

Contesting and Constructing International Perspectives in Global Education

R. Reynolds, D. Bradbery, J. Brown,
K. Carroll, D. Donnelly, K. Ferguson-Patrick
and S. Macqueen (Eds.)



SensePublishers

**Contesting and Constructing International Perspectives in
Global Education**

Contesting and Constructing International Perspectives in Global Education

Edited by

R. Reynolds

University of Newcastle, Australia

D. Bradbery

University of Newcastle, Australia

J. Brown

University of Newcastle, Australia

K. Carroll

Australian Catholic University, Australia

D. Donnelly

University of Newcastle, Australia

K. Ferguson-Patrick

University of Newcastle, Australia

and

S. Macqueen

University of Newcastle, Australia



SENSE PUBLISHERS
ROTTERDAM / BOSTON / TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-94-6209-987-6 (paperback)
ISBN 978-94-6209-988-3 (hardback)
ISBN 978-94-6209-989-0 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,
P.O. Box 21858,
3001 AW Rotterdam,
The Netherlands
<https://www.sensepublishers.com/>

Printed on acid-free paper

All rights reserved © 2015 Sense Publishers

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
Introduction: Interpreting Global Education <i>Ruth Reynolds, Deborah Bradbery, Joanna Brown, Kay Carroll, Debra Donnelly, Kate Ferguson-Patrick & Suzanne Macqueen</i>	1
Section 1: Temporal and Spatial Views of Global Education	
1. Re-Imagining Global Education in the Neoliberal Age: Challenges and Opportunities <i>Graham Pike</i>	11
2. One Size Fits All? Global Education for Different Educational Audiences <i>Ruth Reynolds</i>	27
3. Global Perspectives on Global Citizenship <i>Hilary Landorf & Eric Feldman</i>	43
Section 2: Telling National Stories of Global Education	
4. The Significance of Schooling, Teaching and Education: A South African Perspective <i>Patrick Themba Sibaya</i>	55
5. Educating Diverse Teachers in a Diverse Country: An Issue of Connectivity <i>Udan Kusmawan</i>	63
6. The Neglect of Politics and Power Analysis in Development Education <i>Mags Liddy</i>	77
7. The Implications for Secondary Teacher Training of Large-scale Polish Immigration into England <i>Trevor Davies</i>	89
Section 3: Empowering Citizens for Global Education	
8. Democratising Schools <i>Javier Calvo de Mora</i>	107

TABLE OF CONTENTS

9.	Where's the Action in Global Education? Employing Global Education for Lasting Change through Teacher Education <i>Suzanne Macqueen & Kate Ferguson-Patrick</i>	115
10.	Teaching with a Values Stance for Global Citizenship: Integrating Children's Literature <i>Deborah Bradbery & Joanna Brown</i>	125
Section 4: Deconstructing Global Education		
11.	Service Learning as Post-colonial Discourse: Active Global Citizenship <i>Fran Martin & Fatima Pirbhai-Illich</i>	135
12.	Going Global <i>Kay Carroll</i>	151
Section 5: Transforming Curricula for Global Education		
13.	Historical Culture and Peace Education: Some Issues for History Teaching as a Means of Conflict Resolution <i>Henrik Åström Elmersjö</i>	161
14.	The Digital Studio as a Global Education Site: Imaging to Examine Issues of Social Justice and Human Rights <i>Debra Donnelly & Kathryn Grushka</i>	173
15.	A Global Citizenship Perspective through a School Curriculum <i>Murray Print</i>	187
16.	It Takes a Global Village: Re-conceptualising Global Education within Current Frameworks of School and Curricula <i>Kay Carroll</i>	199
17.	Educating for Global and Local Peace: Emerging Visions, Hopeful Practices <i>Toh Swee-Hin (S.H. Toh)</i>	209
Authors' Biographies		223
Editorial Committee Biographies		229

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editors would like to acknowledge the wonderful support we have received from some key people. First and foremost many thanks to our diligent and hardworking Research Assistant, Monica Gendi. We would never have completed this without her painstaking attention to detail. Secondly to Cecilia Chiu who is a copy editor of exceptional expertise. She chased up every comma and full stop with a vengeance that we now appreciate mightily.

