‘Diluting, decoupling, and dovetailing’: Considering new metaphors for understanding the changing International School landscape in China

Abstract

A major development concerning the growth of ‘private English-speaking international schooling’ has been the transition from a ‘traditional’ mode of activity towards a ‘non-traditional’ context. This is especially the case in Asia, where the majority of international schools now reside. Moreover, we find that in mainland China two-thirds of the 900 schools are now perhaps better classified as ‘international*ised* schools’, catering largely for Chinese nationals and being taught by a largely local teaching force whilst delivering a fusion of international and national curricula in a profit-driven paradigm. A major challenge is to picture and theorise this changing, and increasingly very different, landscape. Our paper offers a new imagery for discussion by using metaphor. Building upon the conflicting ‘diluting’ and ‘decoupling’ metaphors that have been recently introduced in the literature, we present here a conciliatory new imagery, that of ‘dovetailing’. This alternative, third metaphor suggests that the changing landscape in places such as mainland China involves models of private bilingual international schooling that are pragmatically ‘dovetailed’ with the national, fusing cosmopolitan sensitivities with the nationalist needs of the State. This metaphor is now ready to be developed and adapted in China and beyond.

Keywords: International schooling; China; Internationalised schooling; metaphor

Introduction

A major development in the growth of ‘English-speaking International Schooling’, involving schools delivering a curriculum in English outside of an English-speaking nation, has been the emergence in areas, such as Mainland China, of a ‘non-traditional’ (Hayden and Thompson, 2013) type. This activity, involving the delivery in English of a non-national curriculum largely to a majority body of ‘local’ children within a commercially profit-driven paradigm (involving quite often branded networks of schools offering a selection of curriculum provision), began to appear in the mid-1990s just as the international school arena was beginning to attract scholarly attention. In fact, shortly after seminal comment was being made that ‘evolution of the concept is consequently at a relatively early stage’ (Hayden and Thompson, 1995, 327), the first branded and franchised offshoot of England’s Dulwich College appeared in Thailand (Phuket), in 1997 (Russell, 1998). A decade later, there were definite signs of a significant shift away from the ‘traditional’ setting, with the majority of children becoming ‘local’ (Dolby and Rahman, 2008, 690).

Within this shifting scene, away from a previously hegemonic ‘traditional’ landscape towards a ‘non-traditional’ one, the number of ‘international schools’ had hit 6,000 in January 2012, and with a steady, continuous growth rate of two per day had reached 11,000 by 2019 (Speck, 2019). By that stage, 2019, it was very clear the ‘non-traditional’ arena had easily replaced in size the ‘traditional’ (Hayden and Thompson, 2013) type of activity, delivering a pragmatic and partly-ideological schooling experience to a transnational elite (Cambridge and Thompson, 2004). Traditionally, ‘international schools’ are seen as catering for ‘globally mobile professional people whose children accompany them to a variety of postings worldwide’ (Hayden et al., 2000, 107).

Much of the ‘non-traditional’ development is instead driven at a demand-side level by a newer middle class (perhaps constituting a ‘global middle class’) and at a supply-side level by national policy making (perhaps constituting a form of ‘stealth marketisation’: Kim and Mobrand, 2019). Together, this presents a strong platform for potential further growth, especially in Asia (Machin, 2017) and commentators (‘pre-Covid’, of course,) were widely predicting an arena of 16,000 schools by 2026 (Gaskell, 2017).

The growing ‘non-traditional’ sphere stands ripe for theorisation, especially as it involves a newer body of clients (parents, national agencies, and investors). Plus it still involves many expatriate educators (still largely emanating from Britain and North America), alongside a growing body of locally-trained teachers. Our paper offers an original approach to begin picturing this changing landscape. By exploring three metaphors of schooling (‘diluting’, ‘decoupling’ and ‘dovetailing’), we aim to conceptualise the emergent diversity of provision that is beginning to appear, certainly in Mainland China, such as the southern Pearl River Delta area of Guangdong (bordering Hong Kong) where many of the nearly 100 franchised branches of elite private English schools (‘Satellite Colleges’: Bunnell et al., 2020) are set to appear by 2023 (Quinn, 2021).

There are already 46 of these ‘non-traditional’ offshoots in China (Henshaw, 2019) and it is worth describing them in more detail to get a flavour of the new landscape. Flyn (2010) had reported how Wellington College had created ‘an offshoot in Tianjin, China, in the image of the Berkshire school’. It was described as a ‘clone’, designed in the same French rococo style as the Founding College back in Berkshire, England, complete with Wellington’s ‘house system, prep and games’. A spokesperson was quoted as saying ‘it as if Wellington College rises again in urban China.’ Clark (2013) described how Harrow has ‘cloned itself in Beijing, complete with boaters.’ It was reported (Edinburgh Evening News, 23 June 2018) that Edinburgh’s prestigious Fettes College was planning to open a ‘replica’ school in Guangzhou, China, with the exact same grounds, buildings, and the House System. Intriguingly, Haileybury Imperial Service College has an offshoot near Beijing (Merchant, 2016) with two turrets that replicate the entrance to Eton College, revealing a strange trend of ‘cross-replicating’ occurring.

In this regard, our paper is a timely rejoinder to Bunnell’s (2020) comment about how the ‘traditional’ model is being suddenly ‘diluted’, and Poole’s (2020) immediate response which had aired the view that the changes represented more of a ‘decoupling’. In this regard, the newer ‘non-traditional’ types of school, such as the aforementioned British-type ones, as well as the bigger yet more discrete bloc of so-called ‘Chinese Internationalised Schools’ (CISs) need to be ‘decoupled’ from normative and traditional (Western-centric) constructions of the ‘International School’ and seen in their own light as different yet equally valid models, representing an extension rather than an intrusion into the field.

The alternative ‘decoupling’ argument (Poole, 2020) says that the CIS, numbering 700 (Keeling, 2019), in particular should be judged on their own terms, not as an inferior or ‘non-premium’ variant of the ‘elite traditional International School’ but as a different, high-quality version with an approach to education that is perhaps more ‘globalist’ (Cambridge and Thompson, 2004) but nevertheless just as valid as the ‘internationalist’ types. Hence, we see the moniker ‘Internationalised’ as more appropriate and hypothesise that may be the case in other settings such as Malaysia where Bailey’s (2015a, 2015b) case study, for instance, implied there exists a ‘Malaysian Internationalised School’ catering largely for a localised clientele.

