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At present international schools continue to experience unprecedented growth. Offering elite, blue chip education, these schools, which were once the domains of elite expatriates, are now predominantly occupied by locals, many of whom seek access to Western universities and the global knowledge economy. Shifting demographics coupled with delivering a curriculum rooted in a Western tradition may suggest these schools constitute a new form of imperialism.

While both the growth of such schools and their demand for teachers has led to increasing coverage within the mainstream and academic community, there remains a dearth of knowledge regarding teachers. It is into this space that the current study seeks to shed some light. In particular, it aims to explore why and how teachers become ‘international’, and the impact such development has on their praxis. It also seeks to explore how teachers, as front-line workers, position themselves within the discourse surrounding international schools as artificers of a global elite driven by a Western, globalist agenda.

Utilising a mixed-methods approach, the study employs a methodology drawing upon theoretical frameworks developed by Foucault and Bourdieu. This dualist approach serves to not only extrapolate the origin of ideas and motivations that shape teachers’ praxis, it also seeks to understand this praxis in action.

Findings suggest a teacher’s decision to pursue an international career is attributable to a variety of push/pull factors. Moreover, there is a need for a revision of praxis to better meet students’ needs and parental expectations. The evidence suggests that revising praxis is challenged by the opacity of key terms and assumptions within the field. Likewise, teachers employ a variety of approaches to learning and curriculum delivery that are explicitly cognizant not only of students’ cultural, national or ethnic background but also of their elite economic and social status.

The study concludes with recommendations for further research.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Overview

By 2020 it is estimated there will be approximately a half-million international schoolteachers (Resnik, 2012; Gaskell, 2016), catering to the needs of over eight million students (Bunnell, Fertig, James, 2017). However, it should be noted that ‘international school’ is an umbrella term that encompasses a plethora of forms and functions. Some pundits have suggested that an international school is any that offers a curriculum different from the one sanctioned by the local authority (Snowball, 2008). Others propose that legitimate international schools must deliver an international curriculum with a grounding in global awareness and service, as well as explicitly trying develop to intercultural competencies (Hill, 2012; Bunnell, Fertig, and James, 2017).

However, all these signposts are contested terms. Part of the issue is that we know very little about international schools and their teachers (Bunnell, 2017; Bailey, 2015), and how they make sense of an environment for which most are not formally trained (Richards, 2002; McNulty and Carter, 2017). We also know even less about international secondary schoolteachers since elementary and middle school practitioners have been the focus of most academic studies (Tarc and Tarc, 2015; Bailey, 2015; Bunnell, 2017). Therefore, an overarching aim of this study is to provide a space in which international secondary schoolteachers present their insight into the discourses, challenges and opportunities inherent to their profession. It also seeks to uncover how they sense-make in such a space.

Section 1.1: Setting the Stage

At present international schools are at a crossroads. On the one hand, their more traditional manifestations – aimed at developing intercultural competencies and peace – appear necessary, given the rise of globally nationalist agendas and an apparent breakdown in understanding the other as demonstrated by the current refugee crisis or fundamentalist terrorism. On the other hand, such manifestations are rapidly declining as a percentage of international schools, as a new globalist agenda seeks to offer local clientele an international education focused on developing a positional advantage in the worldwide knowledge economy. With state education systems trying to develop international education programmes – some going so far as to fund the building of international schools, or adopting traditional international programmes, such as those offered by the International Baccalaureate (IB) – it would appear the international school is undergoing an ‘existential threat’ (Cambridge, 2017, p. 14).
Such developments ensure that international schools are no longer invisible on the national educational agenda. Moreover, mass media is taking notice as international schools appear to pose a challenge to those systems (i.e., USA, UK, Canada and Australia) from which they syphon the majority of their teachers (Snowball, 2008; Canterford, 2009). This situation is further exacerbated by the increasing attractiveness of international teaching as a career choice and not just a short-term sojourn (Bunnell, 2014).

Finally, 2002-14 witnessed a fourfold increase in the number of international schools, with the majority in Asia and the Arabian peninsula (Brummitt and Keeling, 2013). Most of these cater to a local elite opting out of the national system. Furthermore, these locals represent a new clientele whose culture and background are not aligned with the traditional American-European roots of international schools, leading critics to claim that international schools not only enable a globalist agenda but also represent a new form of cultural imperialism.

However, before rushing to demonise such challenges, it is important to note, since their inception, international schools have always formed part of a Western, expansionist agenda, grounded in expanding markets. Moreover, historically they are rooted in the needs of a mobile elite (Hill, 2012). According to Hayden and Thompson (2013), the international school has undergone four phases, witnessing the development of three types of school. Phase 1 saw the birth of international school in response to the needs of expanding empires and their overseas agents. Classified as Type A schools, they were non-profit, organised by a particular expatriate community to exclusively serve their children’s educational needs (Hayden and Thompson, 2013). Schools were racially and nationally exclusive, and did not embrace the local community. Type A dominated the international sphere until recently.

Phase 2, starting after World War I, was a response to the rebuilding needs of ravaged countries depending on the importation of skilled foreign workers. They offered a variation on the Type A’s in that they now housed a multinational expatriate clientele, albeit all drawn from the professional upper middle class. The first schools to use the term ‘international’ in their name emerged and were guided by an ethos of intercultural understanding, although what exactly this entailed remains largely unexplored (Hill, 2012).

Phase 3 marked the emergence of Type B. Although few in number, these schools remained non-profit but differed from Type A in their explicit commitment to an internationalist agenda with a focus on developing peace and social justice. Embodied by the United World College Movement and European Schools, these institutions emphasised a notion of a shared humanity
that accepted differences through developing multilingualism and intercultural competencies (Hayden and Thompson, 2013). During this phase, a few locals and non-Europeans entered the schools; however, they represented similar socioeconomic backgrounds to their predecessors (Peterson, 2003; Hill, 2012).

Phase 4 is currently underway, bringing with it the emergence of Type C schools. These schools diverge from the previous models in that they are for profit. They provide an international-style education for a local elite population, often disenchanted with their local system and wanting to develop soft skills, such as English proficiency, and intercultural competencies to improve their position in a global marketplace (Tarc and Tarc, 2015; Machin, 2017). These schools have witnessed a paradigm shift in their demographics, as locals represent 80% of the student body (Hayden and Thompson, 2017). This phase, especially within Asia, is driven by a demand that at present continues to outstrip supply (Machin, 2017), leading governments in such places as Thailand, Malaysia, South Korean and more recently Vietnam to all pass laws that not only encourage locals to attend such schools, but in the cases of Korea and Malaysia actually provide funding to set up international schools. In all instances, the driving force has been to permit local students to access international schools, which continue to be seen as significantly contributing to enabling locals to participate in a global, knowledge-driven economy (Machin, 2017).

During Phase 4, all school archetypes continue. However, as Cambridge (2002, 2017) insists, a central thrust within international education is an alignment with a globalist or cosmopolitan agenda, an assertion shared by van Oord (2007, 2008), Cambridge and Thompson (2004), and Resnik (2012). For example, van Oord (2007) contends that while the content of IB’s diploma programme may be international, its epistemic tradition is grounded in Western ideals of free access to information, a competition of different forms of knowledge and an awareness of epistemological infallibility. Within such a framework, the ‘other’ is something exotic, to be studied but without achieving a deep understanding of their culture, personal experience and socioeconomic positioning (Grimshaw and Sears, 2008; Hughes 2009; Poonooosamy, 2014, 2015).

While it is far beyond the scope of the current study to explore the ongoing debate around the role of education as a form of new, Western imperialism, it is pertinent at this point to give a brief overview of the discussion currently unfolding. Echoing sentiments expressed by Bourdieu and Wacquant (1999), a 2017 edition of the influential Comparative Education Review journal explored both the epistemological colonial legacy as it relates to education while acknowledging that the current field and its scholarship is skewed towards a dominance of Western, English-speaking academics. According to Takayama et al. (2017), this ‘colonial entanglement’ must be
embraced when situating any exploration of international education. For, as Bourdieu and Wacquant noted, imperial reason, and especially that operating in a post-colonial world, works at a subtle level where those writing and developing normative value judgements do so from a coloniser's perspective. The books, ideas and values are all grounded in an epistemological and ontological discourse originating in a Western, mainly Anglo, sphere. Moreover, the self-propagation of these ideas and ideals is supported by technologies, such as printing companies and universities, which themselves have their origins in the Western epistemologies, pedagogies and ontologies.

Bourdieu et al. (1999), Brown et al. (2011) and Cambridge (2010) all offer evidence that international education, its values and associated cultures coherently, yet subtly, act as a means of ‘Westernising’ recipients. Moreover, drawing upon Foucault’s notions of governmentality and especially his ideas around regimes shaping epistemological and ontological normativity discourses, Tikly (2004) suggest Foucault offers a viable lens from which to explore education as a potential site of ‘new imperialism’. Utilising this notion, Tikly (2001; 2004) posits education in the guise of international development has been employed effectively by various Western governments and notably the World Bank to create a situation where Western values, such as an entrepreneurial self, Western-styled capitalism and Western culture, are exported as ‘goods’ to the developing world. Within such a situation, the current study can find traction. While international schools and their communities originate in economic and social elites and thus may not be part of a developing world, this does not negate the possibility that they are susceptible to being governed and shaped by values and aspirations not originating within their nationality, culture and ethnic traditions. The subtle impact of such Western ideals must not be downplayed, especially in light of the changing face of international schools, with their proliferation across the globe and the rise a local clientele.

As noted, however, many international schools and organisations, which support them, call for embracing differences and working with them to develop an inclusive school wherein intercultural competencies are adopted and developed. The central tenet is to develop a peaceful world through growing pluralistic, international understanding. As Cambridge (2010), Wells (2011), and Hayden & Thompson (2017) comment, there is a worry that such aspirations may be at odds with an education that eulogises the West, its values and its modus operandi. For example, schools, partially driven by parental wants, are delivered in English, utilising curriculums developed in the West, with a primary focus of gaining access to Western universities (Hayden and Thompson, 2013, 2017; MacKenzie, 2009; Machin, 2017; Walker, 2010). Therefore, as is suggested, what is at play for international students, under the guidance of their teachers, is to learn and adopt
Western-originated epistemologies and ontologies, which potentially detract, negate or displace their heritage (Poonosamy, 2015; Cambridge, 2003, 2010, 2012). What research we have suggests that teachers do reskill when they enter international education as they seek to meet the learning needs of their diverse student body (Bailey, 2015; Cambridge and Thompson, 2014). What is not clear is how teachers, as front-line workers, navigate within such a situation. Nor is there any clarity about the impact such apparently contradicting objectives may have on their praxis. From delivering a curriculum that is culturally robust yet accessible to meeting parental expectations of what an international education is, we know very little about the international teacher.

Such concerns also resonate with other research stating that international education enables characteristics that focus on the positional advantage for a globally elite and mobile middle class, thereby increasing social inequality (Brown and Lauder, 2009; Balarin, 2011). Given that those who can afford international school annual fees in access of $10,000 must be drawn from an economic elite (MacDonald, 2006), international schools and their education appear to be aiding in stacking the deck in favour of elites. Additionally, Brown and Lauder's (2009) study reveals that character traits, such as diplomacy, intercultural competencies, independence and teamwork, are actively developed by international schools, and align with the demands and expectations of transnational corporations.

Moreover, transnational corporations look to handpicked universities for employees and given that over 88% of international students attend university (Matthews, 1988), they have more preferential access to transnational jobs than the norm (Brown and Lauder, 2011; Canterford, 2009). Such statistics appear to reinforce ex-IB Director General George Walker's (2010) assertion that most of the clientele for the IB Diploma want the skills and attributes that would support their entry into Western universities. Therefore, international schools with roots in the internationalist agenda often experience tension between their historical heredities, competing for students, and parental expectations (Sanz Guiterrez, 2014). The current study unfolds against this backdrop.

Tarc and Tarc (2015), Bailey (2015) and Bunnell (2017) unanimously agree little is known about international teachers, no matter if they are local or international hires. Part of the challenge in researching teachers is the high turnover rate at international schools – roughly 14% per annum for teaching staff (Odland, and Ruzicka, 2009), with senior administration turning over approximately every four years (Hawley, 1994; Benson, 2011). Furthermore, the lack of a governing body combined with various recruitment agencies – such as the Council of
International Schools (CIS) or Search Associates – that have regional recruitment agendas (in this case, Europe and the North America respectively) makes unearthing consistent data difficult. Many schools now hire via their websites, further obfuscating data (Hayden and Thompson, 2016).

International teachers are engaged at both a local and international level. The majority (i.e., more than 60%) of overseas teachers come from the USA, UK, Canada and Australia, an imbalance partially explained by the historical roots of schools, but more likely driven by parental expectations (Richards, 2002). Finally, a review of the literature, such as that gathered in the series of compendiums on international education, edited by Hayden and Thompson, reveals that research has tended to focus on teachers’ professional needs or their being instruments of curriculum delivery. Little is available on teachers as independent agents who are artificers of practice and navigators of discourses. For example, we know that international schoolteachers enter international schools lacking given skill sets and in need of reskilling (Deveney, 2007; Bailey 2015), or that they are part of a segmented labour force (Canterford, 2009) who experience various levels of precariousness within contracts and working conditions (Bunnell, 2015; 2017). There is some minimal insight into these teachers’ professional aspirations (Hardman, 2001) or the view of students and parents have of international schoolteachers (Hayden, 1998; van Oord, 2004; Mackenzie et al. 2003; MacKenzie 2009). However, what we do not have is the process these teachers go through as they develop their praxis to deliver a curriculum capable of navigating the various discourses and aspirations that an international school embodies. The current study is a small step in redressing this imbalance.

Certain themes are consistent within the literature, most notably an ongoing call for a specialised programme of study to prepare teachers for teaching internationally (Hayden and Thompson, 1998; Snowball, 2007; Levy and Fox, 2017). While some progress has been made at the postgraduate level via such programmes offered by the University of Bath (UK) or Wisconsin-Madison (USA), the research continues to reveal that teachers emerging from national systems lack the training to work internationally (Duckworth, Levey and Levy, 2005; Deveney, 2007; McNulty and Carter, 2017). Indeed among those who have written on the subject, the call for ongoing, on-site professional development (PD) is unanimous, as it aids teachers’ adjustment to the particularities of each school (Hayden, 2002; Snowball, 2008; Doyle, 2010; Bailey, 2015; Mulligan, 2017).

However, whether such PD is taking place in a continuous, relevant and useful manner is questionable (Hayden, 2006; Blaney, 2000; McNulty and Carter, 2017). Studies by Deveney (2007), Harshman and Augustine (2013), and Saava (2013) identify personal traits, such as
openness to and appreciation of different worldviews and cultures, as important to successfully living and teaching internationally. Moreover, Hayden, Rancic, Thompson, (2000) assert that colleagues and students viewed international teachers as the embodiment of international mindedness and intercultural competencies (themselves contested terms), despite the fact that most teachers have received no training in delivering such qualities. Arguably, a different expectation for international teachers is that they must navigate a variety of expectations from students and educators that is informed by a multiplicity of learning cultures and expectations, something national colleagues do not have to contend with (Hayden and Thompson, 1998; van Oord, 2004). It would appear teachers are left to fend for themselves and yet we know little about this situation. To more clearly understand the lived praxis of international teachers, more research needs to be done into their development and how skills and mindsets can be developed, befitting their situation.

In closing, vacancies will continue to be an issue – Resnik (2012) estimates by 2022 international schools will require over 500,000 teachers, with others claiming it can be as high as 780,000 (Gaskell, 2016, p. 24). While local teachers may fill the gap, studies by Richards (1998; 2002) and Lai, Shum and Zhang (2014) suggest their lack of training in Western pedagogic practices and ideals may demand retraining and implementation time. Indeed, as noted above, all those aspiring to teach internationally need retraining and the ability to navigate the various discourses at play within the international school. To this end, the current study seeks to shed light on the situation by addressing the following questions:

1) Who are the participant teachers and how do they explicitly become international?
2) To what extent does being an international teacher shape the praxis of the professional undertaking the role?
3) How do teachers position themselves in the argument that international schools propagate a form of Western imperialism in their teaching, driven by a globalist agenda that trains an internationally mobile elite for positional advantage in a market economy?

Section 1.2: Methods and Methodologies

In undertaking this study, I chose to explore these questions by limiting fieldwork to Type A and B international schools in Japan. This decision was pragmatic, because I have worked in Japan for 20 years in the schools and because the situation in Japan is rarely studied. Type A or Type B schools were explored, not only because they have the longest history in Japan, but also because they are among the largest and most prestigious to attend. Furthermore, they are accredited by an acknowledged body and all offer a recognised curriculum, such as the IB, Advance Placement (AP), International General Certificate of Secondary Education (IGCSE) and General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE). Finally, all the schools’ missions are in
keeping with ideals such as making the world a better place, intercultural competencies, individual growth and critical engagement with knowledge, situating them within the internationalist and globalist agenda discourses.

Within this study, methodologies refer to the underlying theory as to how the research should be conducted, while methods refer to the means through which information is gathered (Harding, 1987; Gough 2002a). Underpinning this study is the conviction that the complex nature of international schools combined with a lack of information on secondary schoolteachers, demands a multi-tiered and multidisciplinary approach (Ball, 1994; Gough, 2000a; Vidovich, 2007; Baxter and Jack, 2008) to ensure a robust exploration. Therefore, a mixed-method format was used, with a central qualitative thrust in which participant-teachers shared and explored their meaning making. To address the lack of knowledge, the first phase involved a questionnaire, containing structured and semi-structured questions followed by open-ended paragraph responses questions. The quantitative structured questions aimed to develop a profile of relevant autobiographical information, such as qualifications, number of years teaching and level of education. Next, a Likert scale was used, seeking input on issues current in educational research, such as teaching practices and school policies. The final section involved paragraph questions, asking teachers to outline and explain their journey to, and within, international education and its role in their praxis. The end of the questionnaire asked for volunteers to continue to the second phase of the study, the in-depth interview.

As the focus throughout the entire study was on teacher sense making, at no time were terms such as ‘international education’, ‘international’ or ‘global mindedness’ and ‘imperialism’ provided. The goal was to uncover teachers’ thinking, not to shape it with the researcher’s bias.

The second stage of the research involved in-depth interviews and, for those willing to continue, the third phase involved participants responding to a set of journal reflections based on issues discussed during and emerging from the interviews. Drawing upon Foucault’s (1993), Bourdieu and Wacquant’s (1992), and Bourdieu’s (2003) notions around reflexive practice, interviews were constructed to enable not only sharing of ideas but also generating understandings about relevant aspects of the current study. Furthermore, questions were shared with participants before the interview to help ensure a considered response.

Questions were grouped into the following macro categories:
• Exploring how participants became international teachers.
• How they navigate different discourses within the field, such as international mindedness and cultural competencies, while being cognizant of key players within this discourse (i.e., parents and students).

All interviews were transcribed.

As I am a principal at one of the high schools in the study, a number of ethical issues had to be considered, not the least of which was anonymity. Moreover, given my position, I avoided direct questions regarding administration or interaction with colleagues. However, given the focus of the questions, information about both groups did emerge and was duly recorded and considered during analysis.

Set against a commitment to uncover teacher voice using mixed methods was the utilisation of a dual methodological approach, grounded in the work of Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu. Given the lack of shared meaning or unifying training, Foucault’s work seemed particularly helpful in uncovering present regimes of truth, by exploring the historical genesis of current normative assumptions presented as ‘truth’. Through tracing and unpacking the genealogy from which subjective norms are enabled through a process of artefact production and empowered via technologies, Foucault’s methodology supports unearthing the processes through which participants constructed themselves as international teachers. Central to this process are his notions of ‘governmentality’ or governing of self, while being cognizant of normative expectations, leading to a production of an acceptable self.

Bourdieu’s methodology furthered this approach, because it enabled the tracking of this acceptable self as it navigates the various discourses operating within the international school setting. Where Foucault explains how we arrived at a point, Bourdieu elucidates how we, and others, continue to build upon and live within it (Hannus and Simola, 2010). For Bourdieu, teaching both unifies and generates, and can be summarised as: ‘(habitus) (capital) + field = practice’ (Bourdieu, 1984, p101). Developed over three phases, the application of Bourdieu’s lens first explores how teachers understand the international school as a field by identifying its habitus (i.e., expectations and values), nomos (i.e., membership attributes and recognition) and doxa (i.e., rules). Secondly, it identifies teachers’ interactions with the various capitals at play, both existent and aspirational, within the field. Finally, drawing upon their historical and emergent ideas, beliefs and understanding, the study explores how teachers’ praxis both shapes and is shaped by the international school and its discourses. In particular, how teachers support their international students, address issues of potential cultural imperialism and pilot the demands of various stakeholders were explored.
Section 1.3: Chapter Map

Chapter 2: The Literature Review

The first section of this chapter reviews the historical background of international schools from their roots as both a pragmatic response to expatriate needs and as an ideal aimed to develop intercultural understanding and peace. By tracing the international schools’ search for legitimacy, as embodied by the establishment of the IB through to its recent rapid expansion, a central theme is the development of a uniquely international school education. The middle section investigates what is known about international teachers, their motives, understandings and challenges/opportunities within their praxis. Attention is given to what is known about international school parents and students, their needs and aspirations, as navigating these are central focuses in current international schools and, thus, teacher praxis. Additionally, how parents and students perceive international teachers is explored. Finally, criticism of the international school as an elitist, Westernization process set within a globalist agenda is explored, as it too may impact praxis.

Chapter 3: The Research Design – Methodological Underpinnings

This chapter examines the appropriateness of utilising the methodological approaches to research, as developed by Foucault and Bourdieu. Central tenets of each methodology are unpacked, defined and explored, followed by a justification for their use within the current study. A central argument for this approach is that educational research demands a compound, complex lens, which is both robust and flexible. Foucault and Bourdieu offer complementary methodologies that enable these requirements. Due consideration is given to the central criticism of Foucault and Bourdieu, that they are deterministic. However, I argue that both recognise individual agency and, to this end, work to inform and liberate. Particular attention is given to the historical roots and implications of how knowledge and norms are formed, as well as to how these are both shaped by and shapers of current and future praxis.

Chapter 4: The Research Design – Methods

Starting with an overview of the timeline of the current study, I then make the case for a mixed-method approach, followed by an examination of the methods and their appropriateness for the task. Following each method is an exploration of how Foucault and Bourdieu are used in making sense of the data and analysing its implications. A central thrust of this chapter is that, given the lack of research on international secondary schoolteachers, what is first needed is a general body
of information upon which meaningful and generative questions can be developed for the interviewee phase.

So the study begins with a quantitative approach aimed at extracting general information about teachers, their background, motives, understandings and practices. From this data, interview questions were developed, based on the research questions mentioned earlier. The last component of the study, journaling, offers interviewees the opportunity to reflect upon ideas that emerge from the study, with a specific emphasis on praxis. Within this section, I explain the process through which schools and teachers were selected for the study. A general summary of each school is also provided. Finally, I examine the ethical considerations of the study, recognizing that my role as a high school principal in the region complicates matters.

Two central principles defined the unfolding of this study. Firstly, this study was grounded in Bourdieu’s notion of reflexivity, wherein participants were able to reflect upon practice and formulate personal understandings. To this end, interviewee questions were shared with participants before the actual interviews, and the journaling exercise was an opportunity to further reflect upon emergent themes. Secondly, the goal was to hear the teachers’ voices as they constructed meaning. Based on my professional experience, teacher voice as a generative agent is missing within academic research into international schools. As noted in Chapter 2, most studies place teachers as objects acted upon, with the result they become subjects enacting others’ agendas. However, what subjects say in an interview can often be problematic, in that statements do not always align with their actions or beliefs. For these reasons, three sources of data collection were employed – questionnaires, interviews and journaling – as such triangulation enabled checking for consistency, divergence and emergent themes within the study.

Chapter 5: Findings and Discussion

Returning to the original, overarching questions, I present the data from the study and, employing the Foucauldian and Bourdieusian lens, extrapolate considerations pertinent to the current study. Set against the generative, quantitative data developed in the questionnaire, the interviews serve as the central focus of information and analysis. Unfortunately, the journaling component was not widely embraced by interview subjects, and so serves mostly to present supporting evidence. Discussions unfold around central themes, some of which are universal, others that are divergent. In line with previous studies, there were other emergent issues, suggesting the dynamic nature within international schools that teachers navigate. The chapter concludes by returning to the overarching questions and summarising findings.
Chapter 6: Conclusions

In this chapter, I reflect upon the study and its strengths and weaknesses. I also suggest, in light of insights drawn from the current study, further areas for exploration.

Section 1.4: Personal Engagements

Working at international schools since 2000, the last 10 as high school principal in two different schools in Japan, I became increasingly aware of the need for teachers to meet expectations standing outside their initial teacher training. This awareness, however, came over time. Initially, when I left Ontario to take up my post in Japan, I had no idea what the form and format of an international school would be. However, having worked previously with Canada’s Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, I was somewhat cognizant of the effect a macro culture could have on a group subsumed within it. Likewise, being married to a Japanese, I knew there was difference in the cultures, but the never considered that this might also apply to learning and education.

The move to an international school challenged me on many levels. First and foremost was the realisation that in our school, modelled loosely on a USA format, a passing grade was 60% and not the ‘normal’ 50%. More was to follow. Despite claiming to deliver an international curriculum in English, students were predominantly still acquiring English, and the content was mostly USA centric in the maths, history and English with senior grades taking something called the ‘AP’ (i.e. Advance Placement). Another shock was that many of my East Asian students simply did not participate in class in the manner I assumed ‘all’ students participated regardless of their ethnic background. When I asked them if they understood what I taught, they always said yes but their assignment results did not bear this out. I was to learn that different nations had different cultures of learning and that there was not a universal means to education.

On another front a number of students’ parents were confused when I explained that student marks would improve as I was teaching to exit expectations – they said students needed to be assessed on what they currently knew – not what they were working towards. Once again I was challenged to rethink my assessment paradigm as one not being based on universal truths but rather one that was shaped and given value by the culture of learning, that is Ontario, where I had gained my experience.

Ironically, because I had worked writing and developing Ontario’s new curriculum, I was handed the task of bringing the IB Diploma into my school. Somewhere along the line I learned that international education was a whole field of study unto itself, with the University of Bath as one of
its guiding centres. What followed was a complete rethinking of what I believed to be true in
education. While specific beliefs, such as the need to deliver a culturally relevant curriculum,
never waned, most other assumptions where re-examined, reshaped and developed – a process
that continues to this day.

Over the next 15 years, I was part of the teams bringing the IB into three schools, one of which
was a Japanese private school offering a bilingual accredited IB diploma that also managed to
meet the Japanese Department of Education diploma expectations. I was continually challenged
as I moved into the role of principal to understand what it meant to be internationally educated.
Indeed, this question also surfaced as my children entered international schools. As a principal, I
found the school lacked the resources and often the understanding necessary to ensure that
students were educated in a robust yet international way. There tended to be an assumption that
if you could teach, then working internationally was just about applying the same skill set in a
foreign setting. There were some teachers – who in the trade we assert deliver a ‘suitcase
curriculum’. That is they moved every two years from school to school, more interested in travel
and collecting cultural trinkets than developing an international praxis. Others remained for
decades in Japan but knew little of its culture, language or norms. Against this background, I was
charged with preparing all to deliver what I interpreted to be an internationally minded curriculum
grounded in intercultural understandings. I looked for relevant academic research but was
disappointed by how poorly secondary schoolteachers were represented.

I also found that the studies presented teachers almost as automatons who deliver or reject
curriculum dispassionately – something I know not to be true. My experience suggested that
teachers are not only critically engaged with learning, assessment and teaching, they do so by
referencing their training and expertise. They are agents of continuity, change and development.
But within the literature such agency was absent and more troubling was the scarcity of
knowledge on how/why teachers navigate the various discourses within the field and make sense
of them while enacting their profession. Through my studies at Bath and working with colleagues,
an idea emerged of me at least starting the conversation in regards to these matters, and the
research presented here is the result.

However, as a researcher, I now faced a conundrum. How could I research teachers if I was also
their principal? The literature is rife with warnings about the need for caution when studying a field
in which the researcher is already a participant. Likewise, there was the very ethical issue that for
some of my participants I was their principal and as such responsible for doing their yearly
reviews. Finally, there was the problem created by the dire lack of research on international
schoolteachers, which meant I had few reference points of what to look for and, more worryingly,
no real sense of what to ask. The more colleagues I spoke to at all levels of the school, the more confirmation came back that I needed to better understand practitioners and why and how they became international teachers.

The process of dealing with the ethical issues was somewhat solved by continually holding myself to account to the BERA Guidelines, as reinforced by the University of Bath. As I outline below, I was careful to seek the necessary permissions by following the procedures each school had for conducting research. Similarly, at all times I reminded participants of the BERA guidelines and that I was researching as part of my doctoral studies at the University of Bath. I also assured them that I would do everything to protect their anonymity and that they could withdraw from the study at any moment. For those whom I was principal, the reality was that I did not have the final say in matters relating to their contract or promotions. Nor could I hold them responsible for getting the ‘wrong answers’ to questions that continued to flummox the best and brightest within the international education field. However, to further reassure them, I let my Head of School know I was conducting research, without revealing the participants’ names. I employed an identical approach with teachers from other schools. As stated previously, for participants from other schools I had both their principal and Head of School approval for research. Far more real was the fact that participants were helping move the field forward by being active in a process that would benefit the international school community and those committed to understanding its form and function. The promised to share an executive summary with them, and their school was well received.

What was interesting was that participants were far more interested in getting into the research questions as they universally shared the topic at hand was one they had thought about and reflected upon. Indeed this energy and enthusiasm for the project convinced me that what I was doing would benefit teachers and also that the research was necessary. Lastly, I realised that at the core of my research was the notion of teacher agency and voice. I maintain and continue to support the assertion that teachers are professional agents capable of directing their decisions and developing their praxis. While it is true my ‘power position’ was a challenge; it also offered a viable means to access and discuss with teachers on their terms the discourses central to the current study. The work needed to be done.

Where to start? How to get teachers to consider their praxis if, like me, many of them had floundered to make sense of it? Moreover, based on personal reflection and conversations with teachers over the years I knew that much of what we do in a classroom and assume often originates in assumptions or other forms of un-thought positioning. It was in this quandary that Foucault and Bourdieu offered help. Foucault provided the framework through which the historical
self and normative beliefs can be traced, while Bourdieu’s work would help discover the repercussions of these paradigms on the actual teacher’s praxis within an international setting.

The result is the current study, which I hope will serve in some small part to initiate discussions and sharing of information to help teachers as they work within the international school setting.

Moreover, I hope it will encourage others to continue the process of discovery, for there remain many areas within the international teacher’s praxis that need a light shone. For those charged with leading teachers, I believe the study will help them identify the needs that international teachers – regardless of their experience and skill level – require and desire. Within my role, I have now begun the process of reconsidering the responsibility I have to provide teachers with the necessary mindsets, tools and questions necessary to enhance their praxis.

Section 1.5: Key Terms

As noted elsewhere, the field of interactional education is full of terms that lack shared understanding and agreement. Even so, most of the terms below are common parlance within international ‘eduspeak’ and are usually discussed as if definitive, shared definitions exist. At no time during this study did participants receive definitions of these terms. Rather they were presented as cognitive spaces wherein participants created meaning. Below I provide a general overview of major terms.

**International School**

As Chapter 2 explains, this term lacks clarity. As the form and format of international schools vary, they can only be defined in the broadest terms, such as an international school delivers a curriculum that differs from the locally authorised one (Hayden, 2006; Snowball, 2008). However, mission statements of the institutions involved in this study align their understanding of international education with that proposed by Hayden and Thompson (1995), and Bunnell, Fertig and James (2017): The international school has an explicit commitment to developing international mindedness and intercultural competencies with the aim of developing a more peaceful and just world. A word of caution, however. ‘International school’ must not be considered synonymous with ‘international education’ (Hayden, 2006; Snowball, 2008), which has explicit commitments to international mindedness and developing cultural competencies.

**International Education**

Cambridge (2012) noted that international education is broad in scope and encompasses kindergarten to tertiary education, and may also include work enacted by international corporations and other bodies. However, for this study, international education is explored as
something that takes place in international schools, specifically at the secondary level. Within the academic literature, the term also encompasses, but is not limited to, the delivered curriculum and the hidden curriculum (i.e., the unspoken or unconscious agendas at play within the delivery and shaping of the curriculum), with their norms and aspirations.