We would like to acknowledge our Editorial Committee who provided much needed commentary on articles and gave us direction when we needed it most. Members of this committee are listed in the back of this text.

We would also like to thank our various authors who revised and revised, engaging in much professional discussion around their ideas of a global education. They have managed to do what we hoped they would – provide us with wide and varied perspectives to lift our visage beyond what our limited contextual experiences have thus far taught us about Global Education. We have learned a lot by the process and we hope readers will also.

Also many thanks to Sense Publishers and Peter de Liefde, Publisher and General Manager, who are so responsive to our queries and helpful at all times.

RUTH REYNOLDS, DEBORAH BRADBURY, JOANNA BROWN,
KAY CARROLL, DEBRA DONNELLY, KATE FERGUSON-PATRICK
& SUZANNE MACQUEEN

INTRODUCTION: INTERPRETING GLOBAL EDUCATION

This text addresses the need for an international perspective on global education and to provide alternate voices to the theme of global education. It takes key themes that require a global perspective and asks educators to indicate how their own experience of global education addresses them. Global education is a broad and contested concept imbued with varied values, understandings and practices. The term ‘Global Education’ is ascribed with a multiplicity of definitions depending on the context of the proponents. The aim of this book is to construct concepts of global education using international perspectives from experts rather than provide one definitive view, definition or approach. We followed the authors’ lead. Some chose to write on global citizenship, some on global education; some gave it an historical lens, some a futures lens. To us this was what we wanted from this book – to tap into a variety of views in order to reveal them to a wider audience. We identified authors who could contribute broad perspectives on global education and key questions were provided. We asked how they defined the area of global education; the key focuses in their field as they related to their national context; their personal contributions to the field; and the key tensions and challenges for global education in the future. We attracted internationally acknowledged authors from North America, Europe, Africa, Australia, and Asia who provided perspectives on a wide variety of contexts including tertiary education, teacher education, various pedagogies, including digital pedagogies, and curriculum development at school, tertiary and community levels. The text explores the tensions inherent in discussions of global education from a number of facets including spatial, pedagogical, temporal, social and cultural; and provides critical, descriptive and values-laden interpretations. We envisage this text as a starting point for a stronger international conception of global education and a way to build a conversation for the future of global education in a neo-liberal and less internationally confident time.

Definitions

Global education is about ‘preparing students for the increasing interconnectedness among people and nation’ (Zong, Wilson, & Quashiga, 2008, p. 199). Exponential

technological and societal change has made us increasingly interdependent and has flattened and converged global boundaries creating a need for global education and learning about all dimensions of humanity (Banks, 2004; Friedman, 2005; Tye, 2003). Global education comprises knowledge, consciousness, intercultural awareness, transnational efficacy and informed advocacy (Lorenzini, 2013). Global knowledge informs students about structural and social inequalities and dominant discourses. This knowledge frames global awareness, citizenship and consciousness (Davies, 2006; Dower, 2014; Dower & Williams, 2002; Carpenter, Weber, & Schugurensky, 2012). Global consciousness is an informed view of rights and responsibilities in the global community (UNESCO, 2012). This consciousness comprises an understanding of the interrelationships between the collective and individual responsibility. It recognises the importance of human rights issues, environmental sustainability and intercultural understanding and creates an impetus towards global citizenship. The notion of a multifaceted multidimensional citizenship embodying personal, social, spatial and temporal dimensions (Cogan & Grossman, 2009) is one way in which global consciousness can be envisaged. It is characterised by engagement with the challenges and opportunities afforded by the issues identified by globalisation. It is a transformative and empowering concept to deconstruct the contemporary and international discourses. The global consciousness enables students to respond to contemporary issues of poverty, social injustice, persecution, exploitation or environmental concerns with transnational efficacy to enact change and seek, through global advocacy, alternative solutions to these issues and contexts. This text connects these constructs of global education and considers how global frameworks are played out in a range of international sites and experiences.