We see the internationalised model appearing in other settings, outside China, which raises its importance even further. Yemini and Furstenburg (2018, 716), for example, refer to ‘an international school following International Baccalaureate (IB) curricula with an inclination towards peace education that caters to Israeli students’, whilst Beech et al. (2021) refer to another school in Israel catering for parents seeking to accumulate ‘cosmopolitan start-up capital’. Sancho (2016, 478) describes how in India a ‘new class’ is buying into ‘private English-speaking international schools’, especially in ‘second tier cities’ where they offer ‘a new arena for the wealthiest to reinstate their class privileges and distinguish themselves from the expanding middle classes.’ The emergence and importance of the CIS in particular has recently started to garner much academic interest (e.g., Poole, 2021; Wright et al., 2022; Wu and Koh, 2022a), and present an interesting contemporary line of academic inquiry.

These changes call for new metaphors to acknowledge the ‘reality’ of the situation on the ground. Consequently, we offer a new, original set of metaphors to help understand, describe and conceptualise the changing landscape. In doing this, our paper revisits and substantially (re)develops Poole’s (2020) ‘decoupling thesis’ by considering that what we are witnessing in areas such as China is the emergence of a new ‘private English international schooling’ landscape that seems to ‘dovetail’ the national, offering a pragmatic and politically expedient model of activity in what is a politically challenging and socially demanding environment. In this context, it is a fusion of (nationally-led) supply and (consumer-led) demand. We offer this new framework so that the changing landscape can be further discussed, investigated, and theorised. This seems especially important when we consider that the international school arena requires an extra 35,000 new educators each year, still mainly from Britain and North

America, and many will be entering this new landscape. Next, we discuss this changing landscape in China in more detail.

A changing landscape

At the turn of The Millennium, mainland China had 22 international schools educating 7,300 children (Sharma, 2016). This grew to 144 schools by 2007, and had reached 260 schools educating 120,000 children by 2010 (Brummitt and Keeling, 2013, 30). By that time, reports had emerged (Brummitt, 2007, 38) of China needing 3,000 schools by 2016. In fact, by that stage (Gaskell 2016) it was being widely reported (Note: all data on the international school arena emanates from one source, ISC Research based in England) that China, with 700, had the most schools of any nation globally (although the United Arab Emirates, and Dubai in particular, had the most students in attendance). It was reported (Holmes, 2019) that there were 169 in Shanghai, and 142 in Beijing, plus a further 55 in Shenzhen, 47 in Guangzhou, and 25 in Chengdu. Westminster School alone plans six branches in China by 2028, beginning in Chengdu (Nan, 2019), whilst the 11 cities around the Pearl River Delta (e.g. Guanghzhou, and Shenzhen) look set for the most future growth (Moon, 2020).

Of the 12,000 of this type of school worldwide by late-2019, China had 857 educating 372,000 children, of which 57% are ‘local’ children (Morrison, 2019). One can assume that by 2021 the number of schools had hit 1,000. Of course, many are of the ‘traditional’ type, offering International Baccalaureate Diploma Progamme (IBDP) schooling for mainly expatriate families wishing to attend elite Western-based universities (Wright and Lee, 2014). However, about two-thirds are of the CIS variety (Keeling, 2019). Most often go by the name ‘International Chinese Private Bilingual Schools’ (Gaskell, 2019) and have also been termed ‘Non-Exclusive International Schools’ (Young, 2018). The inclusion of the term ‘bilingual’ reveals their emergent pragmatic nature, whilst ‘non-exclusive’ implies they are often an option for children who have had to leave/abandon the private Chinese sector (i.e. they are often not the preference choice of parents).

The CIS, growing at a rate of 14% per year (Keeling, 2019) began to appear about a decade ago, when it was noted (Robinson and Guan, 2012) how a growing body of newer private, profit-driven schools had appeared delivering a fusion of national (Chinese) and international curricula, such as the IBDP or Advanced-Level from grade 10 to grade 12. This development,

with schools delivering a pragmatic fusion of curricula and an international curriculum at pre-university level was at the same time being commented upon by Savva (2013, 17) when she described a school in China where most 'students were culturally and ethnically Chinese, despite being Anglophone passport holders' and 'the school followed the national curriculum of England up until the final 2 years of secondary school, at which point it offered the International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma Programme.'

Characterised by the coexistence of national and international orientations and operated in partnership with Chinese business, the CIS is primarily staffed both by local Chinese hires (representing 60% of the school's staff, according to Gaskell, 2019) and a minority expatriate teaching staff (representing about 40%). This is clearly very different from the 'traditional' type of international school where the British and North American-trained educators dominate the market (Canterford, 2003). The '60-40' split towards a majority of non-expatriates neatly confers with Bailey's (2015a, 6) case study school in Malaysia where the 'non-traditional' setting saw the recruitment of overseas teachers capped to 40%, whilst the majority of the expatriate teachers there are from Britain, South African, and Australia (and not North America, revealing a variation of expatriates appearing). However, the ratio of localised to non-localised teachers may be more variable than the literature suggests due differences between region, school type and, more generally, the impact of Covid-19. Despite this, the trend towards employing local hires in international school is certainly shifting paradigms and calls for new concepts/metaphors for understanding the industry from the 'local' perspective.

Evidence is also emerging (Kong et al., 2020) of a high degree of segregation from the local community, and other schools, with many CISs appearing in 'Tier- 2 city' terrain (Keeling 2019). At the same time, we know tensions are appearing in bilingual settings where 'Western' ways of teaching appear to be privileged in the school, at the expense of the lessons taught in Mandarin (Zhang and Heydon, 2016).

Overall, we need to know more about the management and leadership of the CIS. Although we know (Young, 2018) they can exhibit and exercise a degree of autonomy, especially after Grade 9, and have more flexibility in management and administration than other public or private schools for Chinese citizens, they are ultimately answerable to a Chinese city's local educational bureau and must comply with the same government regulations as national

schools, such as delivering ‘patriotic education’. Delivering patriotic education involves, amongst other things, observing symbolic daily routines that reinforce the 12 ‘core socialist values’ (which are observed and displayed around the school), displaying the Chinese flag in every classroom, and raising the Chinese flag and singing the national anthem during weekly assemblies. This strong ‘regulative pillar’, coupled with a very China-oriented ‘normative pillar’ with its own activities and rituals (Bunnell et al., 2017) arguably makes the CIS a distinct type of institution, and this differentiates (or, ‘decouples’) it from the ‘traditional’ types where the ‘regulative pillar’ is more strongly enforced through external agencies through accreditation, and IB authorization. Consequently, a newer form of ‘cosmopolitan nationalism’ (Wright et al., 2022) is being identified in practice.