Rather than restrict teachers in their mapping and unpacking of this term, I have left it open for them. What emerges is, within the confines of the current study, practitioners’ understanding of this term. Moreover, international educational roots are in constructivist education, wherein the learner is encouraged to critically engage with knowledge (Cambridge, 2012) while simultaneously developing specific character traits (Cambridge, 2017). Finally, international education’s curriculum strives to present and access knowledge, skills and applications from an international angle (Rawlings, 2000; Cambridge and Thompson, 2004).

**International Mindedness**
Another ubiquitous term lacking a shared agreement of meaning, ‘international mindedness’, occupies a discursive space between the international and globalist agendas (Cambridge, 2012). Its primary resonance is in the attributes of intercultural awareness and understanding. Although the term may appear limited to culture within international school parlance, it is a catchall phrase that includes awareness of global issues, and openness to gender, ethnic, religious and epistemological differences. Moreover, it commits itself to peace and service (Rawlings, 2000; Cambridge and Thompson, 2004; Cambridge, 2012).

**Intercultural Competencies**
A relatively new term within the international school vernacular, with roots in the work of Gerard Hofstede, it undeniably influences education. On a general level, intercultural competencies recognise that students can develop the communication skills, social skills and understanding needed to work with people of other cultures effectively. At the outset of the study, this phrase was synonymous with international mindedness. However, as interviews progressed, it became evident that new expectations by school accreditation bodies within the region had unyoked the terms. This gave most interviewees an emergent understanding of the term and they started grappling with it as a standalone idea.

**Praxis**
Drawing upon the ideas of Foucault and Bourdieu, I use this term rather than practice throughout the study to acknowledge their shared focus on the generative and reflective nature of work. While practice tends to focus on the performance of a job, praxis is a broader term and acknowledges the role that theory, experience and reflection play in enabling performance. Praxis
also recognises practice is situated in a particular time/place, and that agency is enabled through
the actor's interaction with and to that particularity.
Chapter 2: The Literature Review

International schools are a rapidly expanding institution, now found in over 120 countries worldwide (Canterford, 2009), with an estimated student population exceeding three million in over 6,000 schools (Bunnell, 2014, p. 2). In its most recent report, International School Review estimated that annual income from such schools now exceeds $39 billion, and is expected to exceed $89 billion in the coming decade. The same report also notes that Asia dominates the international school market and growth, with China and UAE both having approximately 540 schools (Gaskell, 2016, p. 24). But the usefulness of this information is difficult to assess, because, depending on whom you read, the number of international schools can vary greatly. For example, in the statistics quoted above, Bunnell’s student population falls 1.37 million short of the estimate given by ICS (Gaskell, 2016, p. 24).

The reasons for this discrepancy lie on three fronts. First, there is a lack of information, especially within academic literature, on these schools. Second, academics and practitioners alike cannot agree on a working definition of an international school (Carder, 2006; Hayden, 2011; Bunnell, 2008). Finally, there is not a governing body to oversee and accredit international schools. Evidence is emerging, showing that international schools are increasingly seeking accreditation through such bodies as the Council for International Schools (CIS). They may as well be subject to inspection from their nation of origin; this is the case with British schools and the Independent Schools Inspectorate (ISI). Indeed, the many programmes aimed specifically at the international national school sector – such as the International General Certificate of Secondary Education (IGCSE), International Advance Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB) and the recent International Primary Curriculum (IPC) – point to a growing sense that there is an international education spectrum along which the major curriculums form, shape and direct pedagogy, assessment and other relevant matters.

But herein lies the problem. Each school is free to pick, and often mix and match, which curriculum it chooses to follow.

The academic study of international education is still emerging. Just over 40 years ago, Leach (1969, p. 15) noted what little attention the academic world had paid to international education (Bunnell, 2014, p. 3), an observation that continues to hold relevance (Hayden and Thompson, 1998; Bunnell, 2014; Hayden and Thompson, 2017). Following in the steps of Leach (1969) and Peterson (2003), Bunnell’s recent work, *The Changing Landscape of International Schooling* (2014), is the first academic attempt to collect the history and development of the international
school story into a cohesive, analytical work. He finds a field that continues to evolve, redefine itself and increasingly may be at odds with itself.

What follows is an exploration of the relevant literature on international education. Section 2.1 explores the history of the international school as both idea and historical event. Section 2.2 explores what we know of the international school clientele and community, and finally Section 2.3 explores what we know of the international teacher.

**Section 2.1: History of the International School**

Bunnell, Fertig and James’ (2017) most recent work, exploring issues surrounding what constitutes an international school, is a good place to start the examination of the relevant literature on international education. The previously noted rapid growth in international schools, in particular over the past 15 years, raises for Bunnell et al. (2017) serious questions about what can legitimately be considered an international school and, by extension, an international education. However, for most of their history, international schools were few and far between, and did not draw much attention to themselves. They drew their legitimacy primarily from the fact they served expatriates living abroad, who had no option but to create schools for their children who accompanied them and would one day return to their home country for higher education.

Tracing the roots of international education is a complex task. The first phase of international schools appears to have originated in response to the rise of nationalism and overseas European trade missions in the late 1800s. For centuries, the boarding school in England, France, Spain and other colonizing nations had served to educate the children of the upper class. However, this was no longer possible or desirable by the late 1800s. Hill (Hill, 2012, p. 246ff) notes that overseas schools educating the children of the European empire builders had been in operation since the 16th century. Neither Hill nor others explain why the boarding school system was no longer capable of meeting the needs of this class. Perhaps an answer may be found in the rapid expansion of European powers and the United States into Africa and Asia. Indeed, the birth of such schools as the European School of Maseru (1890) and the American School in Japan (1902) – both of which were founded by expatriates living in communities that Europe or the USA had little previous contact with – may indicate a growing need that the home countries were unwilling, or unable, to support.

Simultaneously, another notion of what an international school could be was developing within Europe, first explored in the short-lived Grove School but reignited at the 1855 Paris Universal Exposition. This was the call for schools to educate students of various national origins under one roof (Sylvester, 2002, p. 5). Schools for non-locals, once conceptualised as a response to the
needs of an expanding empire, were soon regarded as a response to the violent shortfalls of the empire-building demonstrated on the battlefields of Europe, or colonialism’s ravages of local populations. Therefore, it is no coincidence that, with end of World War I, the first schools calling themselves ‘international’ opened, within a fortnight of each other, in October 1924, in Geneva, Switzerland, and Yokohama, Japan (Hill, 2012, p. 250). Similar to their predecessors, both schools were organised by local expatriates to meet the educational needs of their children (Yokohama International School, 2014). However, there was an added emphasis on educating students with ‘internationalism’, a term used but never explicitly defined (Hill, 2012, p. 250).

Thompson and Hayden (2013), rather than looking at phases of international schools, use the more general notion of ‘types’. Historically, Type A was mostly evident in schools offering home country curricula to a nationally homogeneous clientele. Today such schools may offer a home country education experience, such as the Advanced Placement (USA), or the GCSE (UK). Type A schools dominated phase one and two of international schools. The first phase was defined by expatriates setting up schools to serve their children in an environment that was not supportive of their mother tongue development, nor the pedagogic practices and identities of their homeland. However, with the end of the war, two forces converged and supported the development of a second phase of international schools. The rebuilding of countries ravaged by war, the opening of markets and the improving transportation systems encouraged the need for schools catering to a new professional nomad. Therefore, along with the more established British, American and French schools, there now emerged an international school structure in which different expatriate nationalities were served under one roof (Bunnell, 2011; Hayden; 2006). For the most part, locals did not attend such schools.

The end of World War II witnessed a third phase of international education. In the aftermath of the war, it became clear there was not only the need to rebuild nations destroyed by war but also the need for greater intercultural and inter-national discussions centred in peace and development; so the Type B school emerged, grounded in a post-colonial ethos, in which peace, multilingualism and international understanding were the bedrock (Hughes, 2009; Hayden, 2011; Walker, 2010). Such schools were driven by a mission, which asserts education can develop a better, more peaceful world (Hayden and Thompson, 2013, p.4). Ironically, the Cold War tensions may have further fuelled the drive to create schools grounded in this spirit, as particularly envisioned by the United World College movement founded by Kurt Hahn (van Oord, 2008) or more loosely by the European schools created in 1953 for the employees of the European Union (Hayden and Thompson, 2013, p. 8). Arguably the convergence of Type A and Type B schools led to the creation of the International Baccalaureate, in 1968, and with it the first explicitly international curriculum and diploma.
The roots of the IB were twofold: On the one hand, to create a diploma for students of expatriates that was accepted by home country universities, and on the other, to promote intercultural and international understanding (Peterson, 2003; Hill, 2012). In essence, the establishment of the IB marked a turning point, as international schools now sought a recognized legitimacy by first gaining university acceptance of its diploma, and second, by identifying itself as offering a particular pedagogy that was both constructivist and character forming. The IB has since expanded to offer primary, middle-years and career-related programmes while witnessing consistent growth. While the story of both the IB (Hill, 2002) and international schools (Bunnell, 2014) are well told elsewhere, it is noteworthy that in 1971 there were seven schools offering the IB, all of which were private, and 80% of these were international schools (Bunnell, 2014 p. 11; IB, 2015).

In many ways, the history of the IB is an apt metaphor for the international school movement. At its inception, its handful of associate schools were international, but by 2015, over 56% of its clientele were state schools. Growing from a few diploma candidates, by 2015, it was offered in 4,000 schools, to over 1.2 million students (IB, 2015). From its traditional base in Europe and North America, the IB has significantly grown in the past decade in Asia, which now constitutes approximately 16% of its schools (IB, 2015). However, the growth in the international school, particularly in Asia and the Arabian peninsula, has witnessed a decline in the percentage to approximately 23% of international schools offering IB Programmes (Bunnell, 2014, p. 11) – probably due to the fact that the IB is tied to its Euro-centric past (Halicioglu, 2008; Resnick, 2012), despite research indicating it supports preserving and developing local identities (Hayden and Wong, 1997; Poonoosamy, 2010).

As Hayden and Thompson note, many of these new schools represent a Type C international school – primarily for profit and aimed at the local, economic elite. These elites question the viability of their state schooling system and seek an international education for their children, perceiving it to be superior. These Type C schools represent a fourth phase of international schools and have rapidly become the largest portion of the international school sector. They do not fit with the previous types of international schools in that they are neither geared towards meeting the educational needs of an expatriate community, nor are they necessarily grounded in a philosophy, and by extension pedagogy, that seeks to inculcate values, based in peace and intercultural understanding (Hayden and Thompson, 2013, p.21). These latter traits often identified as hallmarks of what constitute a legitimate international education (Allan, 2013; Bunnell, 2016, p.18), leading some to call for a more robust model of assessing if schools, which claim to be international, are indeed such (Bunnell, Fertig and James 2017; Hayden and
The pedagogy of the international school also traces its roots to constructivist, students-centred ones, which seek to have students critically engage with learning. Cambridge (2002, 2010) notes that international education is indeed a transformative discourse but has its roots firmly in Western values and epistemes that more recently have become overtaken by the values of an elite transnational class (Sklair, 2002), with an emphasis on free market economies, mobile workforces and alignment with ‘brand proposition’.

Cambridge argues that in many regards international schools, especially those offering recognizable, banded education systems, such as the IB, run the risk of neglecting central tenets within their mission statements, which are usually grounded in such values as social justice and multiculturalism. This thrust within international schools has been named their internationalist agenda (Cambridge and Thompson, 2004). Moreover, this form of education seeks to develop multilingualism in an effort to engage more effectively with others and support intercultural competencies. Its curriculum is focused on global rather than national trends (Hill, 2012; Tarc and Tarc, 2015). Without explicit efforts to embrace these, Cambridge fears the schools create a separated, socio-economically similar class that is disengaged and pursues self-interest, and the ‘other’ (those not included in their class) is reduced to the exotic but always incidental (Cambridge, 2002; 2010). Loosely coined as the globalist or cosmopolitan agenda, the focus within this form of education is to enhance status and positional advantage in a global marketplace (Tarc and Tarc, 2015). Indeed, Cambridge has gone so far as to state that at present international schools face an ‘existential crisis’ (2017, p. 14).

However, while international education continues to be a blue-chip education aimed primarily at a global elite (Brown and Lauder 2009; 2011), the make-up of this elite has changed dramatically. In 1969, Leach noted that of the 370 international schools, less than 19% of the students were local (Leach, 1969, p. 148), with the majority of students being American or British (Mayer, 1968, p.148). The latest statistics reveal these proportions have flipped, with over 80% of the students attending international schools now being local. This is especially true in areas where international schools, especially Type C, have expanded rapidly in recent years, such as China, the Arabian peninsula and the Indian subcontinent (Bunnell, 2014).

British, American, UAE, and Chinese governments have been large investors in international schools, with the latter aiming to have 3,000 international schools by 2016 (Bunnell, 2014, p.6). Such growth has led some to predict that approximately 23,000 teachers per annum will be needed to meet the needs (Whitehead, 2013), the vast majority of whom will be headhunted if they are Anglo-American native speakers of English. After all, these are the teachers that parents want (Mackenzie, Hayden and Thompson, 2003). Furthermore, as Canterford (2009) predicts and
recent headlines from the UK have highlighted, demanding such teachers puts stress on national systems in the USA, UK, Canada and Australia, where teacher shortage is already an issue. Not only has this demand thrust international schools into the public spotlight, it also raises questions about what is actually being communicated by the schools when such teachers are actively profiled and sought out. In an attempt to meet parental expectations of what constitutes an international teacher, schools hire a specific profile, thereby legitimising it as the as the ideal or acceptable international teacher (Richards, 2002; Mackenzie, 2003; Canterford, 2009).

As Bunnell (2014) and Millican (2000), among others, argue, the emergence of these Type C schools mark a move away from the underpinnings of the post-war philosophically orientated schools and pedagogy to a new corporate-focused education system, wherein ‘international’ is synonymous with ‘Western’. Indeed it may be argued that this shift has even permeated the International Baccalaureate. During the recent review of its Learner Profile, the IB, once a bastion of the second phase international focus, commissioned a review of the Profile by its former Director General, George Walker, who within his review wrote: ‘The IB cannot be everything to everyone and many students study the Diploma Programme precisely to achieve a passport to higher education in the West’ (Walker, 2010, p. 8). The message is clear: an international education is truly focused on developing the knowledge and skills for success at a Western university and the centrality of internationalist agenda is questionable. Matthews’ (1988) research supports such an assertion, as he notes 88% of international students go to university with that vast majority attending Western institutions.

Section 2.2: The International Clientele: Parents and Students

From its beginning, international education has consistently offered an alternative path and one that is sometimes controversial. As early as the late 1870s, some educationalists were decrying having students educated abroad as anti-nationalist, and indeed many early ‘international’ schools were supporters of an imperialist worldview, wherein the children of expatriates working overseas needed to be educated in the home countries’ curriculum, since local education was considered inferior (Thompson, 2001, p.277). Schools often sought isolation rather than engaging with the local system. Fast-forward approximately 100 years, and the notion of separation had been replaced by embracing the other. As Sylvester (2002b) and Ellwood (2007) note, there remains the central issue of developing an exact definition of what constitutes an international school and more pressingly what such an education means for the student who undergoes it.
However, a reoccurring theme within both academic literature and such schools’ mission statements is the notion of inculcating and living by international values. Hayden (2006) notes there is a spectrum of schools with varying degrees of commitment to supporting international values, a situation further exacerbated by the lack of clarity and agreement on what the values actually are. Nevertheless, the IB in its Learner Profile offers one possible perspective. Originally designed to underpin its Primary Years Programme (PYP), the IB now views this list of 10 attributes as underpinning its notion of international-mindedness, with a focus on developing intercultural understanding and creating a more peaceful world (IBO.org). But these attributes have been clearly identified as Eurocentric, with a sound grounding in the humanist epistemologies that emerged during the Enlightenment (Walker, 2010), an assertion further supported and critiqued by van Oord (2007). However, Allen (2002, p. 134) argues for a consideration of Western and Eastern values as complementary and not necessarily antagonistic.

For their part, Cambridge (2010), Resnik (2008), Whitehead (2005), Bunnell (2010) and Brown and Lauder (2009) posit that what is actually at play is producing a student who is finely attuned to become a worker in the modern, interconnected economy, where intercultural understanding and multilingualism complement a market-focused desire for peace. Indeed, the more recent discussion of global mindedness has witnessed a shift away from critiquing its Western-centric focus to an exploration of its transnational, corporatist agenda grounded in a free-market economy ideal. In particular, the IB has been criticised for presenting different pedagogic identities to different stakeholders at different times (Cambridge, 2010, p. 211). What seems to be emerging within international schools is that a student’s cultural heritage or pedagogic growth are of secondary importance when enabling students to develop the social capital benefits necessary to successfully participate in a global marketplace. Research into the worldview of international students, conducted by Kanan and Baker (2006) and Bunnell (2010), appears to support such an assertion, as both find that international students view themselves as separate from those in national schools, an assertion that would appear to be at odds with the core of international mindedness. Such findings support assertions made by Lauder and Brown (2009), Bunnell (2010), Hayden (2011), arguing that international schools produce a class unto itself that is globally mobile and well suited to participate in the global auction, wherein personal capital with an emphasis on ‘soft currencies, including social confidence, good communication skills, and social fit with colleagues and customers’ reigns (Brown, Lauder, Ashton, 2011, p. 140). In essence, an international education enables positional advantage.

Furthermore, research within the field of international education tends to demonstrate that such schools are part of an upper middle class movement to acquire positional advantage, rather than developing a ‘better world for all’, as many of their missions proclaim. Inquisitive learning,
especially at the upper secondary level, is driven out by the market force of acquisitive learning (as personified in high-stake exams, such as those of IB, IGCSE or AP), enabling students greater access to ‘top’ universities and access to ‘connections’ that will support access to better jobs (Brown, Lauder, Ashton. 2011, p. 145). Indeed, former IB Director General Jeff Beard (2006) clearly identifies the notion of an IB education as a means gaining positional advantage in a global, market economy (Cambridge, 2010, p. 208). However, one should take caution when engaging with this literature. As noted previously, much of the research into international education is still in its formative state. At present, what is missing is research that confirms that such students do indeed enter universities at a rate beyond what they could expect given their socio-economic status.

Allen (2002) and Akram (1995) explore the central role international schools play in the lives and identities of students. Of special note is Akram’s assertion that, within the changing world of expatriate living, the international school is the most stable environment for youth and so plays a much larger role in their lives than it does for their counterparts elsewhere. Furthermore, Allen identifies international schools, by virtue of their globally mobile clientele, as separating themselves from the host culture, often personified by developing their own ‘culture’. For example, schools may permit their students to act or dress in a manner that directly contravenes local norms, thereby failing to raise students who are interculturally aware (Allen, 2002, p. 134). Dunne and Edwards (2010) echo this theme of separateness in their study of international schools in the Philippines. They found students who saw themselves as separate from the local. Furthermore, the students did not aspire to work towards eradicating inequalities, as they viewed them as unavoidable. Both studies suggest that the internationalist aspirations of international schools and students’ expectations may need realignment.

Tension between the local and the expatriate students’ experience at international schools is explored by Poonoosamy (2010, 2014, 2015), Grimshaw and Sears (2008), and Hughes (2009), with all expressing concern that international schools and their curricula can reduce the ‘other’ to ‘exotics’. Often the emphasis on ‘otherness’ not only has the potential to force students into a single identity, such as the passport they hold, but it also risks unveiling the complexities that race, gender, religion and age, to name but a few, play in constructing personal identity. Hughes (2009, p. 138) emphasises the need for international schools to avoid ‘colonizing tendencies’ and embrace a more robust understanding of the self and the ‘other’. Cambridge (2003) offers the IB’s Creativity, Action, Service (CAS) expectation as a viable means for students to meaningfully engage with the other.
Lodewijk van Oord explores the student experience in international education, particularly its learning and worldview. His research is grounded in the earlier identified Type B international schools, wherein developing intercultural understanding and world peace is keystone (van Oord, 2008, p. 51). He is critical of the lack of support offered by the IB in promoting its Peace and Conflict course, and also of its scant uptake among international schools. Drawing upon sample student feedback, van Oord cites how the course expands students’ understanding of the challenges and opportunities they face in the world while simultaneously offering them frameworks to meaningfully understand and participate in it (van Oord, 2008, p. 53f).

His findings are important because they offer an alternative discourse surrounding international schools as places where building social capital is the main purpose. Drawing upon the work of Hill (2002), Gellar (2002), and IB (IBO, 2001), van Oord further argues that the course in question is supportive of minority rights and aspirations, as well as making students aware of the possible consequences of environmental degradation (van Oord, 2008, p. 57). He further argues, in a vein similar to Cambridge (2006), that the IB’s CAS programme is a means through which conflict resolution and environmental guardianship can be fostered (van Oord, 2008, p. 57). Both Cambridge and van Oord state there are frameworks in place for students and other stakeholders to meaningfully support the internationalist agenda of international schools.

Van Oord’s (2004) and Fail’s (2010) studies of student-teacher relations found that cultural and national backgrounds of students shaped what social and pedagogical behaviours they deemed acceptable and meaningful from teachers within the classroom. For the purposes of the current study, their findings suggest teachers working internationally must navigate a multiplicity of expectations regarding their professional praxis in order to support student learning. This work resonates with earlier research conducted by Hayden (1998), Hayden and Thompson (1998), Hayden, Rancic and Thompson (2000) and Wilkinson and Hayden (2010). These studies conclude that teachers on two levels shape the experience of international school students. Pragmatically, teachers prepare students for international examinations, which are recognized by universities for entrance purposes. Ideologically, teachers offer learning opportunities to interact with cultures and epistemic traditions. Moreover, teachers are seen as embodying characteristics of international mindedness and intercultural competencies. Again, such research suggests that pragmatically teachers must have a multiplicity of practice to engage and support student learning, while ideologically they need to develop an understanding of international mindedness and intercultural competencies, as they are models of both.

Dunne and Edwards (2010) find many teachers are surprised when confronted with the idea that the schools could be sites of social change, rather than just focusing on preparing the students
for matriculation to higher education in a Western university (Dunne and Edwards, 2010, p. 34-36). Nevertheless, although specifically in relation to the IB’s Diploma, a study commissioned by the IB finds that regardless of location, both students and their teachers find implementing the IB’s Learner Profile challenging due to the subject-specific expectations upper secondary students must meet (Rizvi, Acquaro, Quay, Sallis, Savage and Shobani, 2014, p. 38).

Furthermore, there are often tensions between the school missions, with an emphasis on community-grounded values and responsibilities, and the teachers and students who understand learning as an individualistic experience (Rizvi, et al. 2014, p. 39-40). Although the study was specific to IB schools, what emerged is the challenge of teaching aspirational values of international mindedness in any context where high-stakes exams and subject-specific learning expectation dominate.

Similarly, as academic years progress, both teachers and students are increasingly formed by the exit expectations, exam preparations and subject-specific knowledge, inquiry and skill sets required (Starr, 2009, p. 121). The tension between the school mission and local culture may be heightened by these expectations, as may the cultural dissonance a student experiences who is not accustomed to such a learning or assessment approach. Therefore, there appears to be a need for the international teacher to not only be aware of the differences in perceptions of what a teacher can and should do, but also of their role within the life of their students, which may diverge significantly from what they have been trained to do or indeed even think of as good practice (Snowball, 2008; Fail, 2010; Mulligan, 2015).

As with other issues, relationships between parents and teachers at international schools have not been explored widely. Nevertheless, the MacKenzie, Hayden and Thompson (2003) and MacKenzie (2009) studies into this area reveal a consistent theme when it comes to school choice and the types of teachers desired by parents. MacKenzie et al. (2003) found that parents are less interested in their child receiving an ‘international education’ than an English language education, a claim that Bunnell (2014) and Tarc and Tarc (2015) reasserted. For parents, an ideal international teacher is most likely to be a native English speaker. The teacher’s ability to teach an ‘international’ curriculum to an ‘international’ body of students is less important.

Canteford’s study offers ancillary evidence that such perceptions are acted upon, finding that teachers from the USA and UK account for over 50% of teachers employed at international schools (Canterford, 2009, p. 81), with Snowball (2008) noting Canadians and Australians also compose sizable numbers (Snowball, 2008, p. 86). However, Lowe (2000) and MacKenzie (2009) also identify a desire among parents to have their school of choice offer a rigorous curriculum that gives their children access to the best universities, often identified as those overseas. Again, the
lack of focus on the international component would appear to support the earlier assertion that, for parents, international schools are places that increase their child’s social capital rather than venues where their child can meaningfully and fully engage with the ‘other’ while working towards intercultural understanding and peace – values that dominate international school mission statements (Cambridge, 2003; MacDonald, 2009; Tarc and Tarc, 2015).

However, MacKenzie’s (2009) study of Japanese parents does find an explicit and robust desire among them to have their child meet people from different countries. Furthermore, these parents view international schools as necessary for preparing their child to live or attend tertiary education overseas. Significantly for the Japanese, a curriculum delivered in English is considerably less important than the aforementioned desired outcomes (MacKenzie, 2009, p. 333). This study is at odds with the findings in Switzerland (Mackenzie, Hayden and Thompson, 2001), Argentina (Potter and Hayden, 2004), Israel (Ezra, 2007), Singapore (Vidovich and Yap, 2008) and Thailand, Saudi Arabia and Sri Lanka (Hayden, 2006), all of which confirm that teaching in English is the dominant choice for seeking an international school education. In a similar vein, Mackenzie notes that in Chinese classrooms the teacher is expected to keep control, whereas in a Japanese one the students are assigned this task (MacKenzie, 2009, p.328) – these cultural expectations, he argues, do affect expectations of international teacher praxis.

Section 2.3: The International Teacher

Hayden and Thompson (2010) note that research into teachers in international schools was scant in academic circles, with most of our information emerging from practitioners working in the field and undertaking post-graduate research. Seven years later, the situation remains’ unchanged (Bailey, 2015; Tarc and Tarc, 2015; Bunnell, 2017). Within the literature is a tendency to cast teachers as deliverers of an international curricula, such as those offered by the IB (Cambridge, 2010) or as defined by their role within the production of a global elite (Brown and Lauder, 2009). To understand this very complex field demands that it must first be contextualized and all its parts unpacked.

Globally, over the past decade or so, teaching has become increasingly scrutinised and measured by states concerned with evaluating effectiveness and seeking quality assurance. Some argue we have entered a postmodern era of teaching wherein the teacher is no longer a purveyor of knowledge but rather a guide in constructing meaning for students (Stables and Gough, 2006; Stables, 2006; Tabrizi, 2016; Wells, 2016). One could argue that teachers are consistently in a state of incompleteness and that ongoing professional development should be the norm (Snowball, 2008; Mulligan, 2015). Hardman (2001), Hayden (2006) and Bunnell (2015)
suggest that such forces and expectations in home nations have encouraged some to venture into international teaching, despite its increasingly precarious nature.

Part of the challenge in studying international teachers is their turnover rate, between 16-20% per annum (Odland and Ruzicka, 2009, p.5), and their diaspora globally. The independence of international schools and the differing qualities of each one may contribute to the high level of turnover among international teachers. Interestingly, only a handful of academics (Hardman, 2001; Bunnell, 2004, 2015; Canterford, 2009; Cambridge, 2002; Joslin, 2002; Odland and Ruzicka, 2009) have explored these phenomena despite the inevitable drain they put on the financial, emotional, pedagogic and social well-being of the affected school (Garton, 2002; Blaney, 2000; Hardman, 2001). In general, they uncover teacher turnover-related issues, such as contracts, voice in decision-making, administrative support, school misrepresenting itself and changing personal situations (Odland and Ruzicka, 2009, p. 23). Cambridge (2002) also notes the general practice within international schools of having a three-tiered approach to contracts (i.e., different contracts for locals, expatriates living locally and overseas hires) may further contribute to teacher dissatisfaction, in-school factions and teacher turnover (Odlands and Ruzicka, 2009; Doyle 2010). More recently, Bunnell argues that changing geopolitical situations and expanding schools, combined with an expanding workforce, have led to a new era in international education, where teaching internationally is now more precarious than ever before (Bunnell, 2015, p.7). Despite these challenges, international teaching continues to attract many applicants, a situation that has caused media in both the USA and the UK to express concern over the apparent ‘brain drain’ (BBC, 2016).

Hardman (2001), and to a lesser extent Cambridge (2002), identify four major archetypes of international teachers: childless career professional, maverick, career professional with family, and senior teachers, whom he further subdivides into three subcategories: senior Penelope, senior career professional and senior maverick. Childless career professionals are generally new to teaching, have a high level of involvement with students and are often cost-effective to schools, as they bring experience but no spouse or offspring. Mavericks like to travel and view international teaching as an adventure; they may also be seeking to avoid their national system. They, too, tend to travel without children but have limited commitment to the school and its community. Finally, the career professional with family seeks a prestigious school and is committed to the school and what it aims to achieve. They usually bring a high degree of experience and skill but are costly to schools since they do travel with a spouse, who may/may not be a teacher, and they usually have children (Hardman, 2001, p. 132). Hardman’s work also identifies some senior teachers as ‘Penelopes’, more concerned with social integration than with developing new, or pertinent skill sets. Senior career professionals are identified as lifelong
learners, who approach their job as a meaningful, stimulating challenge. *Senior mavericks*, like their younger counterparts, are seeking to travel again, now that their family responsibilities are reduced, and they are often focused on retirement plans (Hardman, 2001, p. 133). Of note is that since Hardman’s 2001 study little has been written on the archetypes of international teachers.

Hayden (2006, p.76) hypothesises that international teaching has the potential for teachers to flee the constant changes and challenges faced by their profession in their home country. However, Bailey (2015) finds this not to be accurate. Bailey notes that those new to international teaching often do, as Hayden predicted, experience a ‘de-skilling’ but opt to be transformed rather than transfixed by the challenges posed by teaching an international clientele, with their different learning and assessment expectations (Bailey, 2016 p. 14-15). For the most part, Bailey finds that teachers look to international school as an adventure and, in some cases, an opportunity to learn new skills (Bailey, 2015, p. 13). Indeed, she finds that teachers new to international teaching feel themselves well prepared for the task and so not in need of any specialised training (Bailey. 2015, p. 14).

This is at odds with the findings of Richards (2002), Deveney (2007) and Duckworth, Levy and Levy (2005), who all note that teachers moving to international schools lack the frameworks and understanding necessary to teach an international class. However, Bailey does find among those newer to international teaching an attitude that teachers who had left before the spate of reforms and the rise of public scrutiny during the past decade are unskilled in the latest pedagogical practices (Bailey, 2015, p.9). Indeed, Day (2002) establishes in his study of UK teachers that many live in a mythical halcyon past when the state education and their skill sets are considered strong and unquestionable. Such teachers, he notes, are less willing to embrace reforms or changes.

However, such teachers do not represent the norm in international schools, for as Bailey (2015) uncovers, teachers working overseas develop a greater sense of autonomy and skill by embracing the unknown. It should be noted that though Baily’s sample is small, her findings do stand in contrast with those of Ball (1990), (1994), Sachs (2000), and Comber and Nixon (2009), all of who unearth a general reticence for professional growth among teachers in places as diverse as Australia, the UK and USA.

Bailey’s findings are particularly in need of greater critical scrutiny. I believe they do not actually challenge the suggestions of Richards (2002), Hayden (2006) and Duckworth, Levy and Levy (2005), who all see a need for those entering international education to have an appropriate knowledge and skill set before they start teaching. My personal experience as a teacher and
administrator, who has worked in both a state and international setting, leads me to believe that this topic is in greater need of attention. While experience is a good way to build knowledge and skill sets, having teacher programmes that identify and explore uniquely unfolding areas within the international teaching framework would be beneficial. Without such an underpinning, an international teacher – here I echo the sentiments of McKenzie (2004) and Hughes (2009) – may become yet another form of unwitting imperialism and forming a class of teachers unto themselves.

This theme of international teachers forming a class unto themselves is explored at length in the work of Bunnell (2004; 2014; 2015) and Cambridge (2010), in which the emergent globalisation of international education plays a significant role. In Cambridge’s discussion of the IB Diploma, he argues that market forces are reshaping international education and the values it seeks to inculcate students with (Cambridge, 2010, p. 202). Cambridge argues that international teachers are now tasked with preparing students with mindsets and soft skills that enable them to enter the global marketplace. He claims that this diverges from the original underpinnings of the IB, where a focus on personal growth and community were what teachers had to focus on developing, alongside academic excellence (Cambridge, 2010, p. 210).

