BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The broad range of sources included in this Sage Major Works makes clear that the editors have chosen to interpret the term international education fairly liberally, including works with a focus on school-level and higher/university-level education, curriculum programmes designed to be international in focus, education located in both international and national schools, and education prefixed by adjectives including but not limited to global, comparative, transnational and multicultural.

Though the main focus of this chapter will be on international education in national contexts, in engaging with issues relating to the promotion of international education nationally it is informative to locate the discussion within its broader context. In so doing, the following sections will explore how the concept of international education in national contexts has developed, and to what extent international education developments in other (non-national) contexts have informed, and been informed by, more nationally-based developments.

Formal education systems, as they developed, have tended to be locally or nationally focused, aimed at preparing the young for adulthood in their own national context. Indeed until relatively recently young people, and by far the majority of adults, would only ever have experienced life within national boundaries. As travel became more accessible and those employed as diplomats, colonial administrators and missionaries relocated internationally with their families, schools began to be established for children away from their home countries (see, for instance, the Maseru English Medium Preparatory School in Lesotho, founded in 1890 for the children of the then British administration of Basutoland, traders and missionaries) (MEMPS, 1990). Schools such as MEMPS were arguably the precursors of what would come to be known as international schools, catering for the globally mobile families employed also by increasing numbers of multinational organisations. Often cited as the first such schools, the International School of Geneva and Yokohama International School, both founded in 1924, may be considered classic examples of what Hayden and Thompson (2013) describe as ‘Type A (traditional) international schools’, numbers of which increased rapidly during the 20th century.

Proposed by Sylvester (2002), meanwhile, as the ‘first’ international school, the west London-based Spring Grove School – established in 1866 by luminaries including Cobden, Huxley and Tyndall, and arising from their commitment to free trade, greater international understanding and the development of an international form of education – brought together boys from ten different countries specifically to be educated together and learn from each other. Sadly short-lived (it closed in 1889), Spring Grove could be considered the precursor of what Hayden and Thompson (2013) describe as ‘Type B (ideological) international schools’, exemplified by the United World Colleges (UWC) now based worldwide and arising from the vision of Kurt Hahn and others in establishing in 1962 Atlantic College in South Wales. UWC bring scholarship-funded students from around the world to live and study together for two years, in most cases at pre-university level and in some over a wider age range, with a view to engendering greater international understanding and breaking down barriers that can arise through ignorance and prejudice (see, eg Peterson, 1987).
Hayden and Thompson’s (2013) ‘Type C (non-traditional) international schools’ have developed much more recently than either Type A or Type B, emerging largely in the early 21st century as, in some of the countries where this is permitted, the affluent middle classes have viewed attending an international school as a means of securing a competitive edge for their children through engaging in what is perceived to be a superior form of education. As the existence of a market for education of that form has become more evident, so have commercial organisations responded by establishing schools, and groups of schools, with that market in mind, resulting in the opening of increasing numbers of fee-paying international schools aimed principally not at expatriates but at so-called ‘host country’ families. (See Bunnell 2014, and the introduction to Volume 3 of these Major Works, for further discussion of this relatively recent phenomenon).

Consideration of developments in international schools of whatever type cannot be divorced from the fact that the majority are English-medium (in a context where fluency in English as the dominant world language is valued by aspirational non-native English-speaking families), and from the development of international curriculum programmes. From the launch of the first such programme, the International Baccalaureate Diploma, in 1968 – arising from the need identified by international schools such as the International School of Geneva and Atlantic College for a curriculum better suited to multicultural groups of students than the nationally-focused curricula then in existence – the numbers of such programmes have grown to include the IB Middle Years Programme, Primary Years Programme and Careers-related Programme, as well as, for instance, Cambridge International Examinations’ International GCSE, Fieldwork Education’s International Primary Curriculum and International Middle Years Curriculum, and the US College Board’s Advanced Placement International Diploma. Over a relatively short time period then, the notion of curriculum as a basis for preparing the young for an essentially national future much like that of their parents as the curriculum is based on a selection from the culture of the existing society (Lawton 1989) has come to be challenged by an uncertainty as to the culture of which society the curriculum should be selected from. Further discussion of the increasing internationalisation of curriculum in a national context can be found in Hayden (2013), and of the diversity of forms of international curriculum programmes in Thompson (1998).