Key themes and ideas

Chapters have been grouped around emergent themes of global education and seek to provide an explorative pathway for the reader. Beginning with the thematic thread of Temporal and Spatial Views of Global Education, Pike compares views on the concepts of global education and international education while Landorf and Feldman examine evolving literature on the meaning and application of the term global citizenship. Reynolds uses research literature on all of these themes to clarify the different contexts in which they may be used. All three papers acknowledge ongoing discussions around how global education could possibly be conceived and implemented in different venues and some of the contemporary issues associated with the notion. Pike ('Re-imagining Global Education in the Neoliberal Age: Challenges and Opportunities') points to the rise of neoliberal discourses which has moved education increasingly towards a resource rather than a moral focus on building communities. Using Nussbaum's two poles of education for profit and education for freedom (Nussbaum, 2009) and his own continuum from privilege to common good, Pike develops criteria for the resultant four quadrants that will expose the predominant values and beliefs that inform the practice of global and international education if that position is taken. This

INTRODUCTION: INTERPRETING GLOBAL EDUCATION

provides an incredibly useful platform for global educators at the local and global level to position their actions in different ways and in different times. This theme of pragmatic opportunity as a central feature of global education is taken up by Reynolds ('One Size Fits All? Global Education for Different Educational Audiences'), when she argues that, despite the different terms used, the ideas espoused and the strategies implemented are dependent on the educational context. Thus much of the confusion around the use of terms associated with global education is as a result of the way that practitioners at different levels of education envision what is possible. Landorf and Fredman ('Global Perspectives on Global Citizenship') provide another very important perspective for this discussion by including voices from non-Western sources to the discussion of what global citizenship means. As it is an avowed aim of this text to provide multiple voices on a theme which is most often discussed in a small number of Western, privileged groups, Landorf and Feldman's perspectives are critical. By engaging global educators from many different corners of the world they argue that the development of human capability rather than corporate gain is a crucial element of global citizenship and a guiding framework. Additionally both local and global actions, skills, and interconnectedness are required to be truly global citizens and so debates that argue for one or the other are not helpful in augmenting notions of global citizenship.

It is obvious from our authors' opinions that national perspectives continue to be very important in influencing global viewpoints. Many authors see their own nation's actions as a way of understanding global education. We have grouped these together to put the spotlight on this idea. Telling National Stories of Global Education brings together diverse national narratives of the history and enactment of global education. Stories from South Africa and Indonesia provide unique experiences of global education but ones that can be linked to other places in the world. Sibaya offers the view that experiences of education in South Africa offers perspectives on the importance of overall global values that imbue education, a view influenced by the years of South Africa being isolated from the rest of the world and subject to racial divisions. Kusmawan from Indonesia perceives global education as a matter of connectivity and has the view that information and communication technology (ICT) can help build global connections and local connections in the diverse nation that is Indonesia. The Indonesian challenge of creating social and national cohesion through technology and the vast numbers, diverse cultures, languages and educational settings this involves is confronting. These studies provide real and positive examples of how global education and global citizenship can be achieved within a national context. Additionally in this section stories from Ireland and from England provide examples from nations who are reaching out to the world with authors reflecting on the issues associated with such global interaction. Liddy provides an Irish perspective ('The Neglect of Politics and Power Analysis in Development Education'), arguing that what is called development education in Ireland has a strong history of charity and mission work in its conception of global education and global citizenship. Liddy argues that there needs to be a more critical approach: that neglect of the power and political

aspects of global citizenship in development education could be seen as encouraging issues such as human rights and social justice as personal and individualised concerns rather than structural issues at cultural, economic and/or political levels. Davies (The Implications for Secondary Teacher Training of Large-Scale Polish Immigration into England), who surveyed trainee teachers on their attitudes to global education, found that respondents believed that people from different cultures can be good neighbours but there was an alarmingly low regard for England being socially just and some confusion as to their role as individuals and the wider role of government generally. They recognised that they should exercise individual responsibility and contribute to volunteering and community activity; but few trainees believed that teachers should make their values about other cultures explicit. Both of the latter national narratives portray mixed views on global education, weighing up the constraints of individual rights and responsibilities and the international rights and responsibilities involved. Many teachers seemingly do not see themselves as active global citizens but instead as good global neighbours.

