

International Education: A Reflection During the Time of a Global Pandemic

Stephanie Hollings

Beijing Normal University, China

Abstract

International education has numerous definitions, is used in various contexts and is notoriously not well-defined (Hayden & Thompson, 1995a). This paper draws on two distinct aspects of international education i.e. the idea of an education that goes beyond borders and is considered to generally focus on the movement of students and teachers internationally and then the idea of international education being an approach to education (Peters, 2019). Employing these two definitions, international education will be looked at through the growth and changes in two of the main facilitators of international education. Firstly, international schools in order to aid the look at international education as an approach to education. Secondly higher education and internationally mobile students as a way to illuminate the definition of international education as an education that goes beyond borders. That being said, more emphasis will be placed on international schools and the idea of international education as a method of education. By looking at what does it mean to be international, what is an international school and what ideologies are commonly associated with international education, more light will be reflected on how international education is being seen in the literature and how that has shifted over time by moving through distinct phases and waves. Reflecting on the paradigm shift of international education in the context of international schools and to a lesser extent higher education, the author will argue that there is a need to embrace the duality of what international education is and what it can be, as seen through a time of a global pandemic.

Keywords: International education, international student, international school, international ideology

Introduction

Nobel Peace Prize winner and first Prime Minister of Canada, Lester B. Pearson, proposed the question. “How can there be peace without people understanding each other, and how can this be if they don’t know each other” (Lester B Pearson College of the Pacific, 1982, p. 9).

Today’s world makes it almost unavoidable to meet, study and live with people from diverse backgrounds, religions, customs and perspectives (Braskamp, Braskamp, & Engberg, 2014). As Wilkinson and Hayden (2010) explain, “we meet, we exchange, we learn and we merge, if we are to be efficient human beings in modern society” (p. 95). People’s everyday lives are becoming a mixture of the global and local (Myers, 2010) and thus there is a more pressing need for understanding these diverse perspectives, knowledges, relationships and identities (Braskamp, Braskamp, & Engberg, 2014). Nothing highlights this better than a pandemic. For as much as globalization knows no borders, Ingram (2005) notes the same can be said about germs. That is where international education comes in.

Peters (2019) discusses that international education typically has one of two meanings that differ based on student involvement and engagement. He discusses that the first type is one that goes beyond the borders of nations and involves the exchange of students and staff, including programs such as student exchanges (often considered more in terms of higher education). The second is based more on the approach to education, that being to prepare students to be engaged and active contributors to our intercultural and interconnected world (Peters, 2019). While they may appear inherently different both are intrinsically focused on students and staff gaining an understanding and familiarity with the world. And this comes through knowledge of religions, cultures and global and international regions (Peters, 2019). Thus, international education can be regarded as the impetus for creating the usual rhetoric of international education monikers such as global citizens, cosmopolitans and globally competent people. However, it can and should be seen as much more.

This paper will be concerned mostly with the concept of international education in relation to what is being taught to students or as above-mentioned, the approach to education, in particular in reference to principally international schools. For often it is slated that their *raison d’être* is the promotion of international education, especially in regards to International Baccalaureate (IB) schools (Hill, 2000). As international education is still a phrase used vastly and vaguely (Hayden & Thompson, 1995a), it is important for the concept to be reflected on. In order to be able to accomplish that it is crucial to examine international education through the lens of what it means to be international, what is an international school and student and what are the ideologies behind international education. As only through looking through all these aspects can international education really be understood as a means of reflecting on our pandemic world. Hence, this reflection will look at both definitions of international education, comparing to a lesser extent the changing notion of international education in both international schools and in higher education. Finally, why we need international education will be discussed.

1. What does it mean to be international?

International is an adjective that as this paper will show, can be placed in front of many nouns such as student, school, ideologies, and education. The Merriam Webster dictionary provides three definitions for international:

- 1:** of, relating to, or affecting two or more nations
- 2:** of, relating to, or constituting a group or association having members in two or more nations
- 3:** active, known, or reaching beyond national boundaries

Using any of these definitions we can see that for example international education can be education affecting two or more nations, education involving members of two or more nations or an education that reaches beyond national boundaries. This alone, highlights the issue with what is international education. As from the offset, it can be one of three things, or two of three things, or all of those three things. To get to the crux of the matter, it is imperative to look at the three main aspects of international education – schools, the students that attend these schools and ideology promoted. Only then can we appreciate international education itself.

International School

Like with the case of ‘international education’, ‘international school’ also has a variety of definitions with each school varying to some degree (Keller, 2015). As these schools are able to fluctuate in terms of size, curriculum, demographics, location, administration, funding and even admission criteria, the idea of an international school is hard to define, beyond that generally they are perceived to promote the ideology of international education. (Hayden & Thompson, 1995a; Hayden & Thompson, 2000; Sylvester, 2003; Carder, 2007; Grimshaw & Sears, 2008;

Keller, 2015). Hayden and Thompson (1995a) provided the broad definition of a “conglomeration of individual institutions which may or may not share an underlying educational philosophy” as one definition of international schools (p. 332). Yet, international schools have many other features in which they are characterized by, for example large amounts of international/multicultural students, the curriculum being offered or frequently being associated with organizations such as IB (Poonosamy, 2016). Likewise, Dunne and Edwards (2010) note that most international schools will provide some sort of “internationally recognized university entrance qualifications” such as the previously mentioned IB diploma, the USA’s Advanced Placement program or the British A-Level (UK) (p. 25).