Throughout Bunnell’s extensive writing, he raises concern for the reforming impact globalisation is having on the international school, most notably in the challenges posed by the new Type C school. Indeed, he offers a robust model to assess the quality of schools claiming the international moniker (Bunnell, Fertig, James, 2017). Teachers, he argues, play a central role in legitimising a school as international, because their examples, pedagogies and interactions set the tone and format for international learning (Bunnell, Fertig and James, 2017). In this, Bunnell et al. echo earlier sentiments regarding how central teachers are to meaningful international education, stated by Hayden and Thompson (1995), Garton (2000), and Snowball (2008).

Hayden (1998) cautions that positioning international teachers as a unified group, sharing values and experience, is misleading. Even so, in her study of 226 international schoolteachers, she finds that they shared a common commitment to learning in multicultural settings, with varied perspectives and preparing students for the rigours of exams that would be recognised by leading universities (Hayden, 1998, p. 97). She also expresses significant support for multi-ethnic and multilingual schools that actively sought to broaden students’ perspectives and experiences, leading to a ‘likelihood of positive attitudes developing’ (Hayden, 1998, p. 103). This study, and her latter work with Rancic and Thompson (2000), and indeed the work of Van Oord (2004), all support an assertion that teachers shared fairly cogent understandings of what being
internationally educated means. However, how this actual experience is constructed, underpinned and meaningfully enacted at a secondary school level remains largely unexplored.

I have already indicated some of the cornerstones of expectations regarding international teachers held by both parents and students. There would also appear to be an expectation that such teachers can speak more than one language, participate in extracurricular activities, take part in service-oriented programmes and serve as living examples of international mindedness (Hayden, 1998, p. 167; Hayden, Rancic and Thompson, 2000, p. 118f). Gaining such skills, in particularly the challenging notions of ‘international mindedness’ and ‘intercultural understanding’, are the subject of recent studies by Harshman and Augustine (2013) and Savva (2013). All concur that for teachers to develop a deeper appreciation of other cultures, actual contact with the ‘other’ and reflection upon this event are necessary. While the work of Savva is focused on teaching candidates from the USA, they do note that novice teachers demonstrate greater ability to empathise with students from different cultures when they too had lived and worked overseas at a practicum teaching assignment in an international school. Savva (2013), in her study of teachers from the USA and Canada working at international schools, also notes the development of greater intercultural awareness but stops short of evaluating the impact such sensitivity has on the teacher’s pedagogy and their professional relationship with peers and students (Savva, 2013, p. 223).

However, a larger scale study of international teachers in either pre- or in-service training paints a less positive picture. In their study, Duckworth, Levy and Levy examine the FAST TRAIN programme from the USA, with its focus on developing international teachers. The study finds that candidates are homogeneous as far as social status and certain ideals, such as being respectful of all cultures and being aware of the possible conflict between curriculum content and the student’s understanding (Duckworth, Levy and Levy, 2005, p. 303). However, this study deals with ideals and little reflects how these ideals impact pedagogy and professional relationships. Indeed, many respondents note that as the attended schools are dominated by one culture, they had no clear sense of what working and living in a multinational, multilingual international school looks like (Duckworth, Levy and Levy, 2005, p. 300).

Deveney (2007) places some of the blame for this lack of a culturally aware pedagogy at the feet of teacher education programmes, which, for the most part, still focus on preparing teachers for national systems (Deveney, 2007, p. 313). Additionally, many of her respondents have the opinion that teaching on the job is the only way for international teachers to develop the traits and practices necessary for successfully teaching at an international school. To this end, she urges stronger mentoring programmes be developed at international schools (Deveney, 2007, p. 326).
As part of her literature review, Deveney notes that there are emerging themes: One being teachers who view their primary task as preparing their students for successful entry into Western universities. The second is that, despite cultural or national differences, all students essentially learn the same way (Deveney, 2007, p. 322). More disheartening, she finds within her study in Thailand a noticeable trend among international teachers to not ask Thai students to give an answer in class. When questioned, teachers report that Thai students are slow to respond, while others acknowledged they lowered their expectations for Thai students to make the curriculum more accessible (Deveney, 2007, p. 321).

The lack of cogency between all studies identifies the difficulty of finding consistent themes within the international school literature and arguably within the international school milieu. I would add to the mix here my experience and insight into a hidden expectation among some parents, that their child be educated by an accent that is from the Commonwealth or North America. Indeed, Richards (2002) and Garton (2000) suggest parental prejudice is a contributing factor in who gets hired. A teacher operating in such a situation may find such information helpful when navigating the creation of a positive classroom environment, which supports students-centred learning as well as developing partnerships with parents and the local community.

Blaney (2000) argues that for international schools to fully meet their stated missions they need to be composed of an international teaching team who serves as a role model of international cooperation for students. She also believes that within the current construction and operation of international schools such an approach is failing due to a systemic lack of planning effective recruitment (Blaney, 2000, p.167). Also particularly challenging for international schools is balancing market and parent expectations against their international mission. Indeed, the failure to find the correct balance can lead to a divided staff and become an affront to schools espousing universal values and human rights (Richards, 1998, p. 178). For example, teachers hired locally are not necessarily the most qualified to teach in an international setting. More often than not, they are perceived to be less capable teachers since their training was done in a national system, not grounded in Western pedagogic ideals and practices (Richards, 1998, p. 179; Schwindt, 2003, p.73ff). Schwindt (2003) has gone so far as to propose a model for effectively integrating and utilising local teachers within the international school setting. She argues that such a model is of the utmost importance, considering the claims of universality of such schools and the rising numbers of locals attending them.

After a decade or so, such issues have not disappeared and have been, arguably, exacerbated by the massive growth within the field and the spiralling demand for teachers – a demand that often must be met via locals. Blaney’s observations are also noteworthy when considering the
contracts international schools offer teachers and coalesce around the three main teacher groupings: host-country nationals, ‘local hire’ expatriates and ‘overseas hires’. Each groups tends to have its own contract. For example, shipping allowances, housing and end-of-contract flights home are among the benefits that local hires and local expatriates do not usually have. As well, in some countries, locals may be paid less than their overseas’ colleagues (Garton, 2002, p.88f).

Overseas hires are often sourced at mass-recruitment springtime fairs, such as those held by European Council of International Schools (ECIS) or Search Associates. Although in recent years, the demand for top-quality teachers has meant that, in Japan at least, hiring is often done in the fall, in an interview conducted via social media.

The difference in contracts can be viewed a number of different ways. For example, from a post-colonial viewpoint, these contracts appear to reflect a coloniser mentality, where the local is worth less than the expatriate. Or from a free market economy perspective, the schools are simply paying for the resources in a competitive manner. However, what is clear is that despite mission statements espousing equality, multiculturalism and justice, international schools do not necessarily practice what they preach when it comes to contracts. The coming years will surely see this situation enter a critical stage as the labour demand outstrips supply, a situation further exacerbated by the growing call for legitimisation of international schools (Fertig, 2015; Bunnell, Fertig and James, 2017). International schools will be forced to address the apparent inequality at the heart of its being, lived through by its workforce.

What is clear is that much still needs to be done in the academic exploration of international schools. The challenge in coming up with a working definition of what such schools are, the vast variety in their form and function, their scarcity when considered on a global scale and the lack of a governing body all contribute to the difficulty in studying them. Nonetheless, certain themes have emerged. For a start, we have their ongoing growth and, at least on a mission level, a commitment to developing students enabled to meaningfully engage with the ‘other’. However, the lens through which schools view such values varies. There appears to be clear evidence that parents, some organizations and various educational leaders squarely place the value of such schools on how they develop student’s capacities to situate themselves within the knowledge economy. Others, most noticeably teachers and students, view such education as valuable and challenging, as they confront and work with the ‘other’. There is also some evidence that the international schools may be serving a globalist agenda that has remnants of colonial worldviews.

Whether it is tiered contracts for teachers based on birthplace or current location – with teachers unaware of the challenges in working with a multinational and multi-ethnic population – or parents
believing that Anglo-American native speakers of English are the best educators for their child, there is a need to better understand the why and how of education within international schools.

Moreover, there are clearly expressed expectations and values of what constitutes an international education learning experience. What is missing, however, is an actual study tracking it from growth of an idea through discourse and finally into practice. Admittedly the focus of the research thus far has been on the ‘ideas’ that shape the discourses and practices of international schools, and on the lived-life experience of students. But investigating teachers as the front line of meaning makers within international schools may help shed light onto areas that at present remain murky. In no small way, it is the teacher who has the task of unpacking the curriculum and its expectations while simultaneously modelling international mindedness and supporting students as they navigate a formed past into an international education (Hughes, 2009, p. 137). That teachers do such in a situation of curriculum, personnel and structural change is overlooked and as a result understudied. It is within this area this present study hopes to contribute to the discourse. Through exploring the experience of teachers, I aim to uncover some of the aforementioned themes in an effort to better understand those who, within the confines of the school, are entrusted with supporting student learning and thereby constructing their worldview.

Section 2.4: Foucault, Bourdieu and Education

While their use within this study is explored more deeply in Chapter 3 and 4, it is useful at this point to have a general exposition of Foucault’s and Bourdieu’s key ideas, which underpinned most of this study. Both view education as a powerful, transformative event wherein social norms and expectations are inculcated (Ball, 2013; Bourdieu, Passeron & Nice, 1997; Geiger, 2010). However, this inculcating is a sophisticated process often enacted unconsciously or unquestioningly by teachers (Geiger, 2010; Hannus and Simola, 2010). Yet both theorists offer a somewhat paradoxical view of the construction of a self within a society. Both view the individual as defined and shaped by society. However the individual, with enough knowledge, awareness and self-determination may recognise those forces that seek to control them and through a combination of reflective introspection and explicit action (not only physical, but also mental, emotional and spiritual) break free of current bonds (Hilgers, 2009; Lemeke, 2011). For both, therefore, education is both a cause of and a solution to the problem of a liberated, autonomous self (Ball, 1990; Biesta, 1998; Butin, 2001; Bourdieu, Passeron & Nice, 1997).

For Foucault, the autonomous self is a constructed entity situated in a particular time and place. Employing his method of archaeology, Foucault explores the past in search of a genealogy of those norms and accompanying practices that both govern and organise the present (Zhao,
Underpinning such an interpretation is his notion of discourse. For Foucault discourse embodied the naming, identifying and inculcating with subjective normative value societies’ practices and beliefs. There are multitudes of discourses all vying for dominance. However, those with the power to do so establish the discourse which best consolidates their current advantage (Foucault, 2010, 1994b). As a discourse develops it become part of the ‘unthought’ regime of truth, which remains unchallenged until named and identified as a social construct, rather than a universal truth. Such unthought is central to the domination sought which enables a society to be governed through a process he identifies as governmentality, of which education is a central agent of imposing adherence and discipline to the sanctioned discourse. As the individual is exposed to the regimes and is shaped by them via various technologies (i.e., those forces that shape thoughts, behaviours and actions) and the discipline (discipline is learned, observed and sometimes enforced by society), they develop an acceptable self wherein a subjective self is objectified under a given regime of truth and its related discourses (Roth, 1992; Ryan, 1991; Schlosser, 2013).

Similarly, Bourdieu explores those social structures presently at work. Through his notions of field, habitus and doxa he seeks to uncover the forces that shape and define what society asserts to be valuable, useful and identifiers of development. Education, like any other field, is a place where agents operate to both guard and reproduce their social positioning. Within the field works habitus, which loosely coalesces around such items as dispositions, taste, culture and economic status, to name but a few.

These dispositions characterize how inhabitants of the field act and interpret the world around them. Likewise, they help sense make, that is when a new or challenging event unfolds they shape both perceptions and the normative values ascribed them (Bourdieu, 1984). Additionally, each field has doxa, or written and unwritten rules that are imposed as a means of classifying membership. Doxa and nomos such as credentials and taste, also operate to exclude. However, they are also fluid and changeable over time in an attempt to keep the field relevant and vibrant. Education not only helps impose doxa, and develop the necessary habitus, it also, within the Bourdieusian discourse, produces capitals that may enable membership. Aside from the ubiquitously recognised economic capital Bourdieu also identifies cultural and social capital. Cultural capital exists in three states. Within the embodied state it is present as ‘dispositions of the mind and body; in the objective state, in the form of cultural goods (pictures, books, dictionaries, instruments, machines, etc.), and in the institutionalised state’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.106), in the form of certifications, such as diplomas. Social capital is created and developed through networks of inter-human relations and contacts. These networks both affirm and reaffirm
membership in a particular field and utilise others’ capitals, doxa and habitus in this process (Bourdieu, 1986; Bourdieu, 1984; Nash, 1990).

Given that international education, both as a term and a concept, remains unrefined and undefined (Allan, 2013; Hayden and Thompson, 2017; Bunnell, Fertig & James, 2017), Bourdieu and Foucault collectively provide frameworks capable of working with opacity (Forster, 2015; Geiger, 2010; Hannus & Simola, 2010; Tabrizi, 2016). Bourdieu names those forces which shape how we presently function within any social sphere, while Foucault helps us understand why such forces developed and bore the power to shape. Together, for the present study, they provide the necessary robust framework to explore a field and its agents, which continue to emerge despite lacking a collective, agreed-upon consciousness, central tenets and terms.
Chapter 3: The Research Design: Methodological Underpinnings

Section 3.1: Rationale for Approach

Traditionally quantitative research approaches dominate education due to their claim of impartiality. However, such claims have, since the mid-1980s, increasingly been criticised as the notion of impartiality is questioned, especially when applied to researching the complex nature of human development and education (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011, p. 2). Education and the values assessed within it are, according to numerous theorists such as Foucault and Bourdieu, a political act undertaken in a constructed framework. To propose that education operates under dispassionately applied principles, practices and expectations is misleading, misinformed and without basis.

While Bunnell’s and Hayden’s work establishes international schools as legitimately constituting a field, their variety, geographical isolation and lack of governing bodies gives rise to a lack of a unifying form, format and purpose. Such divergence not only challenges researchers’ resources but any attempt to meaningfully quantify evaluations around set criteria. As Beech demonstrates, any study on international education needs frames of references and approaches that are both robust and move beyond the national agenda (Beech, 2005, p. 2). Indeed, both Ball (1994) and Vidovich (2007) argue that the complexities of a postmodern world, wherein uncertainty and ambiguity are central demands that researchers embrace in a multi-tied and multidiscipline approach to educational research (Baxter and Jack, 2008; Gough, 2002b). Within such parameters, qualitative research may offer a viable means for unpacking and contributing to the discourse on international education.

Smith (1996), Clough (2001) and Erickson (2011) note the growth of qualitative research within education over the past two decades is in direct response to the noted shortcomings of quantitative research when exploring topics requiring an emic rather than etic exploration and understanding (Erickson, p. 45, 2011). Additionally, such an approach constantly reminds the researcher to guard against personal bias influencing what is discovered (Alex and Hammarstrom, 2007, p.169). Such awareness, although not fool proof, does help mitigate occurrences of personal or social bias impacting the research and what it reveals (Gough, 2002a, p. 6ff). Unlike quantitative research, which usually explores and extrapolates through one lens, qualitative analysis accesses multiple lenses (Flick, 2002; Ellingson, 2009; Denzin and Lincoln, 2011). Such a multifaceted approach enables an exploration of the given topic over time, with the
potential to address complex matters in a cogent form while remaining flexible enough to embrace non-cogency and/or emergent contingencies. In the same vein, it does not necessitate studying items that are static.

Qualitative research embraces the ambiguity of the incomplete, the complex and is content to make robust observations based on emergent items. Therefore, in a study that explores being a teacher (itself an inherently transient state) and sense making within a workplace that is both vague and emergent in its cogency, what is required is a robust yet flexible methodology and methods. Finally, qualitative research, when conducted in an ethical and planned manner, offers the potential to more fully understand the individual point of view rather than relying on 'more remote, inferential empirical methods and materials' (Denzin and Lincoln, p. 9, 2011). Rather than reducing the subject to a set of quantifiable numbers, a qualitative approach embraces its complexity while simultaneously accepting that all research is interpretive.

The reality of educational reform and change suggests that teachers are in a state of perpetual ‘becoming’, an assertion supported by the work of Stables and Gough (2006), Hayden, Rancic and Thompson (2000) and Wells (2011). This notion is of central importance to the current study, where the underlying premise is that teachers are ‘becoming’ and are, therefore, open to developing new ideas and interpretations of who they are, what they do and why they do it. Given the focus of the current project on teachers and their becoming ‘international teachers’ as they meet the learning expectations of their students, schools and in some cases external testing bodies in an environment that is often foreign to them, the primary audience for this research will be those who develop and guide professional development for international schools.

School leaders may also find the research of use in understanding how teachers think about their job and the challenges and opportunities this presents. At the same time, it is essential to keep the teacher’s voice central. To this end I have elected to undertake a mixed-methods approach that is squarely grounded in qualitative research and viewed through lenses defined by the work of Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu. Reflecting upon both Foucault and Bourdieu’s contention that teaching is a highly personal and generative practice, I believe such an approach will provoke discussion on the pertinent and identified findings while simultaneously serving as a means of reflective practice for those participating in the study.

The research is constructed in three main phases. Phase 1 involves teachers at selected schools completing a questionnaire. Phase 2 involves interviewing those teachers who agreed to participate via the open invitation at the end of the questionnaire. Finally, the third phase involves teachers keeping a reflective journal. Each phase informs the next. Furthermore, each phase
should give rise to increasingly in-depth analysis. Following, I outline and give a rationale for the methodology and then the methods employed in this study. I proceed to explain the process where schools were identified and teacher contacts made. Next I outline how the research was conducted and then consider its ethical considerations. I conclude by summarising how this approach best fits the goals of the research.

Section 3.2: Overview of Methodologies and Methods

For our purposes, methodologies refer to the underlying theory as to how the research should be conducted, both in terms of methods employed and sense making of data. Within such a perspective, methodologies serve as both formative and generative principles. Methods refer to the means through which information is gathered (Reid and Gough 2002). As Gough (2002a) and Stables and Gough (2010) note, educational research can often be more accurately conceived of as the elimination of ignorance rather than the pursuit of truth. In the current study, that would indeed appear to be a more purposeful starting point, given the vagueness surrounding international schools, the dynamics of their communities and the multilayered relationships between teachers and students, most of whom do not share ethnic or cultural backgrounds. Furthermore, the lack of a shared understanding of what is meant by central tenets within the international school debate, such as ‘international’ or ‘global mindedness’, only obfuscates matters more. Added to the complexity is that each school defines itself differently and teachers usually position themselves personally within the discourse.

The construction of the research, therefore, has to account for such complexity, simultaneously offering both insight and permitting the possibility of blind spots to emerge, which hitherto had not been identified or articulated. To aid in this regard, the research is constructed so that each phase builds upon its predecessor, enabling me to ask crucial questions and anticipate as-yet-unidentified concerns (Gough 2002a, p. 4). Similarly, given the central thrust of this project is to uncover how teachers construct a personal reality grounded in what they believe to be true and live it via their practice, qualitative research permits a greater opportunity to explore explicitly those realities/values that teachers consider significant (Christians, 2011, p.63f).

Indeed, as a central goal here is to uncover teachers’ subjective interpretation of their role and praxis a qualitative research framework permits the voice and interpretative discourses of the teacher to emerge more readily (Phillips, 1993, p. 68f). Furthermore, employing a qualitative approach enables the application of many different approaches in uncovering the complexity of the topic at hand (Baxter & Jack, 2008). Moving from a broad data-gathering questionnaire into interviews and finally journaling, the intent is to move from gathering general data from teachers at the identified schools to establishing a sense of the arena and various discourses from which
they construct and conduct their job. Specifically, the interviews will address the notion of praxis and sense making within an international school, with due consideration given to the role of Westernization and globalisation (Cambridge and Thompson, 2004; van Oord, 2007; Cambridge 2010).

The approach also gives voice to teachers as they address this charge of cultural imperialism and make sense of their job in a situation that is often far beyond their own cultural or educational experience. As well, through a deeper tunnelling into this personal understanding and the possible actions and contingencies that flow from it, the present study – with its focus on understanding, meaning making and action – can more robustly position itself to make claims regarding teacher praxis within international schools. The study will offer an opportunity for teachers to verbalize and consider what they cogitate, while simultaneously enabling the researcher to signpost emergent themes or conditions.

Finally, journaling will offer teachers a way of exploring their role and praxis by posing questions for reflection. The hope is that teacher will begin to understand the broad context within which they operate and, via the methodologies offered by Bourdieu and Foucault, critique their current practice and assumptions in a meaningful way. In the following sections I will do a detailed examination of items raised in this general introduction. I will explore and unpack the work of Foucault and Bourdieu. Then I will examine the actual form and format of the research, and identify challenges that the approach offers. Finally, I will explain how the data is to be analysed and raise issues of ethical concern and how they are dealt with.

3.2.1: Methodologies – Overview

Michel Foucault (1926-84) and Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) were colleagues and friends with a shared interest in power, the construction of meaning and criticising Marxism and neo-liberal ideals (Callewaert, 2006, p. 73). They, however, viewed the world through different lenses. Foucault was a philosopher with a special interest in the history of epistemology, whereas Bourdieu was a sociologist. They never debated their ideas publicly, yet we know they did privately (Callewaert, 2006, p. 74). Education as a vehicle which shapes social relationships, as well as power dynamics and epistemologies, were topics of research for both, yet neither wrote on the international school movement. Bourdieu wrote extensively on education, most notably with Passeron and Nice, in *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (1997), and in numerous articles with Wacquant. For his part, Foucault authored little on education except during his latter years (Ball, 2013, Loc. 172), in numerous interviews and seminars.
Themes developed by Foucault and Bourdieu offer not only a means to explore data but also provide a framework through which such data can be collected. While work has already been done combining the two theorists into exploring prisons (Schlosser, 2013), their combination remains largely untapped in education. Indeed, for the most part, when they are used as a dual lens, one tends to dominate while the other plays a supporting role—see, for example, Sanz Gutierrez’s (2014) examination of parental choice in Peru, or Pitsoe and Letseka’s (2013) investigation into classroom management.

The present study utilises them as equal, mutually supportive researchers in the empirical uncovering and extraction of data. Until recently, using compound lenses, especially a compound consisting of Foucault and Bourdieu, was deemed as questionable within educational research. The apparent lack of common ground between the two theorists was deemed to make their unified application unworkable. However, as Hannus and Simola (2010) in their exploration of power within education argue, using theory that is complementary (Heiskala, 2000), even if somewhat conflicting, can provide an insightful, pivotal structure and analysis within complex fields (Hannus and Simola, 2010, p. 1-3). Therefore, theories do not need to be completely aligned to enable a robust model of extraction and sense making.

A good place to enter into the application of a joint lens is via the two researchers’ mutual understanding of power. Indeed, an understanding of their notion of power is central for the current study, as it underpins so much of what will follow. Foucault and Bourdieu offer a view of power that goes beyond the traditional understanding of it as primarily a means of imposing one’s will upon another for a desired outcome.

Both theorists view power as grounded in relationships that structure the personal, the social and ultimately the understandings and actions that unfold. Foucault’s central aim was to unveil those historical origins and forces that shape the individual and the truths they construct and live by. Herein lies his insistence on uprooting the genealogy and archaeology of the discourses that shape and inform regimes of truth. For him, these forces ultimately inform how we act and think; they are technologies wherein the self is firstly subjectified via societally constructed norms that when absorbed result in an objectification of the self by the self.

For Bourdieu, it is the social unpacking of these forces, wherein habitus, capital, distinction and ultimately self-selection identifies the operation of power in its more subtle nuances. For both, then, power is a generating force that may operate at a conscious level, but generally is more effective when it becomes unconsciously absorbed through experience and practice (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1999; Foucault, 1995, p. 177ff). Foucault explicitly names this process as a new
form of post-Cartesian ‘cogito’, wherein the unconscious becomes a way of knowing by sleight of hand, wherein assumptions are lived without questioning their validity (Foucault, 1994b, p. 323-325). Moreover, it is noteworthy that while Foucault tends to rely upon the operation of power at meso and macro level, Bourdieu deepens ‘Foucault’s account of how subjectivity is constructed through power relations’ (Hannus and Simola, 2010, p.4). In other words, while Foucault identifies the historical roots of discourse and its resulting artefacts and technologies, Bourdieu reveals how such discourses shape access to, maintenance of and ultimately reproduction of classes.

In the following sections, I provide an explanation of the relevant central tenets, ideas and assertions of each theorist. Where pertinent, I note what they state in relation to education, and finally I make a case for the purposeful utilisation of both lenses to guide the study.

3.2.2: Methodologies – Foucault

Foucault writes and speaks extensively on a number of topics, but on education he writes sparingly until later in life (Ball, 2013). However, education, is considered a social event by Foucault and so he covers it under his discourses on social science. A number of overarching lenses are utilised by Foucault as he seeks to unravel the realities at play within the social science. At the heart of his approach is the notion of discourse – or how epistemologies are conceived, evolved and given traction. As he notes in the preface to The Order of Things (1994b): ‘Our thought ... bears the stamp of our age and our geography....’ (Foucault, 1994b, p. xv).

So, for Foucault to understand the present and the projected future, he must trace discourse through its historic roots and routes. The origins of the discourse, he argues, may be found in tracing the history of an idea from its inception, as a symbol or form, through to its development via knowledge, discourses or other social interactions, whereupon it becomes subject, object or both (Foucault, 1991, p. 59). Furthermore, he believes that ideas, their meanings and inceptions are in perpetual flux as external forces shape and reform them. Famously, in The Birth of the Clinic (1994), Discipline and Punishment (1995) and The History of Sexuality series (1976-84), Foucault uses his genealogical method to trace the roots of modern conceptions of madness, crime and sexuality, tying them to the emergence of the ‘nation state’ and centralised power in the 1700s.

However, he argues that the fecundity of genealogies seeking to ascribe unifying meaning to any idea makes unravelling meaning challenging. Unlike Marxism, feminism or structuralism, which seek to discover origin through one unifying principle, Foucault allows for complexity, arguing for a multiplicity of possible constructed meanings that will be shaped into the meaning and purpose in the present. He names this process ‘archaeology’ (Foucault, 2010, p. 33), a process whereby
an idea undergoes manufacturing into subject, object or both via various technologies (Foucault, 2010, p. 40). Technologies can be imposed by a society or personally, and are conceptualised as any ‘force’ that is applied to shape discourse and by extension meaning (Foucault, 1988, p. 19).

In *Discipline and Punishment*, he elucidates this notion by explaining that modernity is concerned with the correct means of training the individual through discipline. This discipline, rather than seeking uniformity, seeks the constructed differences and, through their application to an individual, group or society, gains governance and ultimately defines a regime of truth wherein norms and acceptable selves are constructed. Governance, if applied correctly, will ultimately lead to individual self-regulation within the acceptable boundaries of the dominant regime of truth as shaped by state and economy (Foucault, 1991, p. 188). Therefore, rather than separating agents, forms of power and control, what emerges is a unification of purpose, wherein such technologies as hierarchical observation, subjectively defined norms and associated judgments and examinations are all imposed upon the person.

What also emerges is individualism bereft of the ability to contextualise itself via reference to other possible selves, peers or historical time/space. The self is thus both object and subject simultaneously (Foucault, 1991, p. 189f). By way of explanation, Foucault offers the Panopticon metaphor. Originally developed by Jeremy Bentham, the Panopticon was offered as the perfect prison where all prisoners could be watched at all time. However, Foucault extrapolates from the concept to capture the modern state and its policing of citizenry by ordering their person in time/space. Foucault notes how prisons, sanatoriums and schools are all means of measuring and tracking people over time, and all owe their origin to the emergence of the nation state with its need to control its citizenry and exploit resources as a means of ensuring its survival (Foucault 1991, 1994 and 1995; Ball, 1990, 2013; Ryan 1991).

Part and parcel of developing this situation, for Foucault, is the developing of discourses that are embodied by artefacts that are grounded in genealogy and archaeology. Artefacts may be laws or unwritten social practices but they are understood and adhered to, often without ever being questioned. They help identify and delineate between the acceptable and the delinquent (Foucault, 1995, p. 189f). Such artefacts are discursive spaces created by and within genealogy. Therefore by employing archaeology, according to Foucault, we can establish positions between subjects and objects wherein sense is emergent, made and ascribed. Moreover, by identifying underlying artefacts and discourses, Foucault argues we understand both the conscious and unconscious condition of a state and by extension the individuals within it (Kendall and Wickham, 2003). However, this construction must not be misconstrued as deterministic – an issue I explore later.
3.2.3: Methodologies – Bourdieu

Within the social sphere, and specifically within schools, there are no clear delineations but rather a ‘multiplicity of determinations’ (Bourdieu, 1984, p.106). With the current attempts to identify such delineations (at international schools specifically), not all who apply for community membership are accepted. There are within international schools policies and practices in place that delineate membership. While it may be true that what qualifies a candidate for membership may vary over time, there is nonetheless a set of criteria by which one is deemed worthy of membership. For example, the ability to communicate in English may be one such criterion (though the level of proficiency required may vary over time). Bourdieu’s theory and studies in the area of habitus, field and capital offer robust lenses capable of accessing and analysing the international school and its various constituents.

Bourdieu’s primary focus within his study of education is concerned with universities. Even so, these higher institutions’ operation and situation is similar to that of international schools. He places universities in a field ‘consisting of cognitive and structural mechanisms that mediate socio-political and economic forces while simultaneously reproducing fundamental principles of social stratification’ (Naidoo, 2004, p. 457). Their relative independence from government controls permit universities to create values and behaviours that operate beyond such macro fields as politics and economics.

Arguably, international schools also operate for the most part independent of local governmental controls in a manner similar to Bourdieu’s universities, especially in the way that they too are focused on developing cognitive and structural mechanisms within a setting that often puts them outside host nation regulations. As Hayden and Thompson (1995, 2017) note, the very concept of ‘international school’ is ambiguous and therefore difficult to control or legislate. Both legislating and studying such schools are made further difficult by their poly-national composition. They have teaching staffs that – while mostly drawn from an Anglo-American background – do not share a uniform common pedagogical background and are not subject to professional organisation expectations and constraints, or union interventions, as their colleagues in state schools or private schools face within their home nations. Furthermore, international schools have been identified as places wherein socio-economic stratification is reproduced (Resnik, 2012; Schwindt, 2003; Sanz Gutierrez, 2014: Lowe, 2000; Brown and Lauder, 2009).

At the core of all schools, regardless of level, is teaching and by extension the practice of teaching. Teachers are defined by what they do and how they do it. Bourdieu understands practice as that which both unifies and generates. It is both an end result and a generator. He
proposes the following formula as a means of unpacking and articulating practice: ‘(habitus) (capital) + field = practice’ (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 101). For Bourdieu ‘habitus is both the generative principle of objectively classifiable judgments and the systems of classification (principium divisionis) of these practices’ (Bourdieu, 1984 p. 170). In essence, socially classifiable practices form, through various agents and their sense making of these practices, a normative yardstick and may become codified as policy over time (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 170).

In this regard, Bourdieu shares an understanding of identity and its alignment with post-structuralism, wherein sense making is generated through a navigation of the spaces, sign(al)s and experience of the lived life. Consequently, according to Bourdieu, the world that we inhabit shapes our identity and understanding, resulting in an internalisation of knowing and practices, which we externalise as class. Unlike classical understandings and explorations of class, Bourdieu views class as not only defined by gender or economic capital but rather as an epistemological and discursive space wherein sense is constructed and reproduced through learning. Within such a framework, formal education constitutes a central role in class identity, understanding, exploitation and reproduction. Furthermore, education supports those epistemologies and their manifestations in class identity and reproduction in its habitus (i.e., what it does) and capital(s).

A primary manifestation of a class is in how it cultivates habitus and generates capital. Habitus is articulated, or lived, through the capital it propagates, and the relationship between the two is mutually supportive. Habitus, as generated by a society, involves the constructed norms that form and define thinking and behaviour. Habitus, for Bourdieu, is morally neutral. However, he argues the impact it has may have moral ramifications (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 401). For Bourdieu, capital is not only property but also properties (such as language, taste, social norms, culture) that are internalised, considered valuable and worthy of reproduction as they underpin social mobility.

As Sanz Gutierrez notes, there are two different kinds of capital in Bourdieu’s world: 1. Economic capital refers to what is traditionally understood as capital – namely, the ability to exploit and control economic resources. 2. Cultural capital refers to the ability to navigate and use publically identified characters, such as taste, thinking and dispositions. This is the form that is mostly enabled through education, which seeks to embody in students the necessary doxa and nomos. Cultural capital is evident under three sub-identifiers: credentials (e.g. holding educational certificates); competencies (i.e. embodies physical and mental skills); and social capital (i.e., the social networks one is a member of and has access to) (Sanz Gutierrez, 2014, p. 69). Accordingly, habitus not only structures but also is structured by the capital that each class is
exposed to and generates. Bourdieu argues it is these multiple forms of capital at work that creates class-consciousness, which is both permeable and non-static (Bourdieu, Passeron, Nice, 1997).