Since the publication of the Poole (2020) paper, a number of studies in quick succession (e.g., Assa-Inbar, 2021; Bunnell and Poole, 2021; Cao, 2022; Kostogriz et al., 2022; Poole, 2021; Poole and Bunnell, 2022; Wu and Koh, 2022a, 2022b; Wright et al., 2022; Ying and Wright, 2021) have emerged to suggest the emergent landscape in China is considerably more diverse and complex than first envisioned. For instance, Wu and Koh (2022a) identify three types of ‘internationalised school’ in China: American-style, often offering American curricula; British-style, often branded and quasi-replicas of well-known English private schools; and Canadian-style, often accredited by Canadian provinces whilst many operate within a large network (e.g. Maple Leaf). These relatively new types reflect a new breed of ‘non-traditional’ schooling, implanted from overseas in order to meet ‘agglomerated patterns of local demand’ (Kong et al., 2020, 2). At the same time, Young’s (2018) suggests the existence of a type of school providing a ‘remedial’ rather than an elite academic environment, acting as a schooling of second-choice based upon the student being less settled (and many apparently have been ‘bullied’) in the national system. Also, the families at the school in Young’s (2018) study held precarious social positions in Chinese Society, and many were internal migrants or members of the new entrepreneurial class.

In short, many questions still remain to be answered. How are we to conceptualise the newly emerging ‘non-traditional’ landscape? Do the emerging diversity of ‘internationalised schools’ represent an evolution or reconfiguration of the ‘traditional’ types? Or are they a deviation or a distortion? Do these two types of school exist in parallel landscapes or are they interconnected? Clearly, the overall landscape, certainly as seen in contemporary mainland China, is now a ‘complex scene requiring differing viewpoints and standpoints’ (Bunnell,

2021, 4). It should be said that there were signs in 2021 that the Covid-19 global pandemic was having an effect on job vacancies, with data revealing an 11% decline in 'private English international schooling' job-vacancies globally, although China was seemingly bucking the trend (Jacoutet, 2021). Further, early research into teacher precarity (Bailey 2021) has revealed that areas deemed to be relatively 'Covid-safe' are being seen as preferred options for teachers to move to and remain within, and mainland China is one such area that might attract further investment.

A new framework for visualising the international school landscape

The power of metaphors

Wright et al (2022, 239) state that 'state control over enrolments, curriculum, and practices adds complexity to international schooling in the China context by illuminating interactions between global and national forces.' Our paper attempts to make sense of the complex changing, emergent landscape by offering three metaphors for articulation and further discussion: diluting, decoupling, and dovetailing.

Metaphors are particularly useful in a field like private English-speaking international schooling, which is hard to define and in constant flux. They function as heuristic devices that allow researchers to make sense of the reality, as well as theorising new realities. 'Diluting' implies that the changing landscape is problematic, representing an unwanted intrusion, and one that is at odds with the more 'utopian' (Bunnell, 2014), 'pioneering' (Haywood, 2005, 7) or 'ideal' (Leach, 1969) nature of private English-speaking international schooling as traditionally conceived. The metaphor of 'Decoupling', meanwhile, implies that the changing landscape is a new reality and therefore needs to be understood on its own terms. Finally, the metaphor of 'dovetailing' suggests a more conciliatory approach, one that does not emphasise differences, but attempts to identify areas of congruence.

In proposing new metaphors for understanding the changing international school landscape in China, we take inspiration from the seminal work of Hayden and Thompson (2013) who offered four metaphors for conceptualising 'international schools' in general. Their metaphors included: the 'hotel-chain' metaphor (which we already can easily identify in the form of the schools in Dubai appearing with three price settings, aimed at different markets);

the ‘exclusive’ metaphor; the ‘spa resort’ metaphor; and the ‘food court’ metaphor. The ‘hotel-chain’ metaphor assumes that the international school sector will continue to grow and this growth will be accompanied by increased availability of choice. Developments in the global economy will lead to increased numbers of multinational companies and therefore globally mobile expatriate professionals. It can be seen that this metaphor assumes the growth of the ‘traditional’ international school (and this model is growing as the expatriate market grows). However, the ‘non-traditional’ market is growing fast, at an exponential (and some might argue unsustainable) rate.

The ‘exclusive’ metaphor envisages a future where the market has shrunk, as many national systems of education will have developed to include an international dimension to the curriculum. Moreover, some have even started to open national models - e.g. the ‘International Public School’ which looks set to appear as part of the Egypt 2030 Vision. The Sarawak state government (in Malaysia) intends five residential ‘International Schools’ (Chiam, 2019). There will also be an increase in new international curriculum and assessment in order to meet ‘credentialist’ demand for high-stakes, high-status qualifications. The ‘exclusive’ metaphor captures the current reality, where we can see a high demand for international education from (global) middle class consumers in new settings, and especially in nations which previously have experienced a high ‘brain drain’ of young talent.

The ‘spa resort’ metaphor assumes that education will increasingly be delivered at a distance, providing greater choice of subject, language and access for students. The school as we have come to conceive of it in the physical sense will assume less significance. The ideological dimension (i.e., making the world a more equitable place) would have greater prominence, as the pragmatic aspects of schooling (infrastructure) would not be an issue. This metaphor was somewhat prescient, as distance education via the internet has become a necessity (and it turns out a viable alternative to face-to-face teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic. Furthermore, the ‘spa resort’ metaphor might easily include the franchised overseas branch model, with connections between schools across nations (as practiced by Marlborough College’s links with their branch in Malaysia). Another potential model comes from prestigious Eton College, which has not got involved with the ‘Satellite College’ model, preferring instead to use online technology to inter-act with overseas schools (Buller, 2019).

Finally, the ‘food court’ metaphor (‘food’ has been a popular metaphor in the past, used by Cambridge and Thompson, 2001, and their ‘Big Mac and a Coke’ analogy) presents a future where the distinction between ‘academic’ and ‘vocational’ will be reduced. The emphasis will be on meeting individual needs, allowing students to combine academic and vocational study in a bespoke manner, with curricula choices available ‘a la carte’. Schools that adopt a ‘food court’ approach will ensure that close interaction is maintained between students in different programmes, whilst also providing opportunities for innovation of curriculum (we see this model emerging in China, with fusions of curricula offerings).