Some international schools become international schools by meeting specific criterion, standards and regulations, in order to gain accreditation, authorization, or even membership in either regional or global international school organizations (Council of British International Schools, International Baccalaureate Organization, Council of International Schools, etc.). However, the situation is further complicated by the understanding that some international schools do not use international in their names while on the contrary, some that do not meet any standards or accreditation are not shy to label themselves as international schools (Keller, 2015). The title of a school can thus be seen as not necessarily connoting international education or the delivery of such an education. It would seem then, that a school’s title is not

the most effective way to determine its stance on international education or its ability to be considered an international school.

That is why some like Wasner (2016) states what should make an international school an international school is ethos, values and the culture of the school i.e. a culture founded on progressive and humanist principles of international education, incorporating international understanding or the underlying values of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Bunnell, Fertig and James (2016) also tried to answer the imposing question “What makes a school’s claim to be an International School legitimate?” and by building on Lawrence (1977) came up with two official tasks that legitimize a school’s claim to be agreed upon as an international school: international curriculum and the ‘development of institutionalization theory’ (p. 304). Perhaps it is Gellar (1993) who best summarizes what it is that makes an international school and international school:

Not so much curriculum, but what takes place in the minds of children as they work and play together with children of other cultures and backgrounds. It is the child experiencing togetherness with different and unique individuals; not just toleration, but the enjoyment of differences; differences of colour, dress, belief, perspective. International schools are about the building of bridges, not walls ... We would define international by what schools do in nurturing [multicultural] understanding; that cooperation, not competition, is the only viable way to solve the major problems facing the planet, all of which transcend ethnic and political borders. Thus any school in the world, public or private, can be international (as quoted in Hayden & Thompson, 1995a, p. 337).

This definition highlights the humanism aspect of international education and its ideological foundation, a foundation that was the basis of the rise of international schools after WW11. Historically, international schools appealed to a very limited market of mostly entrepreneurs and traveling diplomats but globalization, like with many other aspects of life, has increased the market for international schools (Hayden, Rancic, & Thompson, 2000; Savva, 2013). As international organizations based on ideological humanism ideals like the League of Nations or the United Nations continued to rise and there was a growth in the need for foreign-service workers, there was a growth in the demand for high-quality education by those globally mobile parents. This coincided with a rise in international schools (Savva & Stanfield, 2018). These initial international schools are now considered as ‘traditional international schools’, garnered with the primary task of enabling students residing outside of their home country to pass leaving examinations and/or university admissions examinations for universities or schools back in their home country (Hayden and Thompson, 2013). Yet it also should be restated that they were also highly inspired and guided by the ethos of the United Nations, i.e. fostering peace and making the world a better place (Hill, 2012; Savva & Stanfield, 2018). As globalization continued to expand, and there was an ever-increasing number of professionals (families in tow), who at some point in their career would be stationed in at least one foreign country has provided an ever-growing demand for international

schools who can answer the call for parents wanting to provide their children with an ‘international education’ and for their children to be cultivated with skills such as ‘worldmindedness’ (Sampson & Smith, 1957; Hayden & Thompson, 1995a; Hayden, Rancic, & Thompson, 2000; Savva, 2013).

As a result of the market and the students being appealed to, traditionally international schools have been associated with children who are often deemed as ‘international people’ (Jonietz, 1991). They are children who grow up and spend significant amounts of their childhood living outside of their home country (Hayden & Thompson, 1995a). These children are known by numerous monikers, such as third cultural kids (coined by Useem et al., 1963), ‘global nomads’ (McCaig, 1992; Kingston, 1993), ‘transculturals’ (Willis, Enloe, & Minoura, 1994), ‘cultural hybrids’ (Bhabha, 1994) and ‘cultural chameleons’ (McCaig, 1996; Smith, 1996). They are oftnoted to be able to “blend their home culture with the host culture(s), thus becoming truly multicultural and achieving what has labeled as a third culture” (Moore & Barker, 2012, p. 554).

Until recently the continued growth in international schools was based on the growing need for more “globally mobile expatriates” and acceptance of limited “host country nationals” into international schools. Now the market has become saturated by those who see beyond just the ideological foundation and in more neo-liberal ideas of the perceived benefits of this type of education including: an ‘English-medium education’ as English is considered the ‘dominant global language’ and the alleged ‘competitive edge’ over students “educated in the national education system” (Hayden & Thompson, 2016, p. 12). Hayden and Thompson (2016) make note of that before 2016, the ratio of the expatriate to host nation students in international schools were 80%, 20% and after 2016 those rations were reversed with the majority of international school students coming “from the affluent aspirational middle classes in those countries” (p. 12). Thus, underscoring the changing face of international schools as no longer primarily serving expatriates. Hence, these new international schools are often deemed as ‘non-traditional’ (Hayden & Thompson, 2013). For they are seen as mediums, by a budding middle and elite class, to secure social mobility for their children (Barratt-Hacking et al., 2018; Gardner-McTaggart, 2014), have their children become proficient in English (Sharma, 2013) and as a way to gain better access to the world’s most prestigious universities (Hayden & Thompson, 2013; Van Oord, 2007; Tamatea, 2008; Savva & Stanfield, 2018). According to data from Brummit (2011) and ISC Research (2013) around 80% of students at international schools are said to come from “wealthy host country families who choose international schools over state-funded or other tuition funded schooling options” (Keller, 2015, p. 902). What this connotes is the evolution of the international school. As international schools are changing, the idea of what it means to be an international school, and how to provide an international education is also forced to shift.