The section Empowering Citizens for Global Education is a compilation of articles envisaging new global futures and strategies to achieve future global citizens with an emphasis on schools. Calvo de Mora argues that democratising schools is an important way to model for students and the wider community how a better society could evolve; Macqueen and Ferguson-Patrick argue that enabling students to take action on important events is a crucial but seemingly rare event in schools and bodes ill for future global citizenship; and Bradbery and Brown argue that the values of global education are crucial for future global citizens. Calvo de Mora ('Democratising Schools') points out that if we want a more equitable global community we need to collaboratively bring together families, teachers, administrators, and students in schools, because they possess complementary information that can be used to solve educational problems. Often non-formal knowledge such as social and emotional issues, neighborhood issues, and family status builds democratic school communities and such participation is the process by which public concerns, needs, and values are incorporated into governmental and corporate decision-making processes. School community-building can provide direction for the wider world. Macqueen and Ferguson-Patrick ('Where's the Action in Global Education? Employing Global Education for Lasting Change through Teacher Education') critique a pre-service teacher global education program from the point of view of teaching future teachers to take action to engage students in important global issues. They argue that enacting global values is essential for the better world and any action that helps to link the local experience with the global one will assist with this. Despite some degree of reticence in dealing with issues that could be seen as controversial, global ways of acting, being and feeling need to be embraced by teachers. Another chapter by Bradbery and Brown ('Teaching with a Values Stance for Global Citizenship: Integrating Children's Literature') identifies the empowering potential of children's literature as a vehicle for teaching the values and dispositions of global citizenship and

provides some examples of key global issues that can be addressed by such techniques.

Furthering the theme of pursuing a stronger sense of agency for global education in *Deconstructing Global Education*, Carroll ('Going Global') argues that critical literacy, critical inquiry and critical understanding are needed for a global context and engagement. She outlines the impact of contemporary digital and social media practices on global citizenship and suggests a framework for a critical approach to global literacy in schools. Martin and Pirbhai-Illch ('Service Learning as Post-Colonial Discourse: Active Global Citizenship') reframe service learning in a post-colonial context and deconstruct examples from Canada and India.

Transforming Curricula for Global Education concentrates on critically focused strategies and pedagogies for the promotion of global education precepts. All five chapters address initiatives in curriculum to provide a reflexive approach to global education. Although, as Andreotti (2006) notes, soft approaches to global education such as raising awareness of global issues and promoting campaigns are appropriate in some contexts, critical approaches where there are safe spaces established to consider multiple perspectives on inequality and injustice, are also possible. Curriculum can provide some of those spaces. Elmersjo ('Historical Culture and Peace Education') examines the links between historical culture and peace education. He argues that history education acts in a dialectic relationship with its society and when a cultural group moves towards building more peaceful and equitable relationships history education often uncritically follows. A critical approach to history education would be to expose the conflicts in the narratives of past events and to embrace these as part of a well functioning democracy. Donnelly and Grushka investigate social justice and human rights using images in the digital studio. They found that the independent self-directed learning structure of the digital studio environment provided learners with a sense of agency and autonomy in their learning and a space to explore global themes. In the Australian context, the new Civics and Citizenship syllabus is arguably a good model for global citizenship education. Print ('A Global Citizenship Perspective through a School Curriculum'), who was instrumental in developing this curriculum document, points out that there are many opportunities provided in the document to explore notions of global citizenship. The issue is that any form of citizenship education, whether it be global or national or local, is poorly regarded in education curriculum internationally and requires both formal and informal approaches to build engaged citizens. Carroll ('It Takes a Global Village: Re-Conceptualising Global Education Within Current Frameworks of School and Curricula'), also addressing the Australian Curriculum, maps the cross curricular priorities of Asia and Australia's engagement with Asia; Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures; and sustainability across the newly implemented Australian curriculum and concludes that education is the means through which the global village can be envisaged and enacted. Toh ('Educating for Global and Local Peace: Emerging Visions, Hopeful Practices') provides a vision of hope for us with his deep passion for encouraging peace and peaceful critical pedagogy. He argued that global education must employ multiple pathways including Human Rights Education,

intercultural understanding and personal inner peaceful mindfulness. The possibilities are there for us all as educators to provide multiple ways to address global education despite the evident constraints.