Whilst Hayden and Thompson’s (2013) colourful institutional metaphors helped to clarify the possible direction the changing landscape might take, and have already partly taken, we feel that it is now time (in 2022) to offer a set of metaphors that reflect the emerging reality of ‘private English-speaking international schooling’ in the Global South, especially across India, the Middle East, and the ASEAN region, the epicentere of the ‘non-traditional’ models. All the previous metaphors that we can identify (e.g. Cambridge and Thompson, 2001; Hayden and Thompson, 2013) were based on a landscape that assumed the hegemony of the Global North, centred around Geneva, arguably the ‘home’ of the ‘traditional’ setting (e.g. the base of Ecolint, the IB, and the International Schools Association). However, as noted above, the Global South (and mainland China in particular) has now become the epicentre of activity, and the ‘internationalised school’ in its many guises, appears to be morphing into the ‘international school’ of the future, reflecting changes in (national policy making) supply and (global middle class) demand.

It is necessary at this point to briefly explain out use of the terms Global South and Global North. The concept of the global South is often used to identify the regions of Latin America, Asia, Africa, and Oceania and have been described as ‘developing’ or ‘peripheral.’ These countries are contrasted with countries from the global North, such as the UK, US and Australia, which are described as ‘developed’. Although we position China within the Global South, the country appears to sit somewhere between the Global North and South, particularly when considering the urban landscape, such as cities like Beijing, Shanghai and Guangzhou. However, we still choose to use the term Global South because, although many CISs are in major cities, the current growth is among the lesser-developed regions of China (e.g. Chengdu) and the arena now involves many ‘Tier-2 cities’.

Our paper adds to the academic discourse by offering three original metaphors that we see as better reflecting the 'new reality' of 'private English-speaking international schooling' in the global South. Further, we see the third metaphor, 'dovetailing', as a conciliatory one, and lessproblematic than the other two. We next present this framework in detail for further discussion, and debate.

The 'Diluting' metaphor

The metaphor of 'diluting' assumes that the emergence of 'internationalised' schools (and therefore the emergence of the current landscape/industry) is inherently problematic, perhaps even unwelcomed. Here, the hitherto stable and largely insular landscape, akin to a stage of 'mechanical solidarity' (see Bunnell, 2020) has been de-stabilised and undermined by the emergence of the 'non-traditional' types, which is 'diluting the distinctiveness of the [International School] model' (Hallgarten et al., 2015, 3). Commentators suggest that the adjective, 'international' is increasingly being used in various ways that have little veracity (Tarc and Mishra Tarc, 2015).

The ideological and pragmatic purpose of the well-established, accredited and still largely IB authorised 'traditional' type, modelled on Ecolint, is thus being compromised by the emergence of 'pretenders-to the-throne', such as the fast-growing 'Chinese internationalised school'. Based upon studying 'traditional' settings such as Ecolint, Dugonjic-Rodwin (2021 16) identifies the 'guardians of international education'; these 'established schools view themselves as guardians of a highly internalized ethos.'

Such an interpretation might also be supported from a historical perspective. Bunnell (2014) identifies two main phases of international school activity: the 'ideal' phase (roughly from the end of the second world war to the mid- 1990s) and the 'post-ideal' (from the mid-1990s to now). This distinction suggests that the 'ideal' phase, which is associated with the 'traditional', non-profit setting aimed mainly at serving the imaginary 'international community', was characterised by something pure and noble. In contrast, the notion of the 'post-ideal' phase suggests that we have entered into a new 'transitionary phase' (Bunnell, 2020), representative of a movement towards 'organic solidarity' where international schooling is more akin to an interconnected industry, driven by commercial considerations

rather than the post-War moral and ideological commitment to promoting global peace, and international understanding.

Overall, a sense of uncertainty, anomie and existential doubt can be inferred from the nomenclature employed by researchers wrestling with how to accommodate the changing landscape within an imagery of the landscape that had (seemingly) existed. The term 'post-ideal' (Bunnell, 2014) suggests that we have not only entered into a new reality, but that reality is fundamentally different from what came before. The nature of that reality is still not clear, but it is certainly not 'ideal.' Further, the concept of the 'Non-traditional international school' (Hayden and Thompson, 2013, 26) suggests that the new models associated with the changing landscape is a negation of the 'traditional' type, and a deviation away from education based upon values and ideals. It appears as if something has been lost, or at least altered. Rather than being defined in terms of what is (schools pragmatically catering mainly to an ambitious Chinese middle class, rather than merely serving an already privileged transnational community), the 'nontraditional' model is (perhaps unfairly) characterised as an 'incomplete' variation of the 'traditional' (Poole, 2020).

What this ambivalence suggests is a field in flux and transition, 'as the previous norms and values break down and the traditional actors must adjust to emerging, different, and problematic norms and values' (Bunnell, 2020, 767). This same argument could be applied to the academic discourse, which Poole (2021) considers to be rooted in models derived from the global North. It appears as if the reality on the ground, as it were, has leapt far ahead of the academic discourse, which continues to lag behind.

To summarise the emergent situation, from the perspective of the 'diluting' metaphor, we are prone to viewing the emergence of the 'non-traditional' sphere with understandable trepidation and suspicion, as the old is washed away on the tide of the new. In this period of transition and anomie, individuals are likely to cling to what was once familiar and traditional in order to cope with the existential doubt that arises during times of change.

The 'Decoupling' metaphor

The second metaphor, 'decoupling' (Poole, 2020) views the emergence of the new internationalised school landscape as a complete break with what came before. What we are

witnessing is evolution; with the international school morphing, perhaps naturally, into a new form. From the perspective of this 'fundamental break' thesis, it is necessary to 'decouple' the CIS, and other 'non-traditional' models in general, from the normative models derived from the Global North (as said, centred on Geneva). It might be suggested that decoupling is necessary in order to avoid the deficit perspective at the heart of the 'diluting' metaphor. Expanding on this idea, it could also be argued that the 'nontraditional' landscape in general should also be 'decoupled.' Rather than being viewed as a rival or an inferior version of the 'traditional', this burgeoning 'non-traditional' landscape could be seen as a new reality. It has even been argued that the CIS, due to its unique blend/fusion of international and international orientations, should be seen as the 'prototypical globalised school of the future' (Poole, 2020, 455).