3.1 The three types

Hayden and Thompson (2013) classified international schools into three types. Those of ‘Type A Traditional’, those like the ones mentioned above, aimed at providing education for globally mobile people, including diplomats and multinationals employees (Hill, 2014; Hallgarten, Tabberer, & McCarthy, 2015; Bunnell, Fertig, & James, 2016). Based on pragmatic reasons, these types of international schools are stated for possessing high levels of parental involvement (Benson, 2011), a diverse student population from a variety of nations (Leach, 1969; Mayer, 1968), English as the main method of communication, high student mobility and for providing an international curriculum (Leach, 1969; Jonietz, 1991; Hallgarten, Tabberer, & McCarthy, 2015). ‘Type B Ideological’ International Schools, are those like the United World Colleges that attempt to follow as Bunnell, Fertig and James (2016) borrowing from veervers and Pete (2011), “the philosophy of Kurt Hahn and/or education for global peace” (pp. 304-306). While maybe the most uncommon of the three types, they are pedagogically focused on retaining a vision for making the world a better place (Tate, 2013) and providing an international curriculum such as that offered by the IBDP (Bunnell, Fertig, & James, 2016).

The newest type of international schools is one that is more market-based - ‘Type C nontraditional’ International Schools. These non-traditional schools have been argued to “have less altruistic aims” (Machin, 2014, p. 21). Many of them have also been explained to use the term international for the purpose of marketing alone (Hill, 2006), “offering little more than Englishlanguage instruction by home nationals and a token expatriate as a consultant” (Tarc & Mishra

Tarc, 2015, p. 36). Typically, as they are both privately owned and for-profit (Brummitt & Keeling, 2013), these types of international schools are often credited for being created to help fulfill the growing demand for an English education by ‘local (indigenous) parents’ who are more than willing to pay the often high fees for such an education as they see it as a way to help students acquire better qualifications for higher education in English speaking countries such as the USA and the UK (Bunnell, Fertig, & James, 2016). These market-driven purposes have repeatedly led these types of international schools to be criticized for being international in name alone. As critics see them as not truly providing the key elements of an international school, such as international curriculum, environment, or ethos and thus are fundamentally changing the nature of the international school and international education landscape (Bunnell, 2014; Bunnell, Fertig, & James, 2016). Thus, highlighting as noted above the changing nature and face of what it means to provide international education and the students who are provided with said education.

2. International Ideologies

Different international schools have different ideologies that they chose to promote through their curriculum, their school identity and even their school name. Many of these are varied but all seem to come back to the essence of international education. There are ideas, such as promoting world peace and international understanding (Hayden & Thompson, 2000; Carder, 2007; Grimshaw & Sears, 2008); ‘international attitude’ (Hayden & Thompson, 1995b); intercultural understanding’ and the development of ‘globally competitive skills’ (Savva, 2013,

p. 215); intercultural sensitivity (Ellwood, 2010); worldmindedness (Sampson & Smith, 1957); globally minded (Haywood, 2007); global competency (Palmer, 2018); multiculturalism and the idea that “an individual can successfully hold two or more cultural identities’ (Baker, 2001, p. 402); transnational education (Palmer 2018); and intercultural competence.

Often these ideologies are considered ‘Western-centric’ (Calhoun, 2002, p. 883) or ‘Westphalian logics’ (Kim, 2019, p. 4). However, as Kim (2019) goes on to mention, these ideas are nothing new when looking at ancient thinkers such as Confucius or Marcus Aurelius. Heater (2004) points out that t’ung, a principle taught by Confucius, is about the common unity of humanity. While the ancient Roman leader, Marcus Aurelius acknowledged that ‘people exist for one another’ (as quoted in Palmer 2018, p. 136). In the African continent, the Zulu people use the concept of ubuntu, or a ‘collective identity’ which stresses “connectedness, compassion, empathy, humility, and action” (OECD, 2016, p. 4). The origins of such ideologies and concepts such as cosmopolitanism, global citizenship, etc. seem to be nothing new but how they are expressed is constantly changing. Yet, when looking at international education and reflecting on it, they are all important to note as many of these ideologies although slightly different, all come back to the same global idea - international education and its essence.

3. International Education

The concept of ‘international education’ can be traced back much before World War II. As mentioned above, international education although considered a Western idea, can be seen to demonstrate similarities with other concepts from a vast array of cultures and religions. Hill (2012), maintains that the concept of international education has evolved over time as the world has changed and progressed (p. 246). He goes on to mention the work of Goormaghtigh (1989) and Piaget (1993), who express the idea that the beginning of international education was with Czech philosopher, pedagogue and humanist, John Comenius (1592-1670) (Hill, 2012). Hill (2012) also highlights, Rousseau, Victor Hugo and Charles Dickens and the Universal Exposition in London in 1851 for their work in expanding on the notion of international education. What came next, was two world wars, the development of the United Nations, technological advancements such as airplanes, televisions and the internet, and with that came even more progress in the idea of international education, especially in terms of international schools (Hill, 2012, p. 250).

3.1 International Education Defined

International education is both commonly and widely used and at the same time, not “well defined” (Hayden & Thompson, 1995a, p. 327). Sylvester (2002, 2003) studied the oft changing ways in which international education was viewed during the period of 1893 to 1998, discovering that international education has ranged from education for international understanding, to education for world citizenship, or as he calls these two concepts “the twin landmarks of the territory of international education” (2003, p. 202). To expand on these dual ideas, Sylvester (2002), quoted from the 1923 World Conference on Education. Two that really showcase education for world citizenship are Augustus O. Thomas, who expressed that, “today, the citizen must be a citizen of the world. He must know the world, what is transpiring in the world, and know how to interpret the language of the relationships of the world”, thus

concluding that children must receive education on that (p. 113) and also E.J. Sainsbury, who noted that, “the future of the world will depend largely upon the extent to which people of the world will be prepared to temper national feelings and national egoism by the larger considerations of international well-being.....Education will still be national but it must not exclude the wider and more comprehensive view, including the international one (p. 111).