It is worthwhile to note here that, as Bourdieu believes, the individual often operates within their class, habitus and field unconsciously, or at the very least unaware of alternative possibilities of being. Therefore, while they may be able to articulate what constitutes viable membership, they may be unable to explain why such identifiers are selected or even the relevance to the given habitus or field. Education, at both the formal and informal level, serves to inculcate the habitus of class (Bourdieu et al., 1997, p. 72) and provides the potential to develop the social and economic conditions necessary for class mobility. Nevertheless, Bourdieu forcefully argues in Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste (1984) that education is not only about learning explicit skills and knowledge, it is also about learning the unspoken rules of the game that enables one to be clearly identifiable as possessing the required capital and habitus. Furthermore, education enables each class to produce codes of access, expectations and behaviours, which he collectively entitles: Field.

Organised around nomos (provisional codes of social and political behaviour), fields are articulated areas wherein class position is identified and seeks appropriation of resources central to its reproduction. Operating vertically and horizontally, fields crisscross, permeate and in some cases independently operate across other mono-identifiers of class, such as gender, economic positioning and agency. Moreover, nomos creates fields of operation wherein membership is recognised, granted and acted within (Bourdieu et al., 1997, p. 72f). For Bourdieu, field functions primarily on a symbolic level, wherein the rules (i.e., doxa) of the game are subjective (though often under the guise of being objective), with the explicit purpose of constricting access to social spaces wherein class mobility takes place (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 244).

Decoding and understanding these doxa are vital and herein lies the power of gatekeepers who grant access via education to the field, including its status and positional power. By placing class within this broader concept of field, Bourdieu does not preclude the empirical understanding of goods but rather expands its catchments to include those whose status within the field is more fluid and dynamic that homogenous class structures (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 244f). In other words, membership is not solely dependent on economic capital but expands to include the various capitals that compose the field, structure habitus and are ultimately embodied via practice.
Such dynamism permits fluctuation of power and embraces the intensity which struggles for rare goods entail. Furthermore, it accounts for the non-static, yet non-relativist social space that maintains its exclusionary access to status and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 246). In other words, access to both the field and class can fluctuate within time and place, since adaptability is often necessary to ensure reproduction and survival of class. Unlike Marxism, which assumes the necessity of violent class struggle vis-à-vis access to rare goods, Bourdieu contends most struggles take place at a symbolic violent level – words and discourses mediate access to the field and its rare goods (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 249).

It is important to understand at this point that for Bourdieu ‘violence’ is an action done either wittingly or unwittingly that undermines the agency of another, thereby keeping them out of the necessary field, denuded of its potential capital. Those acting as gatekeepers (such as teachers or administrators), therefore, not only are guardians to the field (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 250) and its rare goods but are also active participants in the symbolic violence, which constructs and empowers membership and marginalises others. Within his and Wacquant’s (1999) exploration of imperialist reason, they take great pains to demonstrate how imperialism is most effective when it takes place at the level of language, ideas and access to media. They note the diffusion of American (i.e., United States) English and views of liberty via an academic press, which is, for the most part, based in the USA. In essence, through its ubiquitous presence, the United States and its worldview becomes the established norm and thereby the gatekeeper to unpacking and explaining the world. Again, the central tenet here is that a vast amount of what is accepted as ‘true’ and ‘meaningful’ is actually done at an unconscious level.

Nonetheless, gatekeeping is achieved through a delicate balance, one that consistently needs active moderation of those capitals that members must have versus those that are desired. Confusing the ‘must’ with the ‘preferable’ can risk alienating outsiders who thereby decide that membership is no longer possible or valuable (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 256), thus decreasing the value of membership and ultimately leading to its demise. The real power of the gatekeepers is ‘to universalise particularism’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1999, p. 41). It is at this point that Bourdieu’s theory becomes self-sustaining as the symbolic violence and control, which constitute field, will invariably support practices and capital that empower access to the rare goods, their status, capital and lifestyle. Therefore, gatekeeper practice entails selecting and supporting those who, if granted membership, will reproduce and benefit the habitus, capital and by extension the ‘field’.

Such reproduction is both generative and exclusive. It is generative for those who have the necessary nomos for membership, to be considered worthy of ongoing development; this
membership encourages a pattern of inter-responsibility and viability. Members are, therefore, supported as they seek out the means and methods of understanding the doxa of the field, thereby influencing their habitus and capital, and granting them deeper-level membership. Moreover, with membership comes an expectation that new members will validate the meaning and operation of the field by playing by its rules, and supporting its growth, development and exclusivity. In this regards, new members are also re-generating the field. However, the field is also exclusive, in that without the correct doxa and nomos it becomes very difficult to access, thereby creating a self-generating exclusion cycle.

In a manner somewhat aligned with Foucault’s notion of the self as both subject and object, Bourdieu extrapolates on what occurs within the field to produce the institutionalisation of an acceptable self, which in turn becomes a benchmark for gatekeepers to evaluate the ‘other’. A cornerstone of the acceptable self is explicit understanding of the doxa of the field and living it through a habitus that not only reflects such knowledge but verifies it by putting it into action and accepting it as ‘true’. Nomos – such as accents, social graces and taste – also acts as identifiers for both members and non-members.

From the outside then, membership is identifiable in that all members share a way of ‘doing’ and ‘being’. Without awareness of this self-replicating structure, institutions, and more specifically schools, run the risk of stagnation, wherein the possibility of reimagining the school and its student body becomes impossible. However, within this power/knowledge interaction exists spaces for the individual to act, negotiate and create individual meaning, thereby forming a new equilibrium within any field (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1997, p. 294). Both gatekeeper and candidate act independently but are structured by the habitus, capital and field that they have encountered. Bourdieu explains the power/knowledge relationship as grounded in epistemic precedent (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1997, p. 302) and presents potentialities for decisions, which are ethical, powerful and empowered to re-vision and refocus the self, institution and society (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1997, p. 298-304). The above assertions have led some to criticise both Bourdieu and Foucault as essentially theorists grounded in determinism.

### 3.2.4: Educational Research, Foucault and Bourdieu and the Claims of Determinism

Critics have written much about postmodern thought and especially the work of Foucault and Bourdieu (Nash, 1999; Hilgers, 2009; Schlosser, 2013). Of particular relevance to the current study is the critique that underlying both theorists’ work is determinism, wherein the individual
lacks the agency to act in a manner independent of the various forces at play within their particular time and location. However, such views negate the potential for individual action that both theorists unequivocally believe in (Schlosser, 2013, p. 34). Bourdieu et al. (1997) (1984) are consistent in his assertion that even within the highly structured and orchestrated operation of habitus and field, individuals remain capable of questioning the status quo and can step outside pre-established boundaries to act and 'be' differently.

In a similar vein, even when discussing his ideas about imposing docility among inmates, Foucault is keen to assert the ability for individual agency to counteract this docility. Indeed, he goes so far as to assert that studying the past and tracing its constraining structures is a viable means by which an individual can act ‘differently’. In this regard, he is aligned with Bourdieu’s notion of reflexivity (Schlosser, 2013, p.44). Furthermore, both theorists are clear to note the permeability of central structures within their arguments. Foucault asserts a fecundity of possibility within history, thereby ensuring that individuals have the potential for agency and are not simple automatons in time/space.

For his part, Bourdieu is clear that social structures may be durable but not incontestable (Sanz Gutierrez, 2014, p. 67; Nash, 1999, p. 178ff). Within Foucault and Bourdieu, the individual is continually at pains to balance the limitations that history, society and institutions may place upon them, but this does not negate the ‘transformative trajectory’ that such situations may offer the individual (Sanz Gutierrez, 2014, p. 71). For both Foucault and Bourdieu, the present is contingent. While such contingencies have profoundly dictated structures, modes and means of operation, they do need constant restructuring and refining, thereby creating a discursive space wherein the individual can choose their action (Lemke, 2001, 2011). The path chosen may be enabled through the generative review and study of the present that both theorists offer.

3.2.5: Closing Comments on Foucault and Bourdieu and the Current Study

That educational research is complex is attested to by the multiplicity of methodological lenses and methods it has utilised. Despite the encouragement and use of multiple or event-mixed methods in uncovering the facts (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Paul and Marfo, 2001; Minot and Young, 2009), there remains a reticence to utilise multiple lenses during interpretation. However, with the increasing popularity of action-based research over the past decade, this situation is changing with the emergence of hybrid lenses or combined lenses (Furlong and Oancea, 2005, p. 4-8).
A quick review of databases reveals that over the past five years fewer than 50 academic articles have been written on the subject of education using a Foucauldian lens, and many of these involved young offenders reintegrating into society or the needs of special education. Using the same key and time frame, Bourdieu has underpinned over 100 articles drawing from a wide spectrum of the education debate. Indeed the popularity of Bourdieu has led some to caution that there is a need to diversity or else risk academic myopia within the field of educational research (Resnick, 2015).

However, as I have revealed above, a methodology wherein both authors’ works are given an equal footing is rare, but I believe this is necessary and yields meaning when exploring the current topic. Education is complex, and even more so the formation of an international teachers profession, one that is consistently emerging due to the contingencies and elusiveness that constitute the international school.

Above I have laid out an approach that utilises the historical emphasis of Foucault’s methodology with the social construction of Bourdieu. Where Foucault can help uncover the historical genesis of ideas and practice as they unfold for institutions and individuals, Bourdieu offers a framework of analysis to uncover how such ideas and practice form and shape communities and their constructed habitus and fields of operation, such as those surrounding ‘the teacher’, and further afield, international education (Hannus and Simola, 2010, p.2ff). Both authors share a number of common macro ideas and assertions in relation to uncovering unconscious, or unquestioned assumptions and practices – all of these appear particularly helpful within the current study.
Chapter 4: The Research Design – Methods

Section 4.1: Methods

The complexity of the education field supports a mixed-methods approach. Below I explore the various methods employed, outlining their form and format, and providing a synopsis of how the Foucault and Bourdieu lenses will be applied to structuring and sense-making of the data collected. The actual research was conducted during the international academic years of August 2015 to January 2017.

As a high school principal within Japan, I am part of our local regional principals’ meeting. Initially, at a meeting in spring 2015, I outlined my wish to study teachers at member schools. I explained my reasons for selecting their schools as presented in Section 4.5. At this meeting, I assured the principals that I would make every possible effort to ensure their schools’ and their teachers’ anonymity. Finally, I explained that I would share an executive summary with them upon completion of the study.

All principals at the table agreed that the study seemed in line with activities their schools permitted. However, they requested that I send a formal letter of request at the start of the following year, outlining the study and its intent. This letter was sent to all relevant principals in August 2015, and by early September of that year, all principals had received the consent for the study from their Heads of School.

During August and September, I developed the questionnaire, and ran a pilot of the questionnaire with five teachers from my own school. Using their feedback, I modified and clarified the questionnaire, and shared with participant schools via Google Forms. Data was collected for one calendar month starting mid-September 2015. Themes and statements that emerged during this process helped further refine the interview questions. These questions were developed during winter 2015-16, and piloted in late January 2016 with three volunteers, from my workplace. After the questions were adjusted to add clarity and avoid jargon, interviews took place during spring 2016. In all but two occasions, I visited the teachers at their schools.

I spent summer 2016 reviewing the data from the interviews and identifying any areas where questions remained. As the study was grounded in the belief of research as generative practice, the majority of the journaling prompts were drawn from those areas where interviewees had struggled to answer or had incomplete answers. The journaling exercises took place during September-December 2016.
Section 4.2: Questionnaire

As Bell (2003) and Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2005; 2007) note, the questionnaire needs to be neat, tidy and worded in a manner that is clear and precise. Furthermore, questions should move from the general gathering of information to those demanding a more considered response. It is important for this questionnaire to be jargon free, since jargon may not only confuse the reader, it can also serve to exclude them (Bell, 2003, p. 121). The questionnaire needs to be shaped to address two priorities: 1) Highly structured questions to support clarity and a full range of possible responses, and 2) Open-ended questions that are not leading.

The central aim of this questionnaire is to obtain insight into international secondary school teachers’ thinking and personal background, such as who they are, where they come from, their training and generally their position on topics of particular relevance to the current study. The questionnaire must also consider subsidiary issues that may affect this central aim. Therefore, by means of introduction, there is attached to the questionnaire an overview of this study, its aims and a restatement of the commitment to anonymity. The questionnaire utilises a semi-structured format in which a clear programme is established but leaves open a full range of possible responses. Therefore, the questionnaire moves from structured to semi-structured and finally to open-ended questions, with the latter having a limit placed on the number of characters allowed, to keep responses to manageable lengths. To aid with ease of use and access, the questionnaire was delivered via Google Forms.

The questionnaire is divided into two major sections. Section 1 contains 17 questions; respondents were asked to provide some personal data that may help explain how they got to their current understandings on the topics and questions explored (Cohen, Manion, Morrison, 2005, p. 246). The aim is to help establish a professional profile of teachers participating. Such data is important in establishing parameters around which participants can be grouped, as well as guiding the formation of questions for the in-depth interviews. Section 2 consists of five short-response questions, with a central goal of painting a more robust picture of how teachers view their job, with reference to such key areas as professional development, international education and personal exploration of the extent to which an international setting affects personal professional praxis.

Of note for this and all following stages of the research, is that at no time was a working definition of ‘international education’, ‘international’ or ‘global mindedness’, or even ‘international teacher’ provided. As stated previously, uncovering what and how teachers personally construct these terms and implement them in their praxis was an underlying objective of this research. Ensuring teacher voice and discourse, not the researchers’ subjective understanding, were of upmost
importance. Also, uncovering what teachers currently believe and practice can only be guaranteed when teachers talk and someone listens. Both the structured and semi-structured responses garner a sense of who is thinking what, while the open-ended questions offer the opportunity to identify emergent themes within the given situation (Cohen, Manion, Morrison, 2005, p. 248). These themes serve as the building blocks upon which the interviews are conducted.

Between the general information questions and the open-ended questions sit questions utilising a Likert scale. The Likert scale section has 34 questions, asking respondents to respond using five categories: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree. Within this set of questions, 16 directly relate to how respondents view themselves as teachers, nine seek perceptions of their current schools, six seek to uncover their view of their current students, and three ask for responses to statements made regarding international education. However, as Peabody (1962) and Cummins and Gullone (2000) argue, the ordinal nature of the Likert Scale, while identifying general trends, does not permit a meaningful interpretation of a specific trend. Moreover, if the scale employed is not consistently applied, then it lacks robustness (e.g., if within the same questionnaire different descriptors are used for individual descriptors). Thus, for the method employed herein, the intensity between the agree and the strongly agree lack clarity. To help alleviate such a situation, a consistent weighed scale is used for all questions, thereby adding clarity to the extremes (Norman, 2010).

Using a method developed by the University of Bath, the extremes (i.e., strongly disagree/strongly agree) are weighted using a factor of 200%, while the disagree/agree remain as the base of 100% (Meier, 1953; Rizvi and Lingard, 2006). Neutrals are removed, since they remain undecided and as such cannot be presumed to lean one-way or the other. For my purposes, the two levels of “disagree” are interpreted to be negative, while the two levels of “agree” are positive. I then calculate the total scores to get a net percentage summation, which in turn is divided by 100 to yield a Weighted Means Index (WMI). By employing such a method, any WMI in the +1 to +2 would represent an indication that a given group has strong positive leanings in regards a particular question, while a -1 to -2 would indicate a strong negative disagreement. Anything that falls between 1.0-0.0, regardless if it is agree/disagree, indicates a less strong stance. Zero would represent no leaning whatsoever. Identifying the extremes more robustly supports identifying of areas in need of discussion during the interview and journal-writing phase.

4.2.1: Application of Foucault and Bourdieu

As the numbers of respondents are drawn from a small and closed field, any generalisation attached to the larger field of international education should be avoided. Drawing upon Foucault’s
notions of archaeology, these questions aim to uncover the genealogy of ideas and practices, which in turn may suggest the formation of a field, with its attached doxa and habitus as developed by Bourdieu.

Section 4.3: Interviews

In-depth interviews serve a triple function:
1. To establish the parameters of the study for the participant,
2. To give participants an opportunity to review and construct knowledge in relation to the topic at hand (Kvale, 1996: quoted in Cohen et. al 2005, p. 267; Wacquant, 1999),
3. To stay in line with the awareness of the power dynamics within an interview, the purpose of which both Foucault and Bourdieu note is: To generate data that is both informative and generative.

Below I give an explanation of each of these functions.

To establish the parameters of the study for participant. This is the first time the participants and the researcher meet. It gives the researcher the opportunity to clarify discourses that arise from the questionnaire while affording participants the opportunity to ask any clarifying questions. It also affords the researcher the opportunity to again outline the role of anonymity and ethical considerations that underpin the study. Moreover, at this stage, the interview and its place within the overall research project can be unpacked as a reflexive interplay (Chase, 2011, p. 422), in which the focus is not on having a correct answer but starting a process of identifying ideas, opinions and/or practices held. Indeed, the interview may be conceptualised as a form of professional development, wherein the teacher experiences a space and time in which questions and thinking central to their praxis are reconnoitred. Finally, by asking specific questions while avoiding unnecessary jargon that the tone of the research is set, in which a personal voice and opinion are valued, and participants are afforded some ownership of the project, moving the dialogue from one of the interviewee/interviewer paradigm to that of narrator and listener (Chase, 2011, p. 423).

To permit participants an opportunity to review and construct knowledge in relation to the topic at hand. In this regard, these interviews are informed by the concepts of Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2005), Chase (2011) and Luke (2002), who assert that the interview itself is a real-life situation wherein knowledge and understanding is generated via discourse and human interaction. Furthermore, as the interview is the central point in the research between the questionnaire and the journaling, it is essential that both participants and researcher are clear on the meaning of given terms and the scope of the research. For example, during the interview, key
terms, such as international education, international teacher and international mindedness, although not defined are introduced and discussed. This approach serves a dual purpose. First, it generates data. Second, and flowing directly from Bourdieu’s work of reflexive sociology (Wacquant, 1996; 2008), it encourages the participant to reflect and generate ideas in relation to their context and teaching. Such understanding may aid in the clarification and generation of ideas and practices, which, one hopes, will lead to the development of data during the journaling exercise. However, care must be taken to introduce such ideas in an accessible manner, wherein participants can construct personal, relevant meaning that helps to generate new understandings and contemplations of topics that, up to now, may have remained hidden or thinly unpacked within their international education praxis and discourse. The aim here is to enable participants to view themselves as both part of and shapers of the research while supporting the construction of meaning grounded in their current praxis within the international school setting.

Part of the synchronistic development of knowledge flowing from this situation is data that is both informative and generative – the third and final aim of the in-depth interview method. A central theme explored herein is the notion of power as a generative, liberating force, as well as a closing, controlling entity, with a strong role shaping the educational experience for stakeholders, of which the teacher is but one. Aside from Bourdieu’s own work on the form and format of interviews, such an approach also finds traction within the ethnomethodology approach as outlined by Holstein and Gubrium, (2011), Gubrium and Holstein (2001) and especially in institutional ethnography, as outlined by Manicom (1995). After the interviews are conducted, they are ‘coded’ using strategies outlined under section 4.3.1., with particular emphasis on the construction of meaning by generating normative regimes of truth via experience and professional knowledge, which shapes and is shaped by praxis. In essence this information should lay the groundwork for the development of what both Bourdieu and Foucault identify as an acceptable self.

Questions unfold using a focused trust wherein the ‘how’ and ‘what’ of praxis are established. To this end the following are the four guiding questions:

A. How did the interviewer become a teacher?
B. How (if applicable) did they become international teachers and what, if any, shift did that entail? For example, what has this becoming meant to them as a person/professional?
C. How do they understand international education and international/global mindedness?
D. What do they do to enable themselves and their students to shape learning, understanding and skills in relation to C above?
4.3.1: Application of Foucault and Bourdieu

Questions are broad in nature and directly draw upon Foucault’s notions of genealogy, archaeology and regimes of truth, and Bourdieu’s of field, habitus and forms of capital. The analysis is initially drawing upon Foucault and his notions of genealogy, anthropology and their role as generative powers in enabling the creation, or a continuation, of a reign of truth, as embodied through the technologies enacted and the artefacts produced. Then moving to a focus upon Bourdieu’s tenets of habitus, field and capital, other questions seek to establish ‘how’ and ‘what’ is being constructed, understood, accessed, acted upon and imparted. Likewise, the analysis utilising these lenses seeks to unveil how ideas and discourses generate praxis within the individual teacher’s professional life.

However, the interview itself is a power game wherein interviewer and interviewee are agents acting within normative roles and expectations. In this sense, it is a context wherein meaning unfolds and is constructed. That is, as both Foucault and Bourdieu note, we all live in historical times, and as such social and cultural context affects how we think and talk about social objects, such as schools, their communities and interactions with them (Alex and Hammarstrom, 2008, p. 169). Therefore, what interviewees narrate is situated in the perspectives shaped by historical time/place, social positioning, cultural capital and levels of power (Alex and Hammarstrom, 2008, p. 170).

In this particular circumstance my position as a principal, who has either direct responsibility for some participants or has a working relationship with principals of other participants, needs to be explicitly addressed. I outline the steps taken in regards to such ethical considerations in Section 4.6. Moreover, during both the interviews and their analysis, it remains important to recall that what is of value to the study is teachers’ current and unfolding understanding of central issues, and not having the correct answers. Participants need to have this focus and assertion re-established at the outset of the interview. Such an assertion resonates with both theorists and their discourses surrounding the development of an acceptable self. The interview seeks to uncover if during the development of their praxis teachers are simultaneously creating an acceptable self. What forces guide teachers in this pursuit and what are the hallmarks of this acceptable self are also of relevance to the study.

As Alex and Hammarstrom, (2008), Bourdieu and Wacquant (1999) and Goldstein (2003) all note, the use of reflexivity enhances an interview conducted within the qualitative approach. A useful tool within the reflexivity approach is to tape the interview and for the interviewer to listen again with an ear to understanding what role, if any, the interviewer played in determining what was said (Alex and Hammarstrom, 2008, p. 174). Similarly, as Bourdieu (Bourdieu et al. 1992)
notes, the researcher must at all times be aware not to turn the interviewee into an object via using over-specialized language, intellectual posturing, theoreticist fallacy (i.e., the interviewer knows better than interviewee) and indeed symbolic domination (Burawoy, 2012, p. 189).

The *object* under discussion is the notion of international education and within that the *subjective* sense-making that the interviewees have of it, which may in turn guide their practice and role within the classroom (Wacquant, 1989 p. 35; Bourdieu, 2003, p. 282-83). Moreover, using Foucault’s notions of genealogy, archaeology and the technologies of the self, the aim here is to uncover how the interviewee came to their current understanding and enacting of their praxis. In essence, I seek to explore how they have constructed meaning and action from the interactions and experiences they have had. However, as Foucault notes, the reflexivity approach itself is a social construct and risks becoming another means of relative epistemologies seeping into the research (Kendall and Wickham, 2003, p. 101). Nonetheless, being aware that utterance, declarations and responses given by the interviewee and my own potential bias in identifying them as significant is an important step to letting the utterances guide the sense and not vice-versa.

Given that inside the classroom a teacher guides the construction of meaning within the boundaries and contingences outlined by their school and shaped by personal experience, the classroom and the teacher’s role within it will be, by definition, constantly unfolding. From this perspective, the interviewee is actually best situated to sense make of what is actually ‘going on’, thus enabling the interviewer to be a partner who explicitly identifies possible meanings and their contingencies to the interviewee (Kendall and Wickham, 2003, p. 124). Ultimately, from these utterances, the interviewee is informed and empowered to act or not act upon them. Indeed, such a perspective is wholly aligned with the ideas of Bourdieu and Foucault, both of whom argue for an ongoing construction of meaning wherein actors have varying levels of awareness, power to influence and access to forms of capital that may be able to shift discourses and epistemologies with varying levels of effectiveness (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1997, p. 291). Indeed, it is this very personal, local and subjective erudition of international education that the study hopes to uncover, and, as such, reflexivity serves as a check and balance but not a definitive lens.

**Section 4.4: Journaling**

With the interviews completed, a purposive sample will ideally offer to continue with the project with the focus on studying shared phenomena – namely, the living of normative assumptions and emergent understandings regarding praxis of the international teacher. Utilising Williams’ (1983) notion of keywords and drawing upon the performance ideas, as outlined by Bourdieu (1985), and Foucault’s notion surrounding genealogies and acceptable self, teachers are asked to journal on
selected ‘prompts’, which seek to probe if utterances and claims made during their interview are actually acted upon as they perform their work. Being mindful that I am the direct supervisor of participants, the questions raised are thematic and derived from information that emerged during the in-depth interviews, to support anonymity. Furthermore, all entries are anonymous.

The journaling exercise enables the researcher to explore in detail those topics with particular resonances within the interview, or those that were unforeseen yet emerged during the interviews. Journaling, therefore, serves as both a deepening lens and a contingency framework.

4.4.1: Application of Foucault and Bourdieu

Both Foucault and Bourdieu warn of the pitfalls of research that relies on personal reflection, for interviewees are both subject and object within their lived lives. Poignantly, Bourdieu warns that an unconscious or unsophisticated view of the self may have dire consequences when the researcher seeks to uncover how the self makes meaning. Indeed, Bourdieu undertook his study of the French university system to explicitly render that which ‘is taken for granted’ and to offer a very concrete, very pragmatic vindication of the possibility of a full sociological objectification of the object and the subject's relation to it (Wacquant, 1989, p. 33). Undeniably, he argues that as a practitioner within the system, he had to understand the system to effectively work within it and produce knowledge in a manner that was epistemologically robust.

Likewise, Foucault argues that becoming conscious within one’s current situation – as defined by the technologies, ideas and artefacts constructing and impinging upon us – is an enabling and democratising act, and one that often calls for ethical review and action. In a similar vein, the current study also aims to achieve such an outcome by highlighting participants’ understanding of the construction of the international education field during both the questionnaire and interview phases. Foucault’s metaphor of the Panopticon and technologies of the self are reversed and used by teachers as a means of introspection on their praxis, epistemological assumptions and meaning making. In essence, this entails a process of reflexive praxis grounded in consideration of questions around the development and enactment of learning experiences, and structuring of environments, which are cognizant of students’ background. Likewise, within an international setting teachers not only consider but make explicit their formation and form of praxis.

Journaling presents a forum wherein engagement with the central notions of the study and reflecting upon them may lead to meaningful erudition for the teacher and potentially the stakeholder they interact with. It is also believed that through journaling the teachers will be able to recount or uncover if and how they became an international teacher, and what sensibilities and actions that entails or should entail. In essence, it should reveal what discourses have shaped
them and defined the regime of truth wherein they are situated. Flowing from this is an exploration of how these regimes of truth are lived, enacted and conceptualised within the teachers’ classroom and engagement with students. By this stage, the participants should have some understanding of the issues at play, including the power, technologies and social capitals that underpin and affect the international schooling field and individual praxis.

Section 4.5: Schools and Teachers Selection

Schools were selected based on a number of criteria, not the least of which was to what extent could they be considered international schools. In this regard, the criteria used were: Identifying themselves as an international school, length of time in existence, being accredited by an internationally recognized agency and explicit commitment to international education. Accreditation by, not just membership in, an external accreditation body has been argued for by numerous academics within the field and continues to be a resounding theme, especially in light of the emergence of new, Type C schools (Bunnell, Fertig and James 2017; Hayden, 2011). Therefore, a key deciding factor was that selected schools must be members of the Japan Council of International Schools (JCIS), where members ‘meet a number of important criteria, including stability, continuity, professionalism and an explicit commitment to internationalism’ and collectively form a self-governing body that oversees sports and fine arts events in the region. On a more personal note, accessibility was a key factor for my selecting international schools within Japan.

All schools selected can be described as falling under Hayden and Thompson’s Type A or B international school. It should also be noted that a number of these schools are considered pioneers within the field of international education. Furthermore, the selected schools are considered among the most prestigious and well-established international schools in Japan and as such are among the largest in the country. All schools offer either the IB or AP at the high school level, while two offer the IGCSE, and one the GCSE for grades 9 and 10. All schools’ missions speak to serving an international clientele with an international pedagogy.

Where used in this paper, school names are pseudonyms. Moreover, it should be recalled that the schools act a means through which teachers were contacted and as such identifying or studying them beyond this purpose is not necessary to meet the objectives of the current study.

Please note, all schools are K-12 institutions, with English as their main language of instruction and offering English language acquisition courses for students. By law in Japan, Japanese nationals must attend state-recognised schools. Under current Japanese law, the Ministry of Education considers none of the schools explored as a mainstream school and as such local
Japanese who wish to attend may need permission if they have not completed Japanese middle school.

Section 4.6: Ethical Considerations

At all points during the conducting of research for this project, I drew upon the ethical guidelines established by the British Educational Research Association (BERA, 2011). This study raises a number of ethical considerations aside from those usually present in such research. First, I address those issues, which are generic to this type of research, and, second, I outline those more specific to this study and especially related to my role as principal.

The need for informed consent and anonymity was a central issue with this study. Throughout the study I have made every attempt to ensure that schools and participants understood its parameters. From the outset, schools were asked if they would like to participate, in a twofold process. As noted above, I first broached the topic with the divisional principals at our quarterly meetings and then, having received their consent, wrote to them and their Head of School, seeking permission to conduct research with volunteers from their staff. I reiterated the purpose of the study and emphasised that anonymity of school and participants would be of the utmost importance. I also stressed that due to the particular focus of the study, participation must be voluntary.

To encourage participation, I did note that it might serve as meaningful professional development and reflective practice for teachers. To this end, I committed to sharing an executive summary of my findings upon conclusion of my studies. A similar overview was also presented as an introduction to the questionnaire and the interviews. I also began each interview with a restating of the professional and ethical guidelines I was following, and provided explicit noting of the BERA and University of Bath expectations on conducting ethical research. At all points during the survey, the interview and journaling a participant was free to opt out of further participation (BERA, 2011, p. 6).

To keep anonymity, I have changed all schools’ names and have throughout the paper used them merely as a backdrop to situate the current study. At no point during the interviews or journaling were specific schools named or identified by the researcher. However, in some interviewees’ cases, they did mention schools where they were currently employed or had been employed. Again, in all cases, to protect all parties, pseudonyms have been used for these explicit mentions. All schools were promised an executive summary of the research and all participants were made
aware of this. However, in producing this report, care was taken to ensure that none of the volunteers are compromised as a result of their participation in the study (BERA, 2011, p.7).

My role as principal not only meant I had access to staff but also that teachers at other schools knew I was in regular contact with their principals via our regional organisation. However, I was clear that at all points during the process that:

1. In all instances participation was voluntary and withdrawal from the study at any time was possible.
2. That I would do my best to assure teacher anonymity.
3. That an executive summary of my findings would be shared with all schools.
4. At no point during the research would my findings be shared with other principals.
5. All efforts would be taken to ensure recorded data remained in a secure place and not shared with anyone in a position of authority over participants or in a position to do them harm.

As Bourdieu (Wacquant, 1989) and others note, within research the social positioning of participants and researcher must be considered. As a principal at one of the schools, I am in a position of authority over some of the participants and work professionally with principals of others. To help alleviate any tensions or possibility to do harm, all questions directly relating to current school were placed within the questionnaire. The information was collected using Google Forms. The teachers completed it online, and the option of collecting participant emails was deactivated, so there is no way participants and their responses can be linked. During the interviews, questions directly relating to current school or administrations were not asked. In those cases where administration-related issue arose, such as a need for more PD, it was noted generally and not ascribed to any individual. During journaling, where some questions did specifically relate to school mission, again Google Forms were utilised, with the option to record email addresses deactivated. Indeed, at the journaling stage, one participant did withdraw from the study, as they believed the questions posed bore little relevance to their experience. They were thanked, I agreed to send the executive summary and no further contact was made.

To help address the positional advantage my role poses, I offered to interview participants at their places of work. For those who worked at my school, I interviewed them in our guest reception area, thereby avoiding any high school rooms, such as offices, classrooms, that could potentially represent status.

At all times during this process, my Head of School was kept informed and they were supportive of my research.
All interviewees knew they were being recorded and the recording device was visible at all times. As always, with such in-depth studies, there was the possibility that I might uncover information that pointed to harmful or illegal behaviours, as outlined under the BERA guidelines, with the adjacent response for disclosure. However, at no point during the entire process did such an instance occur.

