Research in International Education

Nadine Dolby and Aliya Rahman
Purdue University

Until recently, international education has existed at the margins of educational research. However, in the current context of globalization, international education has moved closer to the center of educational research throughout the world. In this article, the authors identify, describe, and analyze six distinct research approaches to international education: comparative and international education, internationalization of higher education, international schools, international research on teaching and teacher education, internationalization of K-12 education, and globalization of education. Within each approach, the authors discuss the historical context and the global political, economic, social, and cultural shifts that have shaped the research approach; map the major research trajectories that have developed; discuss the audience and research community; and analyze strengths and weaknesses. The authors conclude with a discussion of emergent trends within research in international education.

Over the past 10 years, the pressure to "be international" and to "internationalize" has dramatically intensified in all aspects of education. Spurred on by the contested processes of globalization (Henry, Lingard, Rizvi, & Taylor, 1999) *international education*—until recently a relatively marginalized term—has moved closer to the center of educational research throughout the world.[1]

Despite the proliferation of the use of *international education* there has been little attention given to the multiple ways that the term is used in the research literature. For example, when we tell new colleagues that we work in the field of research on "international education" they may assume that we are involved in cross-national quantitative studies of science education, efforts to produce "global citizens," research on the internationalizing of curriculum in higher education, or research on the privatization and marketing of education worldwide. Potentially, all of the aforementioned (and much more) might describe what we do on a daily basis in our research, so vast and diffuse is the umbrella term *international education*. The objective of this literature review is to describe and critically analyze the multiple fields that operate under the rubric of research on international education as a way of providing a conceptual framework for future research. We argue that this mapping is critical at this historical juncture as a growing number of

researchers and scholars are using the term *international education* to describe their work, particularly as colleges and universities find themselves under increasing pressure to demonstrate that their research is international (American Council on Education, 2003). Thus, we write this article as an introduction to the field for those who are newly interested in its multiple histories, trajectories, and frameworks. However, we are also aware that the fields of international education are so disparate and disjointed that many researchers who have been working within one specific approach may be largely unaware of research in another realm of "international education."

We take an integrative perspective in this review as we identify, describe, and critically analyze six distinct research approaches in international education. We use the term *approaches* as John Creswell (2007) did, to indicate a body of research with an identifiable core of scholarship or, as in the case of some of the approaches identified here, multiple cores that developed simultaneously and are connected at a metalevel. In addition, we locate the development of each of the six distinct research approaches within its historical context so as to understand why and how each research approach developed. The specific research approaches we discuss both respond to and are shaped by larger cultural, political, social, and economic forces both within and outside of education. For example, it is clear that there are global economic forces that are driving the practices of international education today: from the pressure to recruit international students to bolster declining state support for higher education worldwide to the growing worldwide interest in studying the Chinese language. In this way, our methodological perspective is influenced by the field of social foundations of education as we are concerned with educational research as a practice that is intimately connected to the larger society in which all aspects of education—including research—is situated. In addition, we are cognizant that some approaches evolved and currently function as primarily academic and research areas and others are centrally concerned with practice. Given these differences, this article does not focus on comparison in a narrow sense. Instead, our main objective is to furnish an overview of the research on international education and a framework for intensified discussion and cross-fertilization of ideas among researchers.

Although, as we note throughout the article, there are chronological overlaps among the six approaches we discuss, we have organized the article in (approximate) order of the historical development of each approach we have identified: comparative and international education, internationalization of higher education, international schools, international research on teaching and teacher education, internationalization of K-12 education, and globalization and education. It is undoubtedly true that there is some overlap among these approaches and that some build from/extend the work of other approaches (particularly true of newer approaches, such as globalization and education). However, we also contend that there are definitive traditions and approaches that are unique to each field.

In each of the six research areas, we first discuss the history of the research approach, including the roles of key individuals, professional and/or academic organizations, and government (as applicable) in the initial development of each of these areas. Through this discussion, we examine how these people (and entities) developed research and/or practice in international education within the specific context of their historical moment, noting cultural, social, political, and economic factors. In many cases, fields of practice (e.g., international schools)

evolved first, and then a research approach developed around that particular area. In such instances, we also include a brief history of the field of practice to provide context for readers. Second, we examine the major theories and research trajectories that have developed within each research approach and note shifts and changes over time. In this section we also note, as appropriate, the prominent individuals who have influenced the development of each research trajectory and discuss cultural, social, and economic forces. Third, we focus on the question of audience and orientation. In this section, we delineate the pieces that comprise this particular research community: the relevant professional and academic organizations, the journals, the conferences, and the connections with governmental and nongovernmental organizational structures throughout the world. In doing so, we attempt to provide newcomers to the field of international education with an understanding of the different networks that have shaped how and why research questions are formulated and the audience for the research data and results. We conclude each section with an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of each research approach, with a focus on contemporary concerns, debates, and issues within the field. The analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of each field is our own, based on our extensive reviews of the literature and our work within the field. In our final section, we examine emergent trends in research in international education, based on our review of the six approaches.[2]

Method

Research on international education is vast, exists in dozens of countries, and is published in as many languages. As in any other literature review, this review is necessarily bound by the particular orientations of the reviewers—both our strengths and our limitations. We have chosen the literature to be reviewed and provided the framework and analysis (Weaver-Hightower, 2003). We have also chosen to situate our literature review within an international historical and political context, much as Peter Stevens (2007) situated his research on race/ethnicity and educational inequality in a national (English) context. One of us (Nadine) has been doing research under the rubric of international education for more than 10 years, and the other (Aliya) is a graduate student with extensive international experience but who is reading and reviewing the literature in the field for the first time. Collectively, we have lived in the United States, Bangladesh, South Africa, and Australia and have traveled extensively. This review benefits from the insights of two scholars who bring academic expertise and familiarity, extensive international experience, and (in the case of the graduate student) new questions and concerns to the process of literature review. We developed the framework in this article through the process of grouping research into categories, following the model of Marcus Weaver-Hightower (2003) and Anselm Strauss and Juliette Corbin (1990). We also relied on the preexisting structures of the multiple research approaches and orientations in the field of international education. For example, we looked at calls for conference papers, the ERIC database, professional and academic associations, journals, article titles, and books that used the term *international education* and grouped these into various strands. As we decided it was important to situate the development of each approach within its historical context, we did extensive reading in this area. One of us (Nadine), who has been teaching in international education since 1999, also brought to the analysis her reflections from multiple

class discussions about "what is international education" as students attempted to find a way to navigate an unwieldy literature. We refined the categories and our analysis through constant conversation and revision of drafts.

There are several limitations to this article. First, as is obvious, we are writing this article in English and our literature review was restricted to literature published in English. Considering the vast amount of literature that was unavailable to us, we would encourage scholars who write and publish in multiple languages to pursue similar work. Second, although research in international education occurs worldwide, the economics of publishing at the current moment dictate that much of the research that is available globally (in English) is published with imprints from the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, Canada, and a handful of other countries, primarily British Commonwealth Countries (e.g., South Africa, India, Singapore, and New Zealand). In addition, as readers are aware, scholars based in the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia contribute disproportionately to journals and books published in English, though of course not all of those scholars are nationals of those countries or necessarily conduct research in the same nation of their professional affiliation.

Given these limitations, we have endeavored to include research examples and literature from as many national contexts as possible. However, as a literature review of modest size and scope, it is impossible to include an example from every national context. As appropriate, the historical development of research approaches is discussed within their national contexts: For example, the international schools approach developed largely in England and the comparative and international approach has its origins in France.

We focused the majority of our literature review on contemporary research, defined as 1990-2008. Although we provide historical context for each approach, we are particularly concerned with analyzing international education within the post–Cold War era, as the economic and political realities of the world—including the world of educational research—changed dramatically, rendering older paradigms obsolete. Finally, we attempt to review a broad range of the available literature that terms itself *international education* and did not exclude literature based on particular philosophies or methodologies. We have identified six approaches in this article. Two we excluded from our discussion are research on language education and research on the influence of technology on education. We based this decision on this article's focus on research approaches that operate under the rubric of *international education*. Although research on both language and technology certainly incorporates international aspects, neither clearly identifies itself in its literature as "research on international education." So, although examples from both areas are discussed in the context of other approaches, neither is an exclusive focus. In addition, research on language education and research on the study of the influences of technology on education are substantial, well-established research approaches in and of themselves and are more appropriately explored in articles devoted exclusively to that approach. We have also excluded literature on intercultural education, most of the field of multicultural education, and research from fields such as cross-cultural psychology. We have made that decision for two reasons. First, as noted earlier, we have limited our literature review to research termed *international education*—a term that is not commonly used to describe any of those fields. In addition, all of these fields incorporate significant national

components. There is sizable research in the field of multicultural education, for example, that is not international in orientation. For purposes of this essay, we limited our review to research that commonly is referred to as *international education*.

Comparative and International Education

Comparative and international education are two subfields of educational research that are often linked in their academic and scholarly pursuits. Although the purpose of this article is to focus on international education, in this case we will also interweave discussion of comparative education as there is considerable blurring of boundaries between the two subfields.

History

As Michael Crossley and Keith Watson (2003) wrote, the roots of comparative education can be traced back to French scholar Marc-Antoin Julien's 1817 proposal that governments should collect and distribute statistical information on education so that through comparison education could become a science with standardized principles and practices.[3] The International Bureau of Education, established in Geneva in 1925, was the first institute of its kind, and the post–World War II period saw the establishment of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD); and the World Bank. The subsequent creation of statistical information about educational systems throughout the world drove the consolidation of comparative education as a field driven by a positivist, scientific outlook (Noah & Eckstein, 1969). Isaac Kandel (1881-1965) is often cited as the founder of modern comparative education, and his work for UNESCO in the 1940s on national schooling systems is considered central to the field's development (Epstein & Carroll, 2005).

Crossley and Watson (2003) mapped a different history for the development of international education, tracing its origins to César Auguste Bassett (also French). As Crossley and Watson discussed, Bassett was concerned that the French educational system was too myopic and inward looking. To counter this, in 1808, Bassett called for scholars from outside of France to conduct research on the French system to provide new insights and perspectives. Bassett's theoretical approach to international education diverges from that of the comparativists. While comparativists have generally focused on systemic and positivist analysis of educational systems, internationalists have concentrated on examining national education systems within their political, cultural, social, and economic context. Crossley and Watson suggested that these two slightly different general orientations have marked a dividing line between "comparativists" and "internationalists": Comparativists tend to focus on academic policy research largely removed from questions of context and application, whereas internationalists are more concerned with the specific context, location, and application of their research. Despite these differences, the two subfields have operated in close cooperation with each other, at least in the sharing of scholarly journals, conferences, and intellectual and academic discourse (see "Audience and Orientation," following). Perhaps most significant for this article, both areas evolved as fields of research and continue to operate as largely scholarly endeavors.

Research Trajectories

As the field of comparative and international education is diffuse and without shared methodologies and theories, conversations about how to define the field are extremely prevalent within the literature (Cook, Hite, & Epstein, 2004; Crossley, 1999; Epstein & Carroll, 2005; Marginson & Mollis, 2001; Wilson, 1994). Thus, in this article, we attempt to first summarize (in broad strokes) how scholars in the field have tried to make sense of the various research trajectories that are subsumed under the *comparative and international education* rubric. We then briefly sketch an overview from the perspective of an outsider who is facing this literature (and these continuing conversations) for the first time, mindful of our larger purpose of mapping six overarching research approaches. As a field with 60 plus years of peer-reviewed publications, we can only briefly reference central and representative research in this field.[4]

Surveying the earliest years of comparative and international education from its beginnings until the 1960s, scholars in the field tend to identify four distinct approaches to research: *travelers' tales*, *lending and borrowing*, *historical and cultural studies*, and *comparative education as a science* (Altbach & Kelly, 1986; Crossley & Watson, 2003). Travelers' tales, the oldest research approach, involves the descriptions of educational practices in other nations; lending and borrowing extends the travelers' tales paradigm in that it explicitly seeks to examine other nations' educational practices with the objective of reforming and improving the conditions in education in one's home nation; historical and cultural studies seeks to understand the particular philosophy, character, and perspectives of a specific national educational system within the context of its own culture and society; and finally, comparative education as a science marks the beginning of the dominance of empirical, positivist analysis in the field as comparative and international education strove to align itself as closely as possible with the more scientifically rigorous traditions in the social sciences and to discover universal laws to be applied to the relationship between schools and society.

Comparative education in particular gained a secure position in mainstream educational research through its embrace of the dominant paradigms in the social sciences: structural functionalism and human capital theory (Altbach & Kelly, 1986). Theoretical and political shifts in the late 1960s and 1970s called into question the significance of these theories for understanding the reality of newly independent countries all over the world. Paradigms that addressed inequality, world systems theories, Marxism, and neo-Marxism shifted the focus of research in many fields, including comparative and international education. Although the comparative focus was still prominent, more researchers working in this field began to study—within their own context—newly independent nations throughout Africa, giving rise to critical analysis of colonial educational practices, which in some cases persisted even after political independence.

Research in comparative and international education from the 1980s through the present has become increasingly diverse in terms of methodology, theoretical paradigms, and focus. In overarching terms, contemporary research in the field falls into four trajectories. First, there is a trajectory of research that follows the traditional comparative paradigm of comparison of differing national contexts. Despite the major challenges to the paradigm of nation in the social sciences and

humanities (Appadurai, 1993, 1996; Cheah & Robbins, 1998), much research within this framework strives to elucidate differences in educational systems, teaching practices, policies, governance, curriculum, and so on to promote improvement and reform. Research focuses on all educational levels, from preschool through higher education, and sometimes also includes sites outside of the formal educational system. Representative work in this trajectory includes Kathryn Anderson-Levitt's (2004) research on reading instruction in Guinea, France, and the United States; Wing-Wah Law's (1995) comparison of the role of the state in higher education reform; school choice policies in the United Kingdom and the United States (Bondi, 1991); the role of the small state in higher education (Crossley & Louisy, 1994); and the implementation of multicultural education in Australia and the Netherlands (Leeman & Reid, 2006).

A second common approach to contemporary research in this field falls under the rubric of *traditional international education*. Researchers working in this research trajectory focus on educational practices, policies, and so on within a particular national context, eschewing comparisons. Following in the earlier tradition of the historical and cultural studies approach, researchers attempt to elucidate the particular contours of educational practices within their local context. Representative work in this trajectory includes research on citizenship in Botswana (Preece & Mosweunyane, 2006), education and Muslim identity in France (Limage, 2000), decentralization in Nicaraguan schools (Rivarola & Fuller, 1999) and in Malawi (L. Davies, Harber, & Dzimadzi, 2003), and concepts of adolescence and secondary education in Mexico (Levinson, 1999). As Gita Steiner-Khamsi (2006) discussed in her comparative historical analysis of the development of comparative education in the United States and the German Democratic Republic, the change in name of the major U.S. professional organization in the field from the Comparative Education Society (CES) to the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) in 1969 solidified a shift that had taken place in the field in the past decade: from a comparative to an international approach, often associated with research on development, discussed in the following.

