

*International Teacher Education: Liberal Cosmopolitanism
Revisited or Postmodern Trans-nationalism?*

by

Peter P. Grimmett
Professor and Director
Institute for Studies in Teacher Education
Simon Fraser University, Canada

Keynote Address at the 2nd Pacific Rim Conference on Teacher Education
Illinois State University, Normal, IL
October 26, 2008

International Teacher Education: Liberal Cosmopolitanism Revisited or Postmodern Trans-nationalism?

ABSTRACT

This paper begins with a characterization of three periods of teacher education research and policy in North America over the last sixty years to demonstrate how teacher education has moved from an initial emphasis on training and direct instruction through a focus on “learning to teach” to today’s emphasis on policy and outcomes. It also documents how the governance of teacher education has changed through these periods from benign government control in the 1960s through institutional governance in the 1980s and early 1990s to the current state of professional self-regulation in a policy context of de-regulation. It will show how professional self-regulation—whether through accreditation agencies like NCATE or TEAC in the States, or the BC or Ontario Colleges of Teachers in Canada—is a product of the current neo-liberalist policy emphasis on accountability.

In addition, the talk will characterize how the current policy context has fundamentally altered the role of universities in society. Neo-liberalist forces undermine the development of the nation state for which universities previously under liberalism played a central role. The nation state has been supplanted by supranational entities fostering cross-border standardization. The university’s role in society has been transformed into one supporting economic development and global competitiveness, a role that is at odds with the four-century-old relationship between the nation state and the university that supported professional responsibility and self-governance as a form of delegated authority to bodies possessing expertise.

This, then, is the policy context in which the work of teacher education is now situated and to which it must respond. The important question is how? International teacher education is one avenue that has been vigorously explored. But what exactly is international teacher education in the current policy context? One frame is a classic liberal intellectual stance that rejects nationalism in favor of a radical liberal international order. A second is a cosmopolitan position that argues against the flaws of nationalism and the nation-state, to elevate international law and consensus in the pursuit of equity and justice. World citizenship is what matters, not nationality, because issues of ecology, poverty, climate change, etc., must be addressed outside of territorial boundaries. A third view is postmodern trans-nationalism which sees liberalism and cosmopolitanism as fragmented and presents instead a postcolonial view of the nation as poly-ethnic and contested, rejecting the decontextualized modes of cosmopolitanism. This articulation of internationalization takes education beyond a modernist endeavor with national boundaries to focus on how the processes of cultural, political, and economic globalization has turned internationalization into a form of economic competitiveness and individual performativity.

Such an economic rationalist distortion needs to be deconstructed and contested in a manner that does not suggest a nostalgic longing for a return to the classic liberal stance or cosmopolitanism. The paper will argue that the heavy neo-liberal emphasis on economics is denying us all the benefits of cultural and political globalization in international teacher education.

International Teacher Education: Liberal Cosmopolitanism Revisited or Postmodern Trans-nationalism?

This last sixty years have seen three periods of teacher education research and policy in North America. Over that time, teacher education has moved from an initial emphasis on training and direct instruction through a focus on “learning to teach” to today’s emphasis on policy and outcomes. The governance of teacher education has also changed through these periods from benign government control in the 1960s through institutional governance in the 1980s and early 1990s to the current state of professional self-regulation in a policy context of de-regulation. I will show how professional self-regulation—whether through accreditation agencies like NCATE or TEAC in the States, or the British Columbia (BC) or Ontario Colleges of Teachers in Canada—is a product of the current neo-liberalist policy emphasis on accountability.

In addition, I characterize how the current policy context has fundamentally altered the role of universities in society. Neo-liberalist forces undermine the development of the nation state for which universities previously under liberalism played a central role. The nation state has been supplanted by supranational entities fostering cross-border standardization. The university’s role in society has been transformed into one supporting economic development and global competitiveness, a role that is at odds with the four-century-old relationship between the nation state and the university that supported professional responsibility and self-governance as a form of delegated authority to bodies possessing expertise.

This, then, is the policy context in which the work of teacher education is now situated and to which it must respond. The important question is how? International teacher education is one avenue that has been vigorously explored. But what exactly is international teacher education in the current policy context? I explore three different conceptions. My thesis is that the heavy neo-liberal emphasis on economics is denying us all the benefits of cultural and political globalization in international teacher education.

Three Periods of Teacher Education Research and Policy

Phase 1 (1960-1980):

Teacher Education as Training under Government Control

During this period, teacher education was largely viewed as training, teaching was assumed to be content transmission, and researchers presumed an unproblematic connection both between teaching and learning, and between training and teacher behavior. The governance of teacher education was largely in the hands of benign governments that consulted with professionals and the body politic to make policy

changes affecting the practice of teacher education. Joint Teacher Education Boards advised policy makers on appropriate direction and the approach functioned with considerable good will from all parties, probably because benign government control essentially allowed institutions a lot of freedom within broad policy constraints.

Things fell apart¹ because training, direct instruction, and an emphasis on classroom management was seen to have little or no effect on producing the kind of citizens needed for a democratic society and the workforce requisite for sustaining economic viability; as a consequence, the centre of government control could not hold. The best supporters of the training model lost conviction and the worst passionate intensity of business and academic critics came through. The catalyst for the revelation of the emphasis on teacher learning that was to characterize phase 2 was *A Nation At Risk* and the advent of the Holmes Group.

Phase 2 (1980-2000):

Teacher Education as Learning to Teach under Institutional Governance

The advent of the Holmes group, the report of the Carnegie Forum on teacher education, and the founding of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) all came about in 1986 as a response to the National Commission on Excellence in Education's (1983) report *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. All were committed to the idea that, to produce a professional teaching force, research had to codify the professional knowledge base of teaching and teacher education. Goodlad's (1990) study of teacher education institutions was both particularly critical of what was happening and catalytic of an emphasis on teacher learning. Hence, the language of "learning to teach (Feiman-Nemser, 1983) replaced the language "teacher training." Schön's (1988) "reflective practice" superseded direct instruction. Institutional governance took root in the first phase and has continued to the beginning of the 21st century. In this approach, the institution responsible for the delivery of a teacher education program exercises self-governance. Gideonse (1993) noted that this idea gained credence because a teacher education institution "not only is the place where the preparation needs and conflicts have to be resolved, but also is where the specifics . . . are all supposed to come together" (p. 6).

¹ This theme derives from Yates' poem, *The Second Coming*, particularly the lines highlighted in the first stanza below:

*Turning and turning in the widening gyre
The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
**The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.***

The above three lines constituted the theme for a keynote address I gave at the 2007 annual conference of the Canadian Association for Teacher Education, held at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, on May 27. In essence, each period comes to an end when things fall apart and the centre cannot hold, because the best lack all conviction and the worst are full of passionate intensity, a foreshadowing of the next period that is about to begin.

Things fell apart toward the end of this phase because research and practice became consumed with a focus on teacher's beliefs, values, and their learning as professionals, to the neglect of attention to quality assurance and outcomes. The centre of institutional governance could not hold because universities were seen not as partners with the field but as independent institutions protecting their vested and prioritized interests. The best in universities were too busy with their own world of research and practice—much of it, as Cole's (1999, 2000a, 2000b) research points out, a case of survival in the academic world—to enter the public debate about the nature and purpose of teacher education. The worst displayed their passionate intensity in calling for the de-regulation of teacher education and the handing over of vital practice experiences to the field. The catalyst for the revelation of contrasting policies of professionalization and de-regulation was the unrelenting criticism of right-wing think tanks and the public mistrust of teacher education institutions.

Phase 3 (1990-2010): Teacher Education as Policy in a Governance Context of Professional Self-Regulation and De-Regulation

Viewing teacher education as learning to teach did not, however, concern itself with outcomes. During phase 2, Haberman (1985) and Evertson, Hawley and Zlotnik (1985) began to ask questions about whether or not teacher education made a difference to student learning in classrooms. This line of inquiry foreshadowed the shift that emerged in the 1990s toward framing teacher education around policy issues. As a consequence, much research followed the recommendations of critiques of conventional teacher education programs to focus on teacher quality and public accountability. The governance is characterized by professional self-regulation amidst a policy emphasis on de-regulation. The professionalization agenda comes together in "the articulation of a knowledge base for teaching in the form of competencies or standards that address many different aspects of teaching" (Zeichner, 2006, p. 60). The de-regulation agenda shifts the focus from pedagogy to content knowledge and verbal expression, maintaining that pedagogy and professional learning are best acquired on the job. Accordingly, advocates of the de-regulation agenda argue strongly for alternative routes to certification outside normal teacher preparation programs and professional self-regulation.

Things are now falling apart because the competition between professionalization and de-regulation policies is making the governance of teacher education very difficult for universities and professional bodies alike. The delicate balance between professional control and institutional autonomy has not always been attended to with care. Consequently, the centre of professional self-regulation appears not to be holding. University institutions have contested what they see as unwarranted intrusion into their programs and autonomy. The best in universities and professional bodies have tried to work toward collaboration but they are in the minority and seem to have lost conviction. The worst in universities and professional bodies have gone about the contestation, which ultimately became a legal struggle, with a passionate intensity that ran deep. The catalyst in Canada for the revelation of a phase that is yet to come is the

two British Columbia court cases. A “best” foreshadowing of this new phase could be found in the Association of Canadian Deans of Education (ACDE) *Accord on Teacher Education*²; a “worst” possibility could entail the dissolution of professional bodies and the consignment of teacher education to schools, as has happened in England, where a policy emphasis on de-regulation has turned into an insidious mix of over-regulation alongside rhetoric about professionalization.

“Things falling apart” characterizes what I see happening in the macro-political world. What has happened at that level over the past 20-30 years that now directly affects international teacher education? Let me explain by first exploring the macro-political setting.

A MACRO-POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE³

The macro-political setting of the current period (Phase 3) is neo-liberalism, which has led to the decline of the nation state. Previously, under liberalism—where the individual was characterized as having autonomy and could practice freedom, and the role of government was to protect individual freedom—universities were central to the development of the nation state.

Liberalism emerged out of the Enlightenment as an economic and a political theory. Over the last two centuries it has been the dominant discourse that shaped and influenced nation-states and the institutions situated therein. The Enlightenment saw the emergence of the modern nation-state in Europe that was made possible through a pre-modern institution, the university. The university played a critical role in the formation of the modern nation-state and enjoyed a special relationship that “linked [it] to the destiny of the nation-state by virtue of its role as producer, protector, and inculcator of an idea of national culture” (Readings, 1996, p. 3). This created a social contract and a symbiosis between the nation-state and the university since the nation-state provided fiscal stability and protection for the university and the university in turn created the underlying culture that bound society to the nation-state, i.e., the university provided the means whereby the “production of national subjects was to take place in modernity” (Readings, 1996, p. 46). The advent of the nation-state coincided with the emergence of a new understanding of the role of the individual within the society that gave the individual primacy.

Neo-liberalism is an outgrowth of liberalism in that it similarly emphasizes the primacy of the individual. It differs, however, in that it sees a role for the private sphere to expand to create more efficient market transactions in the public sphere through the

² See Collins & Tierney (2006) for a discussion of this and Appendix A for the actual *Accord*.

³ I am grateful for the stimulating ideas that Lane Trotter has shared with me on this subject.

introduction of private sphere market mechanisms that are seen as inherently more efficient than public sector mechanisms. Neo-liberalist policies thus create artificial market mechanisms within the public sphere for the provision and distribution of public goods and services. This neo-liberal framework appropriated the thinking of earlier liberal thinkers like John Stuart Mill who provided the theoretical and political framework for limiting public intervention in the private sphere (to address market inefficiencies) in order to protect the interests of the individual within society (Olssen, 2000). Neo-liberalism co-opted this framework because it provided an acceptable political rationale that allowed for public intervention in the private sphere and used regulation to extend the private sphere into the public sector (King, 2007). Public goods and services were re-defined as commodities that could more effectively be delivered through private sector competition. This structure is managed by the state through third-party evaluative regulatory structures that operate at arms length from the state to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of scarce public resources and remove the potential for inefficiency caused by political interference or lack of accountability. It should be no surprise, then, that during Phase 3 (1990-2010) of neo-liberalist de-regulation we have seen the emergence of professional regulatory bodies.

The neo-liberal framework had its beginnings in Phase 1 (1960-1980) and gained increasing influence during the first part of Phase 2 (1980-2000) (Olssen, 2000). But it has become hegemonic since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991 (Readings 1996; Dale 2005) that led to the discrediting of the alternate competing modern socio-political system epitomized by a Marxist economic framework. As neo-liberalism became the dominant discourse, there was no effective alternative to counter its apparent pervasive influence. Davies and Bansel (2007) indicate that neo-liberalism has been successful because it “both competes with other discourses and also cannibalizes them in such a way that neo-liberalism itself appears more desirable, or more innocent than it is.” (p. 258). In other words, we have come to believe that the ways of neo-liberalism are common sense and inevitable. Hence, neo-liberal thought has been able to extend its hegemonic socio-economic reach into the public sphere to redefine roles and responsibilities in education, healthcare, and social welfare in terms of their economic utility (Fitzsimmons, 2000; Davies & Bansel, 2007).

Key world shaking events like the dismantling of communism and the rise of globalization have also unleashed rogue economic forces that are manipulated by unscrupulous transnational entrepreneurs (Napoleoni, 2008). This is because in the global economy, it is virtually impossible for political activity to regulate and control the free market. As a result, Western businesses are now forced to wage war continuously with “globalization outlaws” who counterfeit their currency and products that they then sell throughout the world at rock-bottom prices, e.g., the July 6, 2008 police haul in Sydney, Australia, of imitation designer clothes with a market value of \$millions.

Until the end of the Cold War, universities were protected from the direct influence of neo-liberalism because they were bastions of cultural reproduction designed to counter external threats such as the Soviet Bloc (Readings, 1996). The change from liberalism to

neo-liberalism has had profound consequences for universities. The privileged position the universities previously enjoyed has eroded and they are now regarded as another appendage of the state social welfare apparatus. From 1989 on, governments in various western nation-states implemented neo-liberal changes to the structure and role of the universities through funding changes that resulted in the reduction of the block grant, the imposition of targeted funding (funding for specific purposes such as university-industry research), the imposition or deregulation of tuition, the implementation of corporatist managerial structures, (Giroux, 2002; Middlehurst, 2004; Olssen & Peters, 2005; Marginson, 2006; Henkel, 2007) and actively encouraging the universities to work with the private sector to support national economic development (Dale, 1999, 2001, 2005; Altbach, 2004; Marginson, 2004; Considine, 2006), including an emphasis on internationalization that sometimes borders on rogue economic expansionism. This point about supporting economic development is particularly important because research which had been conducted in the public sphere and available to all as a public good was changed to a function aimed at the application of science into commodified technology (technoscience) products (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). In addition, the university was increasingly seen as a tool for job training (vocational drift) that prepared students for the labor market.

Under neo-liberalism, then, universities are no longer central to the formation and cultural continuity of the nation state, i.e., their traditional role in knowledge production and cultural reproduction is downplayed. Rather, they have been made the tool of academic capitalism to support economic development and global competitiveness. The process of re-inventing universities as corporate entities is at various different stages around the world but well under way within the western nation-states. As Slaughter and Leslie (1997) indicate the process is well underway in Australia, New Zealand, the UK and the United States but it is also alive in France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Scandinavia, and Canada. It has led to a corporate structure in universities where faculty is treated as an academic proletariat and administration views itself as New Public Managers. One consequence is that faculty is now seen as a group of self-interested individuals, undermining the notion that they act with professional responsibility. That is, the capacity for self-governance through collegial decision-making is seen as an anathema to the effective use of public funds. This is at odds with the modernist relationship between the nation state and the university that supported professional responsibility and self-governance as a form of delegated authority to bodies possessing expertise.

Previously, professionalism was seen to support the public good because it added to our understanding of what it means to be human. MacIntyre (1997) defined professionalism as “any coherent form of socially established cooperative human activity through which goods internal to that form of activity are realized in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence” (p. 124). Neo-liberalism rejects such a premise, viewing professionalism as benefiting an elite few at the expense of the majority. It is particularly critical of professionalism within universities because they represent sites of possible critique against economic rationality. Since neo-liberalism emerged in response to the riots of 1968, when those in the world of high finance began to view democracies as

ungovernable, Crozier et. al.'s (1975) 'Report on Governability' argued that "democratic citizens must be made more governable and more able to service capital" (Davies and Bansel, 2007, p. 250).

Whereas liberalism was concerned with the "good life", neo-liberalism is more about the "goods life", i.e., acquiring and consuming products. Neo-liberalism also undermines "professionalism"—there is no longer a need for an expertise-based middle class in a distinctive nation state. This was the case even in government civil service. Cameron's (1995) stunning exposé of greed and corruption in the Mulroney (Prime Minister, 1984-1993) era of Canadian politics has this revealing commentary from a deputy minister:

In the Mulroney years, it wasn't smart to [exercise professional judgment to] argue against the prevailing opinion. It *was* held against you. "We can't afford boosterism," the deputy said. "You have to allow professionals to speak their minds." When they don't or when they can't, he explained, they become risk-averse, cautious, and ultimately useless. (p. 455)

Instead, neo-liberalism promotes "governmentality"—the end goals of "freedom," "choice" and "competition," etc., are government constructions that are continuously monitored by New Management technocrats, and represent not a retreat from government intervention but a re-inscription of particular techniques required for the exercise of government. In this way, freedom as a form of dissent, critique, and debate is re-defined as compliance, consumption, and productivity. Such a state of affairs lionizes economic rationality where individuality is discovered not in community but only in relation to market fulfillment, i.e., the state *creates* individuals who are enterprising and competitive entrepreneurs. Consequently, the nation state has been supplanted by supranational entities, e.g., the European Union (EU), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB), etc. These entities exist to provide both socio-economic-political stability and harmonization. The creation of the supranational entity "requires all member nations to cede and pool some of their national policy making capacity to the regional organization" (Dale, 1999, p. 12). But the decline of the nation state has not yet become its outright demise. Even though transnational global economic activity is the order of the day, there are still things at which national governments balk. For example, nation states such as the USA and Saudi Arabia do not permit non-nationals to own their resources but expect their citizens, under free trade, to be able to own other countries' resources, e.g., oil. In Canada, the former Reform Party leader and noted free-enterpriser Preston Manning put his concerns about resource buyouts in this way in a newspaper interview: "If you don't want Osama Bin Laden fiddling with Quebec hydro lines or Beijing controlling the {Alberta} oil patch, there should be national-security provisions in the approval process to protect our values and objectives." The nation state's decline, however, has led to a trend toward standardization and instrumental rationality, which in turn is fostering de-professionalization. In Europe, we have the Bologna Agreement, in Canada the Trade, Investment, and Labor Mobility Agreement (TILMA), trade and labor mobility agreements that supersede any attempt by local

jurisdictions to establish professional standards. It is in this context that an emphasis on economic rationalism is making universities into trans-national bureaucratic corporations. How does this affect university-based international teacher education?

International Teacher Education

I want to explore three different ways of conceptualizing internationalization:

Classical Liberal Stance

One frame is a classical liberal intellectual stance that can be traced back to Kant's *Perpetual Peace* of 1795 where he wrote about the rise of an international legal order. This stance rejects nationalism in favour of a radical liberal international order. Many of the advocates of this form of internationalism view nationalism as a form of xenophobic degeneration. For example, Hobshawm (1990), a British Marxist historiographer, argued that traditions are constructed by national elites to justify the existence and importance of their respective nation states. Or Gellner (1983), a liberal philosopher, criticized nationalism as a political principle that holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent, because it is nationalism that engenders nations (with their homogeneity of culture) and not the other way round. While the former viewed socialism as the alternative to nationalism and the latter saw the emphasis of liberalism on the individual as the alternative, neither of these two critics was opposed to the nation-state as such. What they rejected was radical nationalism, especially in its ethnic form. This rejection was mainly cognitive, seeing nationalism as based on a distorted view of the past and on socially constructed traditions. They considered the nation-state as a viable entity with sovereignty on which to further the advocacy of a better human condition beyond the closed world of atavistic nationalism. Hence, this classical liberal stance seeks a world made up of a pluralist international political culture, a culture that is both inclusive and compatible with deliberative democracy and multiculturalism.

Cosmopolitanism

A second frame views internationalization as a cosmopolitan position. It argues strongly against the flaws of nationalism that is centrally derived from the nation-state. The cosmopolitan frame critiques the classical liberal stance that is deemed to elevate the rule of international law and consensus. In its place, it calls for an individual moral responsibility to all humankind, a vision that diminishes the importance of national identities because territorial boundaries cannot contain democracy or morality. Cosmopolitanism sees globalization as fundamentally altering national politics, in that they are now subsumed under the dictates of the economy that is no longer controlled by any one nation-state. Power relations are not just between different nation-states (as the classical liberal stance would have it) but, as Beck (2006) points out, between global capital, nation-states, and civil society. Nationalism therefore has no place and cosmopolitans regard it as irredeemable. They look instead to a moral universalism that transcends all forms of particularism and patriotism. Like Nussbaum (1994), they view patriotic pride (which she characterizes as close to jingoism—excessive contempt for

other countries) as morally dangerous and subversive of the worthy goals of equity and justice. The nation-state does not and cannot uphold these ideals; they can only be served by allegiance to a worldwide community of human beings. World citizenship is what matters, not nationality. The nation-states cannot solve issues of ecology, poverty, population growth, climate change, etc.; they must be dealt with over and above national concerns and territorial boundaries. Moreover, in the context of multicultural societies, political identity cannot be rooted in a single ethnic, cultural representation.

Postmodern Trans-Nationalism

A third frame is postmodern trans-nationalism. Trans-nationalism was first articulated by Bourne (1916). In its modernist form, it designated a recent shift in migration patterns. Migration used to be directed movement with a point of departure and arrival. It is nowadays increasingly regarded as ongoing movement between two or more social spaces. Increased global transportation and telecommunication now permit migrants to develop strong trans-national ties to more than one home country, blurring the congruence of social space and geographic space. Trans-national relationships, however, do not equate to multinational ones. Whereas the latter are between and among nation-states and their corporate agents across territorial boundaries, the former are between and among individuals and other entities regardless of national borders. Modernist trans-nationalism, then, is very close to cosmopolitanism in its distrust of the nation-state.

With the postmodern turn, this trans-nationalist view sees both nationalism and cosmopolitanism as having fragmented and hybrid identities, arguing that many forms of national consciousness were constructed out of original forms of societal poly-ethnicities. Poly-ethnicity is thus regarded as an historical norm that was reversed by the advent of the nation-state. As such, this frame represents a post-colonial view of the nation as contested terrain and rejects the de-contextualized modes of cosmopolitanism (Tarrow, 2005). Put differently, it does not attempt to transcend patriotism toward a cosmopolitan vision but examines the nation-state as a discursive construct that ever includes new ethnicities and different cultures. Hence, the experience of difference is regarded as fundamental to all identities, including national identity (Dolby & Cornbleth, 2001). This frame replaces the classical liberal assertion that nationalism is the sole construction of elites with the recognition that it is constituted by different subjectivities. This in turn leads to a post-modern examination of trans-national identities, where learning and educational relationships are examined from a power perspective (Dolby & Cornbleth, 2001). Consequently, the ambivalent processes of globalization set the scene not for human growth and emancipation but for resistance and contestation of the self (Tarrow, 2005). Self and society are seen as fluidly located within different, polycentric discourses. This articulation of internationalization takes education beyond a modernist endeavor within national boundaries or moral universalism across borders to focus on how the processes of cultural, political, and economic globalization are affecting self and society.

At the same time, however, this post-modern turn has become vulnerable to what Jameson (1991) calls "the logic of late capitalism"; that is, a heavy neo-liberal emphasis

on the economic aspect of globalization has turned internationalization into a form of economic competitiveness and individual performativity that has invaded our understanding of self and society. Society has become increasingly confused, fragmented, and disoriented as a result of the neo-liberalist economic and cultural restructuring emphasizing individual enterprise and free-market competition. This surge of late capitalism has led to a call for people to surrender their capacities for engaged politics in exchange for market-based values, relationships, and identities. Consequently, civic discourse has given way to the language of commercialism, privatization, and deregulation; and any sense of agency (individual, professional, or social) is defined largely through market-driven notions of individualism, competition, and consumption. In this changing society, education has increasingly become regarded as a commodity, not a public good.

Such an economic rationalist distortion needs to be deconstructed and contested if we are to come to an understanding of international education that does not equate to rogue economic expansionism. But my position is that we have to do it in a way that does not suggest a nostalgic longing for a return to the classic liberal stance or cosmopolitanism. My argument is that the heavy neo-liberal emphasis on economics is denying us all the benefits of cultural and political globalization in international education. The danger in attempting to rectify this imbalance is that we risk losing out on international work completely, thereby throwing out the baby with the bathwater. Marginson's (2007) global revision of the public/private divide in higher education provides a framework that enables us to understand how we can evoke multicultural and multi-political learning in international education in this post-modern era.

Marginson's Public/Private Divide

Marginson (2007) argues that our common understandings of the public/private distinction in higher education are drawn from neo-classical economics and/or statist (i.e., associated with the nation-state) political philosophy. However, the development of competition and markets at the national level, and the new potentials for private and public goods created by globalization in higher education, have exposed weaknesses in the traditional notions of public/private. For example, (1) the statist notion that higher education is always/already a public good blinds us to its role in producing scarce positional private goods for students, even in free systems; (2) because there is no global state, both statist and neo-liberals model the global higher education environment simply as a trading environment without grasping the potential for global public goods in education—goods that are subject to non-rivalry or non-excludability, and broadly available across populations, on a global scale (p. 315). A good is considered non-rivalrous if one person's use of it does not diminish another person's use. A good is considered non-excludable if a person cannot be prevented from using the good. Positional goods, or status goods, those that benefit the individual, are private goods. According to Marginson, public goods and private goods are not mutually exclusive and may be inter-dependent wherein the production of one may lead to the production of the other. That is because higher education in one nation has the potential to create

positive and negative externalities in another; and all higher education systems and institutions can benefit from collective systems, e.g., those that facilitate cross-border recognition and mobility. Marginson thus sets out to revise public/ private in higher education. Rather than defining public/private in terms of legal ownership, he focuses on the social character of the goods. He argues that public/private goods are not always zero sum and that under certain circumstances provide conditions of possibility for each other. He proposes (a) units in national government that focus specifically on cross-border effects; (b) global policy spaces—taking in state agencies, individual universities, NGOs and commercial agents—to consider the augmentation, distribution of and payment for global public goods.

While many view higher education as a public good, Marginson argues that it is not intrinsically so and that this belief serves to conceal the extensive role higher education plays in producing and distributing private goods. Likewise, in the case of public and private institutions, the ownership of the institution does not determine its nature. Private institutions can produce public goods and public institutions may produce private goods. In all cases, it is the practice of education that reveals the underlying purpose. Worldwide, the practice of higher education has become more and more dominated by the pursuit and enhancement of individual status goods. The outcomes of higher education are designed to produce an economic advantage to the individual that can be exchanged in the marketplace.

But it need not be so. Higher education can

. . . produce predominantly private goods, or predominantly public goods, or achieve an (unstable) balance between them. The mix of public and private goods produced is determined by public policy, institutional manager-leaders, and the day-to-day practices of personnel (Marginson, 2007, p. 315).

The values and principles that govern the organization, and their interpretation by leaders and faculty, determine the nature of the goods produced. The problem facing international education is that the neo-liberal agenda ensures that current outcomes are understood primarily through the market environment and therefore within the context of global *private* goods.

Conclusion

What does this mean for international education in postmodern times? Simply this: If higher education is to resist the neo-liberalist trend to use internationalization to produce private positional goods (with the slippery slope of rogue economic expansionism that this can lead to), then we need to re-negotiate globalization to derive ways in which the path of higher education can be influenced toward the production of global public goods that contribute to a more sustainable, healthy, peaceful, and equitable world (Kaul, Conceicao, Goulven, & Mendoza, 2003; Marginson, 2007). There are two traps to be avoided here. First, we must avoid the neo-liberalist trap of appealing to classical liberal and/or cosmopolitan premises to sell private, positional

goods to international students, whether at home or overseas. Second, we must avoid the related trap of nostalgically longing for a classical liberal or cosmopolitan approach to international education when the changed and changing world demands that we act differently. My thesis is that we will begin to lead students toward global public goods that contribute to a more equitable world when we situate our practice in a postmodern trans-national perspective that recognizes the centrality of difference and views self and society as fluidly located within polycentric discourses. Only then will we gain the cultural and political understandings that globalization permits.

References

- Altbach, P. (2004). Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 1, 1-20.
- Beck, U. (2006). *The cosmopolitan vision*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bourne, R. (1916). Trans-national America. *The Atlantic monthly*, 118 (July), 86-97. Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Group.
- Cameron, S. (1995). *On the take: Crime, corruption, and greed in the Mulroney years*. Toronto: Seal Books, McClelland-Bantam.
- Cole, A. (1999). Teacher educators and teacher education reform: Individual commitments, institutional realities. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 24(3), 281-295.
- Cole, A. (2000a). Case studies of reform in Canadian preservice teacher education. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 46(2), 192-195.
- Cole, A. (2000b). Toward a preliminary understanding of teacher education reform in Anglophone Canada. *McGill Journal of Education*, 35(2), 139-154.
- Collins, A. & Tierney, R. (2006). Teacher education accord: Values and ideas of the teaching profession in Canada. *Education Canada*, 46 (4), 73-75.
- Considine, M. (2006). Theorizing the university as a cultural system: Distinctions, identities, emergencies. *Educational Theory*, 56(3), 255-270.
- Dale, R. (1999). Specifying globalization effects on national policy: A focus on the mechanisms. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14(1), 1-17.
- Dale, R. (2001). Constructing a long spoon for comparative education: Charting the career of the 'New Zealand model'. *Comparative Education*, 37(4), 493-500.
- Dale, R. (2005). Globalisation, knowledge economy and comparative education. *Comparative Education*, 41(2), 117-149.
- Davies, B. & Bansel, P. (2007). Neoliberalism and education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20(3), 247-259.
- Dolby, N. & Cornbleth, C. (2001). Social identities in transnational times. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 22 (3), 293-296.
- Evertson, C., Hawley, W., & Zlotnik, M. (1985). Making a difference in educational quality through teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36, (3), 2-10.

- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman.
- Fitzsimmons, P. (2000). Changing conceptions of globalization: Changing conceptions of education. *Educational Theory*, 50(4), 505-520.
- Gellner, E.A. (1983). *Nations and nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Gideonse, H. (1993). The governance of teacher education and systemic reform. *Educational Policy*, 7(4), 395-426.
- Giroux, H. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(4), 1-37.
- Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Haberman, M. (1985). Does teacher education make a difference? A review of comparisons between liberal arts and teacher education graduates. *Journal of Thought*, 20 (2), 25-34.
- Henkel, M. (2007). Can academic autonomy survive in the knowledge society? a perspective from Britain. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 26(1), 87-99.
- Hobshawm, E.A.E. (1990). *Nations and nationalism: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, the cultural logic of late capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kant, I. (1795). *Perpetual peace*.
- Kaul, I., Conceicai, P., Goulven, K., & Mendoza, R. (2003). *Providing global public goods: Managing globalisation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- King, R. (2007). Governance and accountability in the higher education regulatory state. *Higher Education*, 53, 411-430.
- MacIntyre, A. (1997). *After virtue: A study in moral theory*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Marginson, S. (2004). National and global competition in higher education. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 31(2), 1-28.
- Marginson, S. (2006). University leaders' strategies in the global environment: a

- comparative study of Universitas Indonesia and the Australian National University. *Higher Education*, 52, 343-373.
- Marginson, S. (2007b). The public/private division in higher education: A global revision. *Higher Education*, 53, 307-333.
- Middlehurst, R. (2004). Changing internal governance: a discussion of leadership roles and management structures in UK universities. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 58(4), 258-279.
- Napoleoni, L. (2008). *Rogue economics*. London, UK: Allen & Unwin.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Nussbaum, M. (1994). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. *The Boston Review*, <http://www.bsos.umd.edu/gvpt/Theory/Patriotism%20and%20Cosmopolitanism.pdf>.
- Olssen, M. (2000). Ethical liberalism, education and the 'new right'. *Journal of Education Policy*, 15(5), 481-508.
- Olssen, M., & Peters, M. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313-345.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schön, D.A. (1988) Coaching reflective teaching. In P.P. Grimmett & G.L. Erickson (Eds.), *Reflection in teacher education* (pp. 19-29). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Tarrow, S.G. (2005). *Transnational protest and global activism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Yeats, W.B. (1919). The second coming. Printings: *The Dial* (Chicago), November 1920; *The Nation* (London), 6 November 1920; *Michael Robartes and the Dancer* (Dundrum: Cuala, 1921); *Later Poems* (London: Macmillan, 1922; 1924; 1926; 1931). *The Literature Network*. <http://www.online-literature.com/yeats/780/>
- Zeichner, K. (2006). Different conceptions of teacher expertise and teacher education in the USA. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 33 (2), 60-79.

APPENDIX A

Figure 1. ASSOCIATION OF CANADIAN DEANS OF EDUCATION (ACDE) PRINCIPLES OF INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION

ACDE supports the following principles for initial teacher education in Canada:

An effective teacher education program demonstrates the transformative power of learning for individuals and communities.

An effective initial teacher education program envisions the teacher as a professional who observes, discerns, critiques, assesses, and acts accordingly.

An effective initial teacher education program encourages teachers to assume a social and political leadership role.

An effective initial teacher education program cultivates a sense of the teacher as responsive and responsible to learners, schools, colleagues, and communities.

An effective initial teacher education program involves partnerships between the university and schools, interweaving theory, research, and practice and providing opportunities for teacher candidates to collaborate with teachers to develop effective teaching practices.

An effective initial teacher education program promotes diversity, inclusion, understanding, acceptance, and social responsibility in continuing dialogue with local, national, and global communities.

An effective initial teacher education program engages teachers with the politics of identity and difference and prepares them to develop and enact inclusive curricula and pedagogies.

An effective initial teacher education program supports a research disposition and climate that recognizes a range of knowledge and perspectives.

An effective initial teacher education program ensures that beginning teachers understand the development of children and youth (intellectual, physical, emotional, social, creative, spiritual, moral) and the nature of learning.

An effective teacher education program ensures that beginning teachers have sound knowledge of subject matter, literacies, ways of knowing, and pedagogical expertise.

An effective initial teacher education program provides opportunities for candidates to investigate their practices.

An effective initial teacher education program supports thoughtful, considered, and deliberate innovation to improve and strengthen the preparation of educators.