**Section 4.7: Challenges and Success within the Research**

Aside from the aforementioned ethical considerations, a number of issues did arise during the process. An interesting, but unforeseen, issue was the actual number of people who responded to the survey and wished to be part of the project. Initially, I was concerned that, given the relatively small number of secondary teachers at the identified schools, the return yield would be small on all facets of the study. I was also concerned that I would not be successful in getting participants from all schools. However, in both regards I was pleasantly surprised.

After the Google Forms went live, I had 42 responses from all schools. This was both a boon and a challenge. It was a boon in that I had a much larger sample from which to draw conclusions and develop questions. However, it also posed a problem, in that the depth of information could conceivably have been rich enough to develop statistically significant conclusions without reference to other parts of the planned study. Nonetheless, upon reflection, I decided this approach would have deviated from my original plan of investigation – that of uncovering teacher voice – and so I decided to continue with my use of this questionnaire as mostly a means of grounding my own information but also to get participants to consider the questions and, if they chose, to continue. Both these goals were met, as all participants in the interview noted that during the completion of the questionnaire they had found questions they never thought about before. A number were also quite intrigued about the conclusions the questionnaire would draw. From this questionnaire, 13 people requested interviews. Indeed, one participant, who was on maternity leave, was so interested in participating that we met during the summer holidays. The topic definitely resonated with all those interviewed.

Interviews proved rewarding but were time consuming. Given that they had to take place during the school year, I had assumed finding time to meet would be difficult. It was not. In all instances, bar one (the above-noted maternity leave), we met after work. This number of interviewees was more than I had initially allotted for. However, given that I had the opportunity to interview teachers from all secondary school disciplines, with the exception of physical education, and that
people had volunteered their time to complete the survey, I interviewed everyone interested. Judging by the pilot, I estimated that interviews would take approximately one hour, which proved accurate. As I also wished to interview the teachers at their place of work, this meant a lot of travel time. To help with the increased work burden, I used the website transcribeme.com and hired a university student to transcribe all interviews. To vet this service, I reviewed the ethical considerations outlined in BERA and explicitly covered with the student the need for confidentiality when transcribing. I also ensured she knew none of the teachers whose interviews she transcribed.

Using a transcript in conjunction with the taped interview was very helpful in reviewing the data collected – especially in those circumstances when interviewees paused to consider their responses to questions. Such pauses did not always show up on the transcript but nonetheless, proved useful in gauging teachers responses to questions as they mined into their experience, beliefs or assumptions, thereby helping me to determine areas of reflection when I developed the journaling exercises.

A major shortcoming of the interviews was that volunteers came from only five of the eight schools, and 50% of those interviewed were from one school.

Unfortunately, the journaling exercise proved to be the least successful of the three methods employed. In total there were 10 different respondents. However, the largest yield for one prompt was nine, which dwindled to three for the final prompt. Most of the answers were short and as such served up less detail than had been hoped for.

Section 4.8: Positionality within Research

Within studies that are qualitative, it is accepted practice that the researchers' positionality is identified and explored. Not only does such a declaration establish the researcher's place within the phenomena they are studying, it also underpins a robust and precise reflexive practice, itself a necessary component of the qualitative researcher's toolbox (St. Louis & Barton, 2002; Savvides, Al-Youssef, Colin & Garrido, 2014; Nakata, 2015). Positionality seeks to place the researcher within the interpretive method that is qualitative research by explicitly identifying biographical information that sets the researcher within their time/space continuum. It draws upon such factors as gender, race, education, religion, nationality, status, power and other social identifiers (Relles, 2016).
Aside from the acknowledgement by Hayden and Thompson (2013) (2016) that most of what we know about international schools comes from the researcher – usually a teacher or administrator, within the field – there remains a dire lack of discussions within the academic literature on the methodologies and methods best suited to researching international schools. This shortfall reflects an overall scarcity of theorisation and discourse within the broader field of international studies (Savvides, Al-Youssef, Colin & Garrido, 2014).

Cormier (2017) Nakata (2015) and Savvides, Al-Youssef, Colin & Garrido, (2014) all note that being an insider is advantageous, as it engenders identification between researcher and participant. The participant views the researcher with greater trust because they share common parlance, experiences and understanding of what is studied. Moreover, being an insider often increases the access to participants (Cormier, 2017, p.2). On the opposite side of the coin, proponents of the researcher as outsider argue that distance between researcher and subject is necessary, as it enables the researcher to make statements which are neutral and do not have to be considerate, beyond ethical boundaries.

Until recently, both these traditions were seen as the only possibilities within the field, with the outsider status being preferable, as the researcher was expected, within the positivist tradition, to remain aloof, neutral and objective. However, with the onset of post-structuralism and/or deconstructionist methodologies – many of which in no small part trace their roots to Foucault and Bourdieu – comes criticism of this mythological researcher. Gone are the conventional dualistic assertions that researchers are either insiders or outsiders, and in their place is the emergence of a deeper understanding of the researcher as occupying a space, especially within the qualitative methods approach, that is in-between (Earl, 2017; Simeon, 2014; St. Louis and Barton, 2002; Nakata, 2015). Nakata (2015), Savvides, Al-Youssef, Colin & Garrido, (2014) and Cormier (2017) all assert that this new space permits a greater understanding of the phenomenon being studied and, moreover, accepts that interpretation and validation, not truth, are the cornerstone of qualitative research (Earl, 2017).

Within such a state, not only must the researcher remain open to criticism, they must also remain dynamically self-aware, both in the construction of the research and in its interpretation (Earl, 2017). Therefore, such research must always remain open to reinterpretation and reconsideration. A triangulation of methods underpins a robust methodology and analytical framework. This framework, however, is both cognizant and tempered by the explicit awareness and ongoing reflexivity, itself grounded in the acceptance that researcher and participants are co-constructors of meaning.
I have no doubt that my own experiences not only shaped what I believe to be essential but also the lens through which interpretation is made. As a perpetual emigrant, I have lived in Ireland, Canada and Japan for protracted periods of time, sometimes as a visible minority and sometimes as one in camouflage. Indeed, my accent is hybrid Irish-Canadian and has me endlessly answering the question all internationalists struggle to explain: ‘Where are you from?’

Moreover, being married to a Japanese and working in an international school, I have a sense of permanence and access to the local that a number of my colleagues do not have. Being male, white and an English speaker does carry with it a sense of status within Japan, while my position as a principal may carry such for my colleagues and other teachers within the region. As a principal, I made an explicit effort to remain in the classroom and teach an IGCSE course. I do this not only because I believe it is important for administrators never to lose sight of whom they serve and serve with, but also because teaching history is fun and the best reality check on those aspects of the principal job that can drain one.

Additionally, for this project, I was a researcher, who had a question that needed answering.

So, in a genuine sense, I was both insider and outsider within this study, having to navigate new territory. As an insider, I was aware of the notion embraced by some of international mindedness or developing intercultural competencies across all members of our community. Indeed, given the fact that I knew such terms, suggests my membership. I also knew other schools in the region, due to changing accreditation expectations, were looking to sense make of these terms and most likely would be supportive of research that could help them. Finally, as a principal, I had worked with other principals in the region and was comfortable approaching them with my request to gain access to their staff. I also knew that there were accepted ethical considerations around trust, anonymity and the rule of ‘to not harm’ that my fellow principals and their Heads of School would expect me to follow.

However, I was also faced with the reality that my research topic was, at present, still outside the norm, and one that was emergent rather than having a substantial amount of work and theory to draw upon. Key terms were fluid and getting teachers to discuss praxis rather than practice could be a challenge, because I was a direct line supervisor for some and worked the supervisor of others. In this sense, my role as principal and researcher made me an outsider. Undeniably, on a few occasions where I was asked, usually at the end of an interview, what I thought, I would uncover I might have disappointed when I answered I was not too sure.
However, at no point during the interviews did I have a sense that my position threatened or posed a threat to interviewees. Most were aware that what we were discussing was an emerging field and as such there were no right answers. Moreover, I was clear at all times that what I was interested in was the teachers’ understanding and actions within their praxis, and that through their dialogue they were helping me understand and answer questions I had. The decision not to work from set definitions of critical terms may have furthered this sense of a co-construction of meaning, as participants could freely share their musings and actions about relevant themes. Lastly, the questions asked actively sought to enable and engage the interviewees with creating meaning. That there was a shared sense was evident by the fact that all wanted to read my final report as a means of furthering their insight into their praxis.

The process of piloting the research proved very helpful as it helped get rid of the researcher’s jargon occupying the initial questionnaire and interview questions. Likewise, by identifying set questions asked in the same order, I attempted to ensure – regardless of whether I knew the participant or not – that the questions, the tone of delivery and emphasis on listening were standardised when collecting data. Making the decision early to tape the interviewees was also beneficial, as it avoided my jotting notes and potentially leaving participants with the sense they were pawns rather than interactive contributors in an exercise in meaning-making. There was also the potential ethical consideration I needed to be cognizant of due to my positional status within the school and the local community. How these were traversed is extrapolated under Section 4.6 above.

Section 4.9: Data Analysis

The work of Foucault and Bourdieu underpins the method and methodology of this project. To this extent, their theories act as a pre-coding framework (Cohen et al. 2005, p. 283). For example, Foucault’s notions of genealogy and discursive regimes of truth guide questions relating to teachers’ motives and understandings for entering the international school setting, while Bourdieu’s concepts surrounding capital guide questions concerning teachers’ articulation of parents’ motivations for enrolling children in an international school.

Presenting the quantitative data is mostly a matter of collating individual data into clusters of data groups within the pre-coded parameters noted above, such as areas taught, length of time teaching and geographic location of teacher training. As the questionnaire yields a significant amount of individual data, pre-coding served as a means of reducing the personal data to collective clusters, which are then transcribed onto various graphs. In some cases, where data from the interviewees and the general questionnaire overlapped – such as years teaching or educational background – I provide a dual graph, presenting both data sets. Data collected here
is also part of a triangulation process aimed at checking the validity of analysis being made across the three areas of the questionnaires, the interviews and the journaling. Data is also cross-referenced for cohesion, convergence or divergence across these areas (Hannus and Simola, 2010).

However, analysis of the Likert Scale questions proves more problematic when dealing with the extremes (i.e., strongly agree/strongly disagree). Utilising a method of weighting developed by the University of Bath, these extremes are weighted using a factor of 200%, while the disagree/agree remain as a base of 100%. Neutrals are removed. The two levels “disagree” are interpreted to be negative, while the two levels of “agree” are positive. Total scores are calculated and divided by 100 to yield a Weighted Means Index (WMI). A WMI in the +1 to +2 range represents strong positive leanings in regards a particular question, whereas a -1 to -2 range indicates a strong negative disagreement. Not only does such an approach aid the generation of some broad understanding of what teachers believed and do, but it also enables the formulation of the specific question to ask during the interviews. Therefore, while remaining grounded in my dualistic Foucault-Bourdieu lens, the research is a reflexive process wherein I check my preconceived questions against the data emerging from the questionnaire.

A perennial problem of analysis in qualitative work and specifically interviews is developing a robust coding or scoring process – which itself can be a highly interpretive act between the researcher and data collected (Cohen et al. 2005, p. 282). Nonetheless, exploiting the theoretical lens grounded in the work of Foucault and Bourdieu, I segment oral text into smaller fragments ‘of meaning for close consideration, reflection, and interpretation’ (Ellingson, 2011, p. 595).

The earlier work of Miles and Huberman (1994), Cohen et al. (2005) suggest utilising a staged approach when extracting meaning from interviews. During Stage 1, the meaning is generated by frequencies of occurrence and identifying specific patterns and themes. Utilising the coding developed from Foucault’s and Bourdieu’s framework, I code individual transcripts for such notions as genealogy of ideas, technologies of self, field, habitus and the like. During Stage 2, all utterances are clusters around the given codes. Stage 3 is where within each cluster I look for emergent, divergent and in some instances anomalous themes and ideas. Cross-referencing these themes with data collected during the questionnaire and written journals constitutes Stage 4. Part of this process is to permit what Glaser (1978) and Glaser and Houlton (2004) name the ‘constant comparison’, whereby assertions are crosschecked for internal and external cohesion. It also permits assurances that as I gather particular utterances into general clusters, the original intent is not lost.
The final stage returns me to my original three questions and viewing the data as a collective whole. Drawing upon Foucault’s archaeology approach, I trace teachers in their historical and geographical context. This approach leads to the classifications under Sections 5.2, where the historical roots of teachers’ current understandings and praxis are studied. From these historical roots emerge aspects of habitus and especially a clear notion that for participants, the international school is a field unto itself. The dual lens also serves to unpack the deeper findings discussed in Section 5.3, where core components – such as the role of the various capitals, key players and their assumptions – help to shape and influence teachers’ praxis. However, as teachers and their voice were central to the study, their reflexive utterances are both the grounding and the launch of matters under exploration in this section.

During the interviews, the questions about actual praxis within the international classroom, and especially the potential for cultural imperialism, did appear to flummox most participants, who admitted to not having considered them before, or paused for longer than usual to gather their thoughts. As a researcher, I found this interesting. As questions had been shared with participants before, I wondered if perhaps they had not read them or, as became evident, the questions posed a challenge needing deep consideration. Emerging from these questions is section 5.4, wherein teachers unpack their understanding of the potential for cultural imperialism within their praxis and outline the steps they take to challenge it.
Chapter 5: Findings and Discussion

This study aims at answering three overarching questions:

1) Who are teachers and how do they explicitly become international?
2) To what extent does being an international teacher shape the praxis of the professional undertaking the role?
3) How do teachers position themselves in the debate that international schools educate a form of Western imperialism and are driven by a globalist agenda that trains a globally mobile elite for positional advantage in a market economy?

Section 5.1 presents the general findings from the study. Keeping in mind that those interviewed also participated in the questionnaire, this section provides an overview of participants and their background. However, in some cases, I have explicitly separated interviewees from those who only participated in the questionnaire, as it permitted a relevant positioning of them in comparison to colleagues taking the questionnaire.

Section 5.2 identifies and examines the findings from the questionnaire. Highlighting themes and trends, this section seeks to have teachers generally position themselves within the discourse surrounding international education, while simultaneously outlining key practices and beliefs specific to their practices. Data gathered also helps identify relevant questions and areas of exploration for the latter phases of the study.

Section 5.3 present findings from the interviews and reflection journals. Initially, I believed that journaling would be a separate section. However, given that there were only few responses, it made sense to combine data from both these sources into a cohesive discussion. It became abundantly clear that teachers view international education as a unique field, with distinctive opportunities and challenges. By tracing their personal journey into the field and their sense making within it, this section identifies a number of tensions, often contradictory, that the international teacher must navigate.

Section 5.1: Overview of Current Study

The questionnaire garnered 42 responses, of which 13 participants volunteered to be interviewed, with 10 completing response journals.
Figure 1 below illustrates the participants’ number of years teaching at their current schools as well as total years teaching. In line with previous studies (Hardman, 1997; Bunnell 2015), participants tended to be transient. As evident in Figure 1, a large portion of participants had 11+ years of teaching experience. However, most were at their current school fewer than 10 years. Interviewees tended to be at their school longer than the questionnaire norm.

Figure 1: Years at current school and total years teaching

Sixty-seven per cent had worked in state-funded schools and 40.5% had worked at private schools other than international schools. This finding is in keeping with those identified by Hayden (2006) and Bunnell (2015), supporting the claim that teachers were leaving national school settings and viewing international teaching as a viable career option, with interviewees averaging in access of 12 years teaching internationally (see Table 5).

Figure 2 summarises the number of participants and interviewees from each school. Some of the larger and older institutions participated in the questionnaire but had no interviewees, while School 5 accounted for 7/13 interviews. Four of the schools providing interviewees were religiously affiliated.
English is the official language of all schools. All schools’ missions and students’ learning aspirations were situated both within the internationalist and globalist agenda. For example, while three schools firmly stated their roots in providing an ‘American’ or ‘British’ education, they joined the rest in emphasising learner-centred education, promoting intercultural understanding and multilingualism, and aspiring for social justice and service, all clearly emanating from an internationalist bent (Hayden and Thompson, 2013). Some of these skills, such as multilingualism and intercultural competencies, also occupy the globalist agenda, where they are given greater weight by an emphasis on individuality, teamwork/diplomacy and academic excellence leading to placement at university. No schools mentioned students aspiring to technical school or career entrance. All schools explicitly mentioned embracing and learning with Japan in fellowship.

Figure 3 notes that all major academic fields were represented within the questionnaire, with a similar breadth among interviewees, thereby ensuring a spectrum of disciplines. Numerous teachers taught in more than one discipline and level.
Thirty-eight listed themselves as high school/upper secondary level teachers, 24 as middle/lower secondary and two as elementary.

The majority of participants were educated in state schools at the secondary level (Figure 4), received their post-secondary education primarily in Western universities (Figure 5) and held post-graduate degrees (Figure 6). Such findings align with research showing that international schools and their clientele seek well-educated graduates from Western universities. There is also evidence that teachers are participants in a knowledge global economy. For example, three of those interviewed were from non-Western countries, of whom two were educated in the West. Similarly, a number of teachers had studied for their undergraduate and graduate degrees at universities on different continents. Figure 4 presents the types of secondary schools attended by study participants and suggests that assertions of sharing a common ‘culture’ with their international school students is tenuous (see Table 3).
Figure 4: Breakdown of type of secondary school attended by participants (Questionnaire Only)
Figure 5: Location of University Participants Attended

[Bar chart showing the number of responses from different geographic locations.
Geographic Location: Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, South America, Oceania (Inc. Australia and New Zealand).
No. of Responses: 0, 2, 4, 5, 7, 7.
Legend: Questionnaires, Interviewees.]
Only two respondents did not hold a teaching licence.

Figure 7 summarises additional qualifications held by respondents. Some teachers held teaching certificates not issues by a state system. As these qualifications were not the norm, I have noted them herein for reference. All others held state-issued qualifications. Many held multiple qualifications, which may indicate a global trend towards credentialism, as noted by Lauder and Brown (2009), Cambridge (2010) and Bunnell (2016). Moreover, it may also reflect the need among international teachers to continue to up skill or at least have the necessary paperwork to enable employability as a new precariat class.
During all stages of the study, professional development (PD) was deemed to be abundantly available but not always relevant (Figure 13). Localised, in-school and to a lesser extent IB PD were asserted as the most supportive for teacher praxis and student learning. Even so, it was consistently expressed that doing the job was the best means of development and improvement. The root need for such PD however may not have solely grown from a desire for credentials but also as a need, identified by Bailey (2015), to respond to new challenges posed by international teaching, often as a reaction to being poorly prepared by their teacher training and previous experience. It also should be noted that the IB expects that any school certified to deliver its
programmes must have its teachers undergo IB training. This may explain its ubiquitous reference over other programmes, such as the IGCSE and AP.

**Section 5.2: The Questionnaire**

There were three parts to the questionnaire. The first part, presented above, unearthed general background information. The second extracted responses to topics of particular relevance to the current study. The final aimed to elicit a deeper consideration of key questions.

Part 2 comprised 34 Likert scale questions, using five categories: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree. Questions had four focuses:

- View of self as educator;
- Perceptions of international education and current school;
- Observations regarding international students;
- Responses to statements, drawn from the academic literature, regarding international education.

The aim was to develop a snapshot of central issues within teachers’ discourse and praxis, regarding their professional role and international schools. These helped guide and formulate questions for deeper study at the interviewee phase.

**5.2.1 View of Self as Educator: Identifying Generative Beliefs and Actions**

Within this group of questions, teachers situated their professional identity and praxis within an international school context. What emerged were areas of congruency and tension. Table 1 displays congruency around expectations that teachers explicitly considered students cultural background and nationality when planning and executing lessons but less so when developing assessment tasks. However, as noted in Table 1, when the Weighted Mean Index (WMI) with its +1 to +2 range indicating strong agreement is applied, the planning, delivering and assessment of learning students’ cultural background and nationality were not strong considerations. However, Figures 14 and 15 demonstrate that teachers explicitly tap into students’ epistemic traditions and employ global case studies within the classroom, offering evidence of a sensitivity, awareness and commitment among some to localising their teaching by embracing global consideration. Fifty-seven per cent agreed/strongly agreed that they had been trained in teaching international students, with 40% believing they were trained to assess international students. Combined with
the knowledge that most teachers were trained to teach in a state system and now find themselves teaching an affluent group of international students, of which some are still acquiring English (Table 3), what emerges is a picture of teachers who are not trained well enough to address central expectations and needs within an international setting. The impact of this shortfall is noted by the fact that 80% ranked themselves as reflective practitioners yet failed to act upon or acknowledge their students backgrounds when enacting and assessing learning.

By collectively failing to address core components of students learning raises the question – what are teachers reflecting upon? It would suggest teachers lack a conscious framework to situate their praxis, an assertion emphasised by the 73% who were unsure if their views on international education had changed over time. Such a situation appears juxtaposed against assertion that foremost in the attraction to work at international schools is the opportunity to work with people from across the globe in a multicultural setting (Figure 12). Furthermore, given that many participants wanted to become an international teacher to access and utilise multiple perspectives (Figure 15) in their professional praxis, Table 1 suggests a disconnect between thought and action as teachers do not have a strong commitment (identified as a WMI of +1) to use the various backgrounds of their students when planning and executing learning and assessments – raising the question, ‘Why is this so?’

Table 1: Lesson planning, Assessment and Personal Praxis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Weighted Mean Index (Rounded to two decimal places)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I lesson plan, I explicitly consider the cultural background of my students</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I teach, I consciously consider the cultural background of my students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I develop assessments, I explicitly consider the cultural background of my students</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I lesson plan, I explicitly consider the national background of my students</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I teach, I consciously consider the national background of my students</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I develop assessments, I explicitly consider the national background of my students</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my students</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I teach, I am explicitly aware of my students' socioeconomic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been trained in teaching to an international student body</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>+0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been trained in assessing an international student body</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>+0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would consider myself a reflective practitioner</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My view of what is international education has changed signify from when I started</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents = 42**
5.2.2 International Education and Current School – A Teacher’s Tale

This section comprises two groups of questions. The first deals with participants’ general considerations regarding international teaching and the second with their current situation.

Cross-referencing assessments made on the Likert scale (Table 2) with Paragraph Response 3 (Table 4), a conceptual picture of participant views on international education emerged. Firstly, over 60% agree international education should differ from a state-developed one. Nevertheless, a WMI of +0.55 suggests such a stance is by no means a shared, entrenched view. A similar trend was recorded regarding social justice (Table 2), despite its role as a cornerstone in all schools’ mission statements. However, within the paragraph answer (see Table 4), it became clear that for participants social justice equated with global-mindedness and its links to diversity, critical thinking and openness. Other identifiers of an international education were critical thinking, and living, learning and growing with diversity. Therefore, on the one hand there appears to be a lack of commitment to the notion of social justice within international education (see Table 2) yet within practice, and often not using the term social justices teachers do appear to be working towards raising awareness and enacting discourses grounded in social justice (see Table 4). Perhaps this apparent contradiction is situated in the lack of clarity around such terms as social justice, global mindedness and intercultural competencies? As we shall see among interviewees social justice was a means of offering students an alternative and meaningful means to live their lives. Moreover, it was claimed to be a marker of an authentic international education.

So, while no consensus emerged, what is present is a framework of possibilities. For example, as Table 2 reveals, an international education was universally assessed as adding to student’s social capital (WMI +1.17), embracing of social justice and by necessity different from state systems. Such findings suggest most teachers view international education as a unique field composed of its own set of norms, expectations and actions. These assertions, especially that of being different from state systems, when considered against the fact that most teachers were trained in national systems not necessarily aligned with such expectations, was highlighted as in need of deeper exploration during interviews. Moreover, when respondents’ views of their current schools’ operation (Figures 8,9,10) are juxtaposed with their understandings of purposeful international education, what became apparent is that international schools may be a byword for Anglo-American.
Table 2: Response to Statements Regarding International Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Weighted Mean Index (Rounded to two decimal places)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A cornerstone of international education has to do with social justice</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International education should be different from state systems</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>+0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An international education adds to a student’s social capital</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recruitment process I went through to be hired by my present school was accessible to all qualified teachers</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My current school has a strong commitment to international</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>+0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Respondents = 42

Approximately 69% of respondents believe their current school is committed to developing global mindedness. However, a WMI of +0.74 suggest the commitment lacks entrenchment, an assertion further supported by the majority avowal that their schools’ practices and culture predominately draw upon Anglo-America expectations. Similarly, while 81% state their colleagues are drawn from across the globe, they note the majority come from North America and Europe. Such an assertion diverges slightly from previous research, as teachers from Oceania are not as prevalent as would have been expected. Moreover, the current questionnaire revealed that only 35% of respondents declared English as their colleagues’ mother tongue, again contrasting previous findings. Such considerations and this preponderance of North Americans and Europeans may help to explain why for this study respondents offered a qualified agreement on the openness of the recruitment process (WMI +0.88). A similar indictment was found in regards to professional development supporting the school’s mission (see Figure 13).

The quandary arising for teachers is that, on the one hand, their school mission is international in its aspirational claims. But on the other, its normative functioning, including hiring practices, are perceived to originate in an Anglo-America setting. The manner in which teachers resolve this dilemma – while cognizant that international schools do constitute a unique educational field defined loosely around emergent genealogies, doxa and nomos – was clearly an area in need of deeper exploration during interviews.
Figure 8: ‘My current school has a clearly articulated mission that is international in focus’
(rounded up to whole number to enhance visibility)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Response (rounded to 1 decimal place)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighted Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive/negative applied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive/negative applied</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+62</td>
<td>+47.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Percentage summation: +62+47.6-9.5=100.1

WM index = +1.01

Total Respondents = 42
Figure 9: ‘The assessment practices and expectations of my school are predominantly shaped by Anglo-American norms’ (rounded up to whole number to enhance visibility)

Figure 9B (weighted mean calculation for Figure 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rounded to 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decimal place)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive/neg</td>
<td>+14.2</td>
<td>+61.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ative applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Percentage summation: +14.2+61.9-7.1-4.8=+64

WM index = +0.64

Total Respondents = 42
Figure 10: ‘The Teaching culture at my school is primarily dominated by Anglo-American norms’ (rounded up to whole number to enhance visibility)

Figure 10B (weighted mean calculation for Figure 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Response</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rounded to 1 decimal place)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive/negative applied</td>
<td>+14.2</td>
<td>+61.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-14.2</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Percentage summation: +14.2 + 61.9 - 14.2 - 4.8 = 57
WM index = +0.57
Total Respondents = 42
5.2.3 View of Current Students

Table 3 reveals a strong agreement that current students have privileged backgrounds, are drawn from across the globe and are not likely to share a common ‘home’ culture. There was some awareness that students’ mother tongues were not that of the school’s language of instruction, which may help explain why there was no consensus reached on students and teachers sharing a common culture (WMI +0.48). Figure 11 indicates that their status as an overseas teacher held little significance for students. There is some awareness that for international students their school played a more central role in their lives than was the norm in other systems (WMI +0.79). In terms of students-teacher relations, (WMI +1.02) indicated awareness of teachers as gatekeepers to higher education.

The paragraph responses reveal that teachers do use a variety of activities aimed at supporting international mindedness when preparing learning activities (Figure 14), even if such enactment is not done consistently, as noted previously. Figure 15 indicates teachers embrace a holistic approach to living professional lives, encompassing both professional relationships and pedagogical responsibilities. Additionally, there is a belief by some that teachers and students share a common culture (WMI +0.48) that needs further unpacking. However, given the cultural, linguistic and educational background of teachers, such identification may be misplaced. Nonetheless, when these findings are combined with those from Figure 14, it is clear that respondents define and identify their praxis squarely within the Western, internationalist agenda, wherein individualistic, inter-nationalist, character-forming and constructivist education unfold with a Western epistemological and normative underpinning. Additionally, teachers are aware they cater to a global elite. The possibility that such catering may support the enablement of class reproduction was an area identified as needing further exploration during the interview phase.
Figure 11: ‘My status as a foreign teacher carries significant weight with how my students’ perceive me’ (rounded up to whole number to enhance visibility)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Response</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive/negative applied</td>
<td>+28.4</td>
<td>+30.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-14.2</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Percentage summation: +28.4+30.9-14.2-9.6=35

WM index = +0.35

Total Respondents = 42
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Weighted Mean Index (Rounded to two decimal places)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student body I teach is mostly international</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>+0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student body I teach share one common home culture</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>+0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student body I teach is mostly host nation</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students come from a privileged background</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students I teach have the same mother tongue as the school's language of instruction</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>+0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I teach I am aware that I act as a gatekeeper to higher education for my students</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>+1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am aware that school is more central to the lives of international students than their counterparts attending state or private schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>23.8%</th>
<th>47.6%</th>
<th>19%</th>
<th>7.1%</th>
<th>2.4%</th>
<th>+0.79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I share a common culture with those whom I teach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9.5</th>
<th>52.4%</th>
<th>19%</th>
<th>14.3%</th>
<th>4.8%</th>
<th>+0.48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Total Respondents** = 42
5.2.4 Paragraph Responses

Composed of five questions, this section asked participants to write paragraph responses to key statements. As I have already included the responses in the review above, I include here summary visuals, with the exception of question 3, due to its complexity.

**Question 1: What attracted you to international education?**

Responses: Thirty-nine.

Most respondents listed two to three reasons for making a move to international education.

**Figure 12: Push/pull factors attracting respondents to work in international schools**
Question 2: If you received training to specifically support you in working within an international school, briefly explain what it entailed and how useful it was.

Responses: Thirty-seven.

Respondents identified a number of areas presented here, clustered under common themes.

Figure 13: What PD received was supportive of international teaching praxis?

Within the written responses, 10 respondents did note that if a teacher did not possess personal characteristics such as cultural sensitivity, openness to the ‘other’ and an earnest desire to grow professionally, then successfully teaching internationally was not likely. Similar opinions were evident within the interviews.

Question 3: My personal philosophy of international education is:

Responses: Thirty-seven.

Answers here were complex but nonetheless they coalesced around four major themes: diversity, critical thinking, openness to the ‘other’ and social justice. Diversity was understood to include embracing and working with people while cognizant of the role cultural, national, ethnic and religious experiences and expectations may play. Critical thinking was explained as developing students’ ability to think critically, especially when embracing new ideas or beliefs. Openness to
the other was grounded in forming deep appreciation, reverence and understanding of others’ perspectives and aspirations. Social justice sought to make a more peaceful and just world for all.

These themes were often cross-referenced with each other and presented in Table 4. Of note: all answers were focused on human relations and no mention was made of stewardship of the planet, its environment and various life forms.

Table 4: Core themes of respondents’ personal philosophy of international education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Critical Thinking 11 Total</th>
<th>Diversity 17 Total</th>
<th>Social Justice 10 Total</th>
<th>Openness 13 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>7 shared</td>
<td>7 shared</td>
<td>7 shared</td>
<td>8 shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>7 shared</td>
<td>8 shared</td>
<td>8 shared</td>
<td>8 shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>7 shared</td>
<td>8 shared</td>
<td>7 shared</td>
<td>7 shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>8 shared</td>
<td>8 shared</td>
<td>7 shared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4: Please share examples of you, as an educator, supporting international mindedness.
Responses: Thirty-five.

Figure 14: Examples cited by respondents of practices they enacted which support international mindedness

Answers suggested an inherent tension within international education as teachers universally noted the need to embrace ‘other cultures’. However, four also addressed the need for students to remain immersed in their culture, especially for mother-tongue maintenance. This tension, also evident within interviews, serves as a reminder of the challenges teachers face in meeting learning outcomes while ensuring students’ well being and self-image.
Question 5: For me being an international educator means...

Responses: Thirty-five.

Again answers here tended to encompass numerous themes, with two macro themes arising. The first loosely coalesced around personal benefits to the teacher and the second around benefits to the students.

Figure 15: Being an international teacher means...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access multiple perspectives</th>
<th>Enhance teaching skills</th>
<th>Working with international colleagues</th>
<th>Being open to differences</th>
<th>Exploring personal identity and resiliency</th>
<th>Teaching motivated students</th>
<th>Holding high professional standards and practices</th>
<th>International teaching is no different that good teaching elsewhere</th>
<th>Offering non-Anglo-American perspectives on success</th>
<th>Developing globally minded students</th>
<th>Helping students know themselves</th>
<th>To share, appreciate and create a culture of humanity</th>
<th>Support students in uncovering and understanding multiple viewpoints</th>
<th>Working with students to uncover knowledge</th>
<th>Preparing future leaders</th>
<th>Help others navigate new challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 5.3: The Interviews and Journaling

Total number of interviews: 13

Drawing upon a base knowledge established with the questionnaire, this phase sought a deeper probing of the three questions guiding the current study. These were initially designed as separate sections but due to a poor response to journaling prompts, I combined all data into one
analytical narrative. Given that the journals were an opportunity for interviewees to explore issues raised within interviews more deeply, the amalgamation of data for completed journals does highlight and further explain utterances and stances taken during interviews. Drawing upon a Foucauldian lens, initial analysis explores those historical factors, ideas and understandings that led teachers to enter the international school setting and develop a particular and constructed praxis. Utilising a Bourdieusian framework, I explore how that praxis is enacted, reviewed and navigated, cognizant of the powerful discourses and expectations within the international school.