The emergent themes and trends identified in this book represent the many voices of global educators on several continents and the interplay of these. The various frames and lenses through which global education is viewed allow us to present a problematised approach enabling us to confidently engage with global discourses and global citizens. This text provides some initial insights into how we, as researchers and educators from diverse nations, see the world of global education. The editorial team have collated unique/different/rich/compelling stories and ideas, providing a comprehensive statement of what global education means internationally and how this relates to the implementation of global perspectives in educational settings. This is only the beginning. We can see some themes that require further investigation and some ideas that are worthy of providing direction in the field:

1. There is a need to further explore non-Western perspectives on global education. To be truly global we must learn to engage with others who have a view with which we may not be familiar.
2. Readers from the Western world need to apply our critical, post-colonial scrutiny to discourses of globalisation, common good and international imperatives. What would truly global, non-judgemental and mutually supportive communications truly look like? Why would we have such conversations? How would we have such conversations?
3. How have national citizenship narratives been interrupted by global citizenship narratives? What examples of this have not yet been explored?
4. From a curriculum perspective how well have we positioned ourselves for a globally connected world and what are the implications of this? What are the emerging pedagogies of such a world?

We encourage the continuing debate.

REFERENCES

- Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, 1(3), 40–51.
- Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (2004). *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspective*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Carpenter, S., Weber, N., & Schugurensky, D. (2012). Views from the blackboard: Neoliberal education reforms and the practice of teaching in Ontario, Canada. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 10(2), 145–161.
- Cogan, J. J., & Grossman, D. L. (2009). Characteristics of globally minded teachers: A twenty first century view. In T. Kirkwood-Tucker (Ed.), *Visions in global education* (pp. 240–270). NT: Peter Lang.
- Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review*, 58(1), 5–25.
- Dower, N. (2014). Global ethics: Dimensions and prospects. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 10(1), 8–15.
- Dower, N., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Global citizenship: A critical reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

INTRODUCTION: INTERPRETING GLOBAL EDUCATION

- Friedman, T. (2005). *The world is flat*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Lorenzini, M. (2013). From global knowledge to global civic engagement. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 9(4), 417–435.
- Nussbaum, M. (2009). Education for profit, education for freedom. *Liberal Education*, 95(3), 6–13.
- Tye, K. A. (2003). Global education as a worldwide movement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85, 165.
- United Nations Economic, Scientific and Cultural Organisation [UNESCO]. (2012). A roadmap on global consciousness: Thinking and learning for the 21st century. Retrieved from <https://en.unesco.org/cultureofpeace/flagship-programmes/global-consciousness>
- Zong, G., Wilson, A. H., & Quashiga, A. Y. (2008). Global education. In L. S. Levstik & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 197–216). New York and London: Routledge.

SECTION 1

TEMPORAL AND SPATIAL VIEWS OF GLOBAL EDUCATION

GRAHAM PIKE

1. RE-IMAGINING GLOBAL EDUCATION IN THE NEOLIBERAL AGE

Challenges and Opportunities

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I want to explore the lasting impact of neoliberalism on the development of global education, in both K-12 and higher education sectors, in the United Kingdom and Canada. In so doing, I hope to illustrate the urgent need for a reassessment of, and reinvestment in, global education's visionary goals at a time when economic interests, as determined by the global free market, trump the broader concerns of planetary health and the common good. Conflict and controversy, in political as well as educational domains, have always shaped the global education narrative but the neoliberal values that dominate contemporary discourse on public education pose a challenge of an entirely different magnitude. These are personal reflections on an era that has witnessed monumental changes in geopolitical and economic systems, all of which, inevitably, have influenced educational thinking. The probable continuance of such rapid change, allied to the uncertainty of its outcomes, is the context for proposing a re-imagining of global education at a time when its central values are often proclaimed but rarely practised.

GLOBAL EDUCATION AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: RESPONSES TO GLOBALISATION

Global education (at the primary and secondary levels of education) and international education (at the tertiary level) are both reform movements that have attempted to broaden students' understanding of the world in the wake of the impacts of globalisation. Public education systems, inevitably, have emerged from – and have been deliberately shaped to promote – the nation as the primary geographical and political concept. For more than a century, nationalism has been integral to the purpose and practice of education (Green, 1990, 1997). Educational institutions have laboured to produce workers who will meet the nation's need for certain skills and talents, civilians who will perform the requisite duties as voters, parents and tax-payers, and citizens who will defend their sovereignty – even being prepared, when necessary, to sacrifice their own lives in the interests of the nation (Smith, 1998).