Sylvester (2003) also gives examples of the international understanding aspect of international education and how it has been used throughout modern history with his example of, how in 1952, the Executive Board of UNESCO, organized a text on the idea of education for international understanding, and included a list of 8 points, including explaining why there is cultural diversity, understanding that civilizations are dependent upon the contribution of more than one nation and that likewise, human progress is all mankind’s heritage, thus all nations must cooperate, and depend upon international treaties made in good faith and mutual will to have them succeed, meaning that society needs an education towards the concept of a world community, a culture of peace instilled in youth, and the encouragement of children to have attitudes complacent for international cooperation and understanding (UNESCO, 1952). Thus highlighting the indistinct, impreciseness and ambiguousness of the term and what it actually aims to do. This was further noted by Jonietz and Harris (1991), who regarded international education as vague in regards to what it aims to do, simply defining it as “all educative efforts that aim at fostering an international orientation in knowledge or attitudes” (p. 2660). Fraser & Brickman (1968) chose to stress that international education implies relationships such as educational, cultural and intellectual among both individuals and groups from at least two or more nations and a movement across borders, not necessarily in person but also by a book or an idea. Hayden & Thompson (1995a) in response to Fraser & Brickman, state that with that spacious definition of international education, the scope could include, education on foreign education systems, the exchange of students and teachers, and even aid to other countries.

International education can be seen in terms of international mindedness and global awareness, often see as aspects taught through a focus on curriculum (Poonoosamy, 2016). Hayden and Thompson (1998) asked teachers for their opinions on, “what does it mean for students to experience an ‘international education?’”(p. 552). They discovered that the prime factors believed by teachers were “exposure to students within the school, teacher factors, formal curriculum, links with the local community, and informal aspects of school” (p. 565). Hayden and Thompson then used that data in a comparison with their 1995 study asking university undergraduates the same question. The student’s answers varying slightly from those of the teachers in the study identified their top factors as “exposure to students within a school, exposure to students outside school, informal aspects of the school, teacher factors, and formal curriculum”, which draws attention to the differences between how teachers and students answer that question (Hayden & Thompson, 1998, p. 565). On the surface, this study supplies an interesting comparison of teachers and students. However, looking deeper it shows the importance of many factors above and beyond the formal school setting. As the informal sectors, such as need for students to be exposed to diversity within the school and also their community are elucidated upon by both the teachers and students, although perhaps more by

the students. Thus, highlighting the difference between what those who teach and those who learn, deem as the most important factor in making an education international.

This idea of the importance of informal and formal learning was also displayed by the former director of IBO, Ian Hill (2010), who chose to define international education as relational to both the informal school experience and the formal learning by which a student would be garnered with an ‘international perspective’ acquired through learning foreign languages, engaging with global issues, partaking in community engagement and service, connecting with people from diverse cultures and social groups. All of that would then culminate in the development of ‘an open attitude towards all cultures’ and the insight that world peace will only be attained through cultures and people learning to ‘to live together’ (Hill, 2010). Thus, international education is the catalyst for creating the attitudes and knowledge needed for the advancement of world peace. First, though students need to acquire the skills that will enable that to happen. Walker (2004) lists four main fundamental components or skills gained from an international education: cultural understanding, emotional intelligence, collaboration and communication. His argument lies within the framework that with these components students attain the tools necessary to both learn and understand the ever-changing world by being able to negotiate and recognize differences, thereby being able to better contribute to a more peaceful future. It is the ability to both embrace and comprehend the diversity of cultures and interfaces that will allow for children and youth to be able “to thrive in tomorrow’s world” (Hacking et al., 2018, p. 3). It is within this arena of thought that international education can be viewed as the necessity for learners to be exposed to varied and diverse understandings of the world, spawning from the need to understand the context in which real people live, which enlightens one to the issues of inequality in the world or in other words - intercultural understanding (Castro, Lundgren, & Woodin, 2015). Other scholars and organizations use similar monikers as ‘global citizenship’ (UNICEF, 1991), ‘worldmindedness’ (Sampson & Smith 1957), and ‘education for international understanding’ (UNESCO, 1968). These definitions see international education from a humanism point of view, by playing up words such as peace, intercultural understanding, inequality and diversity.

5.3 Changing Paradigms

International education is not limited to just this humanist perspective as the approaches and perspectives to international education are debated. Some scholars such as Cambridge (2003) distinguish between the ‘internationalist approach’ and the ‘globalist perspective’ (p. 56). While the ‘internationalist approach’ recognizes the duty of such an education to be an obligation for world citizenship and world peace, the ‘globalist perspective’ “sees international education not as a process but a product” (Cambridge, 2003, p. 56) therefore “emphasizing advantages such as mobility or certification” (Dunne & Edwards, 2010, p. 25). It is through these distinct views, that the debate on international education becomes more clearly elucidated. Is international education a tool for “common social good” or is it simply nothing more than “a growing market model” (Dunne & Edwards, 2010, p. 25)? It is interesting to remember, that this query is not unique to international education in sense of an approach to education. As it also reflects on the changing face of international schools and the idea of

international education in terms of student mobility and higher education. Both of which has seen shifts from humanitarian and developing global citizens agenda (Caruana, 2014), to a more liberal one, to finally a neoliberal stage (Britez & Peters, 2010).