For presentation purposes, findings and analysis are presented under the following subheadings:

5.3.1 Setting The Stage – Who Are the Players?
5.3.2 Push/Pull Factors for Entering International Education
5.3.3 The International School – Teachers’ Discourse
5.3.4 Becoming an ‘International’ Teacher – Shifting Paradigms and Professional Realignment
5.3.5 The International School Parent – A Discourse of Expectations
5.3.5 The International School Student – The Teacher’s Discourse

Please note all participant names are pseudonyms. To aid with readability, rather than continually give the number of respondents for each question, I have placed them in {} brackets, following the given statement.

5.3.1 Setting the Stage

To preserve anonymity school, interviewees’ current employer or the subject they teach is not identified. In instances where relevant subject specific information was shared, I included it. Table 5 offers further insight into interviewees’ background.

Table 5: Overview of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee Name</th>
<th>Have taught in private, non-international school?</th>
<th>Have taught in state school?</th>
<th>Years teaching internationally</th>
<th>Major curricula taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winston</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martina</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>GCSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the eight schools originally identified, five had staff that continued to the interview phase (see Figure 2). Discussions ranged between 54 to one 104 minutes. All interviewees worked at the secondary school level. Among interviewees, none was from either Africa or South America. Numbers of years worked and experience varied, with no first-year teachers in the sample. Seven of those interviewed held leadership positions, such as heads of department. All, except Winston, had teaching experience at two or more international schools, and only Michael did not possess a teaching licence. Michael had worked solely in international schools and all others had some experience in state schools or in other non-international private schools, or in both (Table 5). Aside from Victor and Gareth, who came to teaching after careers in the military, all others were lifetime teachers. Finally, Michael was raised and home-schooled in Japan; Martina was an international school alumna; and Sebastian a British overseas school alumnus. They were the exceptions, as all others were educated in state schools. Only Florence, had attended a non-Western university for her teacher training and post-graduate work.

Such a profile suggests that, aside from Sebastian and Martina, teachers did not have a secondary school experience similar to that of their students and so must work to understand the space their students occupy. Florence captures this need to make sense of her international placement: ‘I had never interacted with those nationalities or those cultures. But being an Asian I think I had some understanding because some of the values are quite similar to those I find here in Japan…’.

This notion of having to review personal life experiences to adjust to a new environment is echoed by Michael, who though raised in Japan had been home-schooled and socialised with
people in a similar situation to himself. He notes: ‘In retrospect, it was a reasonable homogeneous group compared to what I see in our student body and other student bodies [i.e., at other international schools] today’. Indeed, all interviewees recognized their backgrounds and previous assumptions needed reconsideration and development if they were to successfully make the transition to working and living in an international school setting.

5.3.2 Push/Pull Factors for Entering International Education

As Figure 12 alludes, most study participants entered international teaching as a means of working and growing within an international setting, or as a means to travel. However, during interviews, a clearer more personal view of motives for moving overseas emerged and challenged Hardman’s (2001) typology. For example, Sebastian, Michael and Martina were all products of an expatriate upbringing. They had lived abroad and wanted to continue to do so. Part of their motivation was that they saw themselves as being different and disconnected from their countrymen who had not travelled. Indeed, Michael notes when he returned to his home nation he ‘felt weird not being a foreigner … albeit a foreigner with privileges … and there was always this noise in my head … that somehow I didn’t fit in’.

This desire to live and work in a particular country, often the one where they grew up as expatriates, resonates with findings from the questionnaire (Figure 12) and is not accounted for in Hardman’s typology or other literature on the international teachers, and yet accounts for approximately 25% of participants in this study. Far from being career professionals living abroad, these teachers view their international school teaching position as a means of living in their country of choice. They, therefore, occupy a space between the overseas and local hire. Moreover, although not the only driver for working internationally, being in Japan was a motivating factor for three others. Similarly, three actively sought to work at religious schools, as they were an outgrowth of their faith and a call to support ‘missionary work’.

Gareth echoes the sentiments of six others when he asserts push-factors for leaving his birth-nation, including improved standard of living, and better job prospects and financial rewards. Moreover, specific to international schools, he notes: ‘Of course the other big thing is the classroom management. I had quite good classroom management but you consistently needed to be on … and that’s quite exhausting…’.

Victor expands upon this theme: ‘In international schools, you still have space for your personal input, while in the state, it’s all dictated down to the smallest detail…. In the end, everything
comes down to a national exam’. Such comments echo what previous studies found, in that teachers look to international schools as places for professional growth and expression.

Interviewees also express being drawn to international schools because they are better able to address the ethnic tensions that most state schools face, but fail to address. Focused on developing national citizens, shaped by a dominant culture, which also defined norms and acceptable discourses, all interviewees assert that state schools possibly erode students’ culture and ethnic traditions. Nicholas, who researched about and published on this aspect of international schools, says: ‘For me a public school does not know how to reconcile those [i.e., ethnic, cultural, socio-economic] differences…. Student bodies [within] the school need to have the means not only to say here we are; we have … many … different backgrounds; we can relate to each other…. We understand that others are different but we don’t develop the skills to relate to each other, to engage in intercultural communication’.

As well, all interviewees expressed that working in an international setting among international colleagues was a pull factor, and was the dominant pull-factor for Patricia and Louise. Their comments suggest that for teachers international schools do constitute a unique field within education. Moreover, there is evidence that as state schools push an agenda of nationalism, international schools push an internationalist one that resonates with participants. Section 5.3.3 further extrapolates on what international schools mean for participants, and in section 5.3.4, they unpack the transformative processes they underwent to become an international teacher.

5.3.3 The International School – Teacher’s Discourse

As interviews progressed, an overarching view of what constituted an international school surfaced. This construction points to schools being rooted in an historical past and practices, but also constituting a distinctive field within education. Additionally, as outlined at the outset of this project, a deliberate decision was made not to explicitly define key terms but rather to let participants and their statements establish parameters and emergent understandings. Consequently, what arose during the interviews is that international schools are complex places, shaped by distinctive discourses and actions, whose inherent contradictions teachers needed to traverse.

5.3.3.1 The International School as Lived Mindset

Louise, echoing the sentiment of eight others, observes: ‘I think that there are a lot of international schools masquerading as international schools and there’re not’. Furthermore, this group asserts that schools, which deliver a state system in an international setting, are not truly international
because they lack the openness to the ‘other’ and their discourses. A legitimate international school is one defined by a mindset and lived through explicit practice, Nicholas suggests: ‘You need to be able to show you can be competent in an intellectual intercultural discourse… to have the possibility of engaging with differences…. It’s how things are being done explicitly, implicitly in the school to develop an actual mindset’. Although there is recognition of the role that historical roots and local culture played in the schools’ operation, flexibility expressed itself via a lived reality wherein ‘many cultures exist but none dominate’ (Louise). Such statements reveal that participants place themselves within the internationalist conceptualisation of international school as embodied by Type B schools. What is of note is that even among participants who work at Type A schools, they share examples of their school practice, such as engagement and service with locals, aligned with Type B sentiments, suggesting a hybrid Type A/B exists.

Moreover, the centrality of flexibility within the international school curriculums was collectively affirmed. Participants note international schools offer a bricolage of curricula that was only possible as they operate beyond the bounds of the local educational authority {6}¹ thereby enabling flexibility to meet students’ needs. Brendan says: ‘You have the freedom to be more flexible with your standards as you teach and you can decide that, okay, we’re not going to do it in that grade … They can do it here…. And we can decide to do that because we have no district code’.

Similarly, Victor notes the ability to differentiate learning, something he was not able to do as a state teacher because ‘They were not open to ideas that moved beyond the dictated curriculum’. Additionally all participants note that international schools are gentle places wherein all are accepted, regardless of their background, culture, creed or race.

Such themes also resonate when working with colleagues drawn from different backgrounds and often with varying pedagogical expectations and understandings. Winston recalls: ‘My Head of Department was American, we had another American, an Australian, a Brit and an Indian…. We were all talking maths but we were all very different doing things and you just kind of accept what people are doing and say, “Okay, yes, I know that you’re going to do things differently. And I’m happy to be flexible…” ’.

5.3.3.2 Tension: Traditions, Flux and Certification

Although there is a wide perception of flexibility at an interpersonal level, participants assert that at an institutional level an ethos of entrenched, unconscious practice pervaded {5}. For example,
Louise expresses her exasperation: ‘There were all these arguments about internationalism, but they never got to the end of it because nothing ever changed. So … there’s no point in having discussions’.

While it may be assumed the participants’ schools would have a clearly articulated understanding of international education and its constituent parts, the participants themselves communicate otherwise. Most note it is an emerging concept and usually driven by an accreditation body’s expectation that such terms be defined locally with evidence provided of their practice. Martina, whose current school was founded in the early 1900s, reveals: ‘We are … going through this whole international mindedness policy writing process. The accreditation bodies are telling us to write it down, which is interesting because you would have thought by now this would have been done’.

Similar sentiments were shared by all, suggesting that schools operate within an unconscious or implied regime of truth, wherein key concepts are passed down by word of mouth, or suggested via inherent practices but not explicitly understood or shared. This suggests that those who stay longest at schools are deemed to have the access to knowledge and practices which grant them privilege, status and understanding, enthroning them as keepers of school traditions and practices. It also suggests that for new faculty understanding and sense make within such an implicit environment is challenging, potentially consigning them to the role of outsider. Martina, a graduate of her current employer, identifies such a process and had experienced it both as student and faculty. Moreover, all participants seem to accept that such a condition is the norm. This situation pinpoints a tension between schools’ statements on ‘openness’ and the lived experiences of novitiates.

Further areas of tension that require the teachers’ attention include the role, purpose and status of English, a Western-focused pedagogical framework and meeting parental expectations, especially when it came to gaining social capital for entrance into university. Finally, all assert that international schools have to work consistently to make sense in balancing the school’s potentially competing expectations of intercultural competencies and student centeredness, best captured in the following observation: ‘You [i.e., the student] are open-minded, when you become sensitive to other people’s culture, when you think of yourself as a global citizen … not forgetting your roots and identity’ (Florence).

Pointedly, especially for those of us involved in leadership within international education, is that teachers gain the vast majority of their understanding of what constitutes an international education from non-academic sources, conversations with peers and ‘doing the job’. While such
an understanding is functional, there remains a significant, untapped discourse surrounding central issues that teachers must address, such as what is the form/function of an international education. Even, those who cite the IB Learner Profile as a well of professional growth fail to unpack its inherent internationalist versus globalist tensions. The current situation itself appears exacerbated by schools lacking an explicit understanding and articulation of what an international education is, an assertion borne out by the consistent refrain within interviews of their current schools only now beginning such a discourse. Indeed, as Cambridge (2017) claims, schools may well be in the throes of an ‘existential crisis’ but it is far larger than a mere economic threat from Type C schools – much of it may be of their making.

The remainder of the chapters unpack how teachers situate themselves, both as person and practitioner, within such a dynamic field.

5.3.4 Becoming an “International” Teacher – Shifting Paradigms and Professional Realignment

Over 95% of those participating in this study attest to the unique situation and, therefore, demands placed upon the character of the international teacher, their praxis and their clientele. It is clearly held that teachers have to work at developing an acceptable self, capable of balancing a myriad of expectations while delivering praxis in a professional and international manner. In essence, international teachers constitute a class unto themselves. What follows is an exploration by teachers of the regimes of truth and their adjacent genealogies, artefacts and technologies that both shape and are shaped by training and experience. What emerge are central tenets and actions, which capture ‘becoming’ an international teacher.

The role of English within the classroom acts as a challenging conduit for reflection and change among all participants. English is accepted as the language of currency, both for teachers and students, as they need it to access classroom learning and eventually to utilise as they participate in the global knowledge economy. All interviewees are literate in written and spoken English, with six having learned English as an additional language. Two are monolingual English speakers; five others are bilingual or have a sound working knowledge of a second language, with the remaining six being multilingual.

For students, English is conceptualised as pivotal not only to their economic advantage but also in accessing global perspectives. For example, Martina notes that outside her EAL class students only read in their native tongue and so tend to only have one political view of the world, something she feels obliged to challenge utilising English as a tool to support researching other perspectives. There is unanimous belief that a primary motive for parents for seeking an
international education is to develop or enhance their children’s English proficiency. English offered access to global perspectives, Western ‘name-brand’ universities, and social and economic capital advantage in the global marketplace. From such a standpoint, English proficiency is a technology of self-enabling positional advantage.

For teachers, English proficiency not only enables their mobility between international schools, it is also supports meeting parental and student expectations. Furthermore, for some, their English ability places them outside their national norm, where English ability was not professionally required or expected. For the six interviewees whose native tongue was not solely English, there is an implicit acceptance of English as the international language, with Francine going so far as to note that ‘all international schools … are in English. Otherwise, they’re named French school or German school’.

Such acceptance of English suggests that international schools are dominated by Anglo-American norms and English is necessary to access the field, regardless of one’s subject knowledge or pedagogical skill. Participants thus confirm Bourdieu and Wacquant’s allegation of ‘a neutralization [sic] of the historical context’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1999, p. 41), wherein participants unconsciously accept truths that are actually historically dependent and subjective. Combining this discovery with that of Bunnell (2017), teachers can be seen as a ‘precariat’ within a globalist knowledge economy, witness to eroding individual agency. However, interviews present a far more complex situation with regards to teachers wrestling with the ‘English’ dilemma.

During their international teaching career, the majority of participants have taught at schools where English is the only language of instruction, dominates social interactions and is a key ability sought by students and parents. Within this study, ‘American’ English is endorsed by all but one school, despite the fact that none had a majority of American teachers. However, rather than view this official school endorsement of American English as an imposition, participants consider it as an opportunity to share with students the myriad of English forms available while simultaneously enhancing their own vocabulary. To quote Michael: ‘You’ll learn the American pronunciation and spelling…. As an international teacher, I have found that I have to learn to speak a language that my students understand, so I’ve had to learn to say flashlight when I mean torch’.

Winston echoes this sentiment: ‘Our department’s gone from very American to very British heavy. But we are very conscious … explaining … that there are other words we can use for [describing] the same thing… [For example,] trapeze and trapezoid’. However, all participants are keen to
note that regardless of form used, they expect students to be consistent in their usage, even if it is not that endorsed by the school. For those who had worked at schools endorsing British English and using English or Commonwealth textbooks, they explicitly taught US systems of measurements and vocabulary to enable students writing SAT exams. Such agency attests to the fact that teachers, in meeting students’ needs, place functionality before school rules – evidence of professional judgement navigating potentially conflicting expectations.

The operation of technologies of self are evident within the role certification played as signifiers of professional competency. For example, all respondents draw attention to their status as a ‘certified teacher’ and uncertified Michael notes the Japanese government recognised his graduate degrees as qualifying him to teach. Such identification of self as certified teacher may originate in fact that international schools are not required to employ certified teachers. However, in practice, schools – driven by accreditation bodies and parental expectations – do look to hire certified teachers, and in specific cases may even require them to be also trained in any of the curricula, such as the AP, IGCSE or IB. As noted previously, the IB expects all those delivering its curriculum to be IB certified.

Autonomously, a number of respondents had undertaken further training and roles within the IB. Aside from the six DP and three MYP certified, two serve as examiners in at least one subject and one is an IB Diploma trainer. Three had received training in the Advance Placement and two were trained in delivering IGCSE. There is a strong belief that being certified in one of the three major curriculums (AP, IGCSE or IB) improves marketability. Even so, none of the participants certified in the IGCSE or AP note that either programme significantly impacted praxis. While this assertion regarding impact on praxis cannot be made unanimously for IB training, Winston notes he is considering ‘getting IB certified, as it increases my marketability’. Such comments suggest teachers use certification to market themselves within the international scene – again itself evidence of the production of a specific, acceptable self.

Of note also is the contention the neither the IGCSE or AP is deemed specifically impactful for the international teacher and student. Not content to teach within boundaries established by the AP, teachers supplement the curriculum to better account for the student composition within their classes. For example, in reference to AP Japanese, Michael says: ‘We have gone beyond AP in our Japanese classes, which many of our students can get a five in their sleep…. We’re reading real Japanese literature; we’re talking about real Japanese culture. And let’s fill those gaps of understanding [left by the AP] as much as possible’.
While all acknowledge the diploma’s high-stake exams, participants in this study also mention its Learner Profile as a force that shaped their pedagogy. All who teach the IB state that the Learner Profile could facilitate developing international mindedness. While Gareth notes supplementing curriculum with global issues is ‘just good practice’ within an international setting, Florence, an IB teacher, examiner and trainer, represents the sentiments of six others: ‘We read the IB guide…. I try to imbibe all those qualities and bring changes to myself and my teaching style, and my teaching style is very different from what it was before’.

Indeed, four of those interviewed explicitly sought employment at IB schools, as they were attracted to its philosophy and approach to learning. Furthermore, the use of IB jargon and short form for central components of the diploma, such as ‘ToK’, ‘EE’ or ‘CAS, arguably serve as identifiers that separate IB teachers from their international colleagues. Moreover, Michael, Winston and Brendan, all non-IB teachers, recognise that within the IB is a meaningful framework from which a teacher can review and develop pedagogy with the potential to underpin effective and meaningful international education.

However, such endorsement of the IB needs a context. Aside from Nicholas, none of the participants are versed in the academic debate on pertinent issues related to the IB or, more generally, international education. For the most part, IB claims are taken at face value, with little awareness or examination of alternative points of view, such as IB’s Westernised, globalist focus. Similarly, all acknowledge the IB offered high-stakes exams, yet none notes that such a system does not align well with its claim to be an enquiry-based learning charter.

Three possible explanations vis-à-vis this lack of critique emerged: 1) Teachers are reluctant to criticize the IB, as its ubiquity within international schools enables future employment. 2) There is a clear perception that it is a curriculum parents want and as such teachers must deliver it as is. 3) The IB appears to have done the legwork for the teacher. As Victor says: ‘Because the IB is an international curriculum, and the Student Profile and all the course documents come with all the rules and regulations, principles, guiding questions and stuff, we just have to follow it’.

So the IB offers a researched-based, ready-to-use international curriculum, which, for teachers already challenged to adapt and teach in an international setting, offered respite and assurances. However, Nicholas, does see a larger, globalist agenda in which IB is only a participant: ‘The IB serves a global elite and the people in a non-Western context are trapped to go to the West because certain models of education [i.e., Western] dominate…. The West is industrialised, it’s wealthy, and the Western humanist principles are now more democratised … because of the internet … because of [mass] communication….‘.
In essence, the West, from colonial times, has produced a globalist agenda via its economic and military prowess, and IB-certified schools and their teachers have been purveyors and gatekeepers to its riches. As became evident, when teachers discuss parental points of view, this is a commonly held belief and understanding. Within such a setting, becoming an international teacher is more challenging, as truth and values held sacrosanct may operate unconsciously and are therefore difficult to articulate and critique. Undeniably, the many references by participants to their schools only recently beginning a process to articulate what an international education means supports such an assertion, as many of these schools present themselves as offering international education yet operate within unclear or undefined territory.

All interviewees offer some form of extracurricular activity in addition to chaperoning events. Francine puts this situation in context: ‘In the public schools I worked in this [i.e., coaching/chaperoning] all stopped when teachers hit 30’. All interviewees assert that offering extracurricular activity is ‘part of their job’. Indeed, for some, such as Victor and Nicholas, extracurricular expectations, especially those with a service component, speaks to their personal belief about what an international education should entail. Aside from understanding the other, Sebastian and seven others noted service programmes enabled students to understand how ‘privileged they are and … [that] they need to be able to ask, “How can I help others to better their lives?”’.

In particular, reaching out to and interacting with the local community is also essential to helping students move beyond the international school bubble, which so many of them live in. All note the learning benefits for their students engaging with local culture, whether through artistic endeavours, service opportunities or cultural interactions. Only Nicholas mentions the benefit to the local community from engaging with the international students. Unanimously, teachers are viewed as central in facilitating such learning. Underpinning this attitude is, again, the construction of an acceptable self who gives personal time to support student learning. Therefore, the international teacher must develop not only skills but also sensibilities specifically attuned to the international situation and the international student.

This presentation of students as a technology shaping the teachers’ development of an acceptable self is evident throughout this study. All interviewees note that teaching internationally requires developing personal and interpersonal praxis unique to the international setting. Even Marge, who questions the uniqueness of international schools, declares: ‘One thing that’s different is that international kids are far more aware of a conflict within themselves as to where they belong…. “What is my identity?”’.
Twelve participants believe, more so than national system colleagues, that the international teachers have to be finely attuned to students’ well-being due to their unique circumstances of learning in a location, and often a language, outside their norm. In developing such sensitivity, teachers are presented as embodying the essence of international mindedness, as they grow from a secure and assured self, raised in a particular time/space within defined national or cultural norms to adapt to one wherein personal norms and knowledge could not longer be assumed. To this end, flexibility is a trait universally deemed essential for the international teacher, something given further momentum by the changing clientele of international schools, with growing numbers of East Asians and locals replacing the traditional, mainly Western, community.

These changing demographics reveal a growing awareness of the need for school-wide English as an additional language (i.e., EAL) awareness, training and consideration. Highlighting this situation, Sebastian, a teacher-librarian, defines his role: ‘We have books in 19 different languages … so I’m trying to encourage them to read as many different things in their own languages as possible, but I’m also trying to get translations of books, so I can get other children, say, British, to read Swedish or German books…. We are getting a … better picture of the world’. Teachers are, therefore, not simple deliverers of change, as previous studies suggest, but are active, guiding agents.

Francine observes: ‘By default, everything we have, Google and so on, is American…. And because of that, students tend to use only American sources. That’s why it’s important to move [students] … towards something other than Google…’. Her attitude not only points to adaptability, it also segues into the expectation that part of becoming an international teacher is embracing and using global knowledge and issues. Even awareness of global trends in pop culture, can support international teachers.

Gareth, a department head, suggests: ‘Make an attempt to connect with the students using their culture. And that can be something as simple as you’ve got a Korean girl who’s really into K-Pop. Mention the name of one of the big boy-band scandals or whatever … they’ll be shocked … but you will have made a connection to them as people’. Furthermore, by embracing the global, not only do teachers develop their pedagogy, they are also better able to connect with the local, which represents ‘foreign’ for most.

In regards to embracing an international ethos, both Nicholas and Florence individually state the following: ‘Teaching internationally is not the same as international teaching’. That is, living and
working abroad is not to be confused with undertaking the weight of embracing an international mindset, with its accompanying need for introspection, change, growth and delivering them to a student body while being cognizant of their backgrounds and needs. Nine interviewees adamantly state that teachers, who use international schools to travel the globe, only remaining at schools for short periods, are not true international teachers. However, nine do attest to the possibility that remaining in international schools – a market with supply shortage and free from state interference – offers an environment ripe for professional stagnation. Gareth captures the sentiments of nine interviewees when he states: ‘If you’re going to be a good one [i.e., international teacher], you have to keep up with the times. You can’t be doing what you were doing 15 years ago ... just pulling out the same whatever it is.... If you want to be an international schoolteacher ... then you have to be prepared to keep learning’. Staff turnover, poor staff appraisal structures and inexperienced administrators are all identified as contributing to the situation.

Additionally, most professional development focus on delivering a curriculum and not on teaching within an international setting, meaning teachers remain under-skilled for the demands of their current post [6]. The consequence of this situation is the belief that the onus lies with the teachers to keep abreast of developments in their field. For participants this is usually done through social media, attending conferences and reading trade magazines, such as The International Educator. None had enrolled in post-graduate studies focused on international education.

Unlike 73.8% of questionnaire respondents who asserted neutrality when reviewing if there had been a significant change in their understanding of international education, 11 interviewees note a significant evolution. For Patricia, change occurred through a combination of reflection, openness and experience: ‘When I first came to Japan, I would not have counted myself as an international teacher ... because I hadn’t experienced different cultures ... I’m working overseas but ... I was not culturally aware of different situations...’.

Patricia and four others observe that becoming an international teacher does not mean becoming a relativist. Rather it offers opportunities to develop by challenging personal beliefs. For example, Patricia notes that as a woman teaching science in Japan and Thailand, she is viewed as an oddity. Her response: ‘Watch a female teach! And I didn’t wear pants the entire time at the school. I always made sure I had heels and a dress on’. Being aware of local expectation also plays a role for teachers who are aware that in countries like Japan, which are largely homogeneous, they are often seen as the embodiment of foreignness. As Louise, an occidental, shares ‘[In Japan] I stick out like a sore thumb. In Germany, I was like everybody else. I looked
like everybody else’. Most interviewees see embracing the local as necessary for professional growth, reinforcing their belief that living in such an environment not only develops their professional praxis but personally ‘began a transition to international mindedness’ (Louise).

For participants in this study, developing global literacy started by embracing the local, either through learning the local language or actively participating in local activities and knowledge. Sebastian goes so far as to assert that a true international teacher ‘should be … multilingual. I think it should be someone who can speak the local language as well … because how can you understand Japan if you can’t speak Japanese?’. Such an assertion implies the operation of a cadre of support staff who help teachers living in a country whose language they do not speak, again evidence of the bubble within which international teachers operate.

It also identifies the dilemma such schools face as they aspire to embracing the local yet their teachers cannot converse with students and parents in their native languages. Without access to the local language, how, for example, can local politics be discussed with local students, many of whom will be eligible to vote in their senior year? A high staff turnover may help explain the situation. As this study reveals, teachers can live in a country for more than 10 years and remain illiterate in the local language. Even so, among schools represented, no formal process is in place to support teachers developing local language fluency, suggesting, ironically, such fluency is deemed unnecessary for teacher’s ability to survive and thrive in an international setting.

5.3.5 The International School Parent – A Discourse of Expectations

In a similar vein, the parents’ expectations and aspirations are also identified as both shaping and being shaped by international teachers’ praxis. Tables, 1, 3 and Figure 14 note teachers are explicitly aware that students’ backgrounds are usually privileged, with many having rich families who have experienced global living and/or travelled widely. Additionally, participants are aware that both parents and students operate under the belief that attending university is the norm. Marge and Victor note they are mindful of parental expectation when they teach and view their courses as university preparation.

However, it is important to keep in mind that these are teacher’s perceptions of parental expectations. Many of the perceptions are based on experience gained from working with parents. What becomes evident, both within this section and others, is that parental expectations do shape how teachers view their praxis. Within such a construct, the parent and their expectations operate as both a force and an artefact that subjectively, with varying levels of
influence, impose a constructed, acceptable self unto the teacher, which is in need of addressing and consideration. Again, while such a role may not be unique to international teaching per se, the economic, social, cultural and national status of parents is evident as a shaping force as teachers develop praxis cognizant of parental expectations and abilities to support learning.

Collectively, parents are viewed as educated, affluent and often globally mobile. Individually they are perceived as falling into one of the following groups: Group 1 consists of local parents who want to have their child educated in an international school. Group 2 are returnees subdivided into two subsets: Those who experienced education in a foreign state system, and those whose child attended an international school during an overseas posting. Group 3 broadly identifies as expatriates and is divided into three subsets. The first set – what many consider the traditional expatriate – are short-term overseas postings with only rudimentary interactions with the local. The second are often married to a local and work locally for a protracted period. The final subset is composed of international teachers with children. Not only do parents collectively share aspirations and expectations, each group also has particular needs. Interviewees assert teachers need to understand such complexity to help facilitate a robust home-school relationship, deemed central to effective student learning and growth.

Group 1 is viewed as the fastest growing demographic and are firmly entrenched in a globalist agenda with a focus on developing positional advantage. To this end, learning English in a native environment is a driving motivator for Group 1 as it means developing cultural capital with transferable currency.

Brendan observes: ‘English proficiency offered an opportunity to step outside the salary-man rat-race norm so ubiquitous in Japan by opening up the possibility to work for a foreign company in Japan’. Michael, a college counsellor, expands upon this theme, noting that an international education ‘produces a product very attractive for international business because it produces … [graduates] who can switch between different cultural roles’. He adds that such an education is ‘going to give them more pathways to [overseas] universities’. Indeed, Patricia and two others share experiences in which teachers are often sought out by parents and even in open-forum events, where they discuss their experiences attending university. By embracing such roles, teachers not only assume the role of representing their university but overseas student life there as well, regardless of whether or not they attended it as a local.

Additionally, for Group 1 overseas hires are often viewed as superior to local teachers, a situation Florence and Nicholas attribute, according to their experience, to the remnants of a colonial past. Others noted similar sentiments are to be found among Japanese who, especially post World
War II, idolised the west. Also the commitment to offering extracurricular activities is, according to Florence’s experience, further evidence for Group 1 of the superiority of international teachers: ‘They [locals] think … the exposure [that students get] in sports, in extracurricular, is beneficial and not available in national schools’. That such views can cast the international teacher as purveyor of class distinction and reproduction is noted by Nicholas who, during doctoral research, witnessed ‘locals who have the money… [and] would rather send their kids to an international school having a DP [i.e., IB Diploma] … because … they want … status and certification … and access to universities that are recognised in most developed countries’. Sebastian says that for local parents, the international school offers the best of both worlds: Students can maintain their mother tongue but in a friendly and welcoming atmosphere that contrasts with the overcrowded, test-focused local one.

In many regards, the returnees of Group 2, due to their background and aspirations, lie between the other two. They share a cultural background with locals. However, with expatriates, they share an overseas experience. Furthermore, while returnees have the option to attend local private or state schools, six perceive three main reasons for the appeal of the international school. First, like their local peers, they believe that local schools are out-dated: ‘They’re going to go to an international school to get a better education…. They accept their education is out of date…. There is little room for personal expression [in secondary school] or independent study…. They don’t want their child to just sit in classes of 40 kids’ (Gareth). Second and particular to Japan: ‘To be considered a true Japanese is to have two Japanese parents, born in Japan, speaking Japanese, living and working in Japan. And if one of those is missing, you’re really kind of in a weird category’ (Michael).

So the school and its teacher fill a space both educationally and emotionally wherein such students are believed to thrive. By continuing to develop English fluency combined with an inquiry-grounded learning environment, this could ‘be a real benefit as they pursue higher education overseas. Although this drive does lose some of its lustre when parent’s realised they have to pay school fees out of pocket and the cost of overseas higher educations is’ (Michael). Michael, a college counsellor, notes the need to identify early for Japanese that enrolling a child in an international school may lead to a lack of language fluency in Japanese, as well as difficulty navigating the social expectations of the culture.

Those who have working experience with Korean, Thai and Indian students express similar sentiments. Through their observations interviewees recognize that in pursuit of one set of capitals within a given field, locals and returnees may exile themselves from their national setting or, at the very least, undermine a smooth transition back into it. Within such a setting, not only is
the teacher a gatekeeper to the international school field and its capitals, they are also, given schools’ missions and commitment to global-mindedness, artificers charged with ensuring that such students remain grounded in an understanding and articulation of their cultural and national field.

Expatriates, who change countries every two to three years, on company expenses, are, aside from Korean families, no longer the norm. Gareth, reflecting sentiments of others, observes of such families: ‘I haven’t come across many of these. Most [families] are very stable; they’ve been in the country for a long time’.

According to the interviewees, most expatriates, especially in Japan, enrolling their child in an international school is pragmatic, since Japanese language expectations at local schools make them inaccessible. Moreover, most seem to want their child to attend university in their home nation {10}. Some interviewees do note such parents, especially those married to locals, enrol their child in local schools as they want them to ‘have the best of both worlds’ (Martina), suggesting that an international education is a means of ensuring capitals and, by extension, positional advantage and growth. However, as Sebastian suggests: ‘Many expatriates are so out of touch with developments in their countries of origin that when they enrol their child in a school, even one explicitly stating it delivers a state-based curriculum, they are surprised to find their expectations challenged and in some cases out-dated’.

Dealing with parental expectations, especially ones involving cultural norms regarding learning and teaching, often place teachers on the front line when dissonance arises. For example, Winston says: ‘Asian cultures are very much against technology in maths…. I had parents who were convinced calculator usage … was making their son stupid’. While Brendan notes Asian parents were not alone holding such views, he cites a similar trend in countries whose national systems focused on rote learning and national university exams. Other interviewees note parents want the English trappings of international education but not necessarily its cultural ones.

