and peace movements, IE gained traction in the aftermath of large-scale war. One of the most radical institutional expressions of internationalism for its time—the League of Nations—emerged in the 1920s in the wake of the devastation and unresolved animosities of the First World War. The creation of the League of Nations and the International Labour Organization in Geneva Switzerland, produced the conditions for the birth of what is now considered the longest-running international school, the International School of Geneva. The next period where internationalism and international education peaked in the 1960s and early 1970s occurred, again, in the decades following a 'world war' with the reconstruction of Europe and the decolonization of European empires. During this post-WWII era the United Nations (UN) was formed, with UNESCO (United Nations Education, Science and Culture Organization) as the official multilateral promoter of international education. In 1966, President Johnson initiated the United States' adoption of the "International Education Act." The UN named 1970 as the "Year of International Education;" funding opportunities for IE peaked in the 1960s before the global financial crisis of the early 1970s (Tarc, 2009).

From the mid-1970s with the 'global' economic downturn and Reagan and Thatcher's neoliberal policy reforms, IE was in a downward trend, albeit still visible in states' 'soft power' strategies under cold war geopolitics (Sidhu, 2006). With the emergence of globalization came the contradictory effects of unifications and disintegrations, cosmopolitanisms and parochialisms, loss of economic autonomy and the rise of new national ethnos (Appadurai, 2006). Nevertheless, one can mark a key shift in the acceptability of international education precipitated by the collapse of the Soviet Union and bipolarity and thereby the unfettered reach of capitalism. From the early 1990s with notions of a 'new world order,' there was an opening up to internationalism and a new found space for articulations of international education as directed toward 'world citizenship.' In the last fifteen years, with the ascendency of neoliberal educational reforms and heightened interconnectedness through intensifying mobilities and telecommunication technologies, international education has found very fertile conditions for growth. Under these conditions of 'global times,' the opportunities for IE in the second decade of the 21st century seem unprecedented. Albeit, these new or expanded opportunities also come with significant risks and complications (Tarc, 2009). This entry represents both a definition of international education as dynamic phenomena in the world as well as an analytic framework for analyzing IE in global times; it begins with a working conceptualization of international education as formed and informed by its 20th century trajectory.

Across the last century, in the West and its peripheries, the term 'international education' carries with it two core semantic components as oriented by: (1) the literal/instrumental and (2) the aspirational/normative. Manifestations of IE are constituted by the interplay of these two core

meanings of (and agendas for) international education (Stier 2004; Tarc, 2009). Literally, *inter-national* education refers to educational activities that cross political borders. IE thus describes a whole array of activities where students, teachers, curricula, qualifications and 'best practices' are mobile, translated or connected up with actors, processes or structures across state educational jurisdictions. And clearly these activities have expanded in scale and frequency particularly in the last two decades of globalizing processes.

The other semantic component arises from the normative/aspirational or larger humanist and progressive set of idealist visions, which have motivated the many creators, supporters and advocates of international education. In the 20th century, in the West, these larger visions were founded on a liberal-humanist ideology that an outward (less-nationalistic), forward-looking and more child-centered model of education could help make a less-violent and more egalitarian world; in simplest terms, IE was cast as an education to foster "international understanding" that could lead to greater sympathy and peace between nations and groups as well as free up education itself from nationalist-serving agendas (Peterson, 1972). These two core roots of international education in the twentieth century continue to structure the meanings and uses of international education in the present.

The two roots of international education are inherently interdependent, as resonant and conflicting. In the first place, the literal definition of IE as an education that crosses political borders is already implicated in a wider (cultural) politics given schooling's conventional role in nation building. Education and formal schooling themselves contain a deparochializing aim of expanding students' understandings beyond their local conditions and experience. To be educated, is to be 'worldly.' In this regard, the tension between the particular and the larger/universal already is constitutive of education. However, given the geopolitical (Westphalian) order of the last few centuries, that 'larger' has been set at, and confined by, the *national* level. Thus international education, at least until quite recently, has also implied a challenge to state sovereignty within its citizenship mandate in schooling. Indeed one of the factors involved in the marginalization of international education for most of the 20th century, were the periodic attacks that international education was unpatriotic (Heater, 2002). Thus core internationalist visions of international education were partially expressed and informing manifestations of IE but remained tempered and constrained due to national and international politics (Tarc, 2009).