Behind this new reality it is possible to discern a subtle change in power relations. Whereas formerly, the landscape was dominated by agents from the Global North, the nexus of activity is now to be found in the Global South. To put it another way, the former centre (the Global North) is now the periphery (at least numerically), whilst the former periphery, (the Global South), is now the centre. This is a major transfer of power. At the same time, a new powerful consumer is emerging in the Global South, appropriating schooling imported from the North. For example, Sancho (2016, 478) describes how a new class is buying into 'International Schools' in India's 'second tier cities' offering 'a new arena for the wealthiest to reinstate their class privileges and distinguish themselves from the expanding middle classes.' From a postcolonial perspective (Said, 1978), this shift in focus might be viewed as part of an inevitable decolonising process. This power dynamic has been recently described (Bunnell 2021, 4 – 5):

> On the one hand, one can easily identify a process of neo-colonial exploitation occurring, as investors and commercial agencies (in the Global North) take advantage of the emerging thirst for a seemingly quality-assured model of private schooling that can meet both parental demand and facilitate economic growth (in the Global South). In this respect, the growth is ethically suspect. At the same time, a more cautious or sceptical viewpoint emerges which identifies nation-states as being in control, and deliberately taking advantage of the desire for continuous growth of the arena of International Schooling.

Having ‘decoupled’ internationalised schools, it is necessary to develop new frameworks for understanding these schools (and the actors therein) on their own terms. Here decoupling is not just on the conceptual level – i.e., viewing the CIS as their own thing – but also requiring decolonising methodologies. The issue with previous descriptions of the landscape in China has been a tendency to view it through the lens of models of international schooling derived from the Global North. In order to understand the ‘non-traditional’ school on its own terms, it is necessary to develop new methodological approaches that complement this process. We suggest that the unit of analysis should be the lived experiences of actors in the school. This is very much in a phenomenological tradition. By focusing on lived experiences, which are often complex, ambivalent and contradictory, a more nuanced narrative is likely to emerge. As such, researchers are less likely to impose pre-fabricated typologies that reify and pigeon hole, and instead allow a new internationalised ‘reality’ to emerge.

To summarise, from the perspective of the ‘decoupling’ metaphor, the Global North continues to dominate the academic discourse, even though the Global South has now become the main arena of activity. It is therefore necessary to ‘decouple’ the ‘internationalised school’ so that it might be judged on its own merits rather than in deficit terms as an ‘incomplete international school’ (Poole, 2020). However, an issue with the ‘decoupling’ metaphor is its dismissal of the ‘international’ as little more than a free-floating signifier, valued not for anything intrinsic, but rather for its symbolic capital. Can we retain some of the ‘utopian’ and irenic focused aspects of the international (such as developing international-mindedness, respect and tolerance) whilst also acknowledging the commercially driven reality of the new landscape, where skills (globally competency) and knowledge prevail, which is now very much oriented to local (global) middle-class, and (aspiring) elites? The metaphor of ‘dovetailing’ may offer us a more conciliatory approach.

The ‘Dovetailing’ metaphor

A dovetail joint, or simply a dovetail, is a joinery technique most commonly used in woodworking joinery (carpentry). It also suggests the combining or interlocking of two things into a unified whole, a new hybrid identity. Our ‘dovetailing’ metaphor acknowledges the ‘reality’ of the situation in areas such as China where a period of fraught transition in which two distinct landscapes co-exist (‘traditional’ and ‘non-traditional’). Yet, this metaphor

also leaves room for acknowledging shared features and characteristics, as well as the tensions that emerge when combining aspects from national and international contexts.

In understanding how the metaphor of dovetailing might be used to understand the new landscape as seen in China, we identity two forms in practice. The first, 'dovetailing as ideal', is largely academic in nature, and considers how notions of the 'international' and the 'national' can be fused conceptually. The second, 'dovetailing as pragmatic reality' moves beyond the academic discourse to consider changes in mainland China at the policy level.

The 'Dovetailing' metaphor explored

An 'ideal' metaphor

'Dovetailing', in practice, would involve the fusion of national and international curricula. Taking the CIS as our example, it is necessary to move beyond simply offering the Chinese national curriculum and an international curriculum and to consider the ways in which such curricula relate to each other on an epistemological level. How might schools find ways to bridge these two curricula? In what ways do these curricula contradict one another? Such discussion would not only help to ease these tensions, but would also lay the foundations for intercultural dialogue, arguably a pre-requisite for any school seeking to identity itself as 'international.'

'Dovetailing' would also entail offering a more even balance of expatriate and local host country teachers. Currently, teaching faculty in CISs are comprised of about 60% Chinese staff and 40% expatriate staff (Gaskell, 2019). It would also suggest a bilingual model of schooling, with English being a less dominant platform of curriculum delivery. Dovetailing can also be understood in relation to the concept of 'cosmopolitan nationalism' (Maxwell et al. 2020). Recently, Wright et al. (2022) have appropriated the notion of 'cosmopolitan nationalism' in order to conceptualise the CIS in a nuanced, more realistic way where the traditional aspect of reconciliation between the ideological and pragmatic dimensions of approach (Cambridge and Thompson, 2004) is given a Chinese makeover. Globalisation compels schools to develop cosmopolitan values that 'embrace diversity and mobility to prepare young people for an interconnected world' (Wright et al., 2022, 239). In a sense, the 'international' that suffuses the 'dilution' discourse could be likened to a Platonic form. It

exists as some kind of elusive ideal that functions in a gatekeeping capacity to keep out the unwanted intruder of the nationally-oriented 'internationalised school'.

Yet the cosmopolitan nationalism concept reminds us that any seemingly 'globalist' education trend is always interpreted and taken up in national-local contexts where aspects of nationalism are inevitably and strategically reinforced and reproduced. To put it succinctly, 'dilution' is inevitable, as the local context, regardless of whether it is in the UK, China or the Middle-East, requires localisation and adaptation (and reconciliation). As Wright et al. (2022, 239) note:

> By appreciating the concurrence of cosmopolitan and nationalistic forces, 'cosmopolitan nationalism' helps to conceptualise how schooling can foster a 'global gaze' while, at the same time, retaining a 'national gaze' by contributing to national economic development, social cohesion, and identities. These dual pressures have the potential to create conflict over the intended role of education in responding to global or national concerns and priorities. The resulting tensions will likely impact schools and students in a complex and diverse manner across different contexts.

The notion of 'cosmopolitan nationalism', an analytical lens to examine how global educational policies, trends, and practices interact with nationalistic tendencies (Maxwell et al., 2020; Wright et al., 2022) also helps to clarify the metaphor of 'decoupling.' As presented by Poole (2020), 'decoupling' suggests a short, sharp break with the international, with the latter being presented as inherently nebulous in nature, little more than a form of cultural/symbolic/social capital deployed by students and parents as a class-making strategy (Basaran and Olsson, 2018). Whilst there is certainly credence to the argument that the 'international' is a form of symbolic prestige, the notion of 'cosmopolitan nationalism' is a reminder that the 'international' also has some substance in the form of developing students' cosmopolitan sensibilities so that they can navigate an interconnected world.