While in the second half of the 20th century international education, in the form of increasing numbers of international schools and development of international curriculum programmes, was growing in response to the growing global mobility of professional families, national forms of education were also being affected by the changing global environment. With gathering momentum and with greater rapidity in some national contexts than others, the inappropriateness of viewing education and the curriculum as a means of preparing young people for a life similar to that of their parents was becoming ever more evident. The effects of what would now be described as globalisation, together in some contexts with the legacy of a colonial past bestowed on later generations by their forebears, were among the factors contributing to a growing international focus in some national school systems. More recently, not only schools but also higher education/university systems began to develop a stronger focus on internationalisation, though for arguably different reasons and manifested in different ways. The next two sections will consider issues and developments in promoting international education in national contexts with a focus first on school-level education and then on higher level/university education.

PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION IN NATIONAL SCHOOLS: CURRENT ISSUES

Many national education systems are now increasingly introducing a more international focus to the school curriculum. Not always statutory in their place in the curriculum, and thus depending in some contexts on the interest, experiences and motivations of individual teachers to draw on materials made available by, for instance, NGOs such as Oxfam (2006), such developments are not necessarily uncontested or free from tension with national curriculum requirements or political influence. Marshall (2007) has discussed the growing development of what she describes as a global dimension to schooling in England, arguing that the UK government interest in ‘global education’ was at that time unprecedented, and highlighting a number of government-endorsed
strategy documents produced since the turn of the century by, for instance, the DfID, DEA, DfES (all in England), ACCAC (in Wales) and SEED (in Scotland). The growing interest in what will here be termed ‘global education’ in the UK context can be traced through the work of many researchers and practitioners. Marshall observes that ‘global’ is sometimes used rather than ‘international’ when describing education ‘because the former is linked to the whole whilst the latter refers to parts of the whole as it recognises national boundaries’ (2007). Global education, she notes, has tended to be linked with ‘an affective and participatory component’, underpinned by values of global social justice and human rights, and drawing on issues including wealth and poverty, human rights, peace and conflict, and the environment, while Osler and Vincent argue that global education aims to ‘build a global culture of peace through the promotion of values, attitudes and behaviour which enable the realization of democracy, development and human rights’ (2002, p2).

Amongst those who have contributed majorly to the debate surrounding the growth in various dimensions of global or international education within the UK are Pike (see eg 2000), Hicks (eg 2007), Heater (see 2002), and Hicks and Holden (2007). In related areas, researchers including Osler and Starkey (see eg 2005) have investigated UK-based issues relating to the experiences and education of young people living in multicultural communities. Considerable work has been undertaken not only in the UK on what is generally described as multicultural education (see, eg, the work of Lynch, 1992) but notably in the USA by Banks (see eg 2011). As ever, terminology when discussing concepts such as international, global and multicultural education is loosely used (see Marshall 2015), and Kolar’s (2012) comparison of the concepts of multicultural and international education as used at school level in the USA is helpful in this respect.

International education in the sense discussed here, and more widely referred to as global education in a number of national contexts, is not of course confined to the UK and USA; Marshall notes shared traits with global education movements in Canada, Germany (Scheunpflug and Asbrand, 2006) and in Europe more broadly, where a network of national agencies known as the Global Education Network Europe (GENE) support global education (Loughlin and Wegimont, 2004). Andreotti et al (2014) meanwhile have explored what they describe as some of the tensions to be found in Finland ‘at the interface of nationalist and global orientations in ideals of global mindedness and global citizenship’, while in Israel the internationalisation of education offered in Palestine Arab secondary schools has been discussed by Yemini (2014), who notes that the international dimensions in such schools are linked to national and political aspects of their context.

In the UK context again, Marshall (2007) proposes 12 methods which could be observed as contributing to a global dimension in schools:

- Appointment of global dimension coordinator
- Partnerships with schools abroad
- Staff development and exchange opportunities
- Global dimension throughout the curriculum, eg through citizenship
- Working with NGOs promoting global education
- Global Days, weeks, conferences and outside speakers
- Promotion and broadening of language
- International visits and hosting international visitors
- Promotion of values and principles associated with global social justice, democracy and diversity
- Development of global education policy
- International School Award
- Offering the International Baccalaureate and/or other international programmes

It is the last of these (though Marshall’s proposal did not assign a hierarchy to the 12 methods) which links to earlier sections of this chapter, in noting as a method for developing a global dimension in schools the offering of an international programme.