Additionally, even the more seemingly instrumental approaches to present-day internationalization of education often invoke the second aspirational meaning of IE. Sometimes the conditions of cross-societal/cultural educational initiatives effectively usher in the normative/aspirational visions and agendas by actors working on the ground level. At other times, demands for the idealist agendas come belatedly. One could consider, for example, the recruitment of international students in Western universities as founded solely on an instrumental logic of generating revenue. However, the actual practices of supporting and educating these international students on the ground, such that recruitment efforts might be sustainable, means that the idealist visions, as fostering intercultural understanding and respect, also find expression, if in a reactive fashion, in the goals of the program and curricula.

To probe further, the liberal-humanist/cosmopolitan vision of IE (the second root) was not a random outcome newly produced by a set of arbitrary actors connecting beyond their political borders, but a result of the ideological inclinations of the actors (as educators or internationalists) who were converging in multilateral spaces as a result of dissatisfaction with their own systems of education and/or nationalistic mindsets. For this reason, educators in international (multilateral) contexts may just as easily represent a set of like-minded progressives as a diverse set of actors representing or embodying their national educational systems/approaches (Mayer, 1968). Further this reality implies, in the context of IE initiatives in developing country contexts (often synonymous with "development education"), that the aspirational vision can represent much more a parochial Eurocentric/Western vision than some kind of truly open and egalitarian orientation. Thus IE as an alternative to national education can mean that on the one hand, procedurally, there is the bringing together of different perspectives to create, for example, a more open inter-national curriculum as in a world history syllabus or in setting international standards to facilitate student mobility (relatively an 'instrumental' task); On the other hand the 'international' of IE domains represents a new, convergent space of reform, which is not (necessarily) a place that values epistemic or inter-cultural difference. Finally, the idealist/aspirational visions of international education may be somewhat 'free-floating' in rhetorical discourse in 'safe' domains, as at a UNESCO roundtable. But the idealist visions themselves typically find a route for specific articulations and possible enactments under particular material conditions and pragmatic needs (Jones, 2000). Therefore, the idealist agendas of IE are co-dependent with the instrumental agendas.

In summary, where inter-national educational activities are initiated for pragmatic or instrumental reasons, many times there is an expectation, or an emergent demand, that the more idealist aims of international respect and understanding are worked at in the operationalization. In practical terms, wherever there are new demands for or initiatives of IE, there are opportunities for (and expectations of) enacting the aspirational goals as fostering international/intercultural cooperation, respect and understanding. Conversely, working to realize the more cosmopolitan and progressive aspirations of IE typically requires the set-up and maintenance of IE activities that have a practical use and are financially sustainable. In this way the literal/instrumental and the aspirational/normative are often different sides of the same coin.

For much of the 20th century, "education for international understanding" represented the overarching purpose of IE (Peterson, 1972; Renaud, 1974). And this normative/aspirational agenda, with updated terms as "intercultural understanding" (de Leo, 2010) "global citizenship" (Oxfam, 2006) or "international mindedness" (IBO, 2013) continues to be embedded in the meanings and practices of IE today. That is, the basic notion of an outward-looking education that can contribute to making a 'better' world in a context of global interdependence cuts across the many variants of international education. The embeddedness of the normative/aspirational is further evident by the frequent calling out of a growing set of international and transnational educational activities deemed antithetical to the goal of greater understanding and respect between nations or cultures. Indeed, that IE practices can be critiqued as 'contradictory' or 'antithetical' illustrates how the idealist visions remain tethered to manifestations of IE in the world. What have changed and are still evolving in the 21st century, are the increased depth and frequency of transnational/international educational activities as well as the altered conceptions

of the interdependencies of the instrumental and idealist agendas driving IE, particularly under neoliberal logics (Rizvi, 2007).