4. Reflections

We can choose to view international education in different lights. We can see it as a response to a globalized world and the need for transferable qualifications and a generation of global and local mobile elites (Cambridge, 2003). We can see it as a tool for preparing the youth to survive and cope in an increasingly interdependent and globalized world (Hayden & Thompson, 1995a). Perhaps, we should add to that now, a pandemic world. It can also be viewed through a globalist perspective (Cambridge, 2003) and a neo-liberal paradigm (Britez & Peters, 2010). Yet, we can also see it as existing within a conflicting duality, which is a thought that will be returned to briefly.

There have been definitions of international education given throughout this paper, one more concerned with what was being taught and one more focused on the movement of students and teachers. I have chosen to see these two in light of two distinct aspects of international education - the education given at international schools and student mobility in regards to higher education. It has been noted that international education has been said to have undergone three distinct stages, which seem to coincide with many of the changing identities of both definitions. The first one of which is the humanitarianism ideals of understanding and peace, highlighted in such documents as the UNESCO 1994 International Conference on Education and other such documents.

The second stage could be considered liberalism or liberal internationalism which was followed by the neo-liberalism stage (Britez & Peters, 2010). If we look closely at the history of international schools or even the three types of international schools, it seems that these three stages could be used to explain some of those changes. From the Type A and Type B, showcasing the first and second stages rather well. Type C is the epitome of neo-liberalism and a market-based idea of international education. This also seems to correspond to what has been seen in higher education, even just within the past twenty years. Choudaha (2017) looking within the timeframe of 1999-2020 at international student mobility, analyzed three waves of trends impacting the student mobility of international students. The first wave, shaped by events such as the 2001 terrorist attacks, saw many international students attracted to research-intensive universities, often postgraduates and often on scholarship (Choudaha, 2017). The second wave was begotten by global recessions and how that initiated the neo-liberalistic motivation of recruiting international students based on financial motivations. As Choudaha (2017) states it was a shift in narrative from “attracting global talent” to “recruiting international students”, even noting that the fields of study of the majority of these recruited students went from research programs to subjects such as business (p. 6). The last wave mentioned is one of increasing competition among new rising international education markets (such as China) with the established, traditional markets (such as the USA and UK), and how that is being affected by Brexit and President Trump’s policies (Choudaha, 2017). While not

exactly in the same boat, these waves do show some of that same pattern of a move to neo-liberalism from seemingly more focused on the ideology of international education to a shift towards market-based principles and the idea of students as human capital.

A glance at some numbers quickly highlights this shift in both contexts. Within international school, Savva (2013) using data from ISC Research 2012, notes that students at international schools have tripled since 2002 (1 million) to just ten years later (3 million) and there is a prediction of reaching 6 million by 2022, with the Asian market holding 53.87% of the market (p. 215). Looking at higher education, Choudaha (2017) noted that between 2000 to 2013, the number of international students doubled to reach 4 million. Data from UNESCO in 2017, showed that there were over 5.3 million globally mobile international students, with that number expected to continue to rise. The changing face of international education becomes more and more apparent but so too does the need to see from the duality of the situation.

Keller (2015) refers to this as the “multiple dualities” of international schools in which he states “international schools face a reality encapsulated in the competing perspectives of post-colonial critique and global civil society idealism” (pp. 904-906). Cambridge and Thompson (2001) argue that most international schools will have conflicting values when it comes to ideological commitments and economic realities. Cambridge (2003) argues that there will be friction between two opposing international school agendas: globalist and internationalist. Keller (2015) goes on to highlight that the ‘globalist agenda’ is the motive for international schools and stakeholders to pursue economic success through elite university admissions and the view that international schools can be a gateway to more global mobility. While on the contrary the ‘internationalist agenda’ is the ideology behind international education and international schools that being to pursue “world peace, understanding between nations, and responsible world citizenship” (Kellar, 2015, p. 906). Matthews (1988) tried to distinguish international schools by those that were ‘ideology driven’ and those that were ‘market driven’ but Hayden and Thompson (1995a) refute that with their thoughts that “many international schools might be a combination of the ideological and market driven” (p. 337). Could not the same be said for universities recruiting international students, that is nothing more than a multiple duality? Take for example two emerging destinations for international education, South Korea and China.

It has been noted that the Korean government in order to become more “economically competitive in the global market” (Kim, 2019, p. 2) has invested billions of dollars in higher education and internationalizing it (Castells, 2009). Part of these efforts are achieved through recruiting international students (Kim, 2019). While this can clearly seem an evident example of neo-liberalism, the ideological background of international education is evident in Korean educational policies such as ‘Korean Education that Harmonizes the World’. A policy that “aims to help individuals understand and practice universal values of mankind such as world peace, human rights, [and] cultural diversity” (Republic of Korea Ministry of Education, 2018, as quoted in Kim, 2019).

China is another country that has been trying to adapt itself as not only a primary supplier of international students but also a supplier of international education. The Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) on behalf of the Chinese government is a great catalyst for this shift, as the Chinese government continues to support “a community of common destiny” (Jiang & Shi, 2019). Thus, the main mechanism of that comes from the internationalization of Chinese higher education. Wen (2017) states that “the internationalization of higher education has become one of the major strategies countries utilize to educate young talents and yield world-class scientific outcomes” (p. 175). Wen (2017) goes on to address the BRI as part of China’s soft power approach as international education, student mobility, in particular, more international students in China will allow for the advancement of both Chinese culture and wisdom in countries that make up the BRI as that will potentially “facilitate the connectivity of policy, infrastructure, trade, finance, and people” (p. 176). Both of these examples show the duality of international education, and that ideology frequently has to work hand-in-hand with pragmatic reasons.