In the latter half of the 20th century, building on some earlier attempts and strategies (Heater, 1980, 1984), educators in the global North began to argue, from

both pragmatic and moral perspectives, that education should better acknowledge and reflect the nature of the contemporary world. The pragmatic viewpoint emerges from the inexorable rise of globalisation: in an era when national economies are increasingly interdependent and the passage of goods and services is indifferent to political boundaries, an understanding of the world as a global village is more attuned to the everyday realities that link people, cultures and places in a vast interconnected web. Whether for good or ill, the argument goes, globalisation has forever changed the way the world works and education shoulders a responsibility to prepare students to adapt and contribute to this enlarged community.

The moral argument draws credibility from the realities of globalisation but goes further than the pragmatist view. Given that we now live in a global village, we have duties and responsibilities that are similarly far reaching in their scope (Dower, 2003). As we are intimately interconnected, and the impacts of our actions and decisions will have consequences for people around the globe, we should extend our 'circle of compassion' to include those who live beyond our nation's border and to 'give the circle that defines our humanity special attention and respect' (Nussbaum, 1996, p. 9). The care and concern for neighbours, one of the defining characteristics of a well-functioning community, becomes a global, rather than just a local or national, ethic. It is an argument grounded more in moral principles than in law, though many of the key pronouncements that it draws upon (such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights) carry considerable weight. Education's role then, in this regard, is to sensitise national citizens to the stark inequalities and injustices of the global system and to equip them with the tools necessary to help ameliorate the lives of the less fortunate, wherever they may reside.

Global education, at the K-12 level, draws from both pragmatic and moral arguments. Building on earlier attempts in peace education to shape public education as a vehicle for developing more tolerant young people who can resolve conflicts without resorting to violence (Heater, 1980), global education continues to focus on the development of the skills and values of cooperation and conflict resolution while also imparting knowledge about global systems, global issues and the interconnectedness of humans and other species. Common to many manifestations of global education is the concept of the global community, incorporating the idea that citizens of one nation should not only understand the global implications of their decisions and actions but also should feel respect and concern for the citizens of other nations who may be impacted by those decisions or may simply need their attention and care. In the intimate milieu of the primary and secondary classroom, where the inculcation of values such as tolerance, respect, fairness and compassion is relatively easy to justify as falling within the mandate for public education, teachers can feel confident about dwelling on these aspects, whether at local, national or global levels.

At the tertiary level of education, international education has become one of the fastest-growing and most influential developments in colleges and universities in recent years (Taylor, 2004). Drawing from earlier traditions in comparative

education suggesting that national systems of education could benefit from a cross-fertilisation of relevant ideas and practice from other systems (Dolby & Rahman, 2008) international education has sought to facilitate the movement and exchange of knowledge, students and professors between institutions in different nations and to promote the benefits of an international study experience. One of the early manifestations of international education, built on the altruistic visions integral to the field of international development, saw many college and university students engage in a volunteer experience through organisations such as the Peace Corps and Voluntary Service Overseas. Today, the rationale for international education is most usually steeped in pragmatism: studying abroad will enhance a student's prospects of employment at a time when the workforce demands skills such as adaptability and cross-cultural sensitivity. Furthermore, creating a cosmopolitan campus at one's own institution facilitates the interchange of perspectives from around the world and thus allows even domestic students to benefit from something of an intercultural experience. In the contested environment of academic freedom that pervades most higher education institutions, the value-laden ideals of global education are less in evidence, though they may still motivate many students and faculty to embark upon international study and research experiences. Such ideals may also be implicit in institutional pronouncements about the value of international education for the development of global citizens.