A third approach is particularly focused on research on development within Third World/developing countries. The focus of this research approach is often applied, policy driven, and evaluative. Researchers working within this research trajectory are as likely to be based in international and transnational organizations (World Bank, OECD, UNESCO, etc.) as in universities, and many commonly work across multiple institutions. Notable publications in this area include edited collections on international development and policy (Piper, Dryden-Peterson, & Kim, 2006; Steiner-Khamsi, 2004b), analysis of the role of multilateral organizations in educational policy (de Moura Castro, 2002; Mundy, 1998; Steiner-Khamsi, 2004a), educational equity (Cortina & Stromquist, 2000), and the impact of international educational initiatives such as Education for All (Mundy, 2006). In some cases, research and scholarship in this area is linked to more activist-oriented work for change, transformation, and social justice, as exemplified in a special issue of *Harvard Educational Review* (Harvard Educational Review, 1981) and the well-known work of scholars such as Paolo Freire (1968/1970). Economists such as Martin Carnoy (1974, 1993) have also had significant impact on the direction of this research trajectory.[5]

Finally, there is a substantial literature within the field of comparative and international education that attempts to define its role within the larger field of

educational research: its methodological orientation; its theoretical basis; its engagement with the new economic, political, social, and cultural structures that have emerged since the decline of the Soviet Union in the 1990s; and the ascendance of capitalism as a dominant economic structure. Much of this work is not empirically based but instead is scholarly and intended to question the traditional strictures of comparative and international education, interrogating its relevance for a world in which the nation-state plays a diminished role and global processes and relations are increasingly paramount. Examples of research and scholarship in this area include a vast array of scholarship reconsidering the tenets of comparative and international education as a field (Crossley, 1999; Crossley & Watson, 2003; Cummings, 1999; Marginson & Mollis, 2001; Wilson, 1994) and the impact of new theoretical paradigms and methodologies on comparative and international education (Arnove & Torres, 2007; Crossley & Tikly, 2004; Epstein & Carroll, 2005; Hoffman, 1999; Vulliamy, 2004; Welch, 2001).[6] In 2002, Martin Carnoy and Diana Rhoten coedited a special issue of *Comparative Education Review*, "The Meanings of Globalization for Educational Change," which specifically explored how the new dynamics of globalization affected analysis within the field of comparative and international education. This final research trajectory is perhaps the most significant in terms of the broader focus of this article as it questions and debates the premises of the approach and interfaces (and in some cases, begins to overlap) with the newer paradigm of globalization and education discussed in the final section. Many of the concerns about the limits of comparative and international education as an approach that is focused on the nation-state as a unit of analysis are evident as an increasing number of prominent researchers in this field work at the borders of other genres of international education, including the internationalization of higher education and globalization and education.

Audience and Orientation

As an established (if internally contested) academic subfield, the audience and orientation of this research genre are fairly well defined. The World Council of Comparative Education Societies was founded in 1970 and currently lists 33 affiliate organizations across the globe. Although the Council itself does not publish a journal, it sponsors an international conference every 3 years and coordinates and publicizes the work of its affiliates. The Comparative and International Education Society (United States) has published *Comparative Education Review* since 1957, and the British Association for International and Comparative Education publishes *Compare*, now in its 36th year. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, established in 1997, is an online journal in comparative education edited by doctoral students at Teachers College, Columbia University. *Comparative Education* has published since 1964.

The audience for literature in comparative and international education is primarily academics, scholars, and researchers working in this particular subfield, though individuals affiliated with international organizations such as the World Bank, UNESCO, and the OECD do publish in the field, attend conferences, and serve on the editorial boards of journals. As a field oriented toward research and the social sciences, comparative education has had little interest in more practice-oriented endeavors. Although the *international* side of *comparative and international* education is somewhat more practice based and locally situated, it tends to

be focused on K-12 issues and on working with nongovernmental organizations and supranational funding agencies.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The central strength of this approach to international education is its established location in the academy and its wide infrastructure of conferences, journals, and organizations. Comparative and international education has rigorous academic standards, lines of scholarly inquiry that have persisted over decades, a canon of literature, and strong links to international supranational and nongovernmental organizations.

At the same time, the field is quite small (numerically), has little influence in academe, and is exceedingly diverse in its methodological approach and content. Comparative and international education tends to function as a separate academic subfield, with only tangential connections to other areas of education. Thus, for example, there may be researchers in the field of math education who do occasional international research but would not consider themselves a part (and might not even be aware) of comparative and international education as a separate academic subfield. One of the difficulties faced by comparative and international education is that it potentially connects with every aspect of education, and thus it consistently faces problems of definition and boundary maintenance. Because of these concerns, journals in comparative and international education are disproportionately focused on the continual evaluation and reevaluation of the state of the field and its future directions. Current concerns with how the field addresses issues such as neoliberalism, globalization, and postmodernism reflect that comparative and international education continues to struggle with its self-definition and how to distinguish itself in a world where an increasing number of academics do international work outside of its framework. Steiner-Khamsi (2006) also noted that focus on the "international education" (one nation) approach has weakened the boundaries of comparative and international education as a field. Drawing on her recent interview with Harold Noah, Steiner-Khamsi commented that single-nation studies may just as easily be published in national, general interest education journals, making the approach vulnerable to dilution and fragmentation as an aspect of "comparative" education.

The Internationalization of Higher Education

History

Unlike the academic field of comparative and international education discussed previously, research in internationalization in higher education emerges essentially from what began as a field of professional practice. In global terms, the internationalization of higher education has roots that extend back to the medieval period in Europe. Perhaps the best known itinerant scholar of this period was Erasmus of Rotterdam (1465-1536), the philosopher and theologian who lived and worked throughout Europe. The European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS), founded in 1987 to promote mobility of university staff and students in Europe, honors Erasmus's central place in the internationalization of higher education. Colonialism was also a significant historical factor in the internationalization of higher education, as the European university model was imposed on colonial subjects in Asia, South America, and Africa beginning in the 18th century and extending through the present (de Wit & Knight, 1999).

    In the United States, the development of higher education was fundamentally an international process, influenced by both the English colleges of Oxford and Cambridge and by the German research university, which was the model for the establishment of John Hopkins University in 1876 (de Wit, 2002). Before World War I, international education in the United States was a loosely organized practice concentrated primarily in churches and church-related organizations (see Bu, 2003, for discussion) with occasional study abroad tours organized by universities (Bolen, 2001). In the immediate aftermath of World War I, the Institute of International Education (IIE) was founded with the mission of promoting international peace and understanding. In its early years, the IIE instituted educational exchanges with European universities, created International Relations clubs on U.S. campuses, and lobbied for the creation of nonimmigrant visas, allowing visiting students and scholars to bypass the restrictive immigration quotas imposed in the Immigration Act of 1921 (Bu, 2003). As Bu (2003) demonstrated, private philanthropic institutions (e.g., the Rockefeller Foundation, the Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs, etc.) were key players in the interwar period in creating the groundwork for the expansion of international education in the postwar years. The Fulbright Program was established by the U.S. Congress in 1946, and in 1947, the Council on Student Travel (now the Council on International Educational Exchange or CIEE) was founded.

    In 1948, NAFSA: The Association of International Educators was established as the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors to provide a professional organization, training, and development of the advisors responsible for the growing population of international students on U.S. campuses.[7]

    As Hans de Wit (2002) discussed, international education during the post–World War II period was firmly situated within the politics of the Cold War as both the United States and the Soviet Union attempted to use international higher education as a means of consolidating and expanding their spheres of influence. During the early years of internationalizing higher education, the primary concern was geopolitical. In the U.S. context, perhaps most significant from the policy perspective was the passage of the National Defense Education Act in 1958 and the subsequent creation of Title VI area studies centers at universities throughout the United States (O'Meara, Mehlinger, & Newman, 2001; Ruther, 2002). Then, 8 years later in 1966, the International Education Act was passed but not funded, and shortly thereafter the Nixon administration repeatedly attempted to eliminate Title VI funding (Ruther, 2002). Geo-political concerns were also the central force driving the international education policies of other nations, for example, Australia's development of the Columbo Plan in the 1950s (Oakman, 2005). Similarly, the Soviet Union opened the doors of its universities to international students from freedom movements that espoused socialist ideologies, such as the African National Congress.

    Given the critical role and importance of federal policy in the internationalization of higher education at this juncture, it is not surprising that policy analysis and evaluation was a significant focus of research in the 1960s and 1970s. For example, works by Stewart Fraser (1965), Richard Lambert (1980), John Melby (1961), Harold Gray Shane (1969), David Scanlon (1960), and David Scanlon and James Shields (1968) reflect the scholarly emphasis on understanding international education through the lens of federal policy. As federal policy became less of a central issue in international education through the 1970s and 1980s, scholarly interest in this area also waned. More recently, major world events have resuscitated

national policy interest in international education and subsequent research. The collapse of the Eastern Bloc beginning in the late 1980s and the end of the Cold War significantly changed the terrain for international education. For example, the European Association for International Education (EAIA) was founded in 1987, two years before the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Given its initial development as a field of practice, research on internationalizing higher education began quite slowly, generally as a secondary concern in a profession primarily concerned with service to incoming and outgoing international students and scholars. Yet, significant and historically important scholarly works were produced during the early years of the development of international higher education (1948-1979), though primarily within academic fields outside of education.

Research Trajectories

Writing in the Australian context, Sandra Meiras (2004) located three predominant rationales for internationalization of higher education: sociopolitical, economic, and academic. Whereas Meiras was interested in mapping a field of practice, research on internationalizing higher education has broadly followed these three trajectories. However, because research on internationalizing higher education has lacked a well-defined academic "home," it has been taken up by scholars in multiple fields, including higher education, business and marketing, foreign languages, sociology, history, and political science.

As discussed previously, sociopolitical concerns dominated the early years of research on internationalizing higher education. Economic priorities began to predominate in the 1990s and soon merged with the renewed focus on international security concerns in the early part of the 21st century. Spurred on by growing competition for international students worldwide, researchers began to examine practices that frame higher education as a commodity to be sold to a growing consumer market across the world. For example, Nattavud Pimpa's (2003) research probed how Thai students make decisions about international education; Tim Mazzarol, Geoffrey Soutar, and Michael Sim Yaw Seng (2003) analyzed the emergence of higher education as a market; Nicoline Frolich (2006) examined the economic justification for internationalization in Norwegian universities; and Philip Altbach (2004) charted the post-2001 decline in the number of international students studying in the United States as restrictions on visas, mobility, and work began to increase (see also Bain & Cummings, 2005; Jacobson, 2003). Simon Marginson and Mark Considine (2000) and Robert Rhoades and Carlos Torres (2006) analyzed the shift of higher education from a "public" national good to a private consumer good as decreased public support created a situation in which universities were compelled to try to attract more full-fee paying international students to make up for growing budget deficits (Duckett, 2004; Marginson, 2004). In such an atmosphere, concerns about quality assurance are paramount, and national and regional educational systems, such as in those in the Caribbean, began to monitor the rigor and standards of imported degree programs (Gift, Leo-Rhynie, & Moniquette, 2006). As study abroad became part of universities' overall marketing schemes, researchers investigated how these programs were also a key component of the growing economic emphasis in the internationalization of higher education (Bolen, 2001; Coffen & Brennan, 2003).

The third research trajectory in internationalization of higher education focuses on the academic aspect of international education. Research in this area concentrates

on the experiences of international students: For example, Jo Morrison and colleagues (Morrison, Merrick, Higgs, & LeMatais, 2005) reported on the performance of international students in the United Kingdom; Anna Smolentseva (2004) and Veena Bhalla (2005) gave an overview of international students in Russia and India, respectively; and Takae Ichimoto (2004) examined the experiences of Japanese women in Australian universities. Research on the academic and personal value of studying abroad has been particularly strong in the United States (Akande & Slawson, 2000; Allen & Herron, 2003; Bacon, 2002; Douglas & Jones-Rikkers, 2001; Freed, 1995; Jurasak, Lamson, & O'Maley, 1996; Shannon, 1995; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; Wagner & Magistrale, 1995; Whalen, 1996). Research on universities attempts to internationalize curriculum are also a growing part of the literature, including Futao Huang's (2006) comparative analysis of universities in China, Japan, and the Netherlands; Anthony Welch, Rui Yang, and Chartse Wolhuter's (2004) study of the process of internationalization at a rural, historically Black South African university; and Simon Marginson and Erienawati Sawir's (2006) comparative analysis of Universitas Indonesia and the Australian National University. Researchers have also focused on the need to assess the actual outcomes of specific universities' programs and policies. In an early example of this type of work, Education and World Affairs (1965) reported on six universities' (Stanford, Michigan State, Tulane, Wisconsin, Cornell, and Indiana University) efforts in the early 1960s. More recently, Crauford Goodman and Michael Nacht (1991) summarized and analyzed the international efforts of university faculty, and beginning in 1989, the American Council on Education has issued numerous reports on internationalization on U.S. campuses (see e.g., American Council on Education, 2003).

Finally, theoretical scholarship has produced models of the internationalization of curriculum. Some of the most cited scholarship in this area includes Hans de Wit's (1995, 2002) historical and conceptual analysis of international education worldwide and Jane Knight's (2004) conceptual mapping of the institutional and national dimensions of international education (see also deWit & Knight, 1999).

Audience and Orientation

For most of its history, practitioners and administrators have been the primary audiences for research in the field of internationalization of education. The Association for Studies in International Education (ASIE), based in Amsterdam, is currently the largest umbrella organization for researchers and practitioners in the field of international higher education. The members of ASIE include international education organizations from Canada (Canadian Bureau for International Education), Australia (IDP Australia), South Africa (International Education Association of South Africa), Europe (European Association for International Education), the Netherlands (Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education), and the United States (NAFSA: The Association of International Educators). However, there are also numerous organizations and institutes that operate outside of ASIE. For example, in Australia there are two other international education organizations: International Student Advisor Network of Australia (ISANA) and International Education Association of Australia (IEAA). Given the proliferation of organizations and the lack of centralized coordination, there are currently plans to launch the Council of International Education Associations, which will coordinate the work of nonprofit, nongovernmental,

international education organizations and organize a regular world conference. Of course, governmental organizations in numerous nations and regions play an integral part in internationalizing higher education. For example, the previously mentioned ERASMUS Project, part of the European Union's Lifelong Learning Programme 2007-2013, encourages transnational student and staff mobility within Europe. UNESCO is also a prominent player in the organizational capacity of international education within higher education: For example, it supports the International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (IESALC), based in Caracas, Venezuela.

Separate organizations with specialized foci have also been established in recent years. In 2001, the Forum on Education Abroad was launched to provide an organizational structure specifically oriented toward serving the needs of institutions and study abroad professionals. Since its founding, the Forum has published "Standards of Good Practice for Education Abroad" and two studies (one baseline) on curriculum integration and study abroad. Although the Forum is a new organization, one of its priorities is data collection and analysis in the field of study abroad.

Journals in this area flourish. The Boston College Center for International Higher Education, one of the major international higher education research centers in the world, reported that its recent inventory of journals in the field of higher education includes 191 publications from all continents, more than 30 countries, and in 14 languages (Altbach, 2007). While increasingly international in scope, some are undoubtedly still focused on national higher education concerns, and journals range from those concerned with practitioner issues to more rigorous, scholarly journals. One of the best known journals in the field is the *Journal of Studies in Higher Education*, published by the Association for Studies in International Education.

Strengths and Weaknesses

As we have discussed earlier, the audience for research on internationalization of higher education was originally largely professionals and administrators working in the field. As a result, the orientation of the research in earlier years was largely practical, applied, and generally unconcerned with the larger context within which the internationalization of education occurs. While the more academically oriented field of international education affiliated with the comparative and international approach was concerned with analysis of cultural and societal structures—for example, the role of the nation-state and neoliberalism—such level of engagement is only now emerging in the internationalization of higher education research.

Given this history, one of the weaknesses of (a portion) of this subset of literature is its uncritical stance toward both its own internal practices and the structures in which it operates. For example, the practitioner-oriented research literature largely fails to question the discourses of "economic competitiveness" and "national security" that predominate in the field. In contrast, there is considerable interest and growth—particularly though not exclusively outside of the United States—in an "internationalization of higher education" literature that is both critical and scholarly. For example, one exception is the work of the extremely well-known scholar Philip Altbach, who has successfully established a reputation in multiple subfields, including the more scholarly focused subfield of comparative and international education, the practitioner-driven field of internationalization of higher education, and the emergent field of globalization and education (Altbach,

1998, 2004; Altbach & Teichler, 2001). Simon Marginson's (2002, 2004; Marginson & Considine, 2000; Marginson & Mollis, 2001) research in the Australian context also transcends the boundaries of multiple approaches discussed in this article.

International Schools

History

Research on international schools has evolved alongside the development and growth of international schools worldwide. Thus, one of the central, continuing issues of concern in the field has been to define the "international school." This ongoing conversation in the research literature shapes the very history of the field as there is disagreement as to which school deserves to be recognized as the "first" international school.

Ian Hill (2001) suggested that the first international school was the International School of Geneva, founded in 1924. As George Walker (2000) explained, the school was established to serve the families of the employees of the new League of Nations and consequently had a student population drawn from nations throughout the world. However, such a pragmatic definition of *international school* is not accepted by all scholars, some of whom find the term more appropriately linked to a school's foundational philosophies. In this vein, Bob Sylvester (2002) named the Spring Grove School founded in London in 1866 as the first international school. While the student population was not geographically diverse, the school was established with the goal of promoting cooperation between nations.

Mary Hayden and Jeff Thompson (1995) noted that the *1964 Yearbook of Education* identifies approximately 50 schools worldwide that could be classified as international. However, because of the limited scope and impact of these schools, research prior to the 1960s was virtually nonexistent. Several shifts since the 1960s have considerably expanded the number of international schools worldwide, and the growing visibility of these schools within the educational world have spurred increased research interest.

Formalized practitioner-oriented organizations for international schools began to evolve through the 1950s and 1960s. The founding of the International Schools Association (ISA) in 1951 provided a network and structure for the cooperation and expansion of international schools (Hill, 2002). Established in Switzerland, the organization is currently administered by an international board of 12 directors, half of whom work in Europe. The ISA created the International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma Programme in 1964 and the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) in 1968.[8] The International Baccalaureate Organization's purpose was to provide an international curriculum that would be accepted by institutions of higher learning around the world, with the IB Diploma Programme serving as the secondary school–level curriculum. Currently offered in 2,220 schools in 125 countries (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2008), the IB curriculum was expanded in the 1990s to include early and middle years schooling. The Council of International Schools (CIS), founded in 1965 and administered out of the United Kingdom, was established with the objective of bringing together educators with similar goals. Also referred to as the European Council of International Schools due to its place of origin, the CIS provides a forum for educators and

researchers to discuss issues outside of the purview of the IB. The CIS also maintains the most complete database of international school enrollment and tuition numbers, though the inclusiveness of its data depends on self-identification by schools as international. In 2006, James MacDonald of Japan's Yokohama International School used CIS public data to estimate that there are 551,232 students attending 907 international schools worldwide.

Shifts in the economy and in technology in the past four decades have also created a globally more mobile population, at least at elite levels. For example, Royal Dutch Shell now supports a network of schools around the world for its employees (Hayden & Thompson, 1995). In addition, the global expansion of, for example, the Japanese economy has created a market for Japanese education abroad. Increasingly, parents concerned with their children's economic security in a global economy have discovered the value of an international education. For example, in her research on international schools in Malaysia, Vicki Yin (2006) found that the school population has shifted in recent years from the children of mobile expatriates to children from neighboring Asian countries sent there by their parents.

Research Trajectories

Similar to the internationalization of higher education research trajectory, the field of international schools evolved primarily as a field of practice. Research increased in the 1970s, and the number of international schools grew and their influence solidified.

This approach to research in international education is limited in scope in comparison to other approaches discussed in this article. Researchers tend to work together, know each other professionally, and respond to each others' work in their publications. However, although it produces a small volume of literature in comparison to other approaches, this approach is immensely international in terms of researchers' physical locations. Researchers in this field produce scholarship wherever there are international schools, with the greatest percentage emerging from the European and Pacific Rim contexts. Thus far, the field has explored a relatively limited number of research agendas and has generally focused on the question of what is or is not to be considered "international education" or "international schooling." In this section, we discuss three facets of this question. First, we consider how this central question has been explicitly addressed in international schools research. Second, we discuss the literature on *third culture kids* that examines the cultures and identities of children who grow up in multiple societies. Finally, we discuss an emergent research trajectory that examines how international schools function on a structural level within national and global arenas. It is this third area of research that provides the most opportunity for growth and development and for connections with other aspects of research in international education.

In a seminal essay addressing the meaning of *international education* and *international schools*, Hayden and Thompson's (1995) review attempts to define and categorize these terms and the relationship between them. Echoing the conflict over the definition of the first international school, Hayden and Thompson asked whether an "international" population is adequate to classify a school as international or if a more fundamental commitment to internationalist principles and philosophies must also be evident. In this essay and in subsequent scholarship,

Hayden and Thompson (2000) argued that the terms *international school* and *international education* have been used so broadly that a necessary sense of ambiguity surrounds their definitions. Consequently, the field has become increasingly broad in its acceptance of research that focuses on a multiplicity of different types of international schools.

This question pervades the major volumes that have been published in the field: Patricia Jonietz and Duncan Harris's (1991) special edition of the *World Yearbook of Education: International Schools and International Education* and collections edited by Hayden and Thompson (1998, 2000) and Hayden, Thompson, and Walker (2002). Terry Haywood (2002) summarized the general perspective on the question of how to define an international school in his proposal that "if the term 'international education' is to have any value beyond the parochial, then its definition must be an inclusive one which all schools that describe themselves in such terms should be able to identify" (p. 173). Finally, Ian Hill (2000) suggested that *internationally-minded* might serve as a more effective descriptor than *international* as it allows schools to offer a curriculum rooted in philosophies of international understanding, in this case the IB program, regardless of the citizenship of its student population. Indeed, Hill's data show that schools serving expatriate families of diverse national origin comprise only a small portion of those schools offering International Baccalaureate programs around the world. Also emphasizing curriculum as an indicator of a school's international-mindedness is a small body of research devoted to bilingual (Carder, 2007) and multilingual (Murphy, 1990, 2003; Sears, 1998) education in schools where English is the language of instruction.

A second research trajectory examines the experiences of *third culture kids*. Coined by Ruth Hill Useem (1976), the term embodies the idea that children growing up outside their native countries (largely the children of expatriates) become part of a third culture rather than one that derives from a simple mix of the home and host countries. Much of the research on third culture kids is concerned with military families (Hunter, 1982; Marchant & Medway, 1987) or missionaries' children (R. A. Tucker, 1989; Wickstrom & Andrews, 1993). However, research in this area has undoubtedly been of personal interest to researchers as a significant number were schooled in international schools (McCaig, 1994; Schaetti, 1996; Smith, 1991). Mary Langford (1998) directly established this link between third culture kids and international schools, arguing that international schools create a space where Useem's third culture is carried out. James Cambridge (2003) expanded this scholarship in his discussion of the differences between the "internationalist" and "globalist" contexts for international education. David Pollock and Ruth Van Reken (2001) further extended Useem's scholarship by differentiating between expatriates and third culture kids. They argued that while an expatriate observes multiple cultures, third culture kids truly live among these cultures and feel membership only to such a hybrid space rather than to particular nations. The majority of this literature asserts that such individuals have distinct and different educational needs and modes of identity development than their "first culture" counterparts (Cotrell & Useem, 1993; Fail, Thompson, & Walker, 2004; Gerner, Perry, Moselle, & Archibold, 1992; Lykins, 1986; Murakami-Ramalho, 2002; Pollock & Van Reken, 2001; Simon, Cook, & Fritz, 1990), that these characteristics are found in a large portion of the world's international school population, and

that such students have and will continue to become an increasingly common presence in all of the world's schools (Langford, 1998).

A third research trajectory considers the impact of shifting national and global contexts on international education. Perhaps most significant is the work of Cambridge (1998, 2002, 2003) and Cambridge and Thompson (2004) who strove to differentiate between *internationalism* and *globalization* as contexts for international education. Cambridge anchored much of his discussion in scholarship from the field of comparative and international education (Jones, 1998; McCabe, 2001), thus providing an increased academic orientation for the research on international schools approach. Drawing on Philip Jones's (1998) scholarship, Cambridge delineated two sometimes conflicting missions of international schools: internationalist and globalist. In the internationalist framework, schools attempt to instill an international-mindedness in students, anchored in an awareness of and concern for humanity worldwide. In the globalist framework, an "international" education becomes a commodity that is marketed to individuals for private economic gain. Cambridge (2003) argued that international schools must identify both their globalist and internationalist missions. Cambridge and Thompson acknowledged the complicated nature of the relationship between globalization and international schools, noting that students can be simultaneously more global and more isolated as they exist in a sphere that is global but elite in socioeconomic terms. In related empirical work, Yoko Yamato and Mark Bray (2006) analyzed the educational marketplace in globalizing Shanghai, China, revealing fierce competition for students between international schools and local schools in the context of an increasingly international population. Thus, discussions of the impact of globalization on international schools are becoming more central to the literature in this approach.

Audience and Orientation

Research and practice in the international schools field remain closely intertwined as most scholars hold positions as teachers and administrators in schools affiliated with the International Schools Association, International Baccalaureate Organization, and the Council of International Schools. Consequently, research is also strongly organized around these entities.

Operating out of the University of Bath's Center for Education in an International Context (CEIS) since 2000, the International Baccalaureate Research Unit (IBRU) is funded by the IBO and stands as the most prominent research organization in the field, with a staff that includes James Cambridge, Mary Hayden, and Jeff Thompson, the three most prolific scholars in the field. The unit exists to support research within the IBO and larger international education research communities through collaboration between universities, publication, and the maintenance of the International Education Research Database, accessible online without registration or membership. The IBRU's quarterly publication, *IB Research Notes*, in print since 2001, is available online and free of charge. The IBO has published the refereed *Journal of Research in International Education* since 2002. Although this title seems to imply an understanding of international education that is limited to discussions of schools and programs with links to the IBO, the journal's articles are actually wider in scope. The IBO hosts frequent regional workshops and conferences around the world, focusing on both professional development and scholarly research. Since 1981, the CIS has published the biannual refereed *International*

Schools Journal, which is geared toward private schools that also see themselves as international. In addition, the CIS sponsors two professional development conferences yearly with research and scholarship as a secondary concern.

Strengths and Weaknesses

As a research trajectory, one of the significant strengths of the research and scholarship on international schools is the central role of practitioners. With few full-time scholars focused on research in this area, much of the published work reflects the situated interests and perspectives of teachers and administrators (in schools and professional organizations) who are enmeshed in the daily life of international schools. In a world of educational research that is dominated by conversations about the split between theory and practice, research on international schools provides a model of engaged practitioner research.

At the same time, the lack of a strong network of academics and scholars is reflected in the relatively weak presence and impact of the field. With the notable exceptions of three leading scholars—Mary Hayden, Jeff Thompson, and James Cambridge—there are few other academics who focus their research intently on the world of international schools. Yet, changing global economic conditions have increased worldwide interest in the IB curriculum, and research on international schools may emerge at the forefront of the globalization and education research trajectory, which is discussed in the concluding section of this article.

International Research on Teaching and Teacher Education

History

Before World War II, research on teaching and teacher education was largely a national endeavor. While there was limited research in the international arena, the few scholars working in this area tended to associate themselves with the comparative and international tradition and research community. However, in the post–World War II era, international research on teaching and teacher education began to develop as an independent scholarly field, though one with significant linkages to other approaches discussed in this article, particularly comparative and international education and internationalizing K-12 education.

In the 1950s and 1960s, international research on teaching and teacher education was situated within the context of the reconstruction of Europe, the beginning of the Cold War, and the birth of independent states in Africa, Asia, and elsewhere. Thus, for example, UNESCO sponsored meetings and conferences in support of emerging democracies as colonial powers left and new universities and teacher training colleges and institutes were developed (see e.g., Parker, 1971, on UNESCO's role in teacher education in Africa). In 1953, the International Council on Education for Teaching (ICET) was founded to provide a mechanism for improving the quality of the preparation of educational professionals and to enhance collaboration among its now (in 2008) 80 member nations. In the United States's context, interest in international research on teaching and teacher education was fueled by growing and sustained criticism of the U.S. educational system at this time, particularly its focus on "life adjustment curriculum." This criticism intensified in the face of the Soviet Union's technological achievements and the launching of Sputnik in 1957 (Bestor, 1953/1985; Rickover, 1959). As teacher

education faced intense public and federal scrutiny, U.S. researchers felt an increasing need to understand how teachers were educated in other countries. William Brickman (1956), writing in the introduction to an issue of the *Journal of Teacher Education* devoted to comparative education, explained,

> Familiarity with teacher education problems in other countries may provide no solution to our own problems, but it may help us to see them more clearly. Apart from taking comfort in the fact that a good part of the world is plagued by a teacher shortage, by low teachers' salaries and status, and by curriculum controversies, we learn better how to appreciate the difficult tasks facing our foreign colleagues in the quest of educating good teachers. (p. 292)

Thus, in some cases, U.S. researchers looked to other nations' problems to contextualize their own and to be able to better respond to growing national pressure to raise standards in the profession, particularly in comparison to the Soviet Union (see Dickson, 1967; Klein, 1960). Professional organizations devoted to various aspects of international teacher education began to expand in this area, as they did in multiple areas of international education (e.g., higher education). For example, in 1966, the association TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) was founded, which provided an association for individuals working in the fields of English as a second language and English as a foreign language.

In the 1970s, there were numerous international developments that contributed to the strengthening of various strands of research in teaching and teacher education, further separating this area of research from its earlier location within comparative and international education. A 1970 UNESCO report, *Current Problems of Teacher Education: Report of a Meeting of International Experts* (Yates, 1970), tapped into growing international dissatisfaction with teacher preparation and the desire for greater international collaboration. In 1972, *Innovation Now! International Perspectives on Innovation in Teacher Education* was jointly published by the International Council on Education for Teaching and UNESCO and surveyed the state of teacher education and change in countries throughout the world, including Soviet bloc and newly independent countries (Klassen & Collier, 1972). Interest in teaching and teacher development in newly independent countries remained strong, bolstered by significant economic investment by organizations such as the United Nations (and specifically UNESCO) and the World Bank (see e.g., Sharpes, 1988). As a wide-ranging field, it is important to note that although some of this research was specifically published in teacher education journals, other research remained within comparative and international education areas or in other academic domains, such as political science, economics, or the emerging area studies fields.

The publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) sparked the re-release of Arthur Bestor's *Educational Wastelands* (originally published in 1953) in 1985 amid a new round of concerns about the global competitiveness of U.S. education, particularly in comparison to Germany and Japan (Steiner-Khamsi, 2006). In the midst of the sweeping teacher education reforms in the United States in the 1980s, renewed attention focused on the internationalization of teacher education programs. Different from the earlier comparative emphasis, this U.S.–based research, which extends to the present, is concerned with the internationalization of U.S. teacher education programs (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1989; J. Tucker &

Cistone, 1991; Schneider, 2003; Shimahara & Holowinsky, 1995). As political and economic change impacted much of the world with the rise of perestroika in the Soviet Union, interest in reform of teacher education worldwide grew (Gumbert, 1990). Today, research on teaching and teacher education from an international perspective flourishes throughout much of the world, and the growth is particularly significant in the newly prosperous countries of the Asia-Pacific rim.

Research Trajectories

As a practical and applied field, research on teaching and teacher education has been largely focused on addressing shared, global problems in the teaching profession (e.g., poor salaries, low standards for entry into teacher education programs, inconsistent preparation, lack of government investment, etc.) and on developing research-based strategies to address these issues at the levels of policy and practice. In addition, the field encompasses both research on teaching and research on teacher education, which have shared, though not identical, interests and priorities. We discuss four specific trajectories in the literature on research on teaching and teacher education: teacher education, international and national policy and teaching, teachers' work and lives in the context of global changes, and international perspectives in specific content areas.

The first research trajectory, teacher education, is quite broad and at certain points intersects with other trajectories. However, there is also a clear and distinct literature and research community that is specifically focused on teacher education, often linked to research communities situated within the comparative and international education approach. Following patterns from this approach, research in teacher education is often analyzed in either a "comparative" or "international" framework. In addition, this trajectory has strong historical roots, extending back to the pre–World War II period, as discussed earlier.

Research in this approach examines teacher education within specific national contexts, for example, South Africa (Lewin, Samuel, & Sayed, 2003), Japan (Ferguson, 1985), Namibia (Zeichner & Dahlström, 1999), and Germany (Schulz-Zander & Fankhänel, 1997), or within comparative, international contexts (Biddle, Good, & Goodson, 1997; Leavitt, 1992; Thomas, 2002; Tisher & Wideen, 1990). Alan Scott and John Freeman-Moir's (2000) edited collection surveys teacher education from both an international and a critical perspective. In the U.S. national context, there is a trajectory of research focused on internationalizing teacher education (Cushner & Brennan, 2007; Schneider, 2003), and in multiple other national contexts (e.g., Australia) there is new emphasis on preparing teachers for a global market and an increasingly international population (Corrigan, 2005). One of the most significant developments in the past decade has been the growth of regionally focused teacher education research, particularly within the Asia-Pacific region (Cheng, Chow, & Mok, 2004; Cheng, Chow, & Tsui, 2001; Morris & Williamson, 2000) and in Europe (Faber, 1999), as both regions emerge as politically and economically organized communities with shared interests. Significant journals that publish research in this area include the *European Journal of Teacher Education*, the *Journal of Teacher Education*, and more general education journals, such as the *British Educational Research Journal* and the *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*. However, given the linkages between this research trajectory and comparative and international education, some of the important literature

in this area can also be found in the journals discussed in the earlier section on "Comparative and International Education."

The second research trajectory focuses on policy development, implementation, and evaluation within international contexts, often reports and analysis generated from projects sponsored by organizations such as UNESCO and the OECD. For example, recent UNESCO reports include inquiry into the relationship between teachers and educational quality (UNESCO, 2006), the characteristics of the current teaching force, and the long-term impact of economic factors on the teaching profession (OECD & UNESCO, 2001). Other studies examine how higher educational institutions structure teacher education programs (Moon, Vlasceanu, & Barrows, 2003) and the results of the Multi-Site Teacher Education Research Project (Lewin & Stuart, 2003a, 2003b), which analyzed initial teacher education in Ghana, Lesotho, Malawi, South Africa, and Trinidad and Tobago. This trajectory of research also has strong linkages to the field of comparative and international education, and much of the literature is published in journals in those fields or in general interest British, European, African, and Asian (among others) educational journals (e.g., the *British Educational Research Journal*, *European Education*, *European Journal of Education*, *African Education Review*, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Education*). Given the nature of the funding sources, much of this research is large scale in nature and directed toward quantifiable outcomes that can directly inform and shape national and multinational educational policy work on teaching and teacher education.

The third research trajectory focuses on teachers' work and lives in the context of global changes. Although methodologically the research in this area encompasses both research-based inquiry and scholarly endeavors, it is united by a concern about the impact of global economic, political, social, and cultural changes on teachers' lives. For example, Andy Hargreaves's scholarship examined the changes wrought by the postmodern age (Hargreaves, 1994) and the new "knowledge society" (Hargreaves, 2003). In describing the impact of the knowledge society, Hargreaves (2003) discussed the importance of creativity and innovation in a society that relies on information as the fundamental component of competitiveness and opportunities and contrasted that imperative with schools' narrow—and ultimately counter-productive—focus on testing and uniformity. In related scholarship, Peter McLaren and Ramin Farahmandpur (2004) explored teachers' lives in the context of the hypercapitalism of the 21st century. The professional status of teaching and its future in a global economy is analyzed in books by Mike Bottery and Nigel Wright (2000) and John Smyth (2000); an edited collection by Christopher Day, Alicia Fernandez, Trond Hauge, and Jorunn Møller (2000); and a theme issue of the *International Journal of Educational Research*, "Education Reform and the Global Regulation of Teachers' Education, Development and Work: A Cross-Cultural Analysis" (Tatto, 2006). Through research that looks at teachers' work from Hong Kong and Australia to Norway, England, and Mexico, these scholars are particularly concerned with the impact of economic globalization, including renewed focus on standards, accountability, testing, and teacher performance in a globally competitive world. Many of the scholars who work in this research trajectory share intellectual and research interests with those of scholars discussed in the final section of this article, which discusses the research on globalization and education.

Research on international education in teaching and teacher education also includes international research and scholarship for virtually every content area,

pedagogical practice, and level of education. An extensive discussion of the international dimension of dozens of content areas is beyond the scope of the article, thus we can only gesture toward the voluminous research that originated (with some exceptions) in the 1950s and 1960s and had become standard practice by the 1990s. Thus, for example, there is international research on teaching and teacher education in science education (Abell, 2000; Appleton, 2006; B. Fraser & Tobin, 1998), primary education (Alexander, 2001), mathematics education (English, 2002; Jaworski, Wood, & Dawson, 1999), second language education (Tedick, 2005), and self-study as pedagogy (Loughran, 2004). While in some national contexts language education is intrinsically "international," there is also interest in making specific links between language education and the teaching of global awareness (Cates, 1990). Finally, there is extensive research on the teaching of global citizenship and the international content of teacher education programs in the area of social studies: Merry Merryfield's (1991, 1996) research on internationalizing teacher education programs is often cited as being at the forefront of this field. Given the extensive nature of this area, it will be discussed in the section "Global Citizenship and Multicultural Education." Although some of the research in this trajectory is published in the comparative and international journals and literature, much is spread throughout the hundreds of content area and general education journals on multiple continents as it is intertwined into the everyday work of educational researchers throughout the world.

Audience and Orientation

There are a considerable number of international organizations with a specific focus on teaching and teacher education. One of the oldest and most influential organizations working in this area is the aforementioned International Council on Education for Teaching. Previously based in the Netherlands, the ICET is now headquartered at National-Louis University in Chicago. Other large international organizations include the Association for Teacher Education in Europe, with representation from more than 40 countries; the Thematic Network on Teacher Education, funded by the European Union and based in Sweden; and the Teacher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa Research and Development Programme (founded in 2005). Such independent organizations often emerge from existing collaborations and partnerships and in many cases work collaboratively with nongovernmental organizations such as UNESCO. For example, in 2006, East China Normal University worked in conjunction with various UNESCO offices to sponsor an international forum on teacher education, teacher professional development, and linkages to the UNESCO's Education for All (EFA) initiative. UNESCO also sponsors independent projects such as its Teacher Training in Sub-Saharan Africa project (TTISSA), which aims to increase the number of teachers and improve the quality of education in 46 countries by 2015. In addition, nationally based organizations (e.g., the Australian Teacher Educator Association and the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers in the U.K.) often incorporate international dimensions into their national conferences through invited speakers, workshops, and the inclusion of presentations on international issues. In other cases, general, regionally based educational research associations (e.g., the Asia-Pacific Education Research Association) include research on teaching and teacher education.

Specialized journals and organizations for various content-specific organizations—national, regional, and international—often incorporate international dimensions. For example, the Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT), which was founded in 1974, is now international in scope and its publications and many special interest groups include a strong focus on global awareness and issues. Similarly, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages serves more than 13,500 members in 140 countries and publishes the internationally known *TESOL Quarterly*.

Although in some of the other sections of this article we have identified relatively small, well-contained communities and audiences for educational research in international education, by its nature international research on teaching and teacher education is broad, diffuse, and often interspersed into the mainstream of dozens of other international, national, regional, and even local educational organizations.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Despite its roots in the largely academic and scholarly field of comparative and international education, international research on teaching and teacher education has evolved over the past several decades into a wide-ranging approach that is largely—though not exclusively—focused on practice and generating solutions to the continuing problems facing teacher education programs and the teaching profession. However, unlike the research on international schools, research in this approach is driven primarily by scholars—there are few teachers who publish or are in involved in research. As a field, international research on teaching and teacher education is oriented toward analysis that reaches beyond the classroom and the relationship between teacher and student, making it difficult for individual teachers to contribute to the literature in a meaningful way.

One of the specific strengths of this area of research is its widespread availability and established profile. Although all of the other research areas discussed in this article have (relatively) narrow audiences and research communities, international research on teaching and teacher education reaches well beyond the confines of any one specific research community to encompass virtually all areas of educational research at some point, particularly within content areas. Although the most robust organizations in this area are independent associations such as ICET and nongovernmental organizations such as UNESCO, large numbers of professional educational associations incorporate *international* into their name (e.g., the International Reading Association). This diffusion throughout the educational research community is a strength in that it involves virtually everyone involved in educational research in some type of "international" dialogue at some point; however, it also dilutes and homogenizes the meaning of *international*—a term that other research communities discussed in this article have tried to both define and protect through shared theoretical language, professional organizations, conferences, and publications.

Internationalization of K-12 Education

In this section, we discuss four research trajectories under the broader rubric of *internationalization of K-12 education*. In contrast to the four approaches discussed earlier in this article, this approach (and the one that follows, globalization and education) does not currently function as a unified research field. Instead, each of the four trajectories discussed here operates with relative autonomy—though

there are certainly instances of crossover and cooperation, which can vary widely depending on national context. However, these four research trajectories share a history of phenomenal growth and development within the wider context of the global political movements and changes that swept the world in the 1960s and 1970s. Thus, they are all outgrowths of larger political, cultural, and social changes and emerged within education as responses to societal problems. During this era, the four trajectories—peace education, global education and multicultural education, human rights education, and environmental education—firmly established themselves as research areas and scholarly and professional communities and continue to function as separate—though related—areas today.

History

Of the four research trajectories, peace education has the oldest history, dating from the small groups of peace educators in New England in the United States in the early 1800s (Johnson, 1998), the London Peace Conference of 1843 (Grossi, 2000), the continental peace movement in Europe in the 1870s (Thelin, 1996), and Mahatma Gandhi's peace activism in India and South Africa in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In the United States, efforts by peace activists to influence school curriculum began in the 1880s (Fink, 1980), and the American Peace Society launched a major review of school curriculum in 1906, an early example of research in peace education. So compelling was peace education at this juncture that the National Education Association supported the founding of an educators' chapter of the American Peace Society, the American School Peace League, which advocated for peace education in schools (Harris & Morrison, 2003). Peace education organizations flourished during the years surrounding World War I, though the frequent labeling of peace educators as *communists* and *socialists* during the Red Scare led some peace organizations to change their names. For example, the American School Peace League changed its name to the American School Citizenship League during this period (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). Lucia Ames Mead, Edwin Mead, Fannie Fern Andrews, Jane Addams, and John Dewey were some of the prominent peace educators in the United States during this period.[9] Aline Stomfay-Stitz (1993) discussed one of the earliest examples of empirical peace education research in the United States, a 1929 questionnaire-based study of 450 educators, which investigated how schools might best implement a curriculum for world friendship and understanding. In the 1930s, major educational figures such as George Counts (1932) focused their scholarship on the role of the schools in constructing a new social order under the broader rubric of *democratic peace education*.

Global education in K-12 classrooms began to establish itself in an international context in the post–World War II years, with UNESCO at the center (Sutton, 1998-1999), an influence that continues today, particularly in European countries. In the United States, Margaret Sutton (1998-1999) dated the founding of "global studies" to 1969, with the publication of James Becker and Less Anderson's *An Examination of Objectives, Needs, and Priorities in International Education in United States Secondary Schools*, while in the United Kingdom, "world studies" flourished under the auspices of the One World Trust, set up in 1973 (Selby, 1982). Virtually simultaneously, global awareness of human rights—and human rights education—began to solidify around the establishment of Amnesty International (1961) in London and the growing environmental education awareness movement

following the publication of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* in 1962. The civil rights movement in the United States served as an impetus for the growth of multicultural education and associated work in research in this field, while similar educational initiatives were underway in the British context as the result of the growing immigrant communities in the wake of the end of British colonial rule in many countries (Selby, 1982). The 1974 UNESCO *Recommendation on Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace, and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms* underscored the importance of these trajectories as fields of practice and research (O'Connor, 1982). With the end of British colonial rule, many countries began the long process of curriculum reform. For example, in Nigeria, global education was included in the curriculum for the first time and seen as a clear break with the earlier, imposed curriculum (Osunde, 1986-1987). Maria Montessori's work also began to exert considerable influence on education, drawing on Christian theology and emphasizing the inherent goodness of children as a crucial component in peace education (Montessori, 1972).

"Global studies" in the United States and "world studies" in the United Kingdom were threatened in the 1980s because of the election of more conservative governments that imposed a National Curriculum (in the case of the United Kingdom) and advocated a more ethnocentric approach to education (in the case of the United States). For example, Kenneth Tye (2003) expressed concern that through the 1990s, the global education movement in the United States became increasingly ethnocentric. While global education was experiencing difficulty in some countries in the 1980s, in other national contexts (e.g., Japan and New Zealand) it was thriving (Collinge, 1992; Tye, 2003). However, in the case of New Zealand, the election of a more conservative government there in 1990 also curtailed efforts in that nation. With the end of the Cold War, global education also spread in Russia (J. Tucker, 1991).

Both human rights education and environmental education followed similar paths, experiencing significant growth in the 1960s and 1970s. As David Suárez (2007) discussed in his detailed examination of the history and current practices of human rights education, UNESCO–sponsored human rights education began in 1953 but only solidified in importance with the release of the previously mentioned 1974 UNESCO *Recommendation on Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace, and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*. William Marsden (1997) in his scholarship on the history of environmental education in the United States and Britain dated the first use of the term to the mid-1960s. However, he noted that concerns about nature and conservation existed much earlier, discussing the influences of religious instruction, the study of geography in the 19th century, and the conservation efforts of the 20th century amid an increasingly urban landscape.

Research Trajectories

Contemporary research on internationalizing K-12 education is concentrated in four research trajectories: peace education, global education and multicultural education, human rights education, and environmental education. All of the trajectories are international in their scope and contribute significantly to the research on international education, despite the fact that none of these trajectories currently use that moniker. Thus, it is important to note that researchers working in the field of internationalizing K-12 education may be less likely to identify themselves as

working within the field of "international education" than researchers in some of the other approaches discussed in this article. However, it is clear that research in this area is a significant aspect of research in international education and is most closely tied to classroom practice.

Global research on peace education focuses on what Betty Reardon (2000) called "education *about* peace" or education that focuses on the creation of a peaceful social order (e.g., research and education on conflict resolution).[10] This trajectory received increased attention and considerable growth during the height of the antinuclear movement in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Scholarship in this trajectory centers on topics of conflict resolution, global security, and preventive programs that counter violence, often turning a critical lens on issues of structural inequality within nations (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996; Harris, 1996; Synott, 1996). Linda Lantieri and Janet Patti's (1996) scholarship on the "peaceable classroom"— based on models developed by Educators for Social Responsibility and the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program—is an often-cited example of how these theories can be implemented in K-12 settings. Reardon's (1993) scholarship combines a commitment to feminist principles with peace education (see also Noddings, 1992; Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). Research on peace education is also notably concerned with varying philosophical foundations and justifications for implementation and action (Page, 2004). Not surprisingly, research on peace education also flourishes in areas with histories of conflict, such as Sierra Leone (Bretherton, Weston, & Zbar, 2005; Wessells, 2005), Africa as a continent (Kisembo, 1993), and Palestine and Israel (Feuerveger, 2001).

Research on global education and multicultural education encompasses a wide range of literature, which also falls under the general rubric of *world studies* (Holden, 2000), *citizenship studies*, and more recently *global citizenship* (Noddings, 2005).[11] Commonly situated within social studies or civic curriculum, the field has the overarching goal of heightening students' awareness of their position within a global reality and how they can contribute to the creation of a peaceful world. Research in this area is quite broad and diffuse, ranging from Merry Merryfield's (1998, 2000, 2005) research on teachers' understanding and implementation of global education to the intersections between global awareness and citizenship education (Brown & Kysilka, 2002; Holden, 2000; I. Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005; L. Davies, 2006; Noddings, 2005; Nussbaum, 2002), the examination of global education programs in particular national contexts (Asano, 2000; Tye, 1999), and Elise Boulding's (1988) earlier work on the role of education in an increasingly interdependent world. Particularly prominent in this area is the work of James Banks (2003) on the connections between citizenship, multiculturalism, and global awareness and Carl Grant and Joy Lei's (2001) edited collection that examines how multicultural education is theorized and practiced in national contexts worldwide, including India, Argentina, Scandinavia, South Africa, and Chile. Special issues of *Social Education* ("Global Education," 1977) and *Theory Into Practice* (Pike, 2000) have been devoted to global education. Notably, 1977 represents the height of an earlier wave of interest in global education, whereas 2000 marks the beginning of a current trend toward focus in this area.

Research on human rights education is complicated by its location at the intersection of multiple disciplines, including education, law, and political science. Within education, research is often evaluative (Barr, 2005; Brabeck, 1994; Schultz,

Barr, & Selman, 2001). Suárez's (2007) recent scholarship analyzes the discussion forum of the Human Rights Education Associates (HREA), an international non-governmental organization with a focus on advocating human rights education, and Felisa Tibbitts's (2002) research maps varying models for human rights education. Research on human rights can also include a focus on language rights (Watson, 2007), and not surprisingly there is a focus on human rights in newly democratic nations, such as South Africa (Carrim & Keet, 2005).

Environmental education research has traditionally focused on issues of sustainability and understandings of place as well as the implementation of these concepts in schools and classroom practice (Hart, 2003; Palmer, 1998; Payne, 2006). As environmental concerns exceed human-created boundaries such as nation, education in this area necessarily takes a global perspective, and much of the scholarship and research follow this trajectory. Environmental education—and particularly global warming—has been given increased attention recently following the impact of Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth* and the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Research that reviews environmental education in a particular national context also flourishes (e.g., Qing, 2004, on environmental education in China). Given the overlap between the four research trajectories discussed here, there is also research that situates itself within multiple trajectories, for example, Charalambus Vrasidas and colleagues' (Vrasidas, Zemblyas, Evangorou, Avraamidou, & Aravi, 2007) research on using international communication technologies, which is grounded in the philosophical perspective that environmental education is peace education within the context of Cyprus.

Audience and Orientation

Given the broad and diffuse nature of the four research trajectories discussed earlier, it is undoubtedly more accurate to note there are multiple audiences and orientations for research in internationalization of K-12 education, though as we will note throughout this section, there are significant areas of overlap.

One of the largest constituencies and audiences is the international agencies whose specific mandate includes peace, human rights, citizenship, global awareness, and environmental education. For example, founded in 1945 after World War II, the United National Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization promotes scientific and cultural understanding as paths to peace. Today it supports conferences and research projects. Its parent organization, the United Nations, is of course philosophically devoted to the peaceful coexistence of nations and initiates numerous peace-related initiatives, including, for example, the United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education (1994-2004). Another nongovernmental organization, the Hague Appeal for Peace, sponsors the Global Campaign for Peace Education (GCPE), which concerns itself entirely with teacher and nonformal education through teacher training, the dissemination of peace education research, and an annual conference that is unique in its tendency to unite scholars and government education ministries from around the world. In the United States, organizations such as Educators for Social Responsibility and Facing History and Ourselves focus primarily on classroom practice, with limited research agendas often concerned with the efficacy and impact of their own programs.

In the academic realm, one of the most prolific scholars in the field of research on peace education is Betty Reardon, who founded the Peace Education Center of Teachers College (PECTC) to serve as a center for the development of peace

education in teacher and nonformal education in the United States. The Centre for Citizenship and Human Rights Education at the University of Leeds and the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington are similarly situated within education faculties/colleges, but in many other cases, centers for human rights education are located within law institutes/schools. For example, the University of Colombo in Sri Lanka hosts the Centre for the Study of Human Rights, which is supported through grant monies from aid agencies around the globe. Centers such as these—particularly ones located within the discipline of education—are strongly oriented toward serving the needs of classroom teachers, developing curriculum, and assessing public policy, particularly in nations with coordinated national curriculum. For example, the Faculty of Education at the University of Melbourne sponsored a Human Rights Education conference in February 2007.

Due to this research trajectory's heavy focus on the needs and interests of classroom practitioners, scholarship appears in a wide range of education journals. However, there are also more specialized research journals in many areas of research, including the new *In Factis Pax*, an "online journal of peace education and social justice" (http:///www.infactispax.org); *Journal of Environmental Education; Environmental Education Research*; the *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*; and *Theory and Research in Social Education*. Because of human rights education's diffuse base, research in this area appears in numerous journals both in and outside of education, including the *Journal of Moral Education*, *Comparative Education Review*, and *Intercultural Education*. In October 2006, the *Journal for Social Science Education* published a special issue focused on human rights education (Tibbitts & Fritzsche, 2006).

Strengths and Weaknesses

One of the considerable strengths of this area of research is its intimate connection to real-life classroom and practice and its visible profile within the larger mainstream literature in education. Unlike fields that have isolated themselves from the main currents of education through publishing in only a small number of journals, research in this area is infused into all aspects of educational research, and there are considerable linkages between areas. For example, there are certainly growing connections between education for peace and global awareness and multicultural education, as the work of scholars such as James Banks (2003) makes apparent. Reardon's (2002) work also indicates connections between human rights and peace education. However, because the field is so enormous, individual scholars and researchers tend to identify strongly with their own particular trajectory (e.g., environmental education).

Arguably, this trajectory of international education is the most significant of the six examined in this article as it has the potential to impact the largest number of students, around the globe, on a daily basis. Yet the field lacks overarching structures, and the continued focus on classroom practice discourages the growth of a robust research base (with a few notable exceptions) that could unify the field as a more significant force globally. Some research trajectories—for example, human rights education—lack dedicated research and publication outlets within the field of education. Other research trajectories, for example, some branches of multicultural education and citizenship education, are national in focus and context and do not fully consider the international as a backdrop for their work. Finally, like other

trajectories, social, cultural, political, and economic context influences the paths of both individual people and their careers and the field as a whole. For example, while environmental education is experiencing considerable growth within the current political climate, human rights education struggles for recognition.

Globalization and Education

Although some of the research trajectories described here have older roots, overall the globalization and education approach to international education is the most recent addition to the scholarship in this area. Similar to the section on internationalizing K-12 education, researchers and scholars working in this approach function as generally separate scholarly communities, with some overlap. Despite the disparities in emphasis and theoretical grounding, the research trajectories discussed in this section are united in their strong linkages to the social sciences and humanities. Unlike the majority of research discussed in this article—which is firmly located in education—scholars working in this approach draw significantly from the research generated in the social sciences and humanities, and some have degrees and/or are located in colleges and faculties outside of education. In this section, we discuss four research trajectories: Black education in global perspective, anthropology and education, world models in education, and critical globalization studies. All of the trajectories draw on theories and paradigms rooted in the humanities and social sciences and thus draw on scholarship that in some cases dates back more than 100 years. However, each of these trajectories has received new prominence and attention within the past two decades as societal forces worldwide focused attention on the emergent global processes that have shifted the economic, political, and cultural organization of our world.

History

Black education in global perspective has perhaps the oldest roots of the four trajectories as it draws on the Modern Pan-Africanism movement for its vision, a movement that dates back to the end of the 19th century. Asserting the unity of African people worldwide, whether on the continent or in the diaspora, Pan-Africanism draws on Black strength and collective vision to address community challenges worldwide. Within education, scholars such as Molefe Asante (1987, 1988) and Asa Hilliard (1995; Perry, Steele, & Hilliard, 2003) are well-known advocates of Afrocentrism in education, a foundation of the current research trajectory.[12] Anthropology and education has more recent roots. Growing out of the field of anthropology, it was first established as part of the foundations of education program at Teachers College in the 1930s. As a field, anthropology and education was institutionalized in the 1950s, with the work of George and Louise Spindler (Spindler & Spindler, 2000), the publication of the proceedings of the first conference on education and anthropology (Spindler, 1955), and the establishment of the Council on Anthropology and Education under the auspices of the American Anthropological Association. Finally, in the 1990s, two additional research trajectories emerged: the world models approach, rooted in the discipline of sociology, and critical globalization studies, an outgrowth of the post–Cold War acceleration of scholarship in critical theory, postcolonialism, postmodernism, poststructuralism, cultural studies, and globalization theory emanating from multiple sites in the humanities, most notably English and anthropology. Historically, these four

research trajectories developed separately, though they are united in that they are interdisciplinary in nature, linking research and scholarship in the humanities with educational theory and practice.

Research Trajectories

Black education in global perspective has received considerable attention recently with the publication of several significant works, including edited collections by Joyce King (2005), James Conyers (2003), and Ama Mazama (2007). Of the three, King's collection is most directly relevant to the concerns of this article as it is located within education and specifically focuses on charting an agenda for research and practice. Coming out of the work of CORIBE (the Commission on Research in Black Education, which will be discussed below), the book examines the "crisis in Black education worldwide" (p. 281), bringing together scholars from numerous countries, including the United States, Brazil, Senegal, and Britain, to both reflect on the situation for Black children, schools, and communities in multiple national contexts and propose strategies for action. Conyers's collection is concerned with creating a theoretical paradigm for Afrocentricity that can serve as a framework for action both inside and outside of schools, while Mazama's collection examines multiple aspects of contemporary African reality and includes the work of noted education scholar George Sefa Dei. In addition to these edited collections, notable research in this research trajectories includes the comparative research of Dei, Asgharzadeh, Bahador, and Shahjahan (2006) on schooling and difference in Ghana and Canada; the impact of Afrocentricism in the United Kingdom (Christian, 2001); and research on Afrocentric schooling and curriculum in the United States (e.g., Ginwright, 2004). For example, Shawn Ginwright's (2004) study of the Afrocentric curriculum reform movement in Oakland, California, traces the fault lines between Revolutionary Nationalists, who ground their perspectives in class analysis, and Cultural Nationalists, who stress the centrality of core African cultural values and beliefs. Over the past decade, this trajectory has maintained its strong connections to Pan-Africanism and Afrocentricity while moving beyond the well-established Africa–North American nexus to propose a research agenda for Black education worldwide. Scholars in this trajectory are connected to intellectual and political currents in the humanities and social sciences. As CORIBE (2001) stated,

> The "ways of knowing" provided by the arts and humanities are often more useful in informing our understanding of our lives and experiences and those of other oppressed people than the knowledge and methodologies of the sciences that have been privileged by the research establishment despite the often distorted or circumscribed knowledge and understanding this way of knowing produces. (p. 1)

Anthropology and education, the second trajectory, is concerned with the role of culture in societies worldwide. Although a significant proportion of research in this area is national in orientation, this research trajectory has been at the forefront of studying immigrants, the global movements of people, and education. One of the most significant publications in this research trajectory is Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco and Desirée Baolian Qin-Hilliard's (2004) edited collection, *Globalization, Culture, and Education in the New Millennium*. The book includes essays from leading scholars in economics, Latin America Studies, Asian American studies, and

technology, among other fields, but with the exception of Howard Gardner, no education scholars are included. Topically, the book is concerned with the impact of technology, immigration, popular culture, economics, and identity on education and uses culture as its main analytic framework, though not all of the scholars are trained in or employed in anthropology departments. Such themes and perspectives are also carried through in Suárez-Orozco's (2001) research and scholarship, which is concerned primarily with the impact of immigration on U.S. schools and communities. Other research in this area includes Bradley Levinson's (2002) work on ethnography and educational policy in the context of the Americas, Kathleen Hall (2002) on Sikh youth in Britain, Ritty Lukose (2005a, 2005b) on Indian youth in Kerala, Jacqueline Mosselson (2006) on Bosnian refugees in New York City, Amy Stambach (2000) on schooling in East Africa, Jasmin Zine (2007) and Bruce Collett (2007) on Islamic schooling in Canada, and Judith Liu, Heidi Ross, and Donald Kelly (2000) on education in China. Wan Shun Eva Lam (2006) provided a comprehensive review of research in this area, with a focus on culture, learning, language, and education. Similar to scholars in the Black education in global perspective trajectory, the anthropologists of education work at the border of multiple disciplines, publishing in anthropology journals, anthropology of education journals, and other educational journals outside of anthropology.

The third trajectory, world models, arises from the empirical, quantitative research of John Meyer, a comparative sociologist, and colleagues (Benavot, Cha, Kamens, Meyer, & Wong, 1991; Meyer, Kamens, & Benavot, 1992). Focusing exclusively on the national elementary-level curriculum, Meyer and colleagues analyzed the content of curriculum from 125 countries dating back to 1920. Based on their analysis, they argued for the "relative homogeneity of the world's primary curricular outlines in the twentieth century" (Meyer et al., 1992, p. 165) and positioned their findings in contrast to positions that argue that varying local factors play a significant role in school curricula. In analyzing earlier work by John Meyer and his colleagues (Boli, Ramirez, & Meyer, 1985; Meyer & Hannan, 1979), Mark Ginsburg and colleagues (Ginsburg, Cooper, Raghu, & Zegarra, 1990) borrowed Rolland Paulston's (1980) classification of equilibrium and conflict paradigms in which equilibrium paradigms apply descriptive methods to cultural phenomena while conflict paradigms train a critical lens on largely economic factors. Using this classification, Ginsburg et al. categorized Meyer et al.'s work as falling within a "world-system-level equilibrium" approach. In contrast, recent scholarship by Gita Steiner-Khamsi (2006) offered a more conflict-focused perspective. Although Meyer and colleagues' research has been published in journals in the comparative and international education field and their work is of considerable interest to scholars of educational policy, curriculum, and reform, we include them in this section because of their training and orientation in sociology.

Finally, there is the trajectory strongly tied to the tradition of critical inquiry within the humanities, social sciences, and education, critical globalization studies. In the tradition of critical educators and researchers since at least the 1970s, scholars working in this area draw on theoretical paradigms related to the ascendancy of globalization to examine how these dynamics crisscross the world of education. The earliest—and perhaps still the best—exemplar of this approach is Nicholas Burbules and Carlos Torres's (2000) edited collection, *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. More recent publications working within this

research approach include Michael Apple, Jane Kenway, and Michael Singh (2005); Fazal Rizvi (2004, 2005); Nadine Dolby and Greg Dimitriadis (2004); Nadine Dolby and Fazal Rizvi (2008); David Gabbard (2000); Allan Luke, Carmen Luke, and Phil Graham (in press); Michael Peters (2005); Leon Tikly (2001); and Greg Dimitriadis and Cameron McCarthy (2001) working specifically within a postcolonial framework.[13] Joel Spring's (1998, 2006, 2007) scholarship in this area is well known, focusing on the ties among schooling, the global economy, and the political and economic domination of multinational corporations.

Audiences and Orientation

As discussed earlier, there is considerable fragmentation within the four trajectories identified in this approach, and thus they are not united by an overarching structure. Within each separate research trajectory, levels of organization and structure vary. The Black education in global perspective trajectory has high levels of coordination and visibility through the work of the Commission on Research in Black Education sponsored through the American Educational Research Association. Although based in a U.S. organization, CORIBE is international in focus and scope and has commissioned research papers, developed a Web site, designed an online graduate student course, and sponsored regional meetings and national colloquia in the United States. Established in 1999, CORIBE's formal work ended in 2001, and there is not yet an established journal or other consistent avenue for scholarly work in this area, though journals such as the *Journal of Negro Education* and *Urban Review* regularly publish work from this trajectory, as do publishers such as Africa World Press.

Similar to the Black education in global perspective trajectory, anthropology and education is a well-established research community, with a regular journal (*Anthropology and Education Quarterly*) and an affiliation with the American Anthropological Association since the establishment of the Council of Anthropology and Education in 1968. Anthropologists are also active in professional associations around the world, though none of the other dozens of anthropology associations worldwide sponsor a journal specifically focused on education. Of particular note for this article is the Pan-African Anthropology Association, based in Cameroon, whose members' scholarship and research may intersect with the Black education in global perspective research trajectory. Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco's approach to scholarship in this area—with an emphasis on immigration—is centered at his recently established Institute for Globalization and Education in Metropolitan Settings at New York University.[14]

The world models research trajectory functions largely as a subset of sociology of education, with connections to the larger global community of sociologists. However, as noted, the world models research trajectory is also part of the conversation in the comparative and international education field and particularly has impact in the policy arena. Finally, critical globalization studies is primarily focused on reaching critically oriented scholars, who are now concerned with how globalization shifts the terrain of critical research and practice. Such discussion and analysis is concentrated in journals such as *Educational Theory* and *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* (based in Australia), with additional publications in related journals such as the *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. Within the globalization and education trajectory that has emerged

from intersections with comparative and international education and the internationalization of higher education, discussions focus around Philip Altbach's Center on International Higher Education at Boston College in the United States; the Monash Centre on Research in International Education at Monash University in Melbourne, Australia; and the UNESCO Centre for Comparative Education Research at the University of Hong Kong, which despite its name, is moving away from a comparative paradigm to embrace critical globalization studies.[15]

Strengths and Weaknesses

As noted earlier, the four research trajectories discussed in this section tend to function as distinct areas with no identity as a larger approach united through a commitment to shared research and scholarship. This is understandable given these trajectories' commitments to well-articulated theoretical positions that are largely incompatible at a philosophical level. Not surprisingly, there is little dialogue between the various research trajectories. In a notable exception, Kathryn Anderson-Levitt's (2003) edited collection, *Local Meaning, Global Schooling: Anthropology and World Culture Theory*, directly addressed anthropologists' misgivings about the "world models" theory discussed earlier, using case studies to argue that the actual practices of schooling are less homogenous and less predictable than world model theory predicts. Although Anderson-Levitt is most concerned about cultural anthropologists' response to the macro-sociology of world models theory, she also indicated that others outside of anthropology—most notably those working in the international research trajectory of the field of comparative and international education—are also concerned about the implications of world models theory for the study of schooling worldwide.

Although there is little dialogue among researchers working within this research approach, one of the potential strengths of this approach is its inherent—if latent—ability to transform all of the other research approaches discussed in this article. Because of its strong theoretical orientation and roots in the humanities and social sciences, the globalization and education research approach is much more likely than other research approaches to have a transformative impact on all of education. Although not heavily engaged with actual practice, globalization and education questions the theoretical underpinnings of the entire international education endeavor—albeit from varying positions. Thus, one of clear strengths of this research approach is the inroads it is beginning to make into multiple aspects of the six research approaches discussed in this article.

For example, a subset of the critical globalization studies trajectory is embedded within the comparative and international education community, represented by Nelly Stromquist and Karen Monkman's (2000) edited collection, *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation Across Cultures* (see also Stromquist, 2002). Karen Mundy's (1998) scholarship is also notable here as it is situated within comparative education frameworks while at the same time critiquing and expanding those frameworks to include research within the internationalizing higher education and critical globalization studies trajectories. Similar movements toward the critical globalization studies trajectory are evident within the internationalizing higher education approach, beginning with Jan Currie and Janice Newson's (1998) *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives* and continuing through the work of many scholars, including Simon Marginson and Mark

Considine's (2000) research on shifts in Australian higher education due to the deliberate withdrawal of state support for universities and Robert Rhoads and Carlos Torres's (2006) edited collection on higher education and the political economy of globalization in the Americas. Similar trends can be noted, for example, in the Black education in global perspective research trajectory, as undoubtedly it has influenced research and scholarship in many fields outside of its own purview, including multicultural education, environmental education, and citizenship education, and has the potential to reshape how scholars working with the comparative and international education approach see their research. Other work that transcends boundaries includes the research of Kenneth King (King & McGrath, 2002), a scholar based in Scotland. King's earlier work (King, 1971) is clearly situated within a Pan-African perspective, whereas his more recent research combines critical perspectives on globalization and a focus on development and comparative education with an interest in African development and the African renaissance in his research in Ghana, Kenya, and South Africa.

Despite these strengths, the impact of this research trajectory is thus far somewhat limited. Furthermore, although the world models and anthropology of education approaches may have impact within their respective fields of sociology and anthropology, their profile in the larger world of international education is limited. Without clear institutional or organizational structure, there have been few discussions about the self-definition of the field, its positioning, and its impact. In contrast to the comparative and international education approach—which is overly concerned with its own contours and boundaries—the globalization and education research trajectory is amorphous and lacks structure as a scholarly and academic community.

Conclusion: Research in International Education for the 21st Century

Similar to other areas of educational research, the six approaches to research in international education developed within specific historical moments: distinct convergences of political, economic, social, and cultural forces that prompted the beginnings of a new research lens on the world of educational practice. This perspective on the development of "international education" as a field over the past 125 years allows us to see how and why particular research foci developed and provides us with a touchstone for mapping the changes that will evolve over the coming decades.

Within comparative and international education, comparative educational research came to the fore at the moment that the nation-state began its ascendance as the predominant form of human political organization on the planet, whereas international educational research became critical to understanding the wave of newly independent nation-states as colonial rule ended throughout Africa and Asia. Research in the internationalization of higher education has similarly been shaped by shifting historical circumstances. Research in this area initially peaked in the 1960s during the Cold War, though much of that research was located outside of education colleges and schools, and is of increased interest again given the new economic realities of higher education worldwide. Although research in international schools is still quite limited, there is growing interest in the IB curriculum throughout the world (Shapira, 2006). As international schools and schools using the IB curriculum increase in number and influence, research in this area will surely expand. International research on teaching and teacher education emerged as a separate research area in the post–World War II era and has expanded significantly since the

end of the Cold War. Internationalizing K-12 education gained prominence as areas of research and practice that grew out of the societal changes in the 1960s and 1970s, with an increased emphasis on the need for peace, global citizenship, and respect for human rights and the environment in the wake of the nuclear threat, changing demographics in developed nations worldwide, and the threat to the survival of the natural world. Finally, the globalization and education research approach has its roots in the paradigms emanating from the social sciences and humanities and has gained increased attention and influence because of its emphasis on foundational theoretical frameworks as guides for analysis and understanding.

In conclusion, we discuss two aspects of what we see as the paths for the development of international education as a research field in the next decades: (a) the ascendance of the globalization and education approach as an increasingly important theoretical framework and (b) with that, the increased convergence and perhaps consolidation of some of the approaches discussed earlier.

First, as we have indicated throughout the article, the globalization and education approach is impacting multiple research approaches because of its power to provide explanatory and analytical frameworks for the analysis of classroom practice, curriculum, and policy. Increasingly, the globalization and education approach is providing the lens through which educators are viewing nationally situated issues and concerns: such as David Hursh's (2007) analysis of No Child Left Behind in the United States, Molathhegi Trevor Chika Sehoole's (2005) research on educational policy reform in South Africa, Cecile Wright's (2005) analysis of Black education in Britain, and Ternzinha Jaraci Machado da Silva's (2005) research on Brazilian education. Despite the noted limitations of the globalization and education approach, it can also potentially provide educational researchers working in any area of international education with a set of theoretical tools and frameworks for analyzing the global context of their own research. From our perspective, it is the global context of educational research that is most central to the development of the future of research in international education in each of the six approaches discussed. The importance of the new global milieu to all areas of educational research is also evident in Keith Watson's (2007) research on language rights in an era of globalization and Birgit Brock-Utne's (2000) scholarship on peace education, also framed within the broader context of globalization.

Second, there is an increasing tendency for overlap and cross-fertilization among the different approaches. Whereas the period of the 1950s to 1990s was a time in which many of these research trajectories established themselves as separate and autonomous research communities, the technological advances of the past decade have allowed for easier and often instantaneous access to the work of researchers around the world, and thus cross-fertilization of ideas and research communities is flourishing. For example, this cross-fertilization is evident in comparative and international education where many scholars are beginning to abandon the older comparative and international frameworks for ones grounded in the globalization and education and internationalization of higher education approach. Thus, it is not surprising that comparative and international education journals and scholars are concerned with the self-definition and boundaries of the field as its traditional paradigms (based on the concept of the autonomous nation-state) are undermined by changing geopolitical realities. Given the ever-increasingly technological advances, we anticipate that the borders between many of these research

approaches will continue to weaken as more and more aspects of educational research become international. At the same time, it is important to underscore that access to technology is uneven and unequal, and there is a danger that scholars in less developed nations will be left even further behind as disparities grow.

As research in international education matures and expands in the 21st century, undoubtedly the six approaches discussed here will change as priorities and realities shift. Yet, taken as a whole, the field of research in international education can only grow in prominence and influence as global processes become increasingly a transparent and obvious part of the everyday lives and practices of our educational communities and the research agendas of educational scholars worldwide.

Notes

We would like to thank the editors of this journal and five anonymous reviewers for their detailed and helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article.

[1]Although *globalization* is a contested term, we draw from David Held and Anthony McGraw's (2003) definition, which asserts that globalization suggests

> a growing magnitude or intensity of global flows such that states and societies become increasingly enmeshed in worldwide systems and networks of interaction. As a consequence, distant occurrences and developments can come to have serious domestic impacts while local happenings can engender significant global repercussions. . . . This does not mean that the global necessarily displaces or takes precedence over local, national or regional orders of social life. Rather, the point is that the local becomes embedded within more expansive sets of interregional relations and networks of power. (p. 3)

[2]Mary Hayden, Jack Levy, and Jeff Thompson's (2007) recent edited collection examines research in international education from a useful, if slightly different, perspective than we do in this article.

[3]Crossley and Watson's (2003) book provides one of the most recent, comprehensive overviews of the field of comparative and international education. Much of the historical background in this article relies on their analysis.

[4]See Cook, Hite, and Epstein (2004) for a comprehensive analysis of trends and influences in the field of comparative education, including a discussion of the most influential individual scholars, published works, and academic programs.

[5]It should, of course, be noted that research on multilateral and transnational education policy extends far past the relatively small field of comparative and international education and involves scholars and researchers working in multiple fields, including higher education, economics, political science, sociology, and so on.

[6]Specifically locating itself within the comparative literature, the Arnove and Torres (2007) book (now in its third edition) is notable for its influence in the field and for its broad scope. The chapters in the collection examine theoretical and paradigmatic issues in the field and the influence of shifts in nation and state on comparative education and also provide overviews of contemporary issues and concerns in education in different regions of the world.

[7]In 1964 the organization changed its name to the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. In 1990, the organization adopted its current name, keeping the well-known acronym NAFSA, but changing the name to reflect the contemporary mission and values of the organization.

[8]For a detailed account of the evolution of the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme beginning in 1925, see Hill (2002).

[9]Dewey's legacy is more complicated as it is well known that he was a supporter of World War I. See Howlett (1982) for discussion.

[10]In contrast, education *for* peace is education oriented toward creating the preconditions for the achievement of peace. See Reardon (2000) for full discussion.

[11]Reardon (2000) noted that in the 30-year period following World War II, *international education* and *education for international understanding* were commonly used terms; she suggested that the contemporary equivalent is *global education*. See Popkewitz (1980), "Global Education as a Slogan System," for trenchant critique of the approach at that time.

[12]Asa Hilliard died in August 2007, as this article was in revision.

[13]Although located somewhat outside of the critical tradition, Liora Bresler and Alexander Ardichvili's (2002) edited collection is noteworthy for its focus on methodological issues in research in international education and its attention to the context of globalization for contemporary research in this area.

[14]See http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/igems/IGEMS.html.

[15]See the Web site of the Boston College Center for International Higher Education for a comprehensive overview of Altbach's research and scholarship (http://www.bc.ed/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/). Both Rizvi and Marginson have served as directors of the Monash Centre for Research in International Education at Monash University (http://www.education.monash.edu/au/centres/mcrie/).

References

Abell, S. (Ed.). (2000). *Science teacher education: An international perspective*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Akande, Y., & Slawson, C. (2000, May-June). *Exploring the long-term impact of study abroad: A case study of 50 years of study abroad alumni*. Paper presented at the 52nd annual conference of NAFSA: Association of International Educators, San Diego, CA.

Alexander, R. (Ed.). (2001). *Culture and pedagogy: International comparisons in primary education*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Allen, H., & Herron, C. (2003). A mixed-methodology investigation of the linguistic and affective outcomes of summer study abroad. *Foreign Languages Annals*, *36*, 370–385.

Altbach, P. (1998). *Comparative higher education*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Altbach, P. (2004). Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *10*(1), 3–25.

Altbach, P. (2007). *Journals and higher education: An introduction*. Retrieved September 5, 2007, from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/hejournal

Altbach, P., & Kelly, G. (Eds.). (1986). *New approaches to comparative education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Altbach, P., & Teichler, U. (2001). Internationalization and exchanges in a globalized University. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *5*(1), 5–25.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1989). *Guidelines for international teacher education*. Washington, DC: Author.

American Council on Education. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses*. Washington, DC: Author.

Anderson-Levitt, K. (Ed.). (2003). *Local meanings, global schooling: Anthropology and world culture theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Anderson-Levitt, K. (2004). Reading lessons in Guinea, France, and the United States: Local meanings or global culture? *Comparative Education Review*, *48*, 229–252.

Appadurai, A. (1993). Patriotism and its futures. *Public Culture*, 5, 411–429.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Apple, M., Kenway, J., & Singh, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Globalizing education: Policies, pedagogies and politics*. New York: Peter Lang.

Appleton, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Elementary science teacher education: International perspectives on contemporary issues and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Arnove, R., & Torres, C. (Eds.). (2007). *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Asano, M. (2000). School reform, human rights, and global education. *Theory Into Practice*, 39, 104–110.

Asante, M. (1987). *The Afrocentric idea*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Asante, M. (1988). *Afrocentricity*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Bacon, S. (2002). Learning the rules: Language development and cultural adjustment during study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, 637–646.

Bain, O., & Cummings, W. K. (2005). Where have all the international students gone? *International Educator*, 14(2), 19–26.

Banks, J. (Ed.). (2003). *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barr, D. (2005). Early adolescents' reflections on social justice: Facing history and ourselves in practice and assessment. *Intercultural Education*, 16, 145–160.

Benavot, A., Cha, Y. K., Kamens, D., Meyer, J., & Wong, S. Y. (1991). Knowledge for the masses: World models and national curricula, 1920-1986. *American Sociological Review*, 56(10), 85–101.

Bestor, A. (1985). *Educational wastelands: The retreat from learning in our public schools*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. (Original work published 1953)

Bhalla, V. (2005). International students at Indian Universities [Electronic version]. *International Higher Education*, 41(Fall).

Biddle, B., Good, T., & Goodson, I. (Eds.). (1997). *International handbook of teachers and teaching*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Bolen, M. (2001). Consumerism and U.S. study abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5, 182–200.

Boli, J., Ramirez, F., & Meyer, J. (1985). Explaining the origins and expansion of mass education. *Comparative Education Review*, 29, 145–170.

Bondi, L. (1991). Choice and diversity in school education: Comparing developments in the United Kingdom and the USA. *Comparative Education Review*, 27, 125–135.

Bottery, M., & Wright, N. (2000). *Teachers and the state: Towards a directed profession*. London: Routledge.

Boulding, E. (1988). *Building a global civic culture: Education for an interdependent world*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Brabeck, M. (1994). Human rights education through the "Facing History and Ourselves" program. *Journal of Moral Education*, 23, 333–347.

Bresler, L., & Ardichvili, A. (Eds.). (2002). *Research in international education: Experience, theory, and practice*. New York: Peter Lang.

Bretherton, D., Weston, J., & Zbar, V. (2005). School-based peace building in Sierra Leone. *Theory Into Practice*, 44, 355–362.

Brickman, W. (1956). An introduction. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 7, 292.

Brock-Utne, B. (2000). Peace education in an era of globalization. *Peace Review*, 12(1), 131–138.

Brown, S., & Kysilka, M. (2002). *Applying multicultural and global concepts in the classroom and beyond*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bu, L. (2003). *Making the world like us: Education, cultural expansion, and the American century*. New York: Praeger.

Burbules, N., & Torres, C. (Eds.). (2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Burns, R. J., & Aspeslagh, R. (1996). Peace education and the comparative study of education. In R. J. Burns & R. Aspeslagh (Eds.), *Three decades of peace education around the world: An anthology* (pp. 3–24). New York: Garland.

Cambridge, J. C. (1998). Investigating national and organizational cultures in the context of the international school. In M. C. Hayden & J. J. Thompson (Eds.), *International education: Principles and practice* (pp. 197–211). London: Kogan Page.

Cambridge, J. C. (2002). Global product branding and international education. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *1*, 227–243.

Cambridge, J. (2003). Identifying the globalist and internationalist missions of international schools. *International Schools Journal*, *22*(2), 54–58.

Cambridge, J., & Thompson, J. (2004). Internationalism and globalization as contexts for international education. *Compare*, *34*, 161-175.

Carder, M. (2007). *Bilingualism in international schools*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Carnoy, M. (1974). *Education as cultural imperialism*. New York: D. McKay.

Carnoy, M. (1993). *The new global economy in the information age: Reflections on our changing world*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Carnoy, M., & Rhoten, D. (2002). The meanings of globalization for educational change [Special issue]. *Comparative Education Review*, *46*(1).

Carrim, N., & Keet, A. (2005). Infusing human rights into the curriculum: The case of the South African revised national curriculum. *Perspectives in Education*, *23*, 99–110.

Cates, K. (1990). Teaching for a better world: Global issues and language education. *Language Teacher*, *14*(5), 41–52.

Cheah, P., & Robbins, B. (Eds.). (1998). *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and feeling beyond the nation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cheng, Y. C., Chow, K. W., & Mok, M. M. C. (Eds.). (2004). *Reform of teacher education in the Asia-Pacific in the new millennium*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Cheng, Y. C., Chow, K. W., & Tsui, K. T. (Eds.). (2001). *New teacher education for the future: International perspectives*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Christian, M. (2001). African centered knowledge: A British perspective. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, *25*(1), 12–20.

Coffen, J., & Brennan, K. (2003). African studies abroad: Meaning and impact of America's burgeoning export industry. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *9*, 139–147.

Collet, B. (2007). National identity and public secondary education: Perspectives from the Somali diaspora in Toronto, Canada. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *10*, 131–153.

Collinge, J. (1992). *Peace education in New Zealand*. Malmo, Sweden: Peace Education Miniprints.

Commission on Research in Black Education. (2001). *Vital principles for education, socialization, research, and African people*. Washington, DC: Author.

Conyers, J. (Ed.). (2003). *Afrocentricity and the academy: Essays on theory and practice*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland Press.

Cook, B., Hite, S., & Epstein, E. (2004). Discerning trends, contours, and boundaries in comparative education: A survey of comparativists and their literature. *Comparative Education Review*, *48*, 123–149.

Corrigan, D. (2005). Preparing teachers of chemistry for a global market. In S. Rodrigues (Ed.), *International perspectives on teacher professional development: Changes influenced by politics, pedagogy and innovation* (pp. 35–55). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Cortina, R., & Stromquist, N. (2000). *Distant allies: Promoting education for girls and women in Latin America*. New York: Routledge.

Cotrell, A. B., & Useem, R. H. (1993). TCKs experience prolonged adolescence. *Newslinks*, *13*(1), 1.

Counts, G. (1932). *Dare the school build a new social order?* New York: John Day.

Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crossley, M. (1999). Reconceptualising comparative and international education. *Compare*, *29*, 249–267.

Crossley, M., & Louisy, P. (1994). The changing role of the small state in higher education: A comparison of national and regional initiatives in the Caribbean and the South Pacific. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education*, *24*, 109–126.

Crossley, M., & Tikly, L. (2004). Postcolonial perspectives and comparative and international research in education: A critical introduction. *Comparative Education*, *40*, 147–156.

Crossley, M., & Watson, K. (2003). *Comparative and international research in education: Globalisation, context, and difference*. London: Routledge.

Cummings, W. (1999). The institutions of education: Compare, compare, compare! *Comparative Education Review*, *43*, 413–437.

Currie, N., & Newson, J. (1998). *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cushner, K., & Brennan, S. (Eds.). (2007). *Intercultural student teaching: A bridge to global competence*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

da Silva, T. J. M. (2005). Black people and Brazilian education. In J. King (Ed.), *Black education: A transformative research and action agenda for the new century* (pp. 297–300). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Davies, I., Evans, M., & Reid, A. (2005). Globalising citizenship education?: A critique of "global education" and "citizenship education." *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *53*(1), 66–89.

Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review*, *58*(1), 5–25.

Davies, L., Harber, C., & Dzimadzi, C. (2003). Educational decentralization in Malawi: A study of process. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education*, *33*, 139–154.

Day, C., Fernandez, A., Hauge, T., & Møller, J. (Eds.). (2000). *The life and work of teachers: International perspectives in changing times*. London: Falmer Press.

Dei, G. S., Asgharzadeh, A., Bahador, S. E., & Shahjahan, R. A. (2006). *Schooling and difference in Africa: Democratic challenges in a contemporary context*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

de Moura Castro, C. (2002). The World Bank policies: Damned if you do, damned if you don't. *Comparative Education*, *38*, 387–399.

de Wit, H. (Ed.). (1995). *Strategies of internationalization of higher education: A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

de Wit, H., & Knight, J. (1999). *Quality and internationalisation in higher education*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Dickson, G. (1967). International teacher education research: The new frame of reference for teacher education reform. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *18*, 277–284.

Dimitriadis, G., & McCarthy, C. (2001). *Reading and teaching the postcolonial*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dolby, N., & Dimitriadis, G. (Eds.). (2004). *Learning to labor in new times*. New York: Routledge.

Dolby, N., & Rizvi, F. (Eds.). (2008). *Youth moves: Identities and education in global perspective*. New York: Routledge.

Douglas, C., & Jones-Rikkers, C. (2001). Study abroad programs and American student worldmindedness: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, *31*(1), 55–66.

Duckett, S. J. (2004). Turning right at the crossroads: The Nelson Report's proposals to transform Australia's universities. *Higher Education*, *47*, 211–240.

Education and World Affairs. (1965). *The university looks abroad: Approaches to world affairs at six American universities*. New York: Author.

English, L. (Ed.). (2002). *Handbook of international research in mathematics education*. Mahwah: NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Epstein, E., & Carroll, K. (2005). Abusing ancestors: Historical functionalism and the postmodern deviation in comparative education. *Comparative Education Review*, *49*, 62–88.

Faber, P. (1999). *English teacher education in Europe: New trends and developments*. New York: Peter Lang.

Fail, H., Thompson, J., & Walker, G. (2004). Belonging, identity, and third culture kids. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *3*, 319–338.

Ferguson, P. (1985). Teacher education in Japan: An historical and comparative perspective. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *36*(5), 20–24.

Feuerverger, G. (2001). *Oasis of dreams: Teaching and learning peace in a Jewish-Palestinian village in Israel*. New York: Routledge.

Fink, C. (1980). Peace education and the peace movement since 1815. *Peace and Change*, *6*(1/2), 66–71.

Fraser, B., & Tobin, K. (Eds.). (1998). *International handbook of science education*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Fraser, S. (Ed.). (1965). *Governmental policy and international education*. New York: John Wiley.

Freed, B. (Ed.). (1995). *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1968)

Frolich, N. (2006). Still academic and national: Internationalisation in Norwegian research and higher education. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, *52*, 405–420.

Gabbard, D. (2000). *Knowledge and power in the global economy: Politics and the rhetoric of school reform*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gerner, M., Perry, F., Moselle, M. A., & Archibold, M. (1992). Characteristics of internationally mobile adolescents. *Journal of School Psychology*, *30*, 197–214.

Gift, S., Leo-Rhynie, E., & Moniquette, J. (2006). Quality assurance of transnational education in the English-speaking Caribbean. *Quality in Higher Education*, *12*, 125–133.

Ginsburg, M. B., Cooper, S., Raghu, R., & Zegarra, H. (1990). National and world-systems explanations of educational reform. *Comparative Education Review*, *34*, 464–499.

Ginwright, S. (2004). *Black in school: Afrocentric reform, urban youth, and the promise of hip hop culture*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Global education: Adding a new dimension to social studies [Special issue]. (1977). *Social Education*, *41*(1).

Goodman, C., & Nacht, M. (1991). *Missing the boat: The failure to internationalize American higher education*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Grant, C., & Lei, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Global constructions of multicultural education: Theories and realities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Grossi, V. (2000). *Peace education: An historical overview (1843-1939)*. Malmo, Sweden: Peace Education Miniprints.

Gumbert, E. (1990). *Fit to teach: Teacher education in international education*. Atlanta: College of Education, Georgia State University.

Hall, K. (2002). *Lives in translation: Sikh youth as British citizens*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (2003). *Teaching in the knowledge society: Education in the age of insecurity*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Harris, I. (1996). Peace education in an urban school district in the United States. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *71*(3), 63–83.

Harris, I., & Morrison, M. L. (2003). *Peace education* (2nd ed.). Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company.

Hart, P. (2003). *Teachers' thinking in environmental education: Consciousness and responsibility*. New York: Peter Lang.

Harvard Educational Review. (1981). A special issue: Education as transformation: Identity, change, and development [Special issue]. *Harvard Educational Review*, *51*(1).

Hayden, M. C., Levy, J., & Thompson, J. J. (Eds.). (2007). *The Sage handbook of research in international education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hayden, M. C., & Thompson, J. J. (1995). International schools and international education: A relationship reviewed. *Oxford Review of Education*, *21*, 327–345.

Hayden, M. C., & Thompson, J. J. (Eds.). (1998). *International education: Principles and practice*. London: Kogan Page.

Hayden, M. C., & Thompson, J. J. (Eds.). (2000). *International schools and international education: Improving teaching, management, and quality*. London: Kogan Page.

Hayden, M. C., Thompson, J. J., & Walker, G. (Eds.). (2002). *International education in practice*. London: Kogan Page.

Haywood, T. (2002). An international dimension to management and leadership skills for international education. In M. C. Hayden, J. J. Thompson, & G. Walker (Eds.), *International education in practice* (pp. 170–184). London: Kogan Page.

Held, D., & McGraw, A. (2003). *The global transformations reader: An introduction to the globalization debate* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Henry, M., Lingard, B., Rizvi, F., & Taylor, S. (1999). Working with/against globalization in education. *Journal of Education Policy*, *14*, 85–97.

Hill, I. (2000). Internationally-minded schools. *International Schools Journal*, *20*(1), 24–37.

Hill, I. (2001). Early stirrings: The beginnings of the international education movement. *International Schools Journal*, *20*(2), 11–22.

Hill, I. (2002). The history of international education: An International Baccalaureate perspective. In M. C. Hayden, J. J. Thompson, & G. Walker (Eds.), *International education in practice* (pp. 18–29). London: Kogan Page.

Hilliard, A. (1995). *The maroon within us: Selected essays on African American community socialization*. Baltimore: Black Classic Press.

Hoffman, D. (1999). Culture and comparative education: Toward decentering and recentering the discourse. *Comparative Education Review*, *99*, 464–489.

Holden, C. (2000). Learning for democracy: From world studies to global citizenship. *Theory Into Practice*, *39*(2), 74–80.

Howlett, C. (1982). The pragmatist as pacifist: John Dewey's views on peace education. *Teachers College Record*, *83*, 435–451.

Huang, F. (2006). Internationalization of curricula in higher education institutions in comparative perspective: Case studies of China, Japan, and the Netherlands. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, *51*, 521–539.

Hunter, E. J. (1982). *Families under the flag: A review of military family literature*. New York: Praeger.

Hursh, D. (2007). Assessing No Child Left Behind and the rise of neoliberal education policies. *American Educational Research Journal*, *44*, 493–518.

Ichimoto, T. (2004). Ambivalent "selves" in transition: A case study of Japanese women studying in Australian universities. *Intercultural Studies*, *25*, 247–269.

International Baccalaureate Organization. (2008). *International education research database*. Retrieved February 19, 2008, from http://research.ibo.org/

Jacobson, J. (2003). Foreign-student enrollment stagnates. *The Chronicle of Higher Education 50*(11), A1.

Jaworski, B., Wood, T., & Dawson, S. (Eds.). (1999). *Mathematics teacher education: Critical international perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.

Johnson, M. (1998). *Trends in peace education*. (Eric Digest ED 417123)

Jones, P. (1998). Globalisation and internationalism: Democratic prospects for world education. *Comparative Education*, *34*, 143–155.

Jonietz, P. L., & Harris, D. (Eds.). (1991). *World yearbook of education 1991: International schools and international education*. London: Kogan Page.

Jurasak, R., Lamson, H., & O'Maley, P. (1996). Ethnographic learning while studying abroad [Electronic version]. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *2*.

King, J. (Ed.). (2005). *Black education: A transformative research and action agenda for the new century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

King, K. (1971). *Pan-Africanism and education: A study of race philanthropy and education in the southern state of America and East Africa*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon.

King, K., & McGrath, S. (2002). *Globalization, enterprise, and knowledge: Education, training, and development in Africa*. Wallingford, UK: Symposium Books.

Kisembo, P. (1993). *A popular version of Yash Tandon's militarism and peace education in Africa*. Nairobi, Kenya: African Association for Literacy and Adult Education.

Klassen, F., & Collier, J. (1972). *Innovation Now!: International perspectives on innovation in teacher education*. Washington, DC: International Council on Education for Teacher.

Klein, R. (1960). Teacher education: U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *11*(1), 20–28.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and ratio-nales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8, 5–31.

Lam, W. S. E. (2006). Culture and learning in the context of globalization: Research directions. *Review of Research in Education*, 30, 213–237.

Lambert, R. (Ed.). (1980). New directions in international education [Special issue]. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 449(1).

Langford, M. (1998). Global nomads, third culture kids and international schools. In M. C. Hayden & J. J. Thompson (Eds.), *International education: Principles and practice* (pp. 28–43). London: Kogan Page.

Lantieri, L., & Patti, J. (1996). *Waging peace in our schools*. Boston: Beacon.

Law, W. (1995). The role of the state in higher education reform: Mainland China and Taiwan. *Comparative Education Review*, 39, 322–354.

Leavitt, H. (Ed.). (1992). *Issues and problems in teacher education: An international handbook*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Leeman, Y., & Reid, C. (2006). Multi/intercultural education in Australia and the Netherlands. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education*, 36, 57–72.

Levinson, B. (1999). "Una etapa siempre dificil": Concepts of adolescence and sec-ondary education in Mexico. *Comparative Education Review*, 43, 129–161.

Levinson, B. (2002). *Ethnography and education policy across the Americas*. New York: Praeger.

Lewin, K., Samuel, M., & Sayed, Y. (Eds.). (2003). *Changing patterns of teacher edu-cation in South Africa: Policy, practice, and prospects*. Sandown, South Africa: Heinemann Publishers.

Lewin, K., & Stuart, J. (2003a). Insights into the policy and practice of teacher educa-tion in low income countries: The multi-site teacher education research project. *British Educational Research Journal*, 29, 691–707.

Lewin, K., & Stuart, J. (2003b). *Researching teacher education: New perspectives on practice, performance, and policy: Multi-site teacher education research project (MUSTER) synthesis report*. London: Department for International Development.

Limage, L. (2000). Education and Muslim identity: The case of France. *Comparative Education*, 36(1), 73–94.

Liu, J., Ross, H., & Kelly, D. (Eds.). (2000). *The ethnographic eye: Interpretive stud-ies of education in China*. New York: Falmer Press.

Loughran, J. (2004). *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher edu-cation practices*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Luke, A., Luke, C., & Graham, P. (in press). Globalisation, corporatism, and critical language education. *International Multilingual Research Journal*.

Lukose, R. (2005a). Consuming globalization: Youth and gender in Kerala, India. *Journal of Social History*, 38, 915–935.

Lukose, R. (2005b). Empty citizenship: Protesting policies in the era of globalization. *Cultural Anthropology*, 20, 506–534.

Lykins, R. (1986). Children of the third culture. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 22(2), 39–43.

MacDonald, J. (2006). The international schools industry: Examining international schools through an economic lens. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 5, 191–213.

Marchant, K. H., & Medway, F. J. (1987). Adjustment and achievement associated with mobility in military families. *Psychology in the Schools*, 24, 289–294.

Marginson, S. (2002). Nation-building universities in a global environment: The case of Australia. *Higher Education*, 43, 409–428.

Marginson, S. (2004). National and global competition in higher education. *Australian Educational Researcher*, *31*(2), 1–28.

Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance, and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Marginson, S., & Mollis, M. (2001). "The door opens and the tiger leaps": Theories and reflexivities of comparative education for a global millennium. *Comparative Education Review*, *45*, 581–615.

Marginson, S., & Sawir, E. (2006). University leaders' strategies in the global environment: A comparative study of Universitas Indonesia and the Australian National University. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, *52*, 343–373.