However, dovetailing national and international demands is no simple task. If the dovetailing metaphor is to have any real academic value, it needs to go beyond articulating the need to combine the national and the international; it also needs to identify *which* aspects are to be combined and *how* they should be combined. As Wright et al. (2022) found, combining national and international perspectives is inherently problematic, as areas of tension will

inevitably emerge. These tensions involve attempting to find a balance between the need to develop (local) students' cosmopolitan sensibilities whilst also ensuring that they retain a strong attachment to the state and develop a strong national identity.

Identifying these shared features and characteristics is also a difficult task. The international and internationalised school landscapes have emerged from different historical moments, and therefore represent very different ideological and philosophical positions. As noted earlier, the 'traditional' types emerged from post-war contexts where promoting understanding and greater empathy was part of the school's institutional mission. In contrast, the internationalised school has emerged from a post-Cold War and 'post-ideal' context that seeks to commodify the 'international' as a form of prestige and distinction (Wright et al., 2022).

However, caution needs to be exercised if we are not to over-emphasise the 'utopian' nature of the 'traditional' models, as they have been left to narrate their own story with little critical intervention. It has been observed that all international schools, regardless of mission or type, must function as a business and guard against losing 'social legitimacy' (Stout, 2015). Surviving in the market is therefore the defining goal of these schools (Gardner-McTaggart, 2020), as it is with any elite expensive model of private schooling.

In this regard, the notion of 'legitimacy' could be a shared concern that functions as a 'dovetail joint' for bringing the 'traditional' and 'non-traditional' landscapes together. Institutions such as the CIS are likely to struggle to be recognised as 'legitimate' as they are often unaccredited (80% of all the 12,000 schools recognized in 2021 by ISC Research are not accredited by any external agency although all are, or should be, licensed by the local Bureau of Education) or are perceived as having very little to do with international education, aside from advertising themselves as such. The provision of an international curriculum, such as the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme (IBDP) with its strong 'regulative pillar', enforced through the authorisation process, emerges here as the central and dominant characteristic of 'traditional' models and can be viewed as its 'primary institutional task', the foundation on which its legitimacy rests (Bunnell et al., 2017).

A pragmatic reality

At this point, it is also necessary to bring current political events in China into the discussion. The need to ensure a strong national identity has recently come to a head here, with new policies being introduced to regulate the private education industry (Quinn, 2021; Xinhua, 2021). Although the 'internationalised school' industry in China has largely been left to regulate itself, moves are now underway to tighten control of the country's fast-growing private education sector. At the end of 2020, the Chinese education ministry published a regulation banning primary and secondary schools across China from using textbooks of foreign countries (CGTN 2020). 'Traditional' types of school that enroll expatriates are the only exception. According to CGTN (2020), the policy is designed to safeguard the nation's educational sovereignty. However, the ban on textbooks is not quite as straight-forward as has been represented in the media, and its implementation clearly depends on the course and the subject. Moreover, it is possible that many schools will be able to find a way to work around this ban. For example, the ban makes a distinction between having books in libraries and using them for teaching purposes. It is possible for teachers to copy parts of books from libraries and use them in their teaching in a covert manner.

More recently, China's State Council has announced tough new curbs on school curricula and ownership of private schools. The new law, which was due to come into effect on 1st September 2021, will limit the teaching of foreign curricula from kindergarten to grade 9 (Reuters, 2021). Previously, private bilingual schools, such as CISs, were free to integrate national and international curricula at any level. Once these changes have been implemented, schools will only be able to teach a foreign curriculum from grades 10 to twelve (i.e. they can still deliver the IBDP).

Before the promulgation of the new law in September, 2021, there were some significant internationalised schools in China, such as YK Pao school in Shanghai. Now, after the law, all CIS from grades K through to 9 are legally required to be not-for-profit. This will undoubtedly make the landscape much more complex, and tortuous for many schools, particularly those that were previously for-profit in nature.

Other recent changes that have been announced include restricting membership of the board of directors at K-9 schools to Chinese nationals (which must also include representatives from the regulators), and no longer allowing schools to organise entrance tests or recruit in advance (Reuters, 2021). These laws appear to be the result of concerns about students in

international schools knowing much about Western culture and society but lacking knowledge of their native country China (CGTN 2020). It remains to be seen how these changes will impact the 'nontraditional' arena. However, it can be speculated that the impact will be significant considering that the provision of an international curriculum, as a gateway to Western universities, is probably a key aspect of parental choice. The example of tighter regulations suggests a variation of the dovetailing metaphor.

Whereas the notion of 'cosmopolitan nationalism' suggests a theoretical understanding of integrating international and national orientations, the regulatory example given above is a form of 'segmented incorporation' (Lan, 2014). Integration is evident, but the integration is not on a deep level – i.e., it is not epistemological. Rather than the systematic exclusion of the 'international', which would be both undesirable (due to the revenue that the CISs probably contribute to China's GDP) and arguably unstoppable (private education is a bottom-up phenomenon, fueled by an expanding (global) middle-class who demand school choice and alternative university pathways), we can see a more subtle form of 'dovetailing' at work. Rather than fusing the international and the national, we discern the strategic and subtle incorporation of the international into a fundamentally national(istic) framework. We might describe this process as a way to ensure that 'international education with Chinese characteristics' prevails, and survives. Whereas 'fusion' suggests hybridity (the ideal meaning of the dovetailing metaphor), 'incorporation' suggests that the aspect (i.e., the international) becomes part of a whole (or perhaps suffused through the whole). Within the paradigm of 'international education with Chinese characteristics', the national becomes the new whole, with the 'international' relegated to a largely rhetorical status.

Conclusion

This paper has built upon the tradition in the arena of international education to offer a new metaphor ('dovetailing') for understanding the changing landscape of English-speaking international schooling that we are witnessing in mainland China. Here, the major body of 'international schools' is of a newer, lesser discussed 'non-traditional' variety serving a majority body of host-country children and offering a fusion of curricula taught by a majority-sized body of Chinese educators. This original input, using the metaphor of 'dovetailing', was inspired by what we could identify as being two existing yet slightly conflicting metaphors that have emerged since 2018 - which we have identified as 'diluting'

and ‘decoupling’. However, we now seek to move the imagery beyond them, by considering a more conciliatory and positive direction in which the fast-growing international school landscape in places such as mainland China seems to be moving.