THE IMPACTS OF NEOLIBERALISM

Global education

Running parallel to the development of the global and international education movements has been the increasingly pervasive influence of neoliberalism (Harvey, 2005) in education systems. During the 1980s, at about the same time as the global education movement was beginning to identify its key tenets and attract interest from primary and secondary teachers in the developed world, the market-driven ideology of neoliberalism was finding a foothold in the governance of school systems and in the struggle for control of curriculum. The major thrust of neoliberal initiatives was a shift away from the 'ethical liberalism' (Manzer, 1994) of the post-war years towards requiring school curricula to focus principally on developing the knowledge and skills required for global competitiveness, based on a perception that schools were failing to adequately prepare students for ensuring their nation's success in the rapidly expanding global economy (Mitchell, 2003). The classic hallmarks of neoliberal thinking in education include: curricula increasingly oriented to the imperatives of a free-market global economy and the honing of skills necessary to perpetuate it; an insistence on 'learning outcomes' that are closely allied to the perceived needs of employers; the prioritisation of STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) subjects over the 'softer' and more creative arts, humanities and social sciences; an attribution of greater value to learning that can be immediately measured; and an increasing

commercialisation of education that views learning as a product to be acquired, rather than as a lifelong way of being.

The pragmatic goals of global education were not necessarily viewed as incompatible with the neoliberal agenda; in fact, lists of essential skills for the late 20th century employment produced by corporate and industrialist think-tanks were often remarkably similar to skill sets promoted by global educators and were used by some in advocacy campaigns for global education (O'Sullivan, 1999). The moral arguments found in the global education literature, however, were often viewed as a threat to the efficient production of suitably qualified workers for the increasingly competitive global economic system. As mathematics, science and technology achieved higher status in the politics of curriculum development, the softer ideals of global education embedded in the social sciences, especially ideas related to the widening of the circle of compassion and to the pursuit of social justice globally, were subjected to more frequent attack in many countries or were squeezed out of an increasingly crowded and regulated curriculum (Pike, 2008; Tye, 2009). The guiding principles of a neoliberal approach to education – standardisation of curriculum, quantifiable outcomes, accountability through performance measurement – presented considerable challenges to the fundamental tenets of global education that view learning as a journey with an undetermined destination and adopt the beliefs and values of the student as the starting point for that journey. The predominant neoliberal focus on the acquisition of a fixed body of knowledge, inevitably prioritised by educational goals that insist on measurable outcomes, was largely at odds with the nascent global education movement that was struggling to define its epistemological parameters and which, in any case, wished to give more weight to skills development and the exploration of values.

In the UK, following a decade of significant growth in world studies (the preferred term at the time), attacks by Roger Scruton (1985), a junior minister in Margaret Thatcher's government, and others of like mind (e.g., Marks, 1984; Cox & Scruton, 1984) marked a serious and significant shift in the political discourse surrounding the leading movements in social and political education. From having enjoyed some, albeit limited, support from the Department of Education and Science, world studies was now directly under attack by government ministers and influential academics. Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly, the freedom enjoyed by teachers to debate the place and scope of teaching contemporary global issues in the K-12 curriculum was severely restricted by the multiple impacts of the 1988 Education Reform Act that heralded the arrival of the first National Curriculum in England and Wales. Not only was the National Curriculum, for the most part, unreceptive to the substance and style of teaching advocated by world studies, but also the pervasive and relentless shift towards the standardisation of curriculum and assessment left teachers with little time or energy to explore ways to integrate topics that were deemed to be peripheral, despite some evidence of initial resistance on the part of global educators (Vulliamy & Webb, 1993).

In Canada, the federal government, under the auspices of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), had committed significant funding to global education projects in eight of the ten provinces beginning in 1987.

Innovative projects undertaken in collaboration with teachers' unions, including the development of 'global schools' in some provinces, nurtured a generation of global educators that built on best practice ideas from many countries. School boards actively promoted global education as a key strand in the social studies curriculum and funded teachers' workshops and summer institutes. However, by the mid-1990s, the tide of widespread support for global education in Canada was rapidly turning. CIDA, without warning, cut its funding for the provincial global education projects in 1995, leaving many projects and organisations struggling for alternative funds and destroying the provincial and national dialogues and support networks that were so important to teachers. Recently established Global Schools discovered that their visions were no longer in line with school board mandates and withered on the vine. Inexorably, the hallmarks of neoliberal ideology began to take hold in education thinking and systems in Canada as elsewhere throughout the developed world.