5. Conclusion

This leads to the important questions of what is an international education and what is it not? One example of what it is, or could be, comes from Wilkinson and Hayden (2010) who researched students at United World Colleges (UWC) with the intention of investigating the mission statement of International Baccalaureate and how that manifests itself or does not in IB students. They gave examples of two students who through their time at a UWC, came to new understandings of themselves as international students partaking in international education. One example was of a German girl, who went in with limited English and a firm belief that her future lied in Germany, but through her coming to understand that her newly found English skills would allow her to attend universities throughout the world, changed her plans, and came to identify herself as not just German but as European (Wilkinson & Hayden, 2010). Likewise, was the example of another girl from a rural area of Cameroon, who after a year at a UWC came to see herself as belonging to the continent of Africa and possessed a greater understanding of the role that Africa plays in the world and the impact of the rest of the world on Africa (Wilkinson & Hayden, 2010). Is this not the aim of international education? Forgetting for a minute, the market-based idea of international education, is it not more important to look at the guiding philosophy. The philosophy of getting people to see themselves as a global citizen or cosmopolitanism, to enhance international mindedness and global competence (feel free to substitute these with any of the other countless synonyms), and to make the world more peaceful.

International education cannot exist in a vacuum. It cannot be purely ideological and exist for only humanistic reasons. Nor can it exist purely to meet the needs of a changing market, where international education is becoming more of a reality for more and more students. It needs to live somewhere within those two dualities as it is too important for it to not exist. The need for students to experience international education has not changed just because the stages, waves or paradigms have shifted. Recent events such as COVID-19, highlight why the world needs international education, international understanding and all the other ideology encompassed within the realm of international education. We can continue to view a pandemic, much like international education through a neo-liberal lens of economic realities. Indeed, the economic

realities of a pandemic are real and important but much like international education we cannot ignore the ideological commitments needed during a pandemic. Does not a pandemic, require a pandemic citizen (Hollings, 2020), global citizen, etc.? Do we not need more people who are internationally-minded, more humanistic and see themselves as international people? It cannot just be the germs that are international. Often though, what we have seen during the pandemic is the opposite, which emphasizes the need for international education, in all of its dualities and complexities.

To return to Lester B. Pearson's question, and to take into context what is happening in the world right now, the implications of why international education is needed becomes more and more apparent. Globalization will continue to make the world a smaller and smaller place, more people will be exposed to people with fundamentally different ways of thinking and lifestyles, global challenges and issues will continue to arise, and for there to be peace and understanding international education is the only way forward.

References:

- Baker, C. R. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Multilingual Matters.
- Barratt-Hacking, E., Blackmore, C., Bullock, K., Bunnell, T., Donnelly, M., & Martin, S. (2018). The International Mindedness Journey: School Practices for Developing and Assessing International Mindedness Across the IB Continuum (Report). Retrieved from <https://www.ibo.org/globalassets/publications/ib-research/continuum/international-mindedness-finalreport-2017-en.pdf>
- Benson, J. (2011). An investigation of chief administrator turnover in international schools. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 10(1), 87–103. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240911398779>
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Braskamp, L., Braskamp, D., & Engberg, M. (2014). *Global perspective inventory (GPI): Its purpose, construction, potential uses, and psychometric characteristics*. Retrieved from <https://gpi.central.edu/supportDocs/manual.pdf>
- Britez, R. , & Peters, M. A. (2010). Internationalization and the Cosmopolitical University. *Policy Futures in Education* 8(2), 201-216. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2010.8.2.201>
- Brummit, N. (2011). *Current data regarding international schools. European Council of International Schools Administrators Conference*. Presented at Istanbul: ECIS.
- Brummitt, N., & A. Keeling. (2013). Charting the Growth of International Schools. In R Bates (Ed.). *International Education and Schools: Moving beyond the First 40 Years* (pp. 25-36). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Bunnell, T. (2014). *The Changing Landscape of International Schooling: Implications for Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Bunnell, T., Fertig, M., & James, C. (2016). Establishing the legitimacy of a school’s claim to be “International”: the provision of an international curriculum as the institutional primary task. *Educational Review*, 69(3), 303–317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2016.1213224>
- Calhoun, C. (2002). The class consciousness of frequent travelers: Toward a critique of actually existing cosmopolitanism. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 101(4), 869-897. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-101-4-869>

- Cambridge, J. (2003). Identifying the globalist and international missions of international schools. *International Schools Journal*, 22(2), 54–58.
- Cambridge, J., & Thompson, J. (2001). Internationalism, international mindedness, multiculturalism, and globalization as concepts defining international schools. <http://staff.bath.ac.uk/edsjcc/intmindedness.html>
- Carder , M. (2007). *Bilingualism in International Schools*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Caruana, V. (2014). Re-thinking Global Citizenship in Higher Education: from Cosmopolitanism and International Mobility to Cosmopolitanisation, Resilience and Resilient Thinking. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 68(1), 85-104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12030>
- Castells. (2009). “Lecture on Higher Education.” Paper presented at the University of the Western Cape. University of the Western Cape, August.
- Castro, P., Lundgren, U., & Woodin, J. (2015). International Mindedness through the looking glass: Reflections on a concept. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 14(3), 78-197. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240915614202>
- Choudaha, R. (2017). Three waves of international student mobility (1999-2020). *Studies in Higher Education*. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03075079.2017.1293872>
- Dunne, S., & Edwards, J. (2010). International schools as sites of social change. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 9(1), 24- 39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240909356716>
- Ellwood, C. (2010). *International mindedness: A professional development*. Saarbrucken, Germany: VCM Verlag.
- Fraser, S. E., & Brickman, W. W. (1968). *A History of International and Comparative Education: nineteenth century documents*. Glenview, USA: Scott Foresm.
- Gardner-McTaggart, A. (2014). International elite, or global citizens? Equity, distinction and power: the International Baccalaureate and the rise of the South. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 14(1), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2014.959475>
- Gellar, C. A. (1993). How international are we?. *International Schools Journal*, 26(1), 5–7.