We consider metaphors to be particularly useful in a field like private English-speaking international schooling, which is hard to define and in constant flux. They function as heuristic devices that allow researchers to make sense of the reality, as well as theorising new realities. We can see that the changing scene, towards ‘non-traditional’ models of activity emerging in places such as mainland China, has led to two conflicting (perhaps extreme) metaphors appearing. ‘Diluting’ implies that the changing landscape is problematic, representing an unwanted intrusion, and one that is at odds with the more ‘utopian’ (Bunnell 2014), ‘pioneering’ (Haywood, 2005, 7) or ‘ideal’ (Leach, 1969) nature of private English-speaking international schooling as traditionally conceived. The perspective represented by the ‘diluting’ metaphor is arguably a conservative one, assuming that the proliferation of ‘non-traditional’ models is out of control and poses a potential threat to the sacrosanctity of the ‘traditional’ setting.

‘Decoupling’, meanwhile, implies that the changing landscape is a new reality and therefore needs to be understood on its own terms. The perspective represented by the ‘decoupling’ metaphor might best be described as an evolutionary one. It views the rise of ‘non-traditional’ models in areas such as the Global South as a ‘natural’ and evolutionary phenomenon. These schools are well-suited to their environments, representing perhaps a form of educational Darwinianism. In our view, therefore, the ‘international*ised* school’, represents a new, pragmatic and politically expedient form that is potentially well-suited to the emergent landscape of China, and wider Asia.

Whilst these two metaphors did genuinely reflect existing positions within the academic discourse and within the industry itself, we now feel that individually they are not sufficient in conveying the nuance of provision and activity that is required in picturing rapidly evolving landscapes such as mainland China. Hence, we now offer the more nuanced metaphor of ‘dovetailing’. This, to us, suggests a more conciliatory approach and one that attempts to find areas of congruence rather than emphasising the emergent differences.

We see the new metaphor of ‘dovetailing’ as having value as a conceptual framework and vocabulary. It is offered in an aspirational sense; not in terms of what *is*, but rather in terms of what *could* or *should* be. As such, the metaphor of ‘dovetailing’ may be of relevance to researchers. Whilst it recognises the need to find points of congruence between international and national orientations, it also acknowledges the practical reality of implementing ‘the international’ in national contexts. This requires new conceptualisations of ‘the international’. This vision of dovetailing does not view ‘the international’ as a transcendent Platonic form, but rather in situated terms as ‘the internationalised’ – that is, a glocalised version of ‘the international’ (such as international-mindedness and global awareness) that is compatible with the sociopolitical realities of the local context.

We believe that the notion of ‘dovetailing’ may also be useful as a heuristic for conceptualising the wider changing landscape. The metaphor compels us to look beyond normative models of international schooling derived from the Global North. As the metaphor of ‘dovetailing’ is offered as a conceptual framework, it is arguably necessary to develop this metaphor with empirical evidence. This empirical evidence might include stakeholders’ (e.g., school leaders, teachers and students) understanding of the conceptually slippery concepts of ‘the international’ and ‘the national’ and what these two might look like when combined as ‘the internationali*sed*.’ This empirical evidence might also want to consider how schools fuse ‘the national’ and ‘the international’ in terms of classroom practice and school routines, as well as what ‘the internationali*sed*’ could or should look like within the context of encroaching regulation.

References

Assa-Inbar, M 2021 A cosmopolitan bubble? Constructions of locality at an international school in China. *Critique of Anthropology 41*(4): 345-360.

Bailey L (2015a) Reskilled and ‘running ahead’: Teachers in an international school talk about
their work. *Journal of Research in International Education* 14 (1): 3-15.

Bailey L (2015b) The experiences of host country nationals in international schools: A case study from Malaysia. *Journal of Research in International Education* 14 (2): 85-97.

Bailey L (2021) International school teachers: Precarity during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Global Mobility* 9 (1): 31- 43. https://doi.org/10.1108/JGM-06-2020-0039

Basaran T and Olsson C (2018) Becoming international: On symbolic capital, conversion and privilege. *Millennium* 46 (2): 96-118.

Canterford G (2003) Segmented labour markets in international schools. *Journal of Research in International Education* 2 (1): 47-65.

Clark R (2013) Why some of Britain's top schools are replicating themselves in the far east." *The Spectator*. https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/why-some-of-britain-s-top-schools-are-replicatingthemselves- in-the-far-east

Brummitt N and Keeling A (2013) Charting the growth of international schools. In Pearce R (ed) *International Education and Schools: Moving Beyond the first 40 years*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 25–36.

Buller A (2019) Top British school Eton College touts gulf soft skills courses. Arabianbusiness.com. https://www.arabianbusiness.com/education/425279-top-britishschool-eton-college-touts-gulf-soft-skills-courses

Bunnell T (2014) *The Changing Landscape of International Schooling: Implications for Theory and Practice*. Routledge.

Bunnell T 2020 The continuous growth and development of 'International Schooling': The notion of a 'transitionary phase'. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 50 (5): 764-768.

Bunnell T 2021 The crypto-growth of "international schooling": Emergent issues and implications. *Educational Review*, 1-18.

Bunnell T, Fertig M and James C (2017) Establishing the legitimacy of a school's claim to be "international": The provision of an international curriculum as the institutional primary task.

Educational Review 69 (3): 303-317.

Bunnell T and Poole A (2021) *Precarity and Insecurity in International Schooling: New Realities and New Visions*. Emerald.

Cambridge J (2011) International curriculum: In Bates R (ed.) *Schooling Internationally: Globalisation, Internationalisation and the Future for International Schools*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 121–147.

Cambridge J and Thompson J (2001) A Big Mac and a coke? Internationalism and globalisation
as contexts for international education. Unpublished paper. Centre for Education in an International Context, University of Bath.
http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.199.5645

Cambridge J and Thompson J (2004) Internationalism and globalization as contexts for international education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 34 (2): 161-175.

Cao R (2022). International schools: A good with special value for Chinese middle class. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research* 631: 962-967.

Chiam A (2019) State government to build five residential international schools to groom rural
students. borneopost.com. https://www.theborneopost.com/category/lite-stories/

CGTN (2020) The future of international education in China. *CGTN*, https://news.cgtn.com/news/2020-11-17/The-future-of-international-education-in-China-VutSbCWfLO/index.html

Dolby N and Rahman A (2008) Research in international education. *Review of Educational Research* 78 (3): 676-726.

Dugonjic-Rodwin L (2021) Field theory and education: A case study of the International

Baccalaureate. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09620214.2021.1886595

Flyn C (2010) Public school unveils China clone. *The Times*.https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/public-school-unveils-china-clone-jhnnwxfmfrb

Gaskell R (2016) The global expansion of 'international schools.' *ECIS Global Insights* 2 (1): 24-27.