**Promoting International Education in National Schools through International Programmes**
It is clear that the UK state-funded education context is just one of those in which programmes designed to be international are now being offered. The growth in demand from international schools for such programmes is not surprising. Those involved initially in developing international curriculum programmes such as the IB would no doubt be surprised, however, to see the enthusiasm with which some of the programmes at least have been welcomed into contexts not initially envisaged as their natural environment. The reasons behind such developments are under-researched, ill-understood and cannot be generalised across contexts and programmes. The contexts can arguably, however, be considered to fall broadly into 2 categories: national state-funded education systems and private schools in national systems.

(i) National state-funded education systems

Hayden (2013) has discussed the adoption of international programmes in state-funded UK schools, with the International Primary Curriculum having been adopted by remarkably high numbers of state primary schools (Bunnell 2010) for reasons that are not entirely clear, though the attractive and comprehensive teacher-supportive IPC resource materials may contribute to the programme’s appeal. That schools in contexts such as England and Wales, with a statutory national curriculum, are prepared to engage in the additional work required to ensure that national curriculum requirements are met, while integrating the IPC into the curriculum, suggests there are indeed strong reasons behind its adoption by more than 1000 state schools to date. Also of interest in the context of England is the adoption of the international version of the national General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE), the IGCSE, firstly into growing numbers of independent schools and, subsequently, into a number of state secondary schools. Though, again, the reasons for this growth have not been researched, they would seem to include preference in some quarters for the perceived greater rigour of the non-coursework IGCSE than the coursework-inclusive GCSE. It will be interesting to note whether recent changes to the GCSE, as well as controversy about whether IGCSE results are considered equivalent to those of GCSE in school results league tables, will reduce demand for the IGCSE in England’s state and independent sectors.

Elsewhere, the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme has for some years been offered in large numbers of US public high schools, for reasons that include raising academic standards, changing school ethos and adjusting ethnic mix by attracting a more varied student demographic (Spahn 2001) while, more recently, the IB Middle Years Programme has also seen a surge in interest from US public schools. In an analysis of policy statements produced by US state boards of education about international education, Frey and Whitehead (2009) concluded that while several US states have promoted international education in public schools, the aims in so doing arise from local and state issues, establishing, they argue, ‘clear boundaries that limit international education to local economic and national security concerns’. Carber (2009), writing at a similar time, proposed a model for international education in US public schools, noting the increasing interest to be found in such schools in nurturing globally-minded students. In the UK meanwhile, the IB Diploma’s growth in the state sector has arguably been linked to concern about, and perceived narrowness of, the A level in England (Bunnell 2008), as well as a short-lived support from central government for the introduction of the IB Diploma in state schools as part of the parental choice agenda. Bunnell (2015 has documented the more recent decline in IBDP state school numbers in this context.

In Australia, Doherty (2009) has reflected on the growing popularity of the IB Diploma programme within both the state and private sector, a growth she pointed out ‘seems at odds with the concurrent push for a national curriculum’ then under discussion. Concluding of the IB Diploma Programme that ‘it is a curriculum developed with cosmopolitan middle-class interests in mind, and is now being strategically deployed to engage the local middle-class consumer’, Doherty highlights issues that have echoes in other national systems. It is clear that, in many state school contexts where international programmes have been adopted, it is not necessarily, or only, the international nature of the programme that explains their appeal.
Further consideration of the nature of the internationalisation process suggests universities have begun to develop what might be described as an ‘internationalisation agenda’. As with schooling, universities have traditionally been national in their focus. More recently, many universities have begun to develop what might be described as an ‘internationalisation agenda’. Further consideration of the nature of the internationalisation process suggests that this has for

Private/independent schools in national systems

If state-funded schools have adopted international curriculum programmes for reasons not entirely arising from their international nature, such programmes have also seen rapid growth in Hayden and Thompson’s (2013) ‘Type C’ international schools. Similar in many cases to their ‘Type A’ schools in, very often, employing expatriate teaching staff and offering an international curriculum, ‘Type C’ schools are arguably national rather than international in that, as private, fee-paying schools they recruit students largely if not exclusively from the affluent non-native-English speaking socio-economically advantaged middle classes for whom an English medium education through an international curriculum recognised by universities worldwide provides a competitive edge for their children, compared with their compatriots, in accessing university level education in prestigious institutions worldwide. Not a phenomenon in all contexts – some countries (including Singapore, for instance) currently prohibit their citizens from attending such schools – one country in which it is clearly observable is Thailand, which has seen a surge in the growth of such schools since Thai nationals were first permitted to attend them (MacDonald 2006).