All interviewees share experiences of having to address conflicts between parents and children when an international education reveals itself to be more than acquiring English. They give examples of parents who believe that the education was causing their children to question political, religious, cultural or social norms, and in some circumstances was eroding their national identity. Brendan notes that parental drive for the child’s acquisition of English can have the opposite effect: ‘They’ll do just enough to keep learning English, but given any opportunity to speak their native language and they’ll use it all the time’. In other examples, students refused to use English, as they had taken on parental fears regarding loss of national identity. In both
scenarios, teachers act as a kind of language police by reinforcing English usage, which risks ‘undermining personal and school commitments to intercultural understanding and being, perceived as not supporting mother-tongue maintenance’ (Louise).

Aside from the unique qualities of each group, there is universal consensus that the vast majority of parents are drawn from an economic elite, possessing the necessary cultural capital and focus on education to positively position their child for membership in a global marketplace. They also share several expectations and aspirations. On a pragmatic level, to access international schools, parents have to pay their sizable tuition fees. Although all participant schools offer financial aid, it is only available to those who were already members and experiencing difficulties. Most interviewees are aware that ‘there are some [i.e., families] … here on a very tight budget and it’s actually quite a sacrifice for parents to send their child to a school like this, even with fee supplements’ (Brendan). Such statements suggest that teachers do perceive that high tuition fees do limit access. However, they also recognise that for some parents, the financial burden is worth it, due to the school’s production of cultural capital and/or pedagogical structures.

In keeping with the view that most parents possess the economic means to pay fees is the likelihood that they can also hire tutors, provide summer enrichment learning opportunities and, in some cases, spend the time with their children to support academic achievement. However, there are also stories of parents overestimating their child’s ability or believing that ‘attending an international school entitled them entry into top universities’ (Louise). Marge shares a story from a former non-international but prestigious school, which resonates with Louise and Patricia’s experience, of parents telling a teacher: ‘This is an elite school and you will serve us’. In Marge’s case, the parent was asked to disenroll but not so in the others. Parental finances also mean that in some occurrences they enrol their children in international schools because the students are incapable of success at national schools or have been asked to leave. For Louise, this has meant dealing with students who are unmotivated and reticent to speak English. Similarly, Patricia has had students in her classes who neither had the background nor the motivation to be successful, citing the example of a student who received a 1/30 on an IB paper.

Such buying power also means that education is not necessarily the meritocracy that schools lay claim to. Among interviewees are three who are also parents and mention the irony of educating students and preparing them to attend universities overseas while at the same time they struggle or cannot afford to send their child ‘home’ to attend university. Living abroad for a protracted period, their child is identified as a foreign student and expected to pay the much higher foreign student fees. Florence, both a teacher and a parent, shares her experiences: ‘I saw some average or mediocre students going to universities, which really good students were not able to
attend due to cost. And who are these children? Mainly teachers’ children’. The result is that teachers’ children may have to attend a local university that offers programmes in English or the teacher may resign to return home in an effort to secure local fees for their children. So teachers, while being guardians of the field and purveyors of its capitals, ultimately may not be able to afford to remain within the field themselves and become – echoing findings by Lauder (2011) and Bunnell (2015) – part of a highly skilled precariat within the globalised economy.

The study reveals that participants are aware of a certain archetype of international education and teacher that parents expect. From his doctoral studies, Nicholas reveals that parents seeking international education are looking for a franchise, most notably, the IB: ‘It’s [i.e., enrolment in an international school] very much about the IB, because students want to go overseas … meaning the US, Canada, sometimes Australia … International mindedness is a bonus from parents’ point of view’ (Nicholas). As noted earlier, English is a primary motivator. However, four interviewees observe that the type of English sought is Anglo-American, with the accompanying accent. Martina, shares personal experiences of her teacher friends who had married locals but kept their maiden names, since having a local name suggests they are not native speakers of English. Moreover, teachers have to ‘look the part’. Again Martina, a native Japanese speaker, has been questioned as to why she teaches Japanese when she visibly is not a Japanese – the assumption being only Japanese nationals could teach Japanese.

In keeping with this theme is the awareness among teachers of their navigating and supporting discourses focused on capital development and class reproduction. At a general level this is reflected in the unquestioned assertion that students would go on to university with career paths lying within the white-collar knowledge economy. Only Gareth notes that such an expectation is outside educational norms and reflects a shared blind spot in international schools regarding vocational opportunities. Identified previously, other areas that need particular teacher unpacking for parents involves the use of technology, inquiry-based learning and other such ‘best practices’.

There is also a significant number (5) who have experienced parents, due to their own academic and economic achievement, overestimating their child’s academic ability. By no means unique to international schools, the situation does affect the teachers’ response. Free from state expectations, international schools, and by extension their teachers, have to justify to parents any changes to learning or assessment expectations and practices. This changes have to be school specific and seen to support students’ short- and long-range development. Gareth, Patricia and Martina all share examples of the time needed to sell new ideas or programmes to parents. Moreover, within the international setting, parental English fluency and shared understanding of pedagogy cannot be assumed (4). Through unpacking such expectations, teachers enable
parents to identify areas where they can support their child in developing the desired capital. In essence, teachers intensify the process of class reproduction. Furthermore, given that parents may not fully understand the system of education they subject their child to, this suggests that teachers not only provide curriculum expertise but also pastoral support in addressing discord between the schools’ expectations and students’ previous experience.

This section outlined teachers’ perceptions and experiences regarding parental expectations and aspirations and the impact they had on teacher praxis. Teachers may not have articulated the expectations in academic parlance. Even so, as the following quote from Victor reveals, they know it: ‘International school parents expect their child to develop a wow-factor ... a capacity to impress ... something that makes them noticeable and identifiable in a crowd’. However, seeking this ‘wow-factor’ is not without its consequences for students and it is to them the discussion now turns.

5.3.6 The International School Student – The Teachers’ Discourse

5.3.6.1 – Overview

Data from the questionnaire suggests some teachers believe they shared a similar culture with their students. Both the interviews and further extrapolation of questionnaire data demonstrates that this is not the case. For example, only 2% participants attended international schools with all others attending state-situated public or private schools (see Figure 4). When this situation is combined with the fact that teachers have been trained to deliver a state expectation and that current professional development is not meeting their needs of teaching in an international setting, it is clear that international teachers have to work diligently to sense make of, and for, their students. As with the previous sections, responses are layered and complex, often intersecting with other topics and not always congruent with the statements of others in the study. Nonetheless, what emerges are three macro discourses around student learning, pastoral needs and service learning.

5.3.6.2 – Student Learning

‘As an international teacher, I strongly feel that this [i.e., international mindedness] should be one of the priority [sic]. By promoting intercultural understanding, we are making our students more open minded and tolerant towards other cultures, creeds, religions and nationalities’. A response to journal prompt #2, this quote summarizes a central belief held by many teachers, namely that
developing international understanding is a duty of an international teacher, while simultaneously identifying a central tension within their praxis – namely, how to develop such an understanding within an Anglo-American environment. Reviewing Figure 8 reveals that most teachers believe their school’s mission is international in focus, yet are firmly entrenched in pedagogy and cultures within Anglo-American norms (Figures 9 and 10). Eight interviewees feel more specifically that their schools operate within United States norms, regardless of the fact that only one school makes such a claim.

Interviewees are aware of this conundrum and share examples of explicitly accessing students’ cultural knowledge and capital to contextualise their learning. Aside from previous examples involving math and research methodologies, numerous cases of teachers moving beyond assigned text and curriculum are provided. For example, Brendan, within his social studies curriculum, shares: ‘When there’s an event that happens around the world, regarding a particular group of people and you have those students in your class, then your lesson has more of an emphasis on discussing the issue and maybe debunking associated myths’. Even within dictated assessment formats, such as those set by the AP or IB, teachers draw upon their knowledge of student’s backgrounds to support cultural differences and ensure effective learning at the same time. For example, Patricia, who, accepting the format of IB summative assessments are non-negotiable, has redesigned formative assessments to include group discussions as her experience had taught her: ‘The direct questioning [of the teacher] in class is actually an alien concept to some cultures, especially those where the teacher is revered, and to question them is seen as undermining their status’.

It must be noted that participants recognise that macro statements regarding how certain cultures learn are not always applicable to individual students. Even so, such information is important to consider when teaching internationally (Marge, Sebastian, Victor). That all interviewees contextualise the form and format of curriculum to incorporate students’ backgrounds identifies a doxa within the international teachers’ praxis of embracing a multiplicity of learning cultures and delivering global context beyond national or cultural boundaries. Arguably it also communicates to students, through a lived exemplar, the operation of international mindedness.

As noted earlier, the IB, even within its highly structured diploma, is viewed as supportive of meeting the praxis needs of international teachers. Its Learner Profile offers teachers a framework wherein they can plan and reflect upon delivering a curriculum that is pedagogically sound while reinforcing international mindedness, multilingualism and inquiry-based learning (6). Critiques, such as van Oord (2007) or Cambridge (2010), identify its Western epistemological roots of both content and pedagogy as problematic. Within the current study, teachers view it as
offering them a viable framework in accessing non-Western traditions. For example, rather than viewing the IB’s prescribed literature list as limiting, Louise notes: ‘We could teach female indigenous playwrights as a text, as long as it’s on the IBO list. You can also use it at lower grade levels. In drama, you could have some type of Asian, Indonesian theatre…’.

Louise flips the official text list on its head to use it as a starting point for accessing literature from across the globe that the teacher may otherwise not have known. The list, in such hands, is a starting point not an end. Louise also suggests that the teacher, within such an approach, is also a learner, as she too will have to study the new text. This notion that legitimate international teachers, as opposed to teachers working internationally, must be committed to ongoing learning resonates with the expectations of being globally aware and did, within this study, appear to have gained significant traction among interviewees.

Arbitrating cultural practices while living employees’ aspirational goals for students is also evident as teachers signposted and constructed an international pedagogical self for students using risk-taking, inquiry and student reflectivity. Both Marge and Francine note the disdain with which risk-taking was regarded by East Asian cultures generally but in Japan specifically, an observation shared by all other interviewees with varying levels of agreement. This means that teachers have to scaffold the developing of this skill: ‘I don’t lecture and I know we have students that come in and can’t ask questions because they’ve come from an [learning] environment where they’re not allowed to ask questions. I say to them, “You know, if you don’t understand it, you’ve got to come and ask”… I have this Grade 9 student who was in the mould, but … very quickly accepted the environment, the culture. Now she is playing a part in it, and is involving herself. And she does ask questions’ (Winston).

On the one hand, Winston may be accused of imposing Western pedagogical values upon his student. On the other, given previously discussed parental ambitions and the schools’ delivery of a set curriculum, he acted in a manner that enabled his student to be successful and learn within this particular environment. So rather than simply ignoring her, he supported her developing a new pedagogical self, capable of operating within a new field and simultaneously enhancing her capital.

Other examples of teachers explicitly developing students’ risk taking outside the classroom through clubs, such as debate or Model United Nations, challenged students, regardless of their cultural heritage, to take risks by speaking publicly. Undoubtedly, such clubs suggest a particular type of training for students that not only enhances their capital but also reinforces class expectations for participation in the global knowledge economy. However, for students from East Asia, where individualism is shunned, it also presents a viable stage upon which to develop skills.
necessary for success in an international school. Such examples unveil a teacher praxis that seeks to meaningfully sense-make within a situation that is potentially discordant.

As noted earlier, the internationalist discourse within international schools supports critical engagement with knowledge, while the globalist one focuses on developing student independence and soft skills. Also as noted, aside from Nicholas, teachers are unaware of the debate surrounding these perspectives on international education. However, their praxis does offer evidence of developing such expectations, most notably in the application of enquiry-based learning and reflexive expectations. Although heralded as ‘best practice’ in some places, as both Victor and Florence share from their own experiences, they are not universal educational practices. For example, Victor notes that within his international setting, physics students have an ‘opportunity to apply their knowledge or test a hypothesis’, something not done in his national system.

For her part, Florence reflects upon how her daughter has changed as she moved from a state to an international system, and says: ‘I saw changes in my daughter when she was in the national curriculum … and then shifted to international. I saw her getting more open-minded, more reflective … on her academics, personal traits, personality’. Indeed, all participants who were not educated within an Anglo-America setting, draw attention to such aspects of an international education. Such statements suggest that within international schools not only the development of a regime of truth wherein international students, with teacher support, develop an acceptable self but they also offer the possibility of reinforcing a class-consciousness. This situation, some participants believe, requires service learning to ensure an ethical or moral balance within students, which enables awareness beyond their current class. The role of service learning is explored under subdivision 5.3.6.4 below.

Table 1 and 3 demonstrate most teachers are aware of the cultural and national backgrounds of their students and generally do execute lessons within the classroom with this awareness. However, these tables also reveal that teachers do not explicitly plan lesson and assessments in reference to their students’ background. Interviewees, as presented above, differ from such in that, while accepting curriculum often dictates set assessments and content, they explicitly draw upon students’ cultural capital to enhance learning. However, all data gathered unanimously identifies a paucity of international teacher support in initial teacher training and ongoing professional development. For example, during journaling and reflecting upon how they gauged if their teaching is reaching students, five interviewees write, ‘Through students expression and body language’, despite previously noting that many cultures seek to please teachers and always present themselves as understanding. Two others note the lack of time to do such reflecting. Only
one notes that due to cultural differences between themselves and their students, they utilise colleagues as reflective partners. Such findings suggest that interviewees are working to incorporate student capital within their classroom; even so, by relying on a feedback loop that is arguably culturally limited, their impact is limited. Thus, there remains much to be done both by schools and associated bodies to enable practitioners in the development, execution and assessment of learning in an international setting.

As noted in the previous section, teachers often are tasked with navigating divergent discourses regarding language. For example, parents want their child to acquire English but not associated behaviours, or students, living in their home nation, resent being forced to speak English (Michael and Louise). Such situations can, as Patricia notes, impact student motivation and learning: ‘They couldn’t read the questions…. Their language [English] was terrible, but their motivation was terrible as well’.

Indeed, there is evidence of students developing a version of English fused with the local language. Eight share examples of such language fusion that resonates across teaching experiences in Germany, Thailand and Japan. Students use this fused language as a group identifier, and it is observed being used by students for whom neither language is their native tongue. Citing Japan as example, interviewees talk about students using Japanese and English vocabulary and grammar haphazardly in their speech. Known as ‘Japlish’, such sentence formation is often shared among all international students within a particular locale, used both inside and outside school (9). Aside from isolating teachers who may not speak Japanese, others note it also isolates new students regardless of their language ability. In need of greater study, such a situation suggests that once granted access to the field, new members can impact it by developing new capitals and habitus. Nonetheless, for this study, it again suggests an area wherein teachers may be gatekeepers but are also isolated within the field due to their personal capitals, or in this case, language ability.

However, for the most part, embracing the local is deemed to strengthen students’ academic and personal development, moving them beyond ‘food, flags and festivals’ (10). For example, when studying Japanese history, Gareth notes locals could interview grandparents and access knowledge otherwise not available and share it with classmates. Moreover, actually living in Japan, developing some Japanese language and cultural fluency, leads to Japan being a central part of the students identities even after leaving Japan (Michael, Sebastian). Marge also notes that Japanese cultural practices, such as humility, self-control and consideration of group dynamics, are constantly modelled by local students and provide an explicit and real opportunity for others to appropriate cultural practices deemed worthwhile. Thus, the school is a space
offering reciprocal benefits for both the local and the foreigner to develop mutual deep understanding and appreciation, as well as cultural capital. That teachers observe such learning suggests they too may internalize the local in such a manner. However, evidence is circumstantial in the current study.

5.3.6.3 – Pastoral Needs

Extending from the earlier assertion that international schools are gentle, welcoming places and linked to the centrality of the school’s place within students’ lives, there appears to be an unwritten rule for teachers to be ‘pastoral leaders’ (8). All schools have a counsellor and most have identified teachers acting within a pastoral capacity, although most were never formally trained in such a role (Patricia). Aside from the previously noted curriculum situations, where teachers draw upon students’ capital, Marge also identifies a phenomenon particular to the international school student: ‘One thing that’s unique is that kids in international schools are far more aware of conflict within themselves as to where they belong’.

Brendan and Michael use the Third Culture Kid framework to understand this conflict but there is a shared sense that the international student, regardless of whether they were local, returnee or expatriate, had stepped outside their home culture. Moreover, participants observe that what students are often identified with, as in terms of their passport, did not always align with reality. There are lots of examples of students who have never lived in nor spoken the language of their passport nation. Nine interviewees identify this as an issue they had dealt with, although only three identify a negative impact on the classroom in the form of defiance using English. Michael believes some of this defiance could be attributed to parents who view international schools as a means to gaining capital in the form of a child’s English proficiency and yet fail to grasp the impact such education may have on other areas: ‘I think their parents are wanting them to be as Korean as possible. Not understanding that the minute you start learning English in an immersion context, you are going to pick up culture…. And maybe it’s not so much kids fighting it but the parents not knowing what to do with the ways their kids are changing’. Such an observation supports his previous call for an initiation programme for parents new to international schools, which highlights the form, format and possible impact of such an education on students. The need for such a programme again reinforces the notion that the international school is a field unto itself and needs unpacking for initiates who may not understand its doxa and nomos. Moreover, it affirms the development of a class unto itself.
5.3.6.4 – Service Learning and Ethical Frameworks

Mentioned explicitly by seven interviewees, the emphasis placed on providing students with ethical decision and service learning opportunities is noteworthy. For some, such as Sebastian and Louise, such opportunities serve as an alternative narrative to the lives lived by many students. For others, these occasions are an ethical obligation upon all international teachers, given their experiences and associated capitals. Moreover, as noted within the survey, and reflected within the interviewees, there is a collective {10} awareness that students not only come from wealthy backgrounds but also possess, via their social and economic capital, ‘the power to influence’ (Victor) and were assumed capable of enabling social justice.

As Table 2, 4 and response journal #3 reveal, there is a consistent assertion that a true international education not only develops social capital but also raises awareness and engagement with social justice. The origins of this shared assertion is not clear. However, it resonates among all regardless of their employer or the curriculum they deliver. Nicholas notes that in becoming an international teacher, practitioners must recognise that ‘international teachers have bigger responsibilities [to model and enable ethical behaviours] than the locals. Not that locals don’t have the capacity, but the wealth that you accumulate, as an international teacher, needs to be shared’. Therein lies the belief that international teachers must embody the social justice values, which also resonates with previous assertions, around embodying international mindedness. This is also evident within service learning.

There is an emphatic agreement that service learning is central to the spirit of an international education. For Sebastian, international students ‘need to know that not everyone is as lucky as they are…. They need to consider, “How can I help other people live better lives”’. Service learning offers a discourse in which, given their status and wealth, they have a responsibility to ensure, support and work with others, often less fortunate, to live improved, more fulfilling lives. Echoing such sentiments, three schools share a common practice, wherein service learning develops longevity projects. Such projects are designed to be long-term commitments that involve students planning, executing and implementing service projects both locally and internationally. These projects share a common characteristic, grounded in raising awareness and developing empowerment, as examples shared by Francine and Sebastian highlight.

Francine worked with a group of students, drawn from sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia, who wished to provide educational opportunities for women in their native regions. However, rather than focusing on raising funds, they ‘wanted to change the view that people had of their countries. They wanted people to know their countries could solve their own problems, but needed some help in getting started’. In a similar case, Sebastian’s project members first
educated themselves about Cambodia and then explicitly sought to develop support that came from Cambodians. This evolved into a long-term inter-school project where senior students provided labour, building and repairing schools in Cambodia, while younger secondary students collected money that enabled the Cambodian students ‘to choose what books they wanted and fit in with what they needed to have for their education’ (Sebastian). In both instances, there was explicit acknowledgement that service is best provided via a grassroots organisation. These examples identify the centrality of intercultural competencies as a hallmark of international schools, as understood by interviewees. Underpinning such sensitivities is the awareness of cultural imperialism, ironically something international schools are accused of promoting.

Section 5.4: Cultural Imperialism?

Some critics argue that international schools are an elitist form of Western cultural imperialism wherein Western values and expectations are presented to communities as neutral normative goods. Indeed, the questionnaire reveals teachers situated their schools’ culture and academic expectations within an Anglo-American ethos and there is only a slight consideration of students’ background in developing and executing learning and assessment. However, the interviewees state that within their praxis is an explicit effort to draw upon students’ cultural capitals in an effort to offset such an ethos. To help understand this apparent contradiction, during interviews two questions were asked. The first, sought teachers’ response to Walker’s (2010) assertion that clients actively sought an international education, and particularly an IB one, in order to access and succeed at Western universities. The second asked teachers to consider if, in their experience, international schools are forms of Western imperialism. Table 6 summarises responses.

Table 6: Summary of responses to statements regarding forms of western imperialism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Qualified Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People select international schools, especially those offering IB, to attend Western universities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International schools are a form of Western imperialism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While two agreed that attending a Western university is a paramount goal, most believe rising university costs, increasing global recognition of international school diplomas and a greater
variety of English language courses at non-Western universities are working to encourage students to attend local or non-Western campuses.

In response to the second question and resonating throughout the entire study is the assertion that international teachers must be ever mindful of their audience and the space(s) they inhabit. Marge, Gareth and Francine are especially clear that international teachers need to be cognisant of their own biases and the biases of curricula delivered to ensure, when possible, they draw upon materials that were globally relevant. If materials are not relevant or, as previously noted, students lack a particular pedagogical culture, teachers are professionally bound to scaffold what and how they teach to enable effective learning. Enabling students, regardless of their culture or nationality, is assumed a norm by all interviewees. Again this expectation points to a self-imposed elaboration of an acceptable self, for none of the schools or curricula covered are capable of imposing or managing such a development.

The ubiquitous use of English is understood as part of a global trend in which English is the shared language. While it offers the ‘potential for linguistic imperialism’ (Marge), its use is mostly a means to an end (Martina). That it potentially underpins class reproduction is offset, in the opinion of interviewees, by its ability to foster dialogue. Specifically, for international students, it renders them capable of enabling peace and development grounded in social justice.

Francine and Victor also note that, given the rise of information technologies and the increased mobility of an elite class, international schools are part of a global elite, whose knowledge and skills are in demand, rather than the operation of a particularly Western imperial agenda. Furthermore, Michael, Louise and Nicholas share a common belief that a large percentage of populations at such schools are already from the West and those who are not are often seeking access to its economic and educational infrastructures, which offer greater mobility, and improved economic and cultural capital. To deny students access to such potentialities could be seen as evidence of racism. From such a perspective, the international teacher can be viewed not only as a gatekeeper but also as a provider of opportunity, albeit for those that can afford it. However, as Nicholas and others note, providing such opportunity is connected to a moral obligation to ensure that social justice is central to the discourse and action of an international teacher and international schools.

The overarching discourse under discussion concerning potential imperial tensions is that of the teacher as practitioner who while aware of given strains may not be able to articulate them at a theoretical level. As noted among all participants, only Nicholas has extensive knowledge of the theories surrounding cultural imperialism, internationalism and globalisation. However, as evident
above, drawing on experience and reflexive praxis, teachers develop an intuitive sense surrounding many central tenets of the debate and discourse, and actively engage in addressing them. Nonetheless, there appears to be room for a more profound theoretical understanding of such issue if teachers, as front-line deliverers of an international curriculum and ethos, are to engage with their students and their community more fully. Moreover, such enhanced theoretical understanding may further their praxis and reflexive growth, thereby enabling a deeper, more nuanced understanding of what an international education is and what it can mean for themselves, their students and potentially their broader community.
Chapter 6: Conclusions

This study began seeking to answer the following questions:

1) Who are international teachers and how do they explicitly become international?

2) To what extent does being an international teacher shape the praxis of the professional undertaking the role?

A third question arises that is a subset of both: How do teachers position themselves in the debate that international schools educate a form of Western imperialism and are driven by a globalist agenda that trains a globally mobile elite for positional advantage in a market economy?

The study utilises teachers’ discourse to trace their agency, actions, thoughts and reflective praxis as professionals engaged in teaching/learning and ‘becoming’ within an international school setting. The study is distinctive in that it places the teacher as the centre of focus. What emerges is the teacher as artificer of praxis, rather than as an agent delivering another’s agenda or curriculum. Finally, it shines a light on their ‘becoming’ process from inception through to delivery and ongoing reflection. As I state throughout the thesis, this information should challenge those responsible for ensuring teacher development and student learning within an international school to provide teachers with the training suitable to the task assigned them. Additionally, for actual practitioners, it is my hope that the findings will resonate with them, helping to further their growth and praxis.

At a macro level the study uncovered the following:

• The decision to enter international teaching is not, as some have argued, a means of avoiding the challenges of working in a state system but is, for participants in this study, an opportunity to develop their pedagogy, enhance economic opportunity and most especially, to embrace and live within a wider, global community. This latter goal resonates among all interviewees with varying levels of commitment.

• International teachers do not come fully equipped to the jobs. There is a need for ongoing professional development, grounded in a professional approach and commitment to reflexivity. This need is further emphasised by the recognition among most participants within this study that international schools and their education are a unique field of education.

• Aside from the professional expectations, participants share a common belief that parents, students and colleagues often view teachers as the embodiment of international mindedness and intercultural competencies. Such soft skills as diplomacy, global awareness and a commitment to service resonates across this study as central mindsets and action that the international teacher must actively seek to develop both within
themselves and their students.

- There is within the international school, a constant tension between a globalist, Western-orientated agenda – often being utilised by an influential local population with the aim of enhancing their positional advantage – and that of the international school mission, with its grounding in peace, service, understanding and service. Within this study, teachers appear to be aware that both sets of values could and do operate simultaneously, with each offering an alternative narrative vis-à-vis the other. With varying levels and skills participants do navigate these spaces and in the process undergo change to their praxis.

- Among interviewees there is a clear divergence between data collected from them and that collected form their colleagues who participated in the questionnaire in regards to students and teachers occupying similar backgrounds. Interviewees are aware that they do not come from, and in some cases could never enter, the same economic and social spaces their students inhabit. However, they do believe that a commitment to living and enabling intercultural dialogue and understanding personified within their delivery of curriculum does offer their students a specific, international learning environment that simultaneously provides capital enhancement, tempered with a commitment to service.

For the remainder of this chapter, I review and consolidate findings for the study under the subsections previously developed. I then proceed to review the study and its place within the field of international education research. Lastly, I suggest future research agendas aimed at continuing a deeper understanding of what has been learned.

Section 6.1: Review and Consolidation of Findings

This study began with a review of the relevant literature and the development of a questionnaire that sought to position international teachers within the field of international education and specifically in the study of secondary school teachers. As noted, this is an area where there is a dire lack of information (Hayden and Thompson, 2017; Bunnell, 2017). From this questionnaire, key themes and discourses were identified, which formed the basis of interview questions conducted with 13 volunteers from the original group of 42 who undertook the questionnaire. These interviews formed the crux of the research, for within them teachers’ voices emerge, which for the most part have been neglected by previous studies.

Finally, during these interviews, areas emerged for further exploration, as I sought to trace teacher praxis from statements of intent and understanding into action. This latter desire has emerged as a result of differences in the questionnaire, where teachers note they are aware of the cultural and national background of their students but such awareness bears little impact on
their praxis, whereas for interviewees, their praxis greatly changed because of this awareness. What is in need of exploration is a larger data based upon which to explore to what extent international teachers are aware of their students cultural and national backgrounds and how such awareness shapes actual classroom praxis. Within the current study it could be argued that those most interested in internationalising their praxis were the ones who sought to continue to the interview phase while for their colleagues their awareness was not central to their classroom activity. However, there is, and the current study suggests this may be true, the case that teachers want to internationalise their praxis but do not have the training to do so. Moreover, there is the reality that teachers deliver the curriculum dictated by their school and may believe they do not have the agency to internationalise it, especially in light of perceived parental goals.

**Section 6.1.1 Becoming an International Teacher**

The study clearly demonstrates that teachers' entrance into international education is increasingly varied and places unique demands upon them. In line with previous research by Richards (1998; 2002) and Snowball (2007), the majority of those entering the field come from a Western pedagogic background. However, this macro grouping needs to be regarded with caution. As Victor and Francine note, their educational background although Western is not grounded in the student-centred, constructivist model that dominates international schools. Florence, who is not educated or trained in the West, draws heavily on her IB training and personal reading to sense make of her new setting.

Certainly, among interviewees there is a clear belief that the IB offers a viable framework through its curricula, training, and to a lesser extent its Learner Profile, to start a process of retooling personal praxis for the international setting. Therefore, despite Marge’s assertions that teaching is universal in its grounding in respect and needs for students, all other interviewees do hold that the international teaching is in need of developing a unique praxis. To clarify, aside from Marge, those educated and trained in the West attest to the belief that their education culture and training did not prepare them for the inquiry-based, critically-engaged-with-knowledge expectation of the international classroom.

This research suggests that international teachers occupy three professional spaces simultaneously: their national origin and training, their embracing of a local culture within their praxis, and an expectation to embrace global knowledge and exemplify intercultural competencies. The need for ongoing training and reflection is not only a constant theme but one that all those entrusted with developing teachers in an international setting must be cognizant of and seek to enable. It would appear that borrowing the latest trends from national settings and
applying them to the international setting may need greater articulation and unpacking if the transmission is to be successful and applicable to the international teacher.

Furthermore, in general, there is a definite need for researchers, schools and teachers to move beyond studying the apparatus of the IB, and specifically its Diploma Programme, as a byword for international education. Pragmatically, as this study reveals, not all who work in international schools deliver IB programmes and are, therefore, also in need of a framework that is relevant and resonant to their circumstances. Moreover, while the current study does unveil practitioners believing the IB Learner Profile a viable entry point into developing international mindedness, they do so without critically engaging with the larger discourses surrounding the globalist and internationalist debate.

To this end, international teachers, regardless of the curriculum they deliver, would appear in need of greater support in unpacking these discourses, as they bear relevance to teachers praxis. This assertion is clearly understood by teachers within this study who recognise that their model of teaching and assessment, while being globally aware, does not always align or permit itself to embrace the international milieu and reality of their classrooms. Arguably more pressing for those delivering IGCSE and AP curriculums is a need to develop teacher support materials aimed at enabling those delivering their curriculums to more purposefully address the needs of their international school clientele.

Finally, these findings should resonate with those charged with overseeing international education and who may be acting under the assumption that teachers come fully equipped to deal with the various international discourses, expectations and needs of participants.

Part of this need to develop a unique praxis may stem from the journey and push/pull factors that participants draw upon when entering the international field. Most come from state school backgrounds, and while some entered international school as a means of travel, the vast majority did so as an opportunity for personal and professional growth. Both within the questionnaire and interviews, the theme of working with others from different background resonates with all. For some, such as Gareth and Winston, there is the reality that within the international classroom they spend the majority of their time teaching students who are able, ready and willing to learn. This had not been their experience in their home country, where they experienced their job as one of behaviour management rather than teaching.

Such a finding expands Hardman’s (2001) archetypes, for herein are teachers ‘escaping’ a national system not out of inability but rather in order to further their pedagogic skills and life
opportunities for their families. For those in this study, working internationally offers a better lifestyle and financial rewards than working within their state system. Indeed, this later notion also resonates with those, such as Florence and Victor, who tired of their states’ focus on exit exams, or others, such as Nicholas, Brendan, Louise and Sebastian, who note that state systems do not adequately address at a meaningful level the multicultural and multi-ethnic needs of their students.

Freed from the confines of producing citizens for the state, all interviewees under this umbrella believe international schools are better equipped to deal with such complexity and, as these beliefs resonated with personal beliefs, they made the switch to international education. However, there is need for of caution captured by Louise, stating that not all schools using the international moniker embrace internationalism – a statement echoed by Patricia, who notes that schools aimed at a local population and are for profit risked placing profit before philosophy, and as such are not truly international schools.

Most significant is the finding that universally all teachers within this study share that their current schools, no matter how long established, are only now beginning a process of articulating what an international education means. Moreover, most teachers rely on inter-colleague discussions, non-academic press and in some cases IB training to develop a personal understanding of international education. It would appear necessary for teachers in the field to have a deeper and more articulated understanding of such current issues as the globalist versus internationalist debate.

Likewise, they may benefit by having greater support and understanding from their schools, for as the front-line purveyors of international education, they are currently aware of and enacting education that addresses cultural imperialism but, as they identify, they need much more training and support. However, if such support is forthcoming, it must surely come from institutions which themselves can articulate their understanding and produce actions aligned with the central tenets of international mindedness and intercultural competencies.