Gaskell R (2017) Clear the hurdles. *British International Schools Magazine*, 6-7.

Gaskell R (2019) The growing popularity of international K-12 schools in China. ICF Monitor.
https://monitor.icef.com/2019/04/growing-popularity-of-international-k-12-schools-in-china/

Gardner-McTaggart A (2020) Educational leadership and global crises; Reimagining planetary
futures through social practice. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*

Hayden M and Thompson J (1995) International schools and international education: A relationship reviewed. *Oxford Review of Education* 21 (3): 327-345.

Hayden M, Rancic B. and Thompson J (2000) Being international: Student and teacher perceptions from international schools. *Oxford Review of Education* 26 (1): 107-123.

Hayden M and Thompson J (2013) International schools: Antecedents, current issues and metaphors for the future. In: Pearce R (ed) In *International Education and Schools: Moving Beyond the first 40 years*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 3-13

Haywood T (2005) The alliance for international education - making possible the age of influence. *International Schools Journal*, 24(2), 7.

Henshaw C (2019) Number of British schools in China to more than double. tes.com. https://www.tes.com/news/number-british-schools-china-more-double

ISC (2021) Education in China - how demand and supply is changing. *ISC*. https://www.iscresearch.com/news-and-events/isc-news/isc-news-details/~post/education-inchina- how-demand-and-supply-is-changing-20190329

Jacoutet D (2021) Teacher shortage? *International Teacher Magazine*. https://consiliumeducation.com/itm/2020/12/30/teacher-shortage/

Kim H and Mobrand E (2019) Stealth marketisation: How international school policy is quietly
challenging education systems in Asia. *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 17 (3): 310-323.

Kong L, Woods O and Zhu H (2020) The (de)territorialised appeal of international schools in China: Forging brands, boundaries and inter-belonging in segregated urban space. *Urban Studies*.

Kostogriz A, Adams M and Bonar G (2022) Affective practice architectures of professional learning in international schools. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2022.2043267

Lan PC (2014) Segmented incorporation: The second generation of rural migrants in Shanghai."
The China Quarterly, 217: 243-265.

Leach R (1969) *International schools and Their Role in the Field of International Education*. Pergamon Press: London.

Machin D (2017) The great Asian international school gold rush: An economic analysis. *Journal of Research in International Education* 16 (2): 131-146.

Maxwell C, Yemini M, Engel L and Lee M (2020) Cosmopolitan nationalism in the cases of South Korea, Israel and the US. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 41(6): 845–858.

Merchant N (2016) China's demand for pricey international schools 'insatiable'. *The Jakarta Post*.https://www.thejakartapost.com/youth/2016/09/12/chinas-demand-for-priceyinternational- schools-insatiable-.html

Moon L (2020, January 20) British schools rush to open new campuses in Greater Bay area." *SCMP.com*.https://www.scmp.com/business/china-business/article/3046830/british-schoolsrush- open-new-campuses-greater-bay-area

Morrison N (2019) China's threat to golden age for western schools. *Forbes.com*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/nickmorrison/2019/10/02/chinas-threat-to-golden-ageforwestern- schools/?sh=68adebfd7feb

Nan Z (2019) Westminster school enters China's education market. *China Daily*. http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/global/2019-05/13/content_37468120.htm

Poole A (2020) Decoupling Chinese internationalised schools from normative constructions of
the international school. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 50 (3): 447-454.

Poole A (2021) *International School Teachers' Lived Experiences - Examining internationalised schooling in Shanghai*. Palgrave, Macmillan.

Poole A and Bunnell T (2022) Precarious privilege in the time of pandemic: A hybrid (auto) ethnographic perspective on COVID-19 and international schooling in China. *British Educational Research Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3801

Quinn C (2021a) Regulations on the way for private schools and tutoring in China." *The Pie News*. https://thepienews.com/news/china-private-schools-tutoring/

Quinn C (2021b) Southern China new hotspots for British schools." *The Pie News*. https://thepienews.com/news/china-intl-schools/

Reuters (2021) China bars foreign curricula, ownership in some private schools." *Reuters*.

https://www.reuters.com/world/china/china-bars-foreign-curriculum-ownership-someprivate-schools-2021-05-17/

Robinson J, and Guan X (2012) The changing face of international education in China. *On the*
Horizon 20 (4): 305-312.

Russell B (1998) Britain's old school ties head east. *The Independent*. https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/britain-s-old-school-tie-heads-east-1156228.html

Said E (1978) Orientalism: *Western Concepts of the Orient*. Delhi: Penguin

Sancho D (2016) 'Keeping up with the time': Rebranding education and class formation in globalising India." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 14 (4): 477-491.

Savva M (2013) International schools as gateways to the intercultural development of North-American Teachers. *Journal of Research in International Education* 12 (3): 214–227

Speck D (2019) Revealed: The phenomenal growth of 'international schools. *Tes.com*. https://www.tes.com/news/revealed-phenomenal-growth-international-schools

Stout W (2015) The promotion of international Education in formal institutions: Potential for conflict? In: Hayden M, Levy J. and Thompson J (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Research International Education*. London: Sage, pp. 406 – 416.

Wright E and Lee M (2014) Developing skills for the 21st Century: The role of elite IBDP schools in China. *International Review of Education* 60 (2): 199-216.

Wright E, Ma Y and Auld E (2022) Experiments in being global: The cosmopolitan nationalism
of international schooling in China. *Globalisation, Societies and Education 20*(2), 236-249.

Wu W and Koh A (2022a) Being “international” differently: a comparative study of transnational approaches to international schooling in China.” *Educational Review* 74 (1): 57-75. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2021.1887819

Wu W and Koh A (2022b). Reining in the international : How state and society localised international schooling in China. *British Journal of Educational Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2022.2048630

Xinhua (2021) China issues revised regulations for private education sector.” *Xinhua net*. http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2021-05/14/c_139946082.htm

Ying M and Wright E (2021) Outsourced concerted cultivation: International schooling and educational consulting in China. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*.

Yemini M and Furstenburg S (2018) Students’ perceptions of global citizenship at a local and an international school in Israel. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 48*(6): 715-733.

Young NA (2018) Departing from the beaten path: International schools in China as a response to discrimination and academic failure in the Chinese Educational system. *Comparative Education* 54 (2): 159-180.

Zhang Z and Heydon R (2016) The changing landscape of literacy curriculum in a Sino-Canada
transnational education programme: An actor-network theory informed case study. *Journal of*
Curriculum Studies 48 (4): 547-564.