As noted elsewhere (including Volume 3 of these Major Works), in the Middle East what Harris describes as a ‘global elite’ (the UAE and Qatar in particular in his analysis: the ‘Gulf aristocracy’) have adapted education through the adoption of international programmes to create, together with other adapted aspects of society, ‘a unique crossroads for globalisation’ (2013). India, meanwhile, has seen a rapid growth in the number of schools offering programmes of the International Baccalaureate and the IB Diploma in particular, in the majority of cases catering for what Ashworth (2011) describes as a niche market of private schools charging high fees to a limited section of the population, who see such a form of education as offering ‘a passport for university studies abroad’ (Guy and Switzer, 2010). Writing of international schools in Israel, as well as more generally, Resnik (2008) suggests that schools offering the IB Diploma ‘offer select students a curriculum that trains them to perform managerial functions in transnational corporations’ and argues that while such schools may have been ‘established in the past in order to encourage peace and understanding among peoples’ they have ‘become today a source of growing inequality in society’ (p149). In the context of independent schools in England meanwhile, programmes such as the IB Diploma are among those highlighted by Brooks and Waters (2014) as illustrating what they describe as the ‘hidden internationalism of elite English schools’.

A number of issues clearly arise in respect of the introduction of such programmes into national schools. However valued the programmes may be, issues such as the training of and support for the local staff who are expected to teach the programmes, as in the case of the IB Diploma in one of its most rapidly growing areas, Turkey (Halicioğlu 2008), clearly need to be addressed. Concerns of different types have also been expressed elsewhere; Wright and Lee (2014), for instance, question whether the educational philosophy of the IB is reflected in practice in the growth of the IB Diploma in China, while Lee et al (2012) explore the challenges they argue are facing leaders of the rapidly growing numbers of schools in the Asia Pacific region offering IB programmes. In Hong Kong specifically, Yamato and Bray (2002) and Yamato (2003) chart the changing nature of such schools, which have increasingly been serving the needs of local families as well as the expatriates for whom they more traditionally catered, while also in the Hong Kong context Lai et al (2014) more recently explored the contribution made by Chinese language teaching to the aims of the IB Diploma in this context.

Clearly, the growth of international programmes in schools worldwide is both satisfying demand and raising questions and challenges. Consideration of developments in university-level education worldwide suggests that questions and challenges are no less evident in that context.

PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION IN NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES: CURRENT ISSUES

As with schooling, universities have traditionally been national in their focus. More recently, many universities have begun to develop what might be described as an ‘internationalisation agenda’. Further consideration of the nature of the internationalisation process suggests that this has for
many years focused principally on recruiting students described variously as ‘international’ or ‘overseas’ for reasons including, in the case of universities in England for instance, the ability to levy fees at a higher level than are levied to ‘home’ (EU) students. That is not to argue that many international students have not enjoyed a very positive and productive experience in studying at such universities, and it is clear that many universities go to great lengths to support them, both pastorally and academically, throughout their studies. The student experience, though, is arguably a ‘national’ one of the country in which they have chosen to study, with the host institution expectations being that (with support for language development and cultural adaptation) the incoming student will adapt to the new educational context. For an overview of issues relating to the growth in student mobility at this level, and the trends in terms of the countries to which mobile students tend to be attracted, see Naidoo (2006).