Lastly, there is some awareness of a need for certification, especially in those blue-chip curriculums, such as the IB, AP and IGCSE, in order to find a job placement. However, far more important was a mindset ready to embrace differences and reflective praxis.
Section 6.1.2 Being an International Teacher and Implications for Praxis

This notion that in becoming and being an international teacher mindset trumps all resonates across the questionnaire and interviews. Aligned with the findings of other studies, the current study’s participants agree that the ability to empathise and work with others who are different is central to success in international teaching. However, within this study there is also a clear consensus that there is a difference between teaching in an international school and being an international teacher. The former reverberates with Hardman’s (2001) maverick archetype that travels from school to school as a means of global travel. Universally, participants note the following changes to their praxis as a direct result of working within an international setting:

a. Expectation and a willingness to offer extracurricular activities and pastoral alertness beyond contract parameters. This grew out of a direct recognition of the central role the school plays in the lives of the international students as well as the awareness that for parents such actions were often expected but more pressingly needed in an effort to make their child’s education valuable, accessible and rewarding.

b. A need to be globally aware and to bring this awareness to fruition within the classroom. Being globally aware, as Gareth extrapolates, not only helps teachers connect with students whose background may be very different from their own but helps curriculum become more accessible to students by drawing upon students’ national and cultural experiences and knowledge. Although no school within the study expresses such praxis be enacted, teachers within IB schools share that according to their understanding the IB does place such an expectation upon them. They comment the IB is explicit in encouraging them when selecting and delivering areas of study to draw upon global epistemic, artistic and other traditions. Those teaching the IGCSE and AP explicitly proclaim no such expectation within these curriculums. However, all state that they do enact such studies and approaches, as they enable students to better access learning aligned with school missions and teachers’ interpretations of what an international education should espouse. Likewise, in all cases, there is awareness that as students sit for various international university entrance placement tests, such as SATs, there is a need for students to learn forms of measurements and specialised language, especially in science and math.

c. Although all but one of the schools in the study utilise American English as their official policy, teachers appear more pragmatic, offering students the opportunity
to use whichever form of English they have learned, so long as it is consistently applied. In this regard, teachers apply school rules and expectations in a manner best suited to student needs. Such flexibility further explored under d below, is another attraction to enter international education for those within the study. There is an awareness that the changing demographics of the schools in question mean a rising number of students with English language acquisition needs. However, the impact upon teacher praxis does not appear a significant issue within this study.

d. Flexibility in delivering curriculum is also shared by all. Most of the secondary schools offer locally developed courses at the grade 7-10 level, with the result that, as Winston and Brendan note, topics are introduced when students are ready and not when a state-centred bureaucracy dictates. Such assertions offer considerable evidence of the operation, among teachers, and within schools, of curriculums being utilised to best meet students needs and thus affirming the learner-centred ethos of the internationalist agenda underpinning Type A and B schools.

e. As a counterpoint to this greater flexibility, the international teacher must engage with reflective practice. At a pragmatic level this may call for them to teach the specialist vocabulary necessary for their students who sit for university assessment tests (e.g., SAT, PSAT). However, as is also evident, teachers have to often consider that when delivering learning the topics they use, the power they wield and the relationship they form should seek to include their students, most of with whom they do not share a common background.

f. Lastly, teachers within this study are aware that parents and students view them not only as embodying intercultural competencies but also as preparing students for access to universities that further their various capitals for participation in a global, knowledge economy. While arguably, such a situation exists in many schools, it may be particularly acute within an international setting, as teachers often are enacting their praxis within a setting and among cultures they may not fully comprehend. There is also a belief that adding to students’ social capital is part of the teachers’ agenda and, therefore, they have to actively continue to be at the forefront of educational praxis.

Section 6.1.3 International Education, Cultural Imperialism and Globalist Agenda

Within the study there is a clear awareness among teachers that they are teaching students who are economically affluent and usually globally mobile. Even among the locals with local
aspirations, there is a sense that they have stepped outside the norm. Although all interviewees, aside from Nicholas, are not well-read on the debate within academic circles regarding the rising tension between the traditionalist, internationalist agenda and the newer globalist one, through experience and practice they are aware of its ramifications.

On one level, there is a shared sense among all that parents, local and expatriate, are concerned with providing their child with a high-quality education in a milieu that develops such soft skills as diplomacy, intercultural competencies, multilingualism and a critical engagement with knowledge. As Victor, sums up, parents want their child to have a ‘wow factor’, and participants offer evidence that both within their classroom and in their extracurricular commitments, they ensure this expectation is met. Moreover, the parents’ ability to hire tutors, and in some case spend time with their children, reinforces the teachers’ belief that their students have opportunities to be academically successful, Thus, by extrapolation, teachers can challenge students that much more, not only in terms of content but also in terms of embracing a global worldview.

Participants are aware, at varying levels of sophistication, that their teaching is grounded in a Western pedagogy but stop short of questioning any issues such an approach may have on students. Most, including Michael, Louise, Patricia, Marge and Martina, recognise that students often live in a personal space of identity discord, as they are enrolled in a learning environment often at odds with their upbringing or previous educational experiences. Undeniably, numerous statements note that parents’ needs and aspirations often trump students’ needs, and those teachers, often on the front line in these situations, are hapless bystanders. Indeed, as noted above, teachers make explicit efforts to develop a curriculum and learning environment that enables all students regardless of their cultural heritage. However, there is a strong call across the entire study for more training, especially training for teaching and assessing in a multicultural, multinational environment. Of particular note is the discord between parents who, on the one hand, want their child to gain access to cultural capitals, yet on the other, wish their child to remain firmly entrenched in those traditions that earmark their culture and/or national identity. In this regard, students and to some extent their parents are joining the teachers in having to navigate unchartered territories, where they simultaneously exist in local, national and international settings.

Rather than seeing this space as a new form of relationship, some parents, from teachers’ perspectives and experience, often expect their child to wear different masks and personalities, depending on the situation, rather than view such space as a new form of ‘being’. Teachers universally share examples where they navigate such terrain with parents as part of their praxis. However, they too seem caught between national and international identities for students, when
the reality may lie within the notion that international students and their learning occupy a completely new form of ‘being’, which is without borders, and offers flexible identities, traditions and language abilities. Moreover, the strong commitment to service learning and enquiry-based teaching offers the potential for students to not only be enabled to find a place within the global knowledge economy, it can potentially offer them an opportunity to engage with work differently.

As an outgrowth of the idea that an international teacher must be globally aware is the assertion made by all interviewees that international teachers should offer a lived example of international competencies. For Sebastian, this means being multilingual. However, most participants hold the idea that the teacher through their praxis and personal demeanour should offer witting evidence to a life lived in partnership with the other. Therefore, modifying curriculums to be culturally and nationally competent and relevant is necessary. Similarly, most recognised service learning as an opportunity for students, under teacher guidance, to move beyond a life that is often pampered and in some circumstances a parental agenda that is utterly shaped by globalist incentives.

Section 6.2: Limitations of the Study

This was a small-scale study, done in a specific geographical area. Given the vastness and the complexity of the international school setting, drawing definitive conclusions about international teachers must be cautioned against. While the strength of the study is its openness to permitting the identification of emergent ideas within the professional praxis of participants, it also allows for a complexity and multiplicity of causes and outcomes. Identifying and clustering these causes and outcomes runs the dual risk of the researcher imposing his own themes upon the data and forcing it to fit into a pre-identified method framework.

Also, by permitting a variety and complexity of responses on a small-scale sample, I run the risk of finding a number of specific comments that pertain to individuals but do not necessarily reflect larger themes and areas of concern to the field. As noted, this latter shortcoming is partially addressed by using a triangulation of data gathering methods, as well as drawing upon teachers from a number of schools, albeit in a limited geographical area. Another limitation is the impact of permitting teachers to volunteer played upon the findings. By having teachers volunteer to continue in the study, there is a strong probability that those who did so were already interested in the topic and had as such given time to wrestling with the central questions that were herein explored. Experience as both a teacher and an administrator leads me to believe that there are many international teachers who do not concern themselves with the challenges of teaching students from an international background. Teachers who remain ambivalent or uninterested in such questions are not heard within this study and their silence is of note, as the findings while
relevant to their students and arguably community may well continue to be unimportant to the given practitioner.

However, it is also true that the findings may help administrators identify trends, discourses and praxis among teachers for whom such issues are unimportant. They can be used to establish training and hiring preferences that ensure such teachers continue to remain in the minority at schools where international education is embraced.

Given that I am an administrator, and listed as such in a number of locations, it is conceivable that someone could identify the schools studied. For this reason, I have not, within the written study, cross-referenced participants to the actual schools where they work. Aside from the ethical considerations, such a cross-reference would add little to the central thrust of the study – for this study schools served as a backdrop to establishing some macro understanding of the local but served little role beyond this. Lastly, not tying central keywords down to precise definitions, means they remain largely emergent throughout the study. Indeed, this nebulousness is one of the key points raised both during the pilot and during the actual interviews. However, I elected to continue along this path as I believe it illustrates a central point that all engaged in the field of international education must confront – namely, that it continues to remain an elusive, enigmatic and dynamic field wherein meaning making and by extension praxis are contingent, emergent and largely undefined. More research and parameters are necessary, especially in light of the rapidly expanding number of schools identifying themselves as ‘international’. Work undertaken by Bunnell, Fertig and James (2017) seeks to develop a set of criteria whereby schools can legitimately assess and claim ‘international status’. Their work may indeed spark a much-needed debate on the topic. However, from personal experience and research, I believe such clarifications remain, at the very least, a number of decades away.

Lastly, my position as an insider, while granting me access to participants reinforced by an insider’s knowledge, inevitably influenced the decisions of what to research and the methods, which I employed. Nonetheless, I believe the cross-referencing of data across multiple methods and specific steps taken to ensure a robust analytical framework does add credence to the assertions made herein. That the findings are open to further exploration and refining is without argument.

Similarly, the potential effect of the power dynamic that is created by a principal within the region conducting the research cannot be denied. However, the fact that one participant did withdraw late into process supports the assertion that participation was voluntary. It also suggests that the topic at hand resonates to a significant extent with the teachers who stayed the distance. The
reasons for this may be varied, but the dire lack of information on this topic is most likely a contributing factor. A lasting impression of all participants is that they take their job as an international teacher earnestly and seek to grow more. I believe the current study, although limited in some areas, does offer a platform upon which thoughtful discourse and development can take place.

Section 6.3: Personal Reflections

On two fronts this research project proves enlightening. On a professional level, especially as a principal, the current study convinced me that there are a number of blank spots in need of illumination for international teachers. Upon reflection, I, and the schools I have worked with, have always operated on the assumption that teachers, regardless of where they come from, can teach successfully at the school. The study’s finding suggests that such is not the case and that teachers must work diligently to not only make sense of the distinctive qualities of each school but more broadly enabling learning in an international setting.

Two areas in particular will shape my future praxis both as a principal and classroom teacher. First, not all teachers share a common experience in terms of the culture and expectations they bring to their classroom. For example, the need to be globally aware not only translates to knowledge within the classroom but also to the relationships that unfold therein, and more generally across the school. In this vein, not only are service learning opportunities good for students’ resumes and college applications, they appear, in the hands of skilled international teachers, to offer a viable learning environment that enables students to experience alternative discourses.

This study suggests that among teachers there is a need for greater professional development, especially in the areas of teaching and assessing in an international setting. The questionnaire intimates that teachers recognise consideration of such items in their praxis but in their actual doing of the job such considerations fail to materialise. The interviewees confirm that all teachers are finding meaningful ways to use students’ cultural backgrounds in the class as a means of offsetting an accepted Western-centric pedagogy. Nonetheless, in terms of actual assessment, there is a suggestion that teachers’ agency is greatly diminished by the expectations of high-stake exams embodied by the three most popular curricula on offer – the IGCSE, AP and IB Diploma. However, there is also the suggestion that professional development done locally is deemed the most beneficial, so this is an area I must consider as a viable means of exploitation in planning and addressing staff needs.
As research, this study, I believe, has shone light on an area that is underdeveloped and underexplored. However, it is not without its limitations. Although every attempt was made to triangulate findings, the journal section failed to deliver robustly. Partially, this is tied to execution, wherein the journal followed interviews after the summer holidays. Herein lies the challenge for any researcher working full-time in a non-researching job, such as school administration, that is constantly in a state of cogency. This situation, however, also echoes others who research within international schools, for there is the challenge that international teachers are for the most part constantly transient. Even those who remain for years at a single school do return ‘home’ to visit family and friends during summer months and as such are not easily accessible during this period. Indeed, the current study bore witness to this. The reduced participation in the journaling exercise done after a summer could suggest that the critical energy and understandings built up during the earlier questionnaire and interviews were lost.

A second limitation of this study is that it is very local in nature and cannot be taken as representative of teachers across the complex and expanding world of international teaching. Teachers within the field offer varying levels of understanding and knowledge regarding the field and its central issues. This is no doubt a result of the very form and format of international education that has – despite attempts to develop legitimizing agencies and training bodies – failed to offer a universally adopted training programme. Indeed, current demands for teachers combined with the rapidly changing landscape of international schools makes such programmes unlikely to develop impact or traction for the foreseeable future.

Additionally, it could be argued that the lack of providing participants with fixed definitions of key terms – such as international mindedness or education – meant they talked about areas that while using a shared lexicon did not share a unified meaning. However, as noted at the outset, such terms at present fail to have universal acceptable definitions, are transient and, as Cambridge (2010) reports, are often at the caprice of the historical time/place within which they are used.

My role as principal may have influenced those who participated. Unfortunately, despite assertions of anonymity and an obligation to ‘do no harm’, some interviewees may have remained unconvinced. Moreover, in such situations, where the researcher is also part of the community, there will always remain ethical considerations, even more so when the person holds a position of authority. However, participants must also be respected and viewed as independent agents. That they choose to participate in the study and to remain as part of the study even when offered the opportunity to withdraw suggests that it resonated with them. Indeed, Marge’s withdrawal during the journaling phase highlights that participants retained agency. Also, as was outlined above,
every effort was taken to ensure no harm was or could be done to participants. Given the topic at hand and the difficulties previously outlined in researching international schools, the current study, I believe, could have been conducted otherwise. The sheer lack of knowledge regarding teachers within international schools, mean this study and its findings are significant enough to merit the approach taken.

However, questions remain. For example, the lack of cogency in the study between the questionnaire and interviewees regarding teaching and assessing while considering and accessing students background is in need of much deeper exploration, as it would appear to be an area of central concern to all engaged with education in an international setting. For now, I am left guessing for possible explanations for this divergence.

Lastly, this is a small, localised study set in a particular time/space. Throughout the study there was ample evidence to suggest that the footprint of international schools within Japan was firmly entrenched in its contact with the outside world, most especially the USA. The ubiquity of American terms, textbooks and norms do appear to have shaped the evolution of the international schools here, though no definitive study has emerged to support such a claim. Those who participated in interviews predominately came from schools with a religious affiliation, which may have influenced their views on the nature and impact of some areas, such as pastoral services or service learning, though all participants spoke of the necessity of the latter in offering students an alternative discourse.

Section 6.4: Future Studies

We are not done. While this study offers some insight into unearthing the teacher voice, it is, as noted above, limited in scope and universality. Arguably, the current study has raised more questions than answers, and it is to these questions I now turn as a means of suggesting areas for fruitful future study.

As stated at the outset, the dearth of knowledge regarding international schools in general and specifically teachers within them continues to be a significant challenge for researchers and practitioners within the field. For example, the current study is challenged by the lack of a historical viewpoint on the form and formation of the international school movement within Japan. While MacKenzie (2009) explores parental choice, there is nothing written exploring the field within which this decision takes place. Situating Japan within an international school setting is complex. Unlike many places, Japan’s international school movement cannot be comfortably located in the post-colonial framework. Those initial schools in Japan were underscored by a national policy to embrace the outside world in the wake of the Meiji restoration. Such pioneer
schools were predominately designed for an elite, Western class working in Japan, usually at the behest of the Japanese government's desire to employ Western experts.

Then, post World War II, many of the schools started to serve the educational needs of the American military stationed in Japan. However, the schools remained outside the sphere of locals. Lastly, and reflecting a global trend, placements at these schools are now sought after by locals, many of whom, want their child to develop global competencies, and the social and cultural capitals necessary for success in the West or in a global knowledge economy. In essence, we have a local elite exploiting the resources available to them to further entrench their positional advantage. However, until further study is conducted these analyses remain conjecture.

Arguably, the work of Edward Said could serve as a framework for such an approach. Said was a leading voice calling upon academics and layperson alike to acknowledge the inherent power and knowledge paradigm that imperial powers left in their wake. Resonating with Bourdieu and Wacquant's (1999) work on the subtle means through which imperial epistemic traditions shape normative culture, Said's work draws heavily on the ideas of Foucault (Sweeting and Vickers, 2007). Said notes that far from being powerless agents, those colonised are active players within a power game. Additionally, they potentially utilise the coloniser's epistemic traditions and normative culture as a means of self-development, self-identity and ultimately as a new mean of liberation (Rizvi and Lingard, 2006; Sweeting and Vickers, 2007; Robbins, Pratt, Arac, Radhakrishna and Said, 1994). Studies utilising Said's framework may further help all stakeholders understand the complex nature of why locals individually may select an international school, even if it potentially undermines some of those values, traditions and identities they hold dear. Lastly, it may provide a framework wherein we can begin to unpack more forcefully the dynamic nature of the role the internationalist and globalist agenda play within the international school niche. Specifically for teachers, this may serve as a further reflective lens through which they can view their praxis in relation to the internationalist and globalist agenda.

Following in this vein, the current findings can be reconsidered, albeit with a different focus, in exploring where the present study's current participants are situated within the globalisation process. Such an approach meaningfully could seek to answer the question: In whose interest does the current work of the international teacher and their praxis operate? Set against the backdrop of work already done by Cambridge (2003), Cambridge & Thompson (2004), Brown and Lauder (2009) and Tarc & Tarc (2015), such a study could carry the current research forwards by placing teachers' praxis within global, national or international trends.
To this end, the work of Gramsci, and specifically that surrounding his notions of hegemony and the development of historical blocs, could prove helpful (Lears, 1985; Ditchburn, 2012; Mayo, 2014). Indeed, Gramsci’s work has been coupled with that of Bourdieu and Foucault as a supplementary lens exploring state and cultural power as a means of shaping educational expectations (Marginson, 2008; Goodall, 2017). Moreover, Gramsci’s work identifies a number of educational agents beyond the strict confines of the teaching profession at play in developing a cultural hegemony that may lie beyond national, racial and language borders (Mayo, 2014; Ives, 2009). Such an observation would indeed resonate with statements made by participants within the current study and noted previously around the diffusion of Western ideals and specifically Western knowledge. Additionally, by starting a process wherein international teachers and the expectations surrounding their praxis are set against others within the education field, it may be possible to establish if criticisms about international schools delivering a globalist education are in stark contrast to those offered elsewhere. Unfortunately, at present, such a comparison is impossible because it remains beyond researchers’ horizons.

Another area which is situated within the broader scope of the current study is suggested by Gramsci’s notion of work and education, wherein meaningful education not only prepares students for work but also prepares them to interact differently with work. Sharing some similarities with Foucault’s notion of regimes of truth and Bourdieu’s operation of the field, for Gramsci those being imposed (i.e., his ‘subaltern’ class) upon often participated actively within their domination, as it served their needs at the time.

However, in the long run, they redefine the hegemony, and thereby establish a new hegemony with their own agenda (Marginson, 2008; Mayo, 2014). Such an insight may help explain the current focus by teachers on redefining their work to include service learning, which currently remains extracurricular yet which they fully embrace as being part of a necessary praxis to enable their students to live fuller lives within a global setting. What was not explored was the extent to which teachers actively prepared their students within the classroom setting to interact differently with their future work. Indeed, this remains yet another untapped area of research within the international school field.

Specifically, in relation to the current study and its situation within the field of research into international teachers, there remain three major areas in need of attention. Firstly, the increasing demand for teachers suggests the traditional providers – namely, the USA, UK, Canada and Australia – will not keep pace with demand. This will mean, as Richards (2002) notes almost two decades ago, an increasing need for teachers from both local and non-traditional backgrounds. How such teachers navigate in an international school field, with its parental expectations, will prove of the utmost importance in the coming years. Developing a clearer sense of how teachers
can be supported on the job appears far more important than exploring the shortfalls of national education systems’ teacher training programmes in meeting the needs for this emerging market.

Secondly, changing demographics may reflect a changing ethos at international schools and indeed a usurpation of their more traditional internationalist agenda with a globalist one. The implications for teachers and their praxis are potentially immense. Will teachers continue to view such aspects of their jobs as pastoral care, extracurricular activities or service learning as hallmarks of an international education, or will teachers, as Brown et al. (2009) (2011) suggest, become part of a global knowledge auction, wherein they sell their skill and knowledge to the highest bidder?

Thirdly, and arguably most important, we still know very little about teachers and their praxis within an international setting. Bunnell (2015), Hayden and Thompson (2017), and Tarc and Tarc (2015) through their work have all raised the visibility while simultaneously uncovering the centrality of teachers to the international school discourse. However, the means through which these teachers live and develop meaningful professional lives, while also acting as artificers of school missions, continues to remain essentially unexplored. In a field where students are expected to possess a ‘wow’ factor and schools embody cutting-edge intercultural competencies, surely it behoves us to better understand those who stand on the front lines.
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Appendix 1

Questionnaire
Survey – International High School Teachers

Thank you for taking time to complete this questionnaire. I appreciate that teaching is a busy profession and time a valuable commodity. However, I hope you will find this questionnaire a useful exercise wherein you, as a teacher, can use some of the questions as a means not only of contributing to an emerging dialogue on international teachers that seeks to understand them, but also as a thought-provoking and reflective experience.

Preamble:
This questionnaire is part of a research investigation into international education being undertaken to meet the requirements for a Doctorate in Education, at the University of Bath, United Kingdom. The research itself is a three-part study comprising of a questionnaire, individual interviews and lastly, a journaling exercise. As you know the field of international education is still relatively new and while our understanding of the field is improving, there still remains a shortage of knowledge in understanding teachers who work within this environment. The present study is an attempt to add new information and a deeper understanding of international teachers and teaching.

Time Commitment: 20-30 minutes to complete.

Audience: This survey is aimed at teachers at the secondary or high school level.

Completion Date: April 30th, 2016

Ethical considerations:
Please know that this research is conducted under the University of Bath’s ethical research expectations and specifically adheres to the ethical guidelines for educational research as developed by the British Educational Research Association (BERA). More details of the guidelines may be found at: https://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/resources-for-researchers. As such, at no time will any specific details of your feedback be shared with your school. When necessary to identify an individual or school within the research, a pseudonym will be used. In the survey below where I ask for specific school affiliation, it serves simply to help ground the study by ensuring I have collected a balanced scattering of responses from various
international schools and secondly to see if any emerging trends of how teachers at a particular school may share an understanding of international education and its various components.

Ongoing participation:
For those interested in continuing to be part of this study I would ask that you either email me directly or complete the optional email information below. The second stage of the research involves an interview around the topic of international education, teaching and your personal experiences within it. The estimate time commitment for each interview is 30 – 40 minutes and will be conducted in April-June 2016.

Part A: Background Information

1. Which school are you presently teaching at?

2. What Subject do you teach in?
   • English
   • Modern Languages
   • Social Science
   • Natural Science
   • Mathematics
   • Fine Arts
   • PE
   • Religious Studies
   • Other: ________

3. What is the official language/languages of instruction at your school? Identify all that apply.
   • English
   • French
   • Japanese
   • German
   • Other:

4. How long have you been at your current school?
   • Less than 2 years
   • 2-5 Years
   • 5-10 Years
5. Your university education primarily took place where (please tick all that apply)
   • North America
   • South America
   • Europe
   • Africa
   • Asia
   • Oceania

6. What is the most advanced degree you hold?
   • Bachelor
   • Masters
   • Doctorate
   • Other ______

7. Do you hold a teaching certificate?
   • Yes
   • No

8. You have taught which of the following (please tick all that apply)
   • Advance Placement
   • IGCSE
   • IB Diploma
   • IB PYP
   • Other: ______

9. Are you a certified teacher trainer in any of the following?
   • Advance Placement
   • IGCSE
   • IB Diploma
   • IB PYP
   • IB MYP
   • IB Educator Certificate
• ECIS International Teacher Certificate
• Other: ______

10. Have you taught in your “home” school country?
• Yes
• No

11. If yes, please answer the following:
• Public (i.e., state funded) – Total Number of Years ___
• Private - Total Number of Years ___

12. How long have you been teaching?
• Less than 2 years
• 2-5 Years
• 5-10 Years
• 10 Years +
• 15 Years +
• 20 Years +

13. How many years’ international teaching experiences do you have?
• Less than 2 years
• 2-5 Years
• 5-10 Years
• 10 Years +
• 20 Years +

14. Have you ever received any specific training for working within an international school?
• Yes
• No
If yes, please explain below:

15. I would best describe myself as:
• Overseas teacher
• Local teacher
16. My own secondary school education took place in:

- State School
- Private School (in home nation)
- International School
- Other

17. I would describe my current school’s teacher make-up as: (select as many as are applicable)

- Primarily from one nation
- Primarily composed of teachers whose mother tongue is English
- Primarily local hires
- A truly international staff

Part B: International Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I share a common culture with those whom I teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a sound understanding of what international education means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school has a clearly articulated mission that is international in focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student body I teach is mostly international</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student body I teach mostly share one common home culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students body I teach is mostly host nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I lesson plan I explicitly consider the cultural background of my students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I teach I explicitly consider the cultural background of my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When I develop assessments I explicitly consider the cultural background of my students.

When I lesson plan I explicitly consider the national background of my students.

When I teach I consciously consider the national background of my students.

When I develop assessments I explicitly consider the national background of my students.

The majority of students I teach have the same mother tongue as the school’s language of instruction.

I have been trained in teaching to an international students body.

I have been trained in assessing an international student body.

My current school has a strong commitment to international mindedness.

I would consider myself a reflective practitioner.

My view of what is international education has changed significantly from when I started.

A cornerstone of international education has to do with social justice.

International education should differ from state systems.

The recruitment process I went through to be hired by my present school was accessible to all.
qualified teachers

When I teach I am aware of that I act as a gatekeeper to higher education for my students

I am aware that school is more central to the lives of international students than their counterparts attending state or private schools

My status as a foreign teacher carries a significant weight with how my students perceive me

My status as a local teacher carries particular weight with how my students perceive me

I would describe my school as one primarily driven by a mission

I would describe my school as one primarily driven by market forces

The teaching culture at my school I primarily dominated by Anglo-American norms?

The assessment practices and expectations of my school are predominately shaped by Anglo-American norms?

An international education adds to a student’s social capital

Students at my school mostly come from a privileged background

When I teach I am explicitly aware of my students socio-economic background

My students will go on to be leaders
Part C: Paragraph Answers:

1. What attracted you to international education?:

2. If you received training to specifically support you in working within an international school, briefly explain what it entailed and how useful it was.

3. My personal philosophy of international education is:

4. Cite examples of you, as teacher, supporting international mindedness

5. For me being an international teacher means:
Appendix 2

Interview Questions

Macro framework
a) How did the interviewer become an educator?
b) How (if applicable) did they became international educators and what, if any, shift that entailed. For example, what has this becoming meant to them as a person/professional?
c) How do they understand their role in living such central ideas as international education and international/global mindedness
d) How do they enable themselves and their students to shape learning, understanding and skills in relation to C above?

To help break the ice - situation question
1. Tell me a little about yourself, your background as an international teacher
2. To what extent do you consider yourself an international teacher? Is this different that say a national, state system teacher? How/why?
3. If they have worked in different schools, how were these experiences different? Similar?

Genealogy /Social Capital/ Field Question
1. Are you aware of any the academic educational discourses debating what it means to be internationally educated?
2. What is an international education? What are its hallmarks? What, if any, are its unique, benefits?
3. Have your ideas regarding international education changed? Explain
4. International education has been accused of being the education of a globally, mobile elite – how would you react to this statement?
5. From your experience why do your students seek out an international education?

Teacher - Archaeology/genealogy and gatekeepers
1. What is the main language of communications at your current school or other schools you have taught at? For example, is it American/British English. Are attempts made to bridge, identity other types of English at your school?
2. What does an international student look like? To what extent do you actively seek to support them 'becoming' this person?
3. Research has outlined that for international school students the school plays a much larger role in their lives than is true of their state educated counterparts. From experience
would you agree with this assertion? Is this an important fact to consider as one becomes a teacher of these young people?

4. What is the language of teaching and assessment at your school?

5. International education has been labelled as another form of Western imperialism? From you experience and practice would you say this is a fair assessment? If it is true does it need to be combatted? How does the teacher seek to do this?

6. George Walker, past Director of the IB, asserted that those attending international schools do so to gain entrance into Western universities while developing the skills to be successful there. Based on your experience comment.

7. What is the role of a teacher in an international classroom?

Teacher - Legitimacy/Panoptica/Field/Habitus

1. What does an international teacher ‘look like’? What may be some of the identifiers they have? Of these identifiers which ones do you have?

2. What ‘international curriculums’ have you taught? Would you like to teach? Are qualified to teach?

3. Have you personally sought out or been made to take courses which give you credentials and status as an international teacher (e.g., IB training)? Why did you seek these out? To what extent did they impact/change your practice of teaching? Understanding of international students?

4. Research has suggested that international school students prefer teachers who are strict, dominant and able to show dissatisfaction with their students more than students in state systems - what are your thoughts on this finding?

Concluding Questions:

Are you aware of dissonance between what you think constitutes good teaching/learning and assessments versus what your school proposes? To what extent does your students’ understanding of teaching/learning align with yours? How to you navigate any dissonance?

Do you have any questions for me?
Appendix 3

Reflection Journal Prompts

Dear All:

I hope this summer proved restful and that the fall has thus far been enjoyable, despite the atrocious weather!

As discussed in May/June, the third part of my research is focusing on developing a deeper understanding of teachers, how they conceptualise and act upon the ideas of international teaching and international education. The first part of the research focused on ‘getting a sense’ of who the teachers were, while the second part, which entailed the interviews, sought to uncover what these teachers did and why they did it. I hope that the individual interview posed some questions that provide an opportunity to reflect upon who are international teachers, what we do, how we do it and why.

This third and final part of the research seeks to explore the actual ‘doing’ of your job. Through practice, experience and reflection, you all do your jobs in unique, insightful and passionate ways in schools that are likewise unique and powerful. As stated during the interviews, in most of the research to date teachers have been understood as agents who are acted upon, whereas my research seeks to understand how they construct meaning, action and relationships as personal artificers of their individual praxis.

In the coming two months, I will share a total of six questions that I would ask you to reflect and write upon. I will share them every two weeks, but you will be able to go back and edit any of your previous responses at any time. I would ask that you date each of your journal entries and edits, as it will help with understanding your extrapolations and thought process. You can write as little or as much as you believe necessary.

As with other sections, thus far completed ALL responses will remain private and reported in a manner that is anonymous. Every effort will be taken to prevent you from being identified and nowhere in the report shall your real name, or your school’s, be used.

I do hope you can continue with this project. I sincerely thank you for the time you have already given this project. Already the findings have proven insightful and will deepen and challenges what we already know about international teachers and education.
Once again, I thank you for your time and effort and most importantly for the professionalism and dedication you have shown during this project. Your ideas, actions and beliefs are helping us shape our understanding of the field.

Please know that you may contact me at anytime via jmh27@bath.ac.uk and that participation is entirely voluntary.

Best regards,
James

Prompt 1
During the interviews, an emergent theme was the notion of an international teacher being internationally aware and sensitive. As an international teacher, how do you get feedback on the alignment of your teaching with this concept? What are some of the key identifiers you look for in assessing the usefulness of such feedback to your present situation?

Prompt 2
Why is intercultural understanding a good thing to promote? To what extent should an international teacher be expected to support it? Please explain your reasoning behind your response.

Prompt 3
Are there 'taboos' within international education? How did you learn about these taboos and do what extent do they impinge upon your professional praxis?

Prompt 4
During the interviews, an emergent theme was the notion of an international teacher as creator and navigator of school mission and international education. To what extent do you enact your school's mission, with particular emphasis on enacting its views on international education? To what extend do you diverge from it? Why/why not?

Prompt 5
Researchers in international education often assert that international education is a ‘field’ or ‘educational field’ wherein a shared language and experience structures space and interactions and by extension such areas as force, legitimacy and even norms. Such ‘fields’ operate by drawing upon their laws and relationships that are often independent of the political or economic
forces within which they exist. From your experience as a professional working within international education, to what extent would you agree that international schools and by extension, international education, constitute a “field”?

Prompt 6
During the study it emerged that a key to being an international teacher was staying up to date in both the international education field and one’s own area of specialisation. How do you remain abreast of developments in these areas?