Global education was patently unprepared for the neoliberal onslaught. Not only were some of its key principles a poor fit with neoliberal thinking, but also the movement itself had paid insufficient attention to the fundamentals of gaining credibility within either academic or political establishments. Indeed, being essentially a grassroots movement, global educators had eschewed the idea of aligning themselves with establishment thinking, arguing that such thinking was at the roots of many contemporary global crises and, therefore, needed to be challenged. Additionally, global education proponents had made many assertions about the efficacy of their favoured teaching and learning strategies, but had devoted little time to providing supporting, research-based evidence (Lister, 1987; Merryfield, 1998). When faced with the sweeping reforms of curricula and assessment practices that neoliberal thinking instigated, global educators were ill-equipped to demonstrate the validity of their beliefs and practice or to adapt to the changing circumstances in education thinking. Challenges to global education's credibility have been further exacerbated by the pervasive impacts of subsequent global events, notably 9/11 and the economic collapse of 2008. The irony, of course, is that global educators believe that their vision for education is key to developing safer and more sustainable societies, but they are struggling to be heard amidst the strident neoliberal voices.

*International education*¹

In contrast to global education, international education has thrived under the influences of neoliberalism. As public higher education institutions across many parts of the developed world have endured consistent, and sometimes drastic, cuts to their funding from governments, those institutions have actively pursued other revenue sources to make up the deficit. At the same time, the attractions of a cross-border educational experience have been recognised in many fast-developing economies, particularly China, India and the oil-rich nations of the Middle East, by increasing numbers of college and university students who view the status of 'international student' as a passport to higher paid employment in their home

country or, in many cases, as a bridge to obtaining permanent residence in a more developed country. This has created a burgeoning pool of eager international students who are willing to pay premium tuition fees, often many times the cost of tuition in their home country, to pursue a dream. This is neoliberalism in education writ large: educational institutions with a desperate need for funds and, in many cases, a dwindling local population, selling the credentials demanded by a growing elite of wealthy students from beyond their national borders. As the market for educational credentials is largely unregulated and global in scope, it offers those students who can afford the fees a wide choice of education providers and thus sets up intense competition between educational institutions worldwide wishing to mine this rich seam of additional revenue.

Of course, higher education institutions that are key players in this market offer cogent and passionate arguments, often supported by government policy (Government of Canada, 2014), senior politicians (Gillard, 2009), and university presidents (Toope, 2011) in defence of their international student recruitment strategy. Such arguments generally focus on the social advantages of diverse, multicultural and multilingual classrooms, the benefits of international exchange partnerships that provide opportunities for domestic students to study in other countries, the potential for faculty exchange and cross-border research collaborations, and the impetus that international students provide in many ways to the development of global citizenship on national campuses. These loftier, more palatably altruistic goals are undeniably beneficial: the vibrancy of the cosmopolitan campus is infinitely preferable to the limited vision of the college or university that caters principally to the needs of its local middle-class neighbourhoods; in a global economy and an increasingly interdependent global system, it makes eminently good sense for future employees to gain experience of other cultures, languages and ways of knowing at the same time as earning their required credential. The desirability of what the forces of neoliberalism have helped to create in higher education institutions, I would submit, is not in question; however, the predominance of economic need as a key – and often unquestioned – driver of the current trends in international education raises many questions that sit uncomfortably with the rhetoric emanating from these same institutions. As the authors of the 4th *Global Survey on the Internationalization of Higher Education* note, the finding that ‘increased/diversified revenue generation’ is not regarded as important by institutions is ‘surprising’, given the evidence to the contrary; they suggest that ‘it is quite likely ... that respondents offered a more “politically correct” answer to this question’ (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014, pp. 51–52).

The rhetoric emanating from government policy statements and institutional strategic plans may talk of the benefits of international collaboration for knowledge exchange and student preparedness while the reality, notwithstanding the actual benefits that may accrue from student and faculty mobility, is mired more in economic self-interest and institutional competitiveness. The moral dilemma inherent in this reality is summarised succinctly in an internal report from a Canadian university: