Working Papers Series

International and Global Issues for Research

Using Bernstein's notion of the pedagogization of knowledge as a

framework for analyzing education in a globalizing world.

Daryl York

No. 2016/7 December 2016

Abstract

Identifying a need for a broad and unifying conceptual framework, this assignment considers use of Bernstein's notion of the pedagogization of knowledge to frame analysis of education in a globalizing world (EGW). Preliminary analysis using the proposed analytical framework suggests that it may have potential for nuanced description of the globalizing endeavour of any type of school; it suggests that education as a whole is more or less susceptible, on certain fronts (or at certain levels), to globalizing influence; and that each school (or school system), depending on its determination to embrace or resist has more or less will to engage with globalization. This idea could be tested in further research, perhaps in an empirical study involving a sample of schools of different types in a given area.

Introduction

In a world increasingly characterized by what Matus & McCarthy (2003:73) describe as "the intensification and rapidity of movement and migration of people, ideas, and economic and cultural capital across national boundaries", or globalization, study of globalization in education is yet to be characterized by the determination of an academic field that is unified: Hayden, Levy & Thompson (2007:1) refer to incorporation of elements of international education within national systems being parallel to education in 'international schools' but without suggesting that the two are fundamentally connected; Hill (2007) appeals for a scrutiny of common ground between international and multicultural education; Marshall (2007a:38) notes that the two significant strands of, on one hand, provision of a global dimension to mainstream teaching and, on the other, education in international schools, have in academic debate hitherto been kept separate. The fact that there are numerous other terms, and other areas of study, identifiable within a general survey of education in a globalizing world - for example: "education for international mindedness" (Hill 2006) (Haywood 2007); "cosmopolitanism" (Nussbaum 2002, "education for cosmopolitanism" Gunesch 2004, "cosmopolitan learning" (Rizvi 2009); "translocalist internationalization" (Chan and Dymock 2008) "global education" (Marshall 2007b:356); "international schooling" (Bates 2011) - serves to highlight the fractured nature of the overall field, which Cambridge (2011:131) describes as contested amid 'economic, political and socio-cultural dilemmas'.

This assignment will suggest that, in order to obtain a broader account of how education is changing due to globalization, there is a need for an approach that is more unifying. It will argue that determination of categories such as "international education" may be premature, and may have in the past contributed to a splintering that hampers a more macro level consideration of the changes being undergone; for example, from the viewpoint of an educator working in national schools, it can be

argued that certain considerations of the term "IE" have led to the privileging of a narrow sense that cannot take into full account educational changes outside the world of 'international schools'.

Rather than specify the existence of an entity "IE" before attempting to determine the field it is supposed to describe, this assignment will advocate developing an account of education that is broad enough to describe all education in a world that is itself becoming more international, i.e. an account of education in a globalizing world. There will be a brief analysis of the descriptive limitations of "IE", followed by consideration of how Bernstein's elucidation of rules governing the pedagogization of knowledge may lend itself to the development of a comprehensive account of education in a globalizing world".

1.   Limits to the sense potential of "International Education"

Of any terms that may suggest themselves in a consideration of education in a globalizing world (EGW), the obvious alternative term to education confined to the national, with usage stretching back to the nineteenth century (Sylvester 2007), is "International education" (IE). Today, "IE" is widely used in numerous forums, but the extent to which there can be said to exist a field of study called IE is debatable. This section will attempt to demonstrate that the sense potential of IE is limited both by the term's inherent polysemy and by, when the relative weight of various contending senses is considered, a certain bias that can be seen to emanate from the inordinate appeal of one particular connotation.

1.1   Polysemy inherent in the expression "International education"

Although the tendency of the expression "International education" to elude straightforward definition is well documented, brief systematic review here will illuminate. It is curious that qualification of 'education' by 'international' leads not to greater but less specificity of signification, as follows. Functional-systemic linguists (see for example Halliday 1984) would argue that 'education' stands as a grammatical metaphor for the process by which educators educate people; in other word, readers of the word 'education' will infer actors - a subject and an object - for the verb 'educate'. According to a now changing but long-standing paradigm, whereby education was equated with the system of education of a particular state, the actors concerned would, naturally, be assumed to be the educators and the learners of that state. However, the placing next to 'education' of 'international' can be seen to preclude those previous assumptions about agency, while opening up the possibility of any of the following three, equally likely, formulations:

i.   <u>International educators</u> educate people

ii.   Educators educate <u>international people</u>

iii.   Educators <u>educate</u> people <u>internationally</u>

Here, ambiguity stems from the fact that 'international' can be bracketed with either the subject ('international people'), the object ('international people'), or the verb ('educate internationally'). This rudimentary linguistic inspection may be used to frame further ambiguity that readily becomes evident in the literature as follows.

i.   <u>International educators</u> educate people

This first formulation, of 'international people' as subject, may be taken to correspond to comparative studies between education in different countries; see Bray (2007) for a discussion of 'international education' versus 'comparative education'. Cambridge and Thompson (2004) have distinguished between, on the one hand, this sense of comparison between different (national) educators viewed from a perspective that is international and on the other the enactment of education by entities that are international, one manifestation of which would be so-called 'international schools' (see next).

ii.   Educators educate <u>international people</u>

Here, 'international people' as object may firstly be seen to refer to the heterogeneous national background student populations of so called 'international schools' (discussed further in 1.2). Secondly, it may be seen to refer to schools in national systems with learners of heterogeneous national background; see for example Hill (2007) who has contrasted multicultural education anchored in state systems of education with education in so-called international schools. Thirdly, there is the sense identified by Lowe (1998) of international developmental education. Fourthly, 'international people' may be seen to be a (euphemistic?) synonym for "***foreign*** people" as evidenced by this usage in an article in the Age (Das 2010) newspaper:

> *"AUSTRALIA'S international education industry has suffered another massive blow with the collapse of eight English language colleges, leaving 2300 foreign students around the country in the dark over their future."*

iii.   Educators <u>educate</u> people <u>internationally</u>

This third formulation, where it is the process 'education' itself that is qualified, could be taken to refer to education with any international dimension offered to any student population, whether mono-national or multinational. Hill (2007) states that international education is not confined to international schools; furthermore, it is straightforward to find on the public record significant numbers of schools in various countries that, while not 'international' by traditional definition, state their aim to offer to their student population an education that is 'international' in nature. Such schools have, for example, obtained accreditation by organizations such as the Council of International Schools (CIS): the greatest

number of CIS accredited schools in any one country is in Australia, where there are forty, of which only one is, 'essentially', an 'international' school (CIS 2009). Similarly, a large number of schools attached to national systems seek, and have obtained, authorization to offer nominally international educational programs, such as the three provided by the International Baccalaureate (IB) organization. In the US alone, of the 1300 schools authorized to offer at least one IB program, a mere 70 are known as international (IBO 2011). Marshall (2007b, 2011) has described much proposed and implemented international dimensions to the education on offer in schools that are defined essentially as national schools in the UK.

1.2   Difficulties in evaluating the distinct significations of IE in a manner that is objective

In this section it is argued that there are certain factors, ontological and semantic, that militate against the relative weight of these various contending senses being compared objectively.

1.2.1   An ontological blind spot

A definition of a school as 'international' which depends on **constitutional** concerns, such as the school name or the number of nationalities counted amongst the student population, may readily be seen to be one that is essentialist, grounded in a **realist** ontology. According to such an ontological view, so-called international schools with their heterogeneous populations, can be seen to be 'out there', distinctly identifiable (in their distinct premises) thus definable ostensibly. Such essentialist definition may be contrasted with what Sen (1985) calls self-determining identity, that which sociolinguists (e.g. Schiffrin 2006:3) term an 'anti-essentialist' or 'performed' view of identity. Within a more nominalist ontology, it is possible to consider how an international identity may be assumed, lived, performed by a school through the actions it chooses to take, and positions it elects to adopt. In this vein, the notion of international-mindedness (Hill 2006, Haywood 2007, IBPYP 1999), which defines internationalism in schools by the type of young person that they aim to produce, and international education as a performed attitude can be described (even if not framed by this term by the authors) as anti-essentialist. Hill (2006:96) argues that "it is the attitude of mind reflected in both the teaching and administration of the school, rather than the cultural composition or location, which is important". This might be termed international education that is aspirational, to be seen more readily in a nominalist ontology.

Indeed, attempts to ontologize 'aspirational' IE will be hampered by the fact that the 'constitutional' sense, within a more ostensibly realist ontology, forms the more established paradigm. Thus there is a natural tendency within the field of education characterized by so-called international schools, to conflate imaginings of international education to the educational offerings within so-called international schools. From such a realist viewpoint, the (nominalist) construction of performed

internationalism will be invisible. Even for an audience receptive to the possibility of an alternative ontology, any framing of discussion of the possibility of IE existing outside the confines of schools that are known as 'international schools' will, through the necessity to challenge assumptions, require extra linguistic effort. This extra linguistic effort (known as "markedness") manifests itself as an excessive obligation to explain itself (as in "methinks he protesteth too much"). The result is that not all debate on international education is framed in terms that are linguistically even terms. Compare the pithiness and immediacy of the expression: "*It may be proposed that international education takes pace in international schools*" (Cambridge 2011:130) with the circumlocution deemed necessary by the International Baccalaureate (2007) in its two page long justification for a more performed view of IE (or with the contortions the current author is going through). Even the reference by Marshall (in the introduction above) to 'mainstream' can thus be seen (given that, in most debate on education, 'mainstream' would anyway be the default tacitly assumed norm) to be marked, showing that the writer is attempting to describe something outside the established paradigm.

1.2.2   A bias emanating from an inordinate appeal and a facile attractiveness of the term "IE"

Furthermore, it can be argued that there is an inordinate appeal surrounding the term "IE", which may contribute to uncritical uptake. One feature of the expression is that it sounds good, both phonetically (its stress pattern and length lend it an authoritative ring), and semantically, in that it seems to promise much: 'international' connotes *inter alia* liberalness of commerce, travel and socialization; to the ear of the education community (including parents, and schools interested in attracting them) it would also sound desirably suggestive of the globalizing *Zeitgeist*. It can be argued further that the attractiveness and popularity of the "IE" may, to some degree, both mask **and** stem from the expression's inherent paradox: 'education' has traditionally suggested a process of socialization into **one** culture, whereas "International" implies a relationship between **several** cultures. In a discussion of such internal paradox (in the expression "sustainable development"), Stables (1996) argues that the inbuilt vagueness of such terms results in ambiguity potential and appeal at the subjective level, thereby obscuring objective evaluation.

Thus the inordinately attractive, slogan like nature of "IE", in combination with the absence of a shared justifiable understanding of the expression 'IE', may be seen to contribute to a certain ontological blindness that strengthens a tendency to associate almost automatically the notion of international education with that of international schools. This automatic association leads to an unwitting promotion of a narrower, 'constitutional', sense that disprivileges discussion of internationalism that is 'aspirational'; where discussion of aspirational internationalism does exist, its excessive obligation to explain itself stalls debate. This is merely one example of how the coupling of 'international' with 'education' may be seen to pre-empt full consideration of some elements of education in a globalizing

world. Now, in contrast to the pre-globalized past, there is a need for a framework that can explain education in a globalizing world in a broader and deeper fashion.

2   Bernstein's notion of pedagogization of knowledge as a framework of conceptualization of Education in a Globalizing world

In order to escape the confines of the term "international education" and develop a conceptual framework for a broad explanation of education in a globalizing world, there will now be consideration of the theorization of Bernstein, of which the potential usefulness of Bernstein's work in analyzing systems of education in a globalizing world has described by inter alia Castells (2000), Moore (2004) and Solomon, who states (1999:266) that certain interest in the work of Bernstein can be related a new

> *'globalized need for an explanatory framework and for tools to understand and analyze contemporary changes occurring in work, in education….'*

According to Singh (2002:572), Bernstein's theoretical project is of enormous significance to an analysis of the production and reproduction of knowledge in a global society. This is not necessarily to suggest that there is anything particularly 'global' in the work of Bernstein; rather, his detailed description of how knowledge and other desirable qualities are transmitted can be seen to claim universality:

> *"I think like Durkheim one can identify and make explicit the social base of the pedagogic relation, its various contingent realizations, the agents and agencies of its enactments. One can begin to formulate a language for the description of the production and reproduction of its discourses. At a more general level such a study connects with the maintenance and change of the knowledge base of society, and crucially with the maintenance and change of modalities of symbolic control, especially those implicated in the process of cultural reproduction."*
>
> *(Bernstein 2001:364)*

The expression 'pedagogic relation' here must seen to be part of Bernstein's theoretical aim to engage with that which lies **behind** education; immediately in this quote we grasp that Bernstein is interested not so much in forms of culture reproduced, or knowledge transmitted, but rather in how or by what that transmission is driven. As Solomon (1999:267) makes explicit in his interview with Bernstein, by the term 'pedagogy', Bernstein seems to imply a higher level of abstraction than 'practices of upbringing and education'; rather he means to imply 'devices that will generate differing practices, producing different sorts of identities'. Bernstein (1990:166) argues that 'pedagogic discourse' is itself no more than a relay for power relations external to itself; a relay whose form has no consequences for what is relayed.' Moore (2004) glosses this argument as the question seemingly asked by BB of how 'to make a distinction between a relay and what is relayed'.

Bernstein manages to distinguish between the two by determining that his use of 'pedagogy', and 'pedagogic', will denote a 'meta' level of analysis, used in order to analyze not how a particular system of education works but rather how systems of education, with all their differences, may be conceived as working, according to principles that are common. In order to describe the common practices, Bernstein introduces the expression 'pedagogic device', the apparent simplicity of which term belies the complex nature of what it entails. (Its application being clearly metaphorical, 'pedagogic device' does not imply teleological intent; like Maxwell's 'demon', it may be considered, without dwelling on its literal connotations, as a useful temporary stepping stone to the ideas it generates.) Like Bernstein, Singh (2002) uses the expression 'relay' to describe the pedagogic device, which he calls: "*an ensemble of the rules or procedures via which knowledge (intellectual, practical, expressive, official or local knowledge) is converted into pedagogic communication*". Thus, with this term, Bernstein evinces contemplation in a broader sense on how knowledge is transmitted - with a distinct focus on how, in the first place, that which is to be transmitted is determined. This determination of stuff that is transmitted (knowledge values or whatever) is called by Bernstein the Pedagogization of knowledge, and deemed by him to occur as follows (adapted from Singh 2002:573):

1. certain knowledge deemed to be worthy of pedagogic transmission is, by a set of ***distributive*** rules, ordered in a way that reflects power relationships between social groups;
2. this ordered knowledge is transformed, by a specifiable set of ***recontextualizing*** rules, into a pedagogic discourse, a form in which the knowledge is amenable to pedagogic transmission;
3. the practice of the pedagogic transmission of the pedagogic discourse is circumscribed, by means of a specifiable set of ***evaluative*** rules, by constraints both on what counts as valid transmission and on what counts as valid acquisition of knowledge.

Bernstein stresses that these three sets of rules are interconnected such that the above is not merely a linear process. At the same time, each of the three sets of rules is presented with additional elements of detail, one particular element of which will be examined below. It may be suggested that it is possible to develop, from the description of the pedagogization of knowledge above, a statement which expresses in Bernstein's terms an explanation, in the most general sense, of the nature of education itself.

Education (for Bernstein is thus): *the pedagogic transmission and evaluation of pedagogic discourse which has been created through the recontextualization of knowledge deemed worthy of pedagogic transmission and classified and ordered in ways that reflect power relations between social groups.*

From here, it is straightforward to identify points in the description where it might be possible to entertain the presence of some element with some globalizing dimension. This would lead to alternative definitions such as:

1. Education is t*he pedagogic transmission (**in a manner more or less liable to global influence***) and evaluation of pedagogic discourse which has been created …..*

2. Education is t*he pedagogic transmission and evaluation (**in a manner more or less liable to global influence***) ….. .*

3. Education is t*he pedagogic transmission and evaluation of pedagogic discourse which has been created (**in a manner more or less liable to global influence***) through the recontextualization of knowledge …..*

*...*and so on*.*

However, while this approach can thus be seen to generate descriptions of education in a global world which are distinct, each one remains abstract and vague; in particular, agency remains implicit. The next section will examine the notion of agency in elements of practice.

3.   The International Baccalaureate as an agent in the Internationalizing world of Education

This section will consider the notion of agency in the endeavours of the International Baccalaureate (IB), a prominent actor in the field of international curriculum that has close links with a range of types of school. The International Baccalaureate (IB) is an ostensible agent, with a mission statement (IB 200?) that includes the following expression of its own agency: *"….the organization works with schools, governments and international organizations to develop challenging programmes of international education and rigorous assessment."* By completing elective authorization processes set by the IB, more than 3285 schools around the world have formally pledged to share its stated aim to develop young people through its three programs, which have established themselves as comprehensive educational packages expressed in tens of thousands of published pages of aims, theoretical underpinnings, and detailed instructions regarding curriculum and assessment, according to which hundreds of thousands of students have been taught and assessed. The IB along with its influence has grown rapidly, especially since 1997, when to the original IB Diploma Program were added the middle school IBMYP and the primary school IBPYP, with which the age range addressed by the IB programs expanded to 3-19, and the number of IB students worldwide surged accordingly. There has been fourfold growth in the number of IB schools in twelve years. A former Director of the organization (Walker 2005) described the IB as a "near monopoly mode of curriculum and study". According to Bunnell (2008), if the number of IB schools continues to grow at a rate of 15% per annum, there will

be more than 10000 by 2022. In light of figures such as these, a total number of tens of millions of International Baccalaureate educated students would only require 1000 students per school (not many if we consider the past, present and near future). In addition to its numerically commanding position, the IB finds (or has located) itself at strategic interface between schools offering its programs that are constitutionally defined as international and a growing number of schools with international aspirations. It was noted above in Part 1 that a mere 5% of the 1300 IB schools in the US are international by constitution. In this vein, Hagoort (1994:11) describes how the Diploma Programme has developed "from a programme for international schools, to an international programme for schools".

Although thus established in the field of IE as a prominent agent, the IB, is not immune either to difficulty in articulating exactly what international education is. The IB Diploma was described by a former head of the organization as "applied international education" (Peterson 1977), but such an assertion is difficult to evaluate. Walker (2006:119) then head of IB has conceded: '*in the end, much of what we do is not really international education*'. In recent publications, the IB (for example 2006) avoids the question of the nature of the process of IE by choosing to focus instead on a purported end product:

 "*Given the variety of IB World Schools, and the complexity of the concept of international-mindedness, the IB has focused on the kind of student we hope will graduate from an IB World School*".

However, despite this deft ontological sidestep, the IB has not been immune from external critical scrutiny of the extent to which its programs comprise education that can be said to be international. Van Oord (2007) has called the IB a tool for occidentalization; Hughes (2009) has critiqued it in post-colonial terms. For my part, I question the degree to which the IB's end product of IE, the list of personal attributes known as the Learner Profile, are fundamentally international; would not these attributes be deemed equally attractive by educators with no international pretention? A number of authors have critiqued the IB via more general sociological theorization of education, such as that of Bernstein. Doherty et al (2009) has used Bernstein's notion of pedagogic identity to describe the IB Diploma in Australia as, less a vehicle of internationalism and more of an elite short cut to educational advantage. Cambridge (2010) also wonders whether the desired pedagogical identity (a Bernstein term) associated with the IBDP may have become more susceptible to market forces. In other writing (2011:129), Cambridge has referred to the IB as an 'agency of recontextualization', which certainly resonates with the agency expressed in organization's own Mission Statement, discussed above: "*….the organization works with schools, governments and international organizations to develop challenging programmes of international education and rigorous assessment*"

Proceeding in Bernstein's terms, "programmes of international education" can be taken to be examples of pedagogic discourse, in the creation of which the IB can thus be seen to avoid the agentive ambiguity that often surrounds 'IE' by specifying agents that it claims have an explicit role to play, including schools, governments, international organizations and the organization itself. The IB can be seen (as Cambridge says) to be making explicit its own role as an agency of recontextualization, seemingly in recontextualization fields of various countries.

4   A closer look at Bernstein's two recontextualization fields

In order to understand what it would mean for the IB to be an agent of recontextualization, as well as to consider what other agencies would be at work in this arena, it will prove instructive to elaborate on the notion of recontextualization field. Bernstein asserts that the recontextualization of knowledge into a form accessible to non-specialist consumers is increasingly undertaken within agencies of recontextualization. He explains that recontextualization is a dynamic, even combative, process of competition between agencies that occurs within what he terms 'fields' and likens (Solomon 1999) to 'arenas'. According to Bernstein, there are two such recontextualization fields: a pedagogic recontextualization field of (PRF), which consists of university departments together with their research; specialized media of education weeklies journals and publishing houses together with their advisers; and an Official recontextualization field (ORF), which consists of specialized departments and sub-agencies of the state and local education authorities together with their research and system of inspectors. Cambridge's description of the IB as an agency of recontextualization invites closer inspection, particularly regarding the question of which field the IB is considered to be working in: pedagogic recontextualization field (PRF) or official recontextualization field (ORF).

More fundamentally, it seems appropriate to question first the value of considering fields which are distinct. The point about 'field', whether it is used in a scientific sense, or whether it is used in the sense attached to it by Bourdieu and others in sociology (see for example Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992) is that it is a useful metaphor for considering subtle interactions in complex situations where causation is not always explicit. By positing two distinct recontextualization fields (PRF and ORF), Bernstein would seem to suggest that there is no interaction between the agents of one field with those of the other. It can be argued on the contrary that even within any given traditional (pre-global) national system of education, there would be scope for rich analysis of the interplay *between* the so-called agencies of pedagogic recontextualization and those of official recontextualization. Surely, for example, universities (agencies in the PRF) could be imagined to exert some influence on what ends up in official curricula, not only by *initially* proffering descriptions of knowledge to be adapted by the education authorities (agencies in the ORF) but also by offering criticism of draft and even final versions of official curricula as well as the of the assessment machinery vehicles that accompany them. This more

recursive conceptualization of interaction can thus be seen to blur the distinction between the official and the pedagogic. I would venture to suggest a conceptualization whereby there is not a pair of distinct fields but rather a single unified one. I suggest further that the IB, as it suggests itself in its mission statement, can be said to operate, in a given country, in this single recontextualization field, which is populated by a variety of other recontextualization agencies. To explore this idea, there will be consideration now of the case of what happened in the recontextualization field of one country, at a certain time during the development of one tract of pedagogic discourse, when one of the recontextualization agencies was the International Baccalaureate.

5   An example of international recontextualization: IB "Turkish Social Studies"

Since 2000, schools authorized to enter students for the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program (IBDP: for students aged 16-19 who are in their last two years of secondary school), have been able to offer a subject called Turkish Social Studies (TSS), which candidates may count as one of a total of six examinable subjects that form part of the IBDP's minimum requirements. I suggest that consideration of TSS is germane to the current discussion because it illustrates one way that, squarely in line with its stated mission, the IB can be seen, in a manner that is amenable to analysis in terms of Bernstein's notion of recontextualization fields, to work with schools and governments to develop programs of international education".

Envisaged as a course that would be primarily taken by Turkish students, TSS grew from need felt by schools in Turkey where students faced the dual requirements of both the IB Diploma and the local Turkish High school diploma which is a prerequisite for university study for Turkish citizens. These schools, which by 1997 had already formed into a loose affiliation, got together in early 1999 to explore the possibility of creating a new course that would satisfy the social studies requirements of the Turkish Diploma and, at the same time, count towards the IBDP, as a subject within Group 3 (Individuals and Society), from which all IBDP candidates are required to choose at least one examinable subject. A working group of teachers and IBDP coordinators from a number of IB Diploma Program schools in Turkey developed in draft form within a framework for curriculum development the IB calls 'School-Based-Syllabus'. To meet the IB curriculum development criteria, the working group did the following three things. Firstly, they changed the content of four separate courses (Physical Geography, Human Geography, History, and Turkish Revolutionary History) and fashion them into the one Turkish Social Studies course. Secondly, the schools the scope of the content of the course was broadened: the course became more international than the subjects it was aiming to replace through consideration of not only Turkish geography and history but of how these related to Turkey's neighbours; at the same time, the course became more universal than the subjects it was aiming to replace through inclusion of elements of epistemology, particularly through the consideration of primary sources. Thirdly, the

assessment framework and procedures for the course were developed by means of performance related criteria designed to emphasize the skills element of the new course and de-emphasize the need for the memorization of knowledge that formed the basis of the local subjects.

From the start, this curriculum development work was, although executed by school teachers, overseen by the IB, in the light of its published guidelines. Thus, through the agency of the IB, the nascent course grew to take on characteristics of IBDP subjects developed by the IB itself: the aims and objectives of TSS were rendered compatible with the overall aims of all the other IB social studies type courses (IBDP Group 3); the assessment framework for TSS, was developed to be compatible with the assessment policy of the IB; subject specific content evaluation was provided by an IB-appointed external examiner (a Turkish academic working for a UK university), who was also charged with overseeing the work, done by the schools, of setting and evaluating examination papers.

Looking in this way at the explicit role the IB played in the production of new pedagogic discourse, it is straightforward to describe the recontextualization agency of the IB as pedagogic. It is also straightforward to describe the recontextualization agency of the Turkish education authorities as official. To be able to teach the new curriculum in place of the four subjects it was to replace, the Turkish IB schools obtained formal authorization from the organ of the education ministry charged with curriculum development, which was duly published in the Turkish Ministry of Education's official gazette.

However, it would be an oversimplification to suggest that the roles played by the IB and the Turkish ministry were purely pedagogic and official respectively. It may be argued firstly that, the course authors (the Turkish school teachers) in the same way that they were guided when producing their pedagogic discourse by the pedagogic framework of the IB, were also guided by their knowledge of the pedagogic framework and traditions of the national education ministry. The resultant pedagogic content of TSS was the product of influences that were in some ways opposing (see above: national/international; specific/ universal; memorization/performance), and could be argued to fall in between the two. I would argue secondly that in addition to the agency it displayed in pedagogic recontextualization, the IB can also be considered an agent of official recontextualization. The IB has constituted its own rules that govern both membership and the award of qualifications; all the work done on recontextualization into pedagogic discourse ultimately deemed appropriate by the IB was carried out in the clear knowledge of everybody that authorization by the IB would happen if and only if Turkish Social Studies met the IB's stated expectations.

6   A refined classification of education in a globalizing world

Within our overall aim of determining a descriptive device for EGW that is sufficiently broad to incorporate, in a fashion that is linguistically neutral, all global dimensions to education, discussion in the previous section of the TSS example permitted the construction of a model of how recontextualization (complex and recursive interaction between various agencies - both pedagogical and official) might be considered to take place in a single field. In this section I discuss how this consideration of agency within the Bernstein notion of recontextualization field may be extended to a situation that is less state bound and thus more global.

It takes a single leap to be able to imagine Bernstein's concept of recontextualization field being sufficiently extensive to envelope all state education systems within a single field of global knowledge transmission, thus encompassing education in so-called national as well as so-called international contexts. Whereas, previously, recontextualization fields could be considered as existing as distinct entities within separate state education systems (presumably one field for each state system to give a number equal to all the states in the world), there is now flow between these systems, in effect resulting in a single, global recontextualization field. This global view seems to resonate with a conceptualization already visualized by Gough (2003) who, in appealing for breathing spaces to preserve local knowledge traditions and identity, refers to the 'internationalized curriculum field'. Within this global field (extending the metaphorical sense of field from physics) there are bodies that exert influence over their particular locality. Schools may be considered more or less dependent on a state system to the degree that state influence is exerted on them. Bernstein's theorization of recontextualization thus both highlights potential application to analysis of a suitably global scope and provides purchase on the notion of agency.

Having elucidated this global sense of agency in a global recontextualization field it is germane to revisit the definition of education derived (Section 2) from Bernstein's conceptualization of a pedagogic device. It was established that, in Bernstein terms, education may be considered to be:

the pedagogic transmission and evaluation of pedagogic discourse which has been created through the recontextualization of knowledge deemed worthy of pedagogic transmission and classified and ordered in ways that reflect power relations between social groups.

It was also established in 2 that certain parts of this definition could be more or less liable to global influence. This partial account, while providing a theoretical framework for potential impact by globalizing forces, clearly provided no account of individual agency i.e. no account of the degree to which agents take steps to embrace or resist globalizing elements.

To provide a descriptive framework for agency, to the above definition *actors* may be specified as follows:

> **Schools**, *transmit in a manner more or less accountable to **a particular state system of education**, to **learners** more or less identifiable with a particular state, pedagogic discourse which has been recontextualized by **agencies** more or less constrained by **state systems**, from knowledge deemed worthy of pedagogic transmission which has been classified and ordered in ways that reflect power relations between **social groups** that more or less transcend state systems.*

From the above, in order to interrogate both susceptibility in the face of and agency towards globalizing elements of education, questions can be asked at four levels, as follows.

	Level of Knowledge Pedagogization susceptible to non-national influence
Level 1 Accountability of transmission	*To what extent is a school accountable to a particular state system of education?*
Level 2 Constitution of student body	*To what extent are learners identifiable with a particular state?*
Level 3 Recontextualization	*To what extent has pedagogic discourse transmitted by the school been recontextualized by agencies constrained by state systems?*
Level 4 Selection and ordering of knowledge	*To what extent has knowledge deemed worthy of pedagogic transmission been classified and ordered in ways that reflect power relations between social groups that transcend state systems?*

The remainder of the assignment comprises discussion of this set of questions, in order to evaluate their value to a theoretical description of EGW.

7   ***Eliciting systematic analysis of international education***

In this section, I use the four question levels identified above to organize notes about distinctions that can be made between schools on the basis of particular types of international endeavour.

a. (Level 1)

There are schools located in state systems liable to state inspection. A globalizing factor here would be the degree to which state inspection itself is influenced by exostate inspection systems. (One could argue that OFSTED's incorporation of a school self-study element (similar to that of Council of International Schools (CIS Accreditation is an example.)

There are schools that, even though located outside their geographical homeland, nevertheless persist with its home country school inspection network (e.g. OFSTED).

There are schools though located outside their geographical homeland that seek a more international evaluation process (CIS Accreditation).

There are schools located within a home system, and accountable to state inspection, that adopt (additionally) an international evaluation process. Some schools do this in the first language of the school (Australian schools seeking CIS Accreditation).

Other schools seek additional evaluation in English when it is not the first language of the school (Turkish schools seeking CIS Accreditation).

Schools accountable to state inspection/evaluation may be considered internationalized at this level by submission to authorization/evaluation process applicable to programs such as those of the IB.

I believe it would be possible to build up from observations such as these a picture whereby firstly there is a certain area (in this case 'evaluation') of generalized potential for educational activity to be influenced by globalization. Secondly, individual schools (or schools systems, in the case of the Victorian state education department that sets store by CIS Accreditation) may exhibit more or less individual will either to engage with globalization.

b. *(Level 2)*

Schools have greater or lesser heterogeneous composition of learner nationalities.

Schools may be more or less determined to widen their heterogeneity.

Heterogeneous schools with may have more or less even distribution, more or less national, or linguistic, dominance.

Schools vary in ability to promote interaction between all the nationalities / languages represented.

Schools vary in their ability to deal with varied educational demands of heterogeneous classes, which can represent extremes of capital holding: Hill (2007) contrasts the children of migrants in multicultural classes with the children of diplomats in international school classes; the vast majority of 'international schools' are fee-paying and thereby shielded from some of the realities faced by multicultural classes in struggling state systems.

c. *(Level 3)*

Schools that offer internationally endorsed curricular frameworks (such as the IBPYP and/or IBMYP) may be considered to undergo international influence at the level of recontextualization. Schools may choose, say, what history to transmit, but the way that this knowledge is recontextualized into pedagogic discourse is significantly influenced by the IB.

Schools in national systems offering syllabus specified programs such as the IGCSE or the IB Diploma in addition to local credentialing requirements will find themselves teaching some content for the external board that they would have taught anyway for their local requirements, but in order to teach it in a format that is appropriate to the external assessment requirements there will necessarily be some recontextualization. Some schools adapt their syllabi in other words to meet credentialing requirements of the IB Diploma (example above in Section 5 of how national curricula in Turkey were recontextualized as international ones).

The most significant form of pedagogic recontextualization that occurs in many schools is that which results from a school's curriculum being offered and assessed in a language that is not the first language of the student body. For schools in a national system where the language is not English, doing say the IBDP, the fact of candidates having to do a whole swathe of knowledge content to be taught and examined in English in *addition* to local first language requirements is evidence of a significant amount of international value added; graduates of such two diploma programs (local and say IBDP) will be fluent and academically proficient in two languages.

(Level 4)

In some schools, significant international national influence on curriculum content selection occurs by the adoption of non-national content. Some schools in order to meet the requirements of teaching IBDP subjects have to augment their content (e.g. more statistics for IB Mathematics SL than would normally be taught locally). In the IBDP schools may offer subjects that are alien to the local secondary school environment (economics, anthropology, business, psychology, ITGS)

For schools in a colonialist context, all content will be selected and ordered for them by authorities in other countries.

For schools in a post-colonialist context, there may be remnants, more or less evident, of curriculum content selected and ordered by foreign authorities.

There would be scope at this level to consider hidden curriculum.

One element of selection and ordering of knowledge that has huge influence on the globalizing nature of a school is the school's language policy. Firstly, the question of how many and which languages to teach is central. The IB has been criticized for its classification of Latin as a foreign

language, which allowed the possibility of young people obtaining an IB Diploma without being able to speak a word of another language. Secondly, development that occurs inside and outside the classroom of learners' English (or whatever the official language of the school is). In the case where English, for example, is the official language of the school, it may be pointed out that the globalizing influence will be in inverse proportion to the number of native English speakers enrolled.

I note that this is the category under which to discuss what Gunesch (2007) terms 'personal' rather than 'institutionalized' international ideals. In this category can be considered: cosmopolitan education (Gunesch 2007); promotion of the IB Learner Profile Schools to transmit the notion of international mindedness; the teaching of Global Citizenship in England and Wales. Yet to appear in curriculum are certain elements that Rizvi (2007) has challenged the IE community to teach learners through inter alia 'epistemic virtue' and reflexive metacognition to be more metaculturally aware. However, one could envisage the possibility of epistemic virtues or of some elements of cosmopolitanism being considered for inclusion in Theory of Knowledge, which being an obligatory part of the IB Diploma schools are expressly accountable for. This subject, not originally part of any national education system, is a clear example of how knowledge for transmission can be selected in an international fashion (by the founders of TOK in the 1960s, and by the developers of the program since).