Key spokespersons of Unesco or IB might want to singularly define International Education by the idealist goal of an education for 'intercultural understanding' or 'international mindedness;' however the very material conditions that have spawned and have, at least, subtly shaped these definitions are the uni/multi-lateral character of their creation and operation (and the parochializing/de-parochializing mindsets of key actors) as shaped by colonial, financial and other competing instrumentalities. In this way the instrumental rationale and vision cannot be ignored as it affects how the aspirational (and the educational) is expressed and enacted. Now clearly there is a difference between university administrators reacting to the educational needs of international students after successfully recruiting them to the university as a revenue stream, and UNESCO's focus on international education to promote intercultural understanding and world peace. But the need to acknowledge and illuminate the dynamic relations between the more normative and instrumental visions in play are important in each case.

The co-dependence of the instrumental and idealist visions/agendas of IE is not to imply that one must accept undesirable forms of IE, but rather to press for nuanced analyses that can reveal the dynamics of *how* the instrumental and idealist agendas form and inform one another, across the levels of governance, policy, program, and practices. Such illumination promises not only better understanding of existing phenomena but offers insight into strategic responses and interventions to develop more self-reflexive, progressive and ethical practices of IE. Thus critiquing *that* an IE initiative is directed by instrumental or pragmatic logics may be accurate but of little impact. Most needed are analyses that illustrate, in a specific time-space conjuncture, *how* the instrumental agenda, for example, is specifically constraining or short-circuiting the realization of the aspirational agenda and thereby the worthiness of the IE initiative itself. Where an initiative is without such an aspirational agenda that can be called upon to reorient practices, then it is decidedly outside what can be considered international *education*. The modifier 'international' is not the only term of the pairing that transcends the purely instrumental; the 'education' term also places a demand that transcends pure expediency.

Ideas and practices of international education (IE) date back many centuries and the interplay and tensions between idealist and instrumental agendas endure. However in 'global times,' IE has become much more an expedient, a 'value-added' qualification for both families and governments seeking competitive advantage in processes and imaginaries of the global knowledge economy (Ong, 2006; Weenink, 2008). Unprecedented are the expanding opportunities for IE under transnational cultural and economic networks and flows. These opportunities come with new complications and altered risks as the idealist and pragmatic agendas of IE become ever more imbricated. Indeed the radical neoliberal agenda seeks to circumscribe and recast the idealist vision by the necessity and value of the 'market.' Neoliberal logics and institutional branding advance a both/and logic to the instrumental and idealist relation. Making profits *and* "doing good" are framed as symbiotic. Recruiting international students as new revenue streams represents the way forward to achieve financial sustainability *and* the university's academic, social, *and* reputational missions. Intercultural competence is valued for fostering more respectful relations between cultures *as well as* for finding and exploiting niche markets across cultural frontiers.

From its emergence during the last rise of international education in the 1960s to its elevated status as the 'gold standard' in a period of internationalization as branding in the 21st century, the International Baccalaureate (IB) provides a useful window on the shifting uses of IE under globalization (Tarc, 2009). The creation and experiment of the IB, made possible by a Ford Foundation grant in 1966, was founded on a practical need for an internationally-recognized secondary school leaving diploma for international school students to access their home country universities. However, most of the creators and key advocates of the IB were much more vested in the aspirational vision of an "education of the whole person" as the way to develop international understanding for a less conflicted world (Peterson, 1972; Renaud, 1974). Nevertheless the internationalist or "global dreams" of the creators and supporters of the IB experiment had to strategically sideline these foundational dreams in their rhetoric and policy statements until the early years of the 1990s as mentioned above. Soon IB and other organizations began using terms like "world citizens" and "global citizens" (Tarc, 2009).

By the turn of the century, increasing numbers of families were recognizing the value of the 'international' of international education. Governments were also soon to follow in recognizing the advantages of promoting global (de-territorialized) and flexible citizenships (Ong, 2006). In some sense in the West, developing citizens to contribute to global economic competitiveness began to trump developing citizens as loyal 'flag-wavers' (Green, 1997). 'International understanding' was no longer deemed a threat but a resource in developing human capital to participate in the global economy. In the case of the IB, its take up in the 1980s by state schools in the US, as a 'nation at risk,' had most to do with its perceived high academic standards. But today, international mindedness is no longer so peripheral in the rush to take up IB for its academic standards, but a core 'value-added' component of the program.