- Gellar, C. (2002). International Education: A Commitment to Universal Values. In M. Hayden, J. Thompson and G. Walker (Eds). *International Education in Practice: Dimensions for National and International Schools*. London: Kogan Page.
- Goormaghtigh J. (1989). *Collegium Lucis* [to the International Baccalaureate. Peterson lecture]. Available at:
<http://www.ibo.org/council/peterson/goormaghtigh/index.cfm>
- Grimshaw, T., & Sears, C. (2008). ‘Where am I from?’ ‘Where do I belong?’: The negotiation and maintenance of identity by international school students. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 7(3), 259–278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240908096483>
- Hacking, E. B., Blackmore, C., Bullock, K., Bunnell, T., Donnelly, M., & Martin, S. (2018). International Mindedness in Practice: The Evidence from International Baccalaureate Schools. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 17(1), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240918764722>
- Hallgarten, J., Tabberer, R., & McCarthy, K. (2015). *Third Culture Schools: International Schools as Creative Catalysts for a New Global Education System*. London: ECIS.
- Hayden, M., & Thompson, J. (1995a). International Schools and International Education: a relationship reviewed. *Oxford Review of Education*, 21(3), 327–345. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1050876>
- Hayden, M. C., & Thompson, J. J. (1995b). Perceptions of international education: A preliminary study. *International Review of Education*, 41(5), 389–404. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01103036>
- Hayden, M. C., & Thompson, J. J. (1998). International education: perceptions of teachers in international schools. *International Review of Education*, 44(5/6), 549–568. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1003493216493>
- Hayden, M., & Thompson, J. (2000). *International Schools and International Education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Hayden, M., & J. Thompson. (2013). International Schools: Antecedents, Current Issues and Metaphors for the Future. In Richard Pearce (Ed). *International Education and Schools: Moving beyond the First 40 Years* (pp 3–24). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Hayden, M., & Thompson, J. (2016). International schools: the developing agenda. In M. Hayden, & J. Thompson (Eds.), *International schools: current issues and future prospects* (2 ed., Vol. 26, pp. 9-16). (Oxford Studies in Comparative Education; Vol. 26, No. 2). Oxford: Symposium Books.

- Hayden, M. C., Rancic, B. A., & Thompson, J. J. (2000). Being International: Student and teacher perceptions from international schools. *Oxford Review of Education*, 26(1), 107–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/030549800103890>
- Haywood, T. (2007). A simple typology of international-mindedness and its implications for education. In M. C. Hayden, J. Levy, & J. J. Thompson (Eds.), *The handbook of research in international education* (pp. 78–89). London, UK: Sage.
- Heater, D. 2004. *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education*. 3rd ed. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hill, I. (2000). Internationally-Minded Schools. *International Schools Journal*, 20(1), 24–37. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234761610_Internationally-Minded_Schools
- Hill, I. (2006). Student types, school types and their combined influence on the development of intercultural understanding. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 5(1), 5–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240906061857>
- Hill, I. (2010). *The international schools journal compendium*. Woodbridge: John Catt Educational.
- Hill, I. (2012). Evolution of education for international mindedness. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 11(3), 245-261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240912461990>
- Hill, I. (2014). Internationally minded schools as cultural artefacts: Implications for school leadership. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 13(3), 175–189. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240914556199>
- Hollings, S. (2020). COVID-19: The Changing Face of Global Citizenship and the Rise of Pandemic Citizenship. *Knowledge Cultures*, 8(3), 81-91. doi:10.22381/KC83202012
- Ingram, A. (2005). Global Leadership and Global Health: Contending Meta-narratives, Divergent Responses, Fatal Consequences. *International Relations*, 19(4), 381–402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117805058530>
- ISC Research. (2012) *Mapping the world of international schools*. Retrieved from <http://iscr.com/>
- ISC Research (2013). *ISC Research: The Market*. Retrieved from <http://www.iscr.com/market/>

Jiang, T., & Shi, L. (2019). The Way of the International Cooperation of Higher Education Under the Strategy of "The Belt and Road". *Science Journal of Education*, 7(3), 73-80. <http://spgjedu.com/article/197/10.11648.j.sjedu.20190703.12>

Jonietz, P. L. (1991). *International Schools: developing a consensus of opinion* (PhD thesis). Brunel University.

Jonietz, P. L., & Harris, N. D. C. (1991). *World yearbook of education*. Kogan Page.

Keller, D. (2015). Leadership of international schools: Understanding and managing dualities. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 43(6), 900-917. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214543201>

Kim, J. J. (2019). Conceptualising global competence: situating cosmopolitan student identities within internationalising South Korean Universities. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 17(5), 622–637. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2019.1653755>

Kingston, P (1993). Cosmopolitan but rootless. In: *The Guardian* 18 May, London

Lawrence, G. (1977). Management Development... Some Ideals, Images and Realities. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 1(2), 21–25. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb014148>

Leach, R. (1969). *International Schools and Their Role in the Field of Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Lester B. Pearson College of the Pacific. (1982). *Adventures in High Endeavour: People Understanding People. The Story of Lester B Pearson College of the Pacific*. Brownstone.