Recent developments in higher education have moved beyond national institutions attracting international students as, for arguably the same purpose (recruiting more students, from outside the home country), universities have recognised that the purpose can equally be served, and on potentially a larger scale, by taking the university closer to new markets. So, for instance, in 2000 the University of Nottingham established the UK’s first ‘off shore campus’ in Malaysia, followed by a second campus in China, while the UK’s University of Central Lancashire operates a campus in Cyprus. Such initiatives have not always been successful, and in some contexts there is a sorry trail of abortive attempts to sustain the alluring vision. The University of New South Wales closed its Singapore off-shore campus after one semester, for instance, and University College London announced in 2015 that it plans to close its branch in Australia (Bothwell, 2015). Among those that survive are Monash University in Malaysia (from Melbourne, Australia), Xi’an Jiaotong-Liverpool University in China, plus the prestigious universities that collaborate to offer programmes through Hamad bin Khalifa University in Qatar’s Education City (including Weill Cornell Medical College, Texas A & M University, Carnegie Mellon University and University College London).

Increasing in popularity are off-shore teaching programmes based on universities delivering their own programmes on the basis of short-term visits by faculty from the home university, with online support provided between visits and, in some cases, in collaboration with an overseas institution. The University of Bath offers MA in Education courses on this basis for instance, through a network of international school-based Study Centres worldwide, while, also from the UK, University of Bristol tutors travel to Hong Kong to teach courses of the Doctor of Education (EdD) programme in collaboration with the City University of Hong Kong. Australian universities have seen major growth in such offshore programmes (Pyvis and Chapman 2005); by 2025 it is estimated that Australian universities will have more than 400,000 student enrolments offshore, around 44 percent of total demand for international university education from Australia (IDP 2003).

A substantial literature base has grown up around the growing phenomenon that might be described as the exportation of national higher education opportunities. Waters and Leung (2013), for instance, discuss the proliferation of ‘international’ degree programmes offered entirely in Hong Kong to local students, with British universities the largest provider of what they describe as ‘transnational education’, issues also explored in Leung and Waters (2013). In discussing the growth of ‘international programmes’ offered in Thailand at university level through the medium of English, Lavankura (2013) concludes that the main drivers include generation of fee income for universities and meeting demands of stakeholders, while noting that the contribution made to the higher education system in Thailand by its higher education internationalisation policy since its introduction in 1990 are not yet clear. The context of Korea, over a similar period, has been the focus of increasing internationalisation of higher education, to the point where internationalisation is now an ‘integral part of mainstream higher education policies and programs …… and is increasingly perceived as a key tool for improving the quality of higher education’ (Kiyong and Minjung 2011). Singapore, meanwhile, as ‘one of the East Asian tiger economies’ (Mok Ka Ho, 2008) has been developing ‘transnational education’ at university level as a means of diversifying its higher education system to enhance its global competitiveness (ibid). Such examples only scratch the surface of the rapidly internationalising nature of the higher education sector worldwide, and some of the motivations for its growth.
CONCLUSION

Clearly, the promotion of international education in national contexts takes many forms. At university level, internationalisation is increasingly commonplace. What internationalisation of higher education actually means, what rationale exists for promoting it, to what extent it is successful and whether it will in all cases be sustainable remains problematic. At times linked to promoting competitiveness of a national higher education sector, at others linked to the increasing dominance of English as the global language, it is undoubtedly inseparable in many respects from the efforts of university students to secure a competitive edge in the global labour market. Not only are Asian students, for instance, using studying abroad as a strategy in this respect; more recently there is evidence to suggest the existence of the phenomenon on a much wider basis, with Brooks et al (2012) highlighting as one example that the numbers of UK students enrolling in universities overseas is also increasing, for what are presumed to be similar reasons.

Motivations for internationalisation of higher education, say Altbach and Knight (2007), include ‘commercial advantage, knowledge and language acquisition, enhancing the curriculum with international content [with initiatives put in place including] branch campuses, cross-border collaborative arrangements, programs for international students [and] establishing English medium programs and degrees’. At the school level, promotion of international education in national systems can be seen to share some similarities. Depending on whether the context is state-funded systems of education developing international dimensions to the curriculum, or state or private schools offering international programmes such as those of the IB or the IPC, the rationale may well, in different contexts, share similarities with some aspects of the increasing internationalisation of the university sector – though the more ideologically-focused aspects of international education found in, for instance, the United World Colleges find few echoes in the higher education context.

Whether at school or university level, what is increasingly evident from an exploration of the literature in both contexts is just how rapidly they are changing, and that they are doing so apparently in parallel and with little, if any, cross-referencing. There would seem to be benefit in each sector becoming better informed about developments in the other, as both work to respond to the rapidly changing nature and demands of the global education environment.
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