In increasingly wider publics, having an 'international experience' (i.e. study abroad) is framed as promising a set of desirable outcomes, as: developing intercultural understanding, global competence, resume building, and a "serving others" disposition. Under conditions of diminishing governmental support for social services and safety nets, the flexible, 'globally ready,' entrepreneurial and service oriented (middle or upper-middle class) person is the idealized student-subject of IE for contemporary times. Of course there are conservative and commutarian reactions to, and opponents of, the increasing import of IE, but they have not yet slowed the growth and intensification of IE in global times.

Most troubling about the expediency of IE on this complex neoliberal terrain is how the idealized visions and outcomes of a liberal-humanist IE are altered or minimized. Beyond the uncritical framing of the *both/and* neoliberal logics, there are grave risks that manifestations of IE re-inscribe the very parochial, arrogant and neocolonial mindsets that IE is theoretically supposed to challenge and undo. Clearly a growing set of critiques attest to these actual and potential negative outcomes of IE (ACDE 2015; Andreotti et al., 2011). While there is no getting around the co-dependence of the idealist and instrumental agendas, practitioners of IE must be vigilant that the de-parochializing core idealist vision of IE is not muted or co-opted. In times of macro global inequality and the micro dynamics of power-knowledge that constitute inter-personal communication, such a demand for vigilance is indeed a vital challenge.

Finally, given the heightened importance of IE, it is no longer the 'practice-based' tag-along to Comparative Education. IE is morphing into a transdisciplinary scholarly pursuit as a sister- or sub-field of 'Global Studies in Education,' where educationalists are theorizing these phenomena (via mobilities, translations, transfers, hybridities, etc.) with special attention to historicizing the shifting conditions, dreams and tensions of IE to illuminate both its limits and potentialities in global times.

References

Andreotti, V., Jefferess, D., Pashby, K., Rowe, C., Tarc, P. & Taylor, L. (2010). Difference and conflict in global citizenship in Higher Education in Canada. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning, 2*(3), 5-24.

Association of Canadian Deans of Education (ACDE). (2014). *Accord on the internationalization of education*. Retrieved from http://www.cssescee.ca/docs/acde/Accord_Internationalization_EN.pdf

Appadurai, A. (2006). *Fear of small numbers: An essay on the geography of anger*. Durham: Duke University Press.

de Leo, J. (2010). *Reorienting teacher education to address sustainable development: Guidelines and tools–education for intercultural understanding*. Bangkok: Unesco.

Green, A. (1997). *Education, globalization, and the nation state*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Heater, D. B. (2002). *World citizenship: Cosmopolitan thinking and its opponents*. London: Continuum.

IBO. (2013). *What is an IB education?* Cardiff, Wales: International Baccalaureate Organization. Retrieved from http://www.ibo.org/globalassets/digital-tookit/brochures/what-is-an-ib-education-en.pdf (accessed July 11, 2016).

Jones, P. W. (2000). Globalization and internationalism: Democratic prospects for world education. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 27-42). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Mayer, M. (1968). *Diploma: International schools and university entrance*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund.

Ong, A. (2006). *Neoliberalism as exception: Mutations in citizenship and sovereignty*. New York: Duke University Press.

Oxfam (2006) *Education for global citizenship: A guide for schools.* London: Oxfam. Available online at http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/global-citizenship/global-citizenship-guides (accessed July 11, 2016).

Peterson, A. D. C. (1972). *The International Baccalaureate: An experiment in international education*. London: G.G. Harrap.

Renaud, G. (1974). *Experimental period of the International Baccalaureate: Objectives and results*. Paris: Unesco.

Rizvi, F. (2007). Internationalization of curriculum: A critical perspective. In M. Hayden, J. Levy & J. J. Thompson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of research in International Education* (pp. 390-403). London: Sage.

Sidhu, R. K. (2006). *Universities and globalization: To market, to market*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *2*(1), 1-28.

Tarc, P. (2009). *Global dreams, enduring tensions: International Baccalaureate in a changing world.* New York: Peter Lang.

Weenink, D. (2008). Cosmopolitanism as a form of capital: Parents preparing their children for a globalized world. *Sociology, 42*(6), 1089–1106.