Machin, D. (2014). Professional Educator or Professional Manager? The Contested Role of the for-Profit International School Principal. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 13 (1), 19–29.

Matthews, M. (1988). *The Ethos of International Schools* (Master's thesis). University of Oxford.

Mayer, M. (1968). *Diploma: International Schools and University Entrance*. The Twentieth Century Fund.

McCaig, N. M. (1992). Birth of a notion. *Global Nomad Quarterly* 1(1), 1.

McCaig, N. (1996). Understanding global nomads. In C. D. Smith (Ed.), *Strangers at Home* (pp. 99–120). Aletheia.

- Merriam Webster International. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2020, from <https://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/international>
- Moore, A. M., & Barker, G. G. (2012). Confused or multicultural: Third culture individuals' cultural identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36(4), 553-562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.11.002>
- Myers, J. P. (2010). 'To benefit the world by whatever means possible': adolescents' constructed meanings for global citizenship. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(3), 483-502. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920902989219>
- OECD. (2016). *Global Competency for an Inclusive World*. OECD.
- Palmer, N. (2018). Emergent constellations: Global citizenship education and outrospective fluency, *Journal of Research in International Education*, 17(2), 134-147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240918793963>
- Peters, M. A. (2019). The crisis of international education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2019.1663410>
- Poonosamy, M. (2016). Aspirations and tensions in developing international mindedness: case study of two students in an IB school in an Indian Ocean Island Nation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 36(4), 583-598. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2015.1064354>
- Piaget, J. (1993). Jan Amos Comenius. *Prospects*, XXIII(1/2), 173-96. https://monoskop.org/File:Piaget_Jean_1993_Jan_Amos_Comenius_1592-1670.pdf
- Republic of Korea Ministry of Education. (2018). Policies and Programs: Major Tasks. Accessed March 1, 2020, from Ministry of Education website: <http://english.moe.go.kr/sub/info.do?m=040101&s=english>.
- Sampson, D. L. & Smith, H. P. (1957). A scale to measure world-minded attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 99-106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1957.9714290>
- Savva, M. (2013). International schools as gateways to the intercultural development of North American teachers. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 12(3), 214-227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240913512589>
- Savva, M., & Stanfield, D. (2018). International-Mindedness: Deviations, Incongruities and Other Challenges Facing the Concept. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 17(2), 179-193. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240918793954>

Sharma, R. (2013). Teachers on the move: international migration of school teachers from India. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(3), 262–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315311433206>

Slingerland, E. (2003). *Confucius analects*. Hackett Publishing.

Smith, C. D. (1996). World citizens and ‘rubber-band nationality.’. In C. D. Smith (Ed.), *Strangers at Home* (pp. 189–201). Aletheia.

Sylvester, R. (2002). Mapping international education: A historical survey (1893-1944). *Journal of Research in International Education*, 1(1), 90–125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147524090211005>

Sylvester, R. (2003). Further mapping of the territory of international education in the 20th century (1944– 1969). *Journal of Research in International Education*, 2(2), 185–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14752409030022004>

Tamatea, L. (2008). A practical and reflexive liberal-humanist approach to international-mindedness in international schools. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 7(1), 55–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240907086888>

Tarc, P., & Misha Tarc, A. (2015). Elite International Schools in the Global South: Transnational Space, Class
Relationalities and the ‘Middling’ International Schoolteacher. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 36 (1), 34–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2014.971945>

Tate, N. (2013). International Education in a Post-Enlightenment World. *Educational Review*, 65 (3), 253– 266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.785938>

UNESCO. (1952). Some Definitions of Education for International Understanding, document 17C/19, Annex II, p. 22, appendix 2. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (1968). Guiding Principles Relating to Education for International Understanding Recommendation No. 64 adopted by the International Conference. *Public Education*, 31.

UNESCO. (2017). *Outbound internationally mobile students by host region*. Retrieved from: <http://data.uis.unesco.org/Index.aspx?queryid=172>

UNICEF (1991) Education for Development: report of the consultation (Thonon-les- France: UNICEF 24-27 January 1991). University Press.

- Useem, J., Donoghue, J. D., & Useem, R. H. (1963). Men in the middle of the third culture: The roles of American and non-western people in cross-cultural administration. *Human Organization*, 22(3), 169–179. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44124957>
- Van Oord, L. (2007). To westernize the nations? An analysis of the International Baccalaureate's philosophy of education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 37(3), 375–390. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057640701546680>
- veevers, N., & A. Pete. (2011). *Kurt Hahn: Inspirational, Visionary, Outdoor and Experiential Educator*. Sense Publishers.
- Walker, G. (2004). International Education and the International Baccalaureate. *Phi Delta Kappa Fastbacks*, 522, 3-33.
- Wasner, V. (2016). Critical service learning: A participatory pedagogical approach to global citizenship and international mindedness. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 15(3), 238-252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240916669026>
- Wilkinson, V., & Hayden, M. (2010). The International Baccalaureate Diploma and student attitudes: An exploratory study. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 9(1), 85- 96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240909358529>
- Willis, D. B., Enloe, W. M., & Minoura, I. Y. (1994). 'Transculturals, transnationals: The new diaspora'. *International Schools Journal*, 14(1), 29–42.
- Wen, W. (2018). Inbound international student policies in China: a historical perspective. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 7(2), 174-183. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323378218_Inbound_International_Student_Policies_in_China_A_Historical_Perspective