In this brief survey, I have attempted to show that consideration of EGW through insights from Bernstein's theorization of pedagogization of knowledge offers rich potential for analysis that is systematic. Although the precise wording of the questions associated with each level may be debatable, I believe that the presence of different levels of analysis provides scope for the elicitation of delicate and polyvalent description of the degree to which any school, or education system, can be said to engage with educational elements connected to the fact of the world's globalizing. I suggest that it became clear, even at the first level under consideration, that there is a kind of continuum in play: at one extreme are schools that actively seek international endorsement, in a second language; at the other are schools that remain bound to state structure. Outside the scope of this assignment, one sees possible links with Bourdieu's notion of 'habitus', which could be invoked when considering executive decisions by schools. Within the scope of this assignment, we can draw a preliminary conclusion that this Bernstein framework permits description in detailed, levelled and objective manner of the international endeavour of any school. While there will be family resemblances between schools that share a number of characteristics, the scope for variation can be seen to preclude simple typology.

8. Possible use of this analytical framework to consider future trends in education in a globalizing world

I believe that further consideration through the framework obtained from Bernstein's description of pedagogization may lead to ways of envisioning future development in education in the globalization world, as follows:

1. International evaluation/accreditation

Schools outside their nominal home system may elect to become more international by changing from their home country school inspection network to such as CIS Accreditation.

More schools in a home system may elect to become more international by additionally adopting, say, CIS Accreditation.

More schools accountable to state inspection/evaluation will become more internationalized at this level by submission to authorization/evaluation process applicable to programs such as those of the IB.

2. Rise in the number of schools of heterogeneous student nationality.

The number of 'international schools' with heterogeneity of nationality in student population may continue to rise. It will be limited by the economy – the vast majority of 'international schools' are fee-paying, and represent the elite tip of the iceberg of the world's schools.

On the other hand one can easily imagine continued family/student mobility leading to increasing degrees of national heterogeneity in schools run by local education authorities (so-called multicultural education).

3. More international recontextualization of knowledge

Schools in national systems may take up programs such as the IB Diploma in addition to local credentialing requirements, possibly in greater numbers, which will result in more internationalized recontextualization of knowledge. This will comprise in the first place adaptation of international of curriculum to suit local needs. In countries, where the local language is not the language of the IB program, the fact that knowledge will be recontextualized from local language into the international language (say English) will have growing impact on numbers of graduates of schools in national systems who become fluent and academically proficient in more than one language. Furthermore, it was seen in section 5 evidence of how recontextualization agencies in national systems can have horizons broadened by exposure to international programs such as the IB Diploma Program. More space might allow exploration of other cases in point. Extensive changes to the Turkish national primary school provision as a result of exposure to inquiry based approaches brought from outside the country (described in for example Altinyelken 2011)

followed exchange of curricular theorization between the Turkish Ministry of Education and the IB.

4. *More international selecting and ordering of knowledge.*

I think that this fourth level of analysis, the international selecting and ordering of knowledge, permits us to see clearly two trends in the future of EGW.

Firstly, reminding ourselves that the task of selecting of knowledge to be transmitted via the system is effected by various agencies including universities and government departments, the degree to which international dimensions of mainstream education will proliferate will be determined by the extent to which these agencies become internationalized, in composition or outlook. We can only speculate on the extent that these agencies could also include international curriculum agencies, or international aid/development agencies, or be influenced by internationally published independent thought (on such as, for argument's sake, cosmopolitanism or epistemic virtues). The world's progress towards globalization will clearly still be constrained by the extent to which nations are willing to forego educational sovereignty (just this summer we have seen education authorities in western Libya quick to reinstate educational programs in Berber language and culture). This suggests that there will be limits to the magnitude of a global dimension within the mainstream teaching of any state, and the growth of such a global dimension will vary, as in each state there will be a distinct and (generally) slowly changing balance between the retention and the relinquishing of national sovereignty.

Secondly, that the growth of 'international schools' will not continue indefinitely can be shown for a reason other than the economic one already suggested (that there will be limits to numbers of fee-paying students). I believe that there are also limits to the ability of vast numbers of schools working independently of national systems to develop effective curricula. If we considered the reduction ad absurdum position whereby all students ended up in 'international schools', then there would remain no national systems of education, in which case whose curriculum would be taught? As Graff (1987) says, 'what should we be teaching when there is no 'we'? It is difficult to imagine how a totally international school system would manage to produce functional curriculum when there is no historically accumulated set of global knowledge and skills to aspire to model or even decide on. I do not believe that most individual schools would be able to adequately match the curriculum generation capacity of a state machine. However, large international agencies such as IB, working directly with independent universities could. Thus, it does seem likely that the role of the IB and other such international providers will continue to grow.

In this section, it has been shown that this adaptation of Bernstein's pedagogic device provides a framework for detailed consideration of the processes at work in the continuously changing field of EGW, thus offering insight into the form future changes to the field may take.

Conclusion

In this assignment, I have described a need I have felt to develop a conceptual framework for analyzing EGW that is broad enough to unify an academic field that is splintered. To meet this need, I have demonstrated how it is possible, following Bernstein's notion of the pedagogic device, to frame analysis of EGW at a number of levels. I have tried to show that the proposed analytical framework has rich potential for delicate and polyvalent description of the international endeavour of any school, within a unifying paradigm that treats national and international schools even-handedly. I believe that this analytic device also provides a framework for predicting trends in EGW.

Partly due to constraints of space, the analysis of EGW using this device has not been as detailed or as critical as I might have hoped; I have only been able to convey a flavour of the analysis that would need to carried out in order to realize a full critical engagement with the potential the framework offers. In particular what I feel has not been sufficiently developed in this assignment is the notion that, on certain fronts (or at certain levels) education as a whole is more susceptible to globalizing or internationalizing influence, and that each school (or school system), depending on its determination to embrace or resist may exhibit more or less individual will to engage with globalization. It strikes me that this ('habitus') angle could be tested further. The fact that this analytical framework is in my opinion sufficiently broad and sufficiently delicate to assess, in the face of globalizing education, endeavour of schools that are differently constituted, it strikes me that one obvious application for the framework would be to survey, in terms of EGW, a sample of different types of schools.

References

Altinyelken, H. (2011). Student-centred pedagogy in Turkey: conceptualisations, interpretations and practices. *Journal of Education Policy Volume 26, Issue 2,* , 137-160.

Bates, R. (. (2011). *schooling internationally' globalization, internationalization and the future of international schools .* New York: Routledge.

Bernstein, B. (2001). From pedagogies to knowledges . In A. N. Morais, *Towards a sociology of pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to research.* New York: Peter Lang.

Bourdieu, P. &. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press,.

Bray, M. (2007). International and Comparative Education: Boundaries,Ambiguities and Synergies. In M. Hayden et al, t*he SAGE handbook of research in international education* (pp. 51-56). London: Sage.

Bunnell, T. (2008). International education and the 'second phase': a framework for conceptualizing its nature and for the future assessment of its effectiveness . *Compare 38- 4,* , 415-426.

Cambridge, J. (2011). international curriculum. In R. bates, *Schooling internationally: globalization, internationalization and the future of international schools.* (pp. 121-147). new york: Routledge.

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

Cambridge, J. (2010). The International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme and the construction of pedagogic identity: A preliminary study. *Journal of Research in International Education 9- 3* , 199-213.

Castells, M. (2000). *The rise of the network society.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Chan, W. & Dymock (2008). The internationalization of universities; Globalist, internationalist and translocalist models. *Journal of Research in International Education* , 184-205.

CIS (2006). *Council of International Schools Accreditation Guide.* Retrieved June 30, 2009, from http://www.cois.org/page.cfm?p=240

CIS (2009). *Council of International Schools.* List of Accredited Schools. http://members.cois.org/directory/isd_accred.aspx.

Das, S. (2010, February 2). Thousands stranded in college collapses . *The Age* .

Doherty, C. M. (2009). Planning Mobile Futures: The Border Artistry of International Baccalaureate Diploma Choosers. *British Journal of Sociology of Education v30 n6* , p757-771.

Gough, N. (2003). Thinking globally in environmental education: implications for internationalizing curriculum inquiry. In W. Pinar, *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (53-72) Taylor & Francis.

Graff, C. (1987). What Should We Be Teaching—When There's No 'We'? *Yale Journal of Criticism* .

Gunesch, K. (2004 vol. 3 no. 3). Cosmopolitanism as a personal cultural identity model for and within international education . *Journal of Research in International Education* , 251-275.

Hagoort, T. (1994). A message from the president. *IB World 6* , 11.

Halliday, M. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* London: Edward Arnold.

Hayden, M. L. (2007). *The Sage handbook of research in international education.* Sage Publications.

Haywood, T. (2007). A simple typology of international-mindedness and its implications for education. In M. L. Hayden, *The sage handbook of research in international education* (pp. 79-89). London: Sage Publications.

Hill, I. (2006). Do International Baccalaureate programs internationalise or globalise? . *International Education Journal* , Vol 7, No 1,.

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

Hill, I. (2007). Multicultural and international education: Never the twain shall meet? . *International Review of Education Volume 53, Number 3* , 245-264.

Hughes, C. (2009). International Education and the IB Diploma Programme: A View from the Perspective of Postcolonial Thought. *Journal of Research in International Education, v8 n2* , 123-141.

IB (2006). *Making the PYP Happen*. http://www.ibo.org

IB (2011). IB World Schools http://www.ibo.org/school/.

Lowe, J. (1998). International and comparative education. *International Schools Journal Volume: 17*, 18-21.

Marshall, H. (2007b). Global education in perspective: fostering a global dimension in an English secondary school. *Cambridge Journal of Education Volume 37, Issue 3* , 355-374.

Marshall, H. (2007a). The global education terminology debate: exploring some of the issues in the UK. In J. L. M. Hayden, *A Handbook of Research in International Education* (pp. 38–50). London: Sage.

Matus, C. &. (2003). The triumph of multiplicity and the carnival of difference: Curriculum dilemmas in the age of postcolonialism and globalization. In W. Pinar, *International handbook of curriculum research.* Taylor & Francis.

Moore, R. (2004). *Education and society: issues and explanations in the sociology of education.* Cambridge : Polity.

Nussbaum, M. (2002). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. C. (ed), *For love of country* (pp. 2-17). Boston: Beacon Press.

Peterson, A. (1977 – Vol. 13, No. 2). Applied Comparative Education: The International Baccalaureate: A Case Study . *Comparative Education* , 77-80 .

Rizvi, F. (2007). Internationalization of Curriculum: a Critical Perspective. In M. Hayden et al, *The Sage handbook of research in international education* (pp. 390-403). Sage.

Rizvi, F. (2009). Towards Cosmopolitan Learning . *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education v30 n3* , 253-268 .

Schiffrin, D. (2006). *Discourse and Identity.*

Sen, A. (1985). Well-being, agency and freedom: the Dewey lectures 1984. *The Journal of Philosophy* , 169-221.

Singh, P. (2002). Pedagogising Knowledge: Bernstein's theory of the pedagogic device. *British Journal of Sociology of Education 23/4* , 571-582.

Solomon, J. (1999). 'Pedagogy, Identity and the Construction of a Theory of Symbolic Control': Basil Bernstein Questioned by Joseph Solomon . *British Journal of Sociology of Education 20/2* , 265-279.

Stables, A. (1996). Paradox in compound educational policy slogans: evaluating equal opportunities in subject choice . *British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. 44, No. 2,* , 159-167.

Sylvester, R. (2007). Historical Resources for Research in International Education (1851-1950) . In M. Hayden et al *the SAGE handbook of research in international education* (pp. 11-24). Lndon: Sage.

Van Oord, L. (2007 37/3). To westernize the nations? An analysis of the International Baccalaureate's philosophy of education. *Cambridge Journal of Education* , 375-390.

Walker, G. (2006). *Educating the Global Citizen.* John Catt.

Walker, G. (2005 November (45)). Partnerships: The way forward for the IBO'. *IB World* , 5–6.