

Apuntes de investigación del BI

Información para la comunidad investigadora del BI

Volumen 3, Número 4

Octubre de 2003

En este número:

Artículos principales

*The Reification of
International Education*

Greg Carroll

*A Historical Perspective in
Defining International
Education*

Bob Sylvester

Reseña de un miembro del Comité de investigación

Samir Chammaa

Noticias de investigación

- ~ **Journal of Research in
International Education**
- ~ **Trabajos de investigación**
- ~ **International education
research database**
- ~ **Sitio web público de IBO**
- ~ **Centro pedagógico en
línea**
- ~ **Conferencia de Alliance
for International
Education**

Bienvenido a los *Apuntes de investigación del BI*, volumen 3, número 4.

El presente número retoma el debate sobre la definición de "educación internacional". En el primero de los artículos, Greg Carroll cuestiona la suposición de la necesidad de una definición preguntando si es posible realizar una distinción válida entre una educación internacional y una buena educación. En su artículo, Bob Sylvester expone sus argumentos a favor de la aplicación de una perspectiva histórica al definir el término, teniendo en cuenta para ello las fuentes disponibles desde principios del siglo XX en adelante. Martin Skelton, en su respuesta a estos artículos, comenta las contribuciones de los autores y señala las principales diferencias entre ambos.

Como tal vez hayan observado, un nombre nuevo aparece al final de esta columna. Roger Brown, anterior jefe de desarrollo y apoyo en investigación de la Unidad de investigación del Bachillerato Internacional, se ha trasladado a Nueva York para dedicarse a la labor de consejero pedagógico. Expresamos nuestro agradecimiento a Roger por contribuir a que los *Apuntes de investigación del BI* se hayan convertido en un destacado foro de debates sobre investigación en el ámbito de la educación internacional y le deseamos la mejor de las suertes en su nueva actividad. Igualmente, esperamos que el futuro de esta publicación sea tan apasionante como su presente.

James Cambridge
Investigador universitario

Los *Apuntes de investigación del BI* son una publicación trimestral de la Unidad de investigación (IBRU) y del Centro de currículo y evaluación (IBCA) del Bachillerato Internacional. Para comunicarse con IBRU, dirigirse a:

IBRU
Department of Education
University of Bath
Claverton Down, Bath
BA2 7AY
REINO UNIDO
Fax: +44 1225 323 277
Correo-e: ibru@ibo.org



Artículo principal

Greg Carroll es catedrático adjunto en el Salem State College. Ha sido profesor de filosofía educativa en la Universidad de Monash, Australia, y ha trabajado como investigador universitario en el Monash Center for Research in International Education. Ha enseñado también en colegios públicos e internacionales de Australia, Alemania, los Países Bajos y Estados Unidos. Posee una licenciatura en Ciencias de la Educación por la Universidad de Melbourne, Australia, un máster por la Universidad de Columbia, Nueva York, y un doctorado por la Universidad de Monash, Australia.

The Reification of International Education

Greg Carroll, doctor, catedrático adjunto, coordinador del programa de estudios sobre la paz, Salem State College, Salem, EE. UU.

Why do we name things? We name them so that we can readily identify them; a name is shorthand for a set of characteristics. When we use the term “hominid” we signify a generally agreed upon set of features. Yet, even for such a readily accessible term, the question “What does it mean to be human?” is an open one. We could easily describe the domain of “human” as our seemingly unlimited capacity for charity or barbarity. It would seem, however, that given recent world events our capacity for moral learning is not one of our strongest features. We closed the second world war with the words “never again”. Yet the close of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first have been at least as barbarous as at any time throughout history. Where does this place international education and education generally? If we take a Deweyian view of education, its dual role is to transmit and transform culture (Dewey, 1966). This being the case, then what culture is international education seeking to transmit and transform? It is on such a question that those concerned with international education need to focus, rather than on what I see as the narrower and limiting question of how to define international education. “How we think about something makes a difference, not only at the level of theory, but in terms of practice as well” (Apple, 1992, p779).

What are the purposes of seeking definitional clarity? It