Marsden, W. (1997). Environmental education: Historical roots, comparative perspectives, and current issues in Britain and the United States. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, *13*, 92–113.

Mazama, A. (2007). *Africa in the 21st century: Toward a new future*. New York: Routledge.

Mazzarol, T., Soutar, G., & Seng, M. (2003). The third wave: Future trends in international education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *17*, 90–99.

McCabe, L. (2001). Globalization and internationalization: The impact on education abroad programs. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *5*, 138–145.

McCaig, N. M. (1994). Growing up with a world view: Nomad children develop multicultural skills. *Foreign Service Journal*, *9*, 32–39.

McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2004). *Teaching against global capitalism and the new imperialism: A critical pedagogy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Meiras, S. (2004). International education in Australian universities: Understandings, dimensions and problems. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *26*, 371–380.

Melby, J. (Ed.). (1961). The rising demand for international education [Special issue]. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *335*(1).

Merryfield, M. (1991). Preparing American secondary social studies teachers to teach with a global perspective: A status report. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *42*(1), 3–10.

Merryfield, M. (1996). *Making connections between multicultural and global education: Teacher educators and teacher education programs*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Merryfield, M. (1998). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: Studies of teachers' thinking and practice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *26*, 342–379.

Merryfield, M. (2000). Why aren't teachers being prepared to teach for diversity, equity, and global interconnectedness? A study of lived experiences in the makings of multicultural and global educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *16*, 429–443.

Merryfield, M. (2005). *Social studies and the world: Teaching global perspectives*. Silver Spring, MD: National Council for the Social Studies.

Meyer, J., Kamens, D., & Benavot, A. (1992). *School knowledge for the masses: World models and national primary curricular categories in the twentieth century*. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Meyer, J. W., & Hannan, M. T. (1979). *National development and the world system*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Montessori, M. (1972). *Education and peace*. Chicago: Henry Regnery.

Moon, B., Vlasceanu, L., & Barrows, L. C. (2003). *Institutional approaches to teacher education within higher education in Europe: Current models and new developments*. Bucharest, Romania: UNESCO: CEPES.

Morris, P., & Williamson, J. (Eds.). (2000). *Teacher education in the Asia-Pacific region: A comparative study*. New York: Garland.

Morrison, J., Merrick, B., Higgs, S., & LeMatais, J. (2005). Researching the performance of international students in the UK. *Studies in Higher Education*, *30*, 327–337.

Mosselson, J. (2006). *Roots and routes: Bosnian adolescent refugees in New York City*. New York: Peter Lang.

Mundy, K. (1998). Educational multilateralism and world (dis)order. *Comparative Education Review*, *42*, 448–479.

Mundy, K. (2006). Education for All and the new development compact. *International Review of Education*, *52*(1), 23–48.

Murakami-Ramahlo, E. (2002). Globally mobile: Talking with Ruth Useem and Anne Baker Cottrell about cross-national educational experiences. *International Educator*, *11*(2), 24–27.

Murphy, E. (1990). *ESL: A handbook for teachers and administrators in international schools*. Clevedon, UK: Multlingual Matters.

Murphy, E. (2003). Monolingual international schools and the young non-English speaking child. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *2*(1), 25–45.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform: A report to the nation and the Secretary of Education*. Washington, DC: Department of Education.

Noah, H., & Eckstein, M. (1969). *Toward a science of comparative education*. New York: Macmillan.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (Ed.). (2005). *Educating citizens for global awareness*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nussbaum, M. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *21*, 289–303.

Oakman, D. (2005). *Facing Asia: A history of the Colombo Plan*. Canberra, Australia: Pandanus Books.

O'Connor, E. (1982). Global education: A report on developments in Western Europe. *Theory Into Practice*, *21*, 224–227.

O'Meara, P., Mehlinger, H., & Newman, R. (2001). *Changing perspectives on international education*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development and UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2001). *Teachers for tomorrow's schools: Analysis of the world education indicators*. Paris: Author.

Osunde, E. (1986-1987). Global education in Nigerian secondary schools. *International Journal of Social Education*, *1*(3), 72–77.

Page, J. (2004). Peace education: Exploring some philosophical foundations. *International Review of Education*, *50*(1), 3–15.

Palmer, J. (1998). *Environmental education in the 21st century: Theory, practice, progress, and promise*. New York: Routledge.

Parker, F. (1971). UNESCO's aid to teacher education in Africa. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *48*, 167–171.

Paulston, R. (1980). Education as anti-structure: Non-formal education in social and ethnic movements. *Comparative Education*, *16*, 55–66.

Payne, P. (2006). Environmental education and curriculum theory. *Journal of Environmental Education*, *37*(2), 25–35.

Perry, T., Steele, C., & Hilliard, A. (2003). *Young, gifted, and Black: Promoting high achievement among African-American adolescents*. Boston: Beacon.

Peters, M. (2005). *Education, globalization, and the state in the age of terrorism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Pike, G. (Ed.). (2000). Global education: Viewed from around the world [Special issue]. *Theory Into Practice*, *39*(2).

Pimpa, N. (2003). The influence of peers and student recruitment agencies on Thai students' choices of international education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *7*, 178–192.

Piper, B., Dryden-Peterson, S., & Kim, Y. S. (2006). *International education for the millennium: Toward access, equity, and quality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Pollock, D. C., & Van Reken, R. E. (2001). *Third culture kids: The experience of growing up among worlds*. Boston: Nicholas Brealey Publishing/Intercultural Press.

Popkewitz, T. (1980). Global education as a slogan system. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *10*, 303–316.

Preece, J., & Mosweunyane, D. (2006). What citizenship responsibility means to Botswana's young adults: Implications for adult education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education*, *36*(1), 5–21.

Qing, T. (2004). Historical review of environmental education in China. *Chinese Education and Society*, *37*(3), 34–38.

Reardon, B. (1993). *Women and peace: Feminist visions of global security*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Reardon, B. (2000). Peace education: A review and projection. In B. Moon, S. Brown, & M. Ben-Peretz (Eds.), *Routledge international companion to education* (pp. 397–425). New York: Routledge.

Reardon, B. (2002). Human rights and the global campaign for peace education. *International Review of Education*, *48*, 283–284.

Rhoads, R., & Torres, C. (2006). *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Rickover, H. G. (1959). *Education and freedom*. New York: E. P. Dutton.

Rivarola, M., & Fuller, B. (1999). Nicaragua's experiment to decentralize schools: Contrasting views of parents, teachers, and directors. *Comparative Education Review*, *43*, 489–522.

Rizvi, F. (2004). Rethinking globalization and education after September 11. *Comparative Education*, *40*, 157–171.

Rizvi, F. (2005). Rethinking brain drain in the era of globalization. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Education*, *25*, 175–193.

Ruther, N. (2002). *Barely there, powerfully present: Thirty years of U.S. policy on international higher education*. New York: Routledge.

Scanlon, D. (1960). *International education: A documentary history*. New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications.

Scanlon, D., & Shields, J. (1968). *Problems and prospects in international education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Schaetti, B. (1996). Phoenix rising: a question of cultural identity. In C. Smith (Ed.), *Strangers at home: Essays on the effects of living overseas and coming "home" to a strange land* (pp. 177–188). Bayside, NY: Aletheia Publications.

Schneider, A. I. (2003). *Internationalizing teacher education: What can be done?* Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

Schultz, L., Barr, D., & Selman, R. (2001). The value of a developmental approach to evaluating character development programmes: An outcome study of "Facing History and Ourselves." *Journal of Moral Education*, *30*(1), 3–27.

Schulz-Zander, R., & Fankhänel, K. (1997). Learning networks in German schools and teacher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *20*(1), 61–70.

Scott, A., & Freeman-Moir, J. (Eds.). (2000). *Tomorrow's teachers: International and critical perspectives on teacher education*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Canterbury University Press.

Sears, C. (1998). *Second language students in mainstream classrooms: A handbook for teachers in international schools*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Sehoole, M. T. C. (2005). *Democratizing higher education policy: Constraints of reform in post apartheid South Africa*. New York: Routledge.

Selby, D. (1982). World studies and the core curriculum. In D. Hicks & C. Townley (Eds.), *Teaching world studies: An introduction to global perspectives in the curriculum* (pp. 55–71). London: Longman.

Shane, H. (1969). *The United States and international education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shannon, E. (1995). Reflections on the meaning of study abroad [Electronic version]. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *1*.

Shapira, I. (2006, December 17). Educators, parents eager for an edge opt for IB classes in grade schools. *The Washington Post*, p. A1.

Sharpes, D. (1988). *International perspectives on teacher education*. London: Routledge.

Shimahara, N., & Holowinsky, I. (Eds.). (1995). *Teacher education in industrialized nations: Issues in changing social contexts*. New York: Garland.

Simon, U., Cook, A. S., & Fritz, J. (1990). Factors influencing the adjustment process of foreign school-age children residing in the United States. *International Education*, *19*(2), 5–12.

Smith, C. (1991). *The absentee American: Repatriates' perspectives on America*. Bayside, NY: Aletheia Publications.

Smolentseva, A. (2004). International students in Russia [Electronic version]. *International Higher Education*, *40*.

Smyth, J. (2000). *Teachers' work in a globalizing economy*. London: Falmer Press.

Spindler, G. (1955). *Education and anthropology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Spindler, G., & Spindler, L. (2000). *Fifty years of anthropology and education, 1950-2000*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Spring, J. (1998). *Education and the rise of the global econ*omy. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Spring, J. (2006). *Pedagogies of globalization: The rise of the educational security state*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Spring, J. (2007). *A new paradigm for global school systems: Education for a long and happy life*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stambach, A. (2000). *Lessons from Mount Kilimanjaro: Schooling, community, and gender in East Africa*. New York: Routledge.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2004a). Decentralization and recentralization reform in Mongolia: Tracing the swing of the pendulum. *Comparative Education*, *40*(1), 29–53.

Steiner-Khamsi, G. (Ed.). (2004b). *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2006). The development turn in comparative education. *European Education*, *38*(3), 19–47.

Stevens, P. (2007). Researching race/ethnicity and educational inequality in English secondary schools: A critical review of the research literature between 1980 and 2005. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*, 147–185.

Stomfay-Stitz, A. (1993). *Peace education in America, 1828-1990*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Stromquist, N. (2002). *Education in a globalized world*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Stromquist, N., & Monkman, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Suárez, D. (2007). Education professionals and the construction of human rights education. *Comparative Education Review*, *51*(1), 48–70.

Suárez-Orozco, M. (2001). Globalization, immigration, and education: The research agenda. *Harvard Educational Review*, *71*, 345–365.

Suárez-Orozco, M., & Qin-Hilliard, D. (2004). *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sutton, M. (1998-1999). Global education and national interest: The last fifty years. *International Journal of Social Education*, *13*(2), 6–28.

Sylvester, R. (2002). The "first" international school. In M. C. Hayden, J. J. Thompson, & G. Walker (Eds.), *International education in practice* (pp. 3–17). London: Kogan Page.

Synott, J. (1996). Australian aboriginal constructions of humans, society, and nature in relation to peace education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *71*(3), 84–94.

Tatto, M. T. (2006). Education reform and the global regulation of teachers' education, development and work: A cross-cultural analysis. *International Journal of Educational Research 45*, 231–241.

Tedick, D. J. (Ed.). (2005). *Second language teacher education: International perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Thelin, B. (1996). Early tendencies of peace education in Sweden. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *71*(3), 95–110.

Thomas, E. (Ed.). (2002). *Teacher education: Dilemmas and prospects*. London: Kogan Page.

Tibbitts, F. (2002). Understanding what we do: Emerging models for human rights education. *International Review of Education*, *48*, 159–171.

Tibbitts, F., & Fritzsche, P. (2006). (Eds.). International perspectives of human rights education [Special issue]. *Journal for Social Science Education*, *7*(1).

Tikly, L. (2001). Globalisation and education in the postcolonial world: Towards a conceptual framework. *Comparative Education*, *37*, 151–171.

Tisher, R., & Wideen, M. (1990). *Research in teacher education: International perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.

Tucker, J. (1991). *Global education comes to Russia*. (ED352284)

Tucker, J., & Cistone, P. (1991) Global perspectives for teachers: An urgent priority. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *42*(1), 3–10.

Tucker, R. A. (1989). Growing up a world away. *Christianity Today*, *33*(3), 17–21.

Tye, K. A. (1999). *Global education: A worldwide movement*. Orange, CA: Interdependence Press.

Tye, K. A. (2003). Global education as a worldwide movement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *85*, 165–168.

UNESCO. (2006). *Teachers and educational quality: Monitoring global needs for 2015*. Montreal, Quebec: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

University of Minnesota. (2005). *Internationalizing undergraduate education: Integrating study abroad into the curriculum*. Minneapolis: Author.

Useem, R. (1976). Third culture kids. *Today's Education*, *65*, 103–105.

Van Hoof, H., & Verbeeten, M. (2005). Wine is for drinking, water is for washing: Student opinions about international exchange programs. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *9*(1), 42–61.

Vestal, T. (1994). *International education: Its history and promise for today*. New York: Praeger.

Vrasidas, C., Zemblyas, M., Evangorou, M., Avraamidou, L., & Aravi, C. (2007). ICT as a tool for environmental education, peace, and reconciliation. *Educational Media International*, *44*, 129–140.

Vulliamy, G. (2004). The impact of globalisation on qualitative research in comparative and international education. *Compare*, *34*, 261–284.

Wagner, K., & Magistrale, T. (1995). *Writing across culture: An introduction to study abroad and the writing process*. New York: Peter Lang.

Walker, G. (2000). Connecting the national to the global. In M. C. Hayden & J. J. Thompson (Eds.), *International schools and international education* (pp. 193–204). London: Kogan Page.

Watson, K. (2007). Language, education and ethnicity: Whose rights will prevail in an age of globalisation? *International Journal of Educational Development*, *27*, 252–265.

Weaver-Hightower, M. (2003). The "boy turn" in research on gender and education. *Review of Educational Research*, *73*, 371–498.

Welch, A. (2001). Globalisation, post-modernity and the state: Comparative education facing the third millennium. *Comparative Education*, *37*, 474–492.

Welch, A., Yang, R., & Wolhuter, C. (2004). Internationalising a rural, historically Black South African university. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*, 317–331.

Wessells, M. (2005). Child soldiers, peace education, and postconflict reconstruction for peace. *Theory Into Practice*, *44*, 363–369.

Whalen, B. (1996). Learning outside the home culture: An anatomy and ecology of memory [Electronic version]. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Study Abroad*, *2*.

Wickstrom, D. L., & Andrews, L. A. (1993). Personality characteristics of staff members at selected overseas missionary boarding schools. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, *21*(1), 74–85.

Wilson, D. (1994). Comparative and international education: Fraternal or Siamese twins? A preliminary genealogy of our twin fields. *Comparative Education Review*, *38*, 449–486.

Wright, C. (2005). Black educational experiences in Britain: Reflections on the global educational landscape. In J. King (Ed.), *Black education: A transformative research and action agenda for the new century* (pp. 291–296). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Yamato, Y., & Bray, M. (2006). Economic development and the marketplace for education. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *5*(1), 57–82.

Yates, A. (1970). *Current problems of teacher education: Report of a meeting of international experts*. Hamburg, Germany: UNESCO Institute for Education.

Yin, V. (2006). International curriculum offerings: How are they addressing the aspi-rations of South-East Asian students? *IB Research Notes*, *6*(1), 2–6.

Zeichner, K., & Dahlström, L. (1999). *Democratic teacher education reform in Africa: The case of Namibia*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Zine, J. (2007). Safe havens or religious "ghettos"? Narratives of Islamic schooling in Canada. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *10*(1), 71–92.

Authors

NADINE DOLBY is an associate professor of curriculum studies and affiliated faculty in cultural foundations, College of Education, Purdue University, BRNG 4146, 100 N. University, West Lafayette, IN 47907; e-mail *ndolby@purdue.edu*. Her research exam-ines international education and higher education in relationship to globalization.

ALIYA RAHMAN recently completed her master's degree in curriculum studies at Purdue University. Her research examines postcolonial and poststructural theories in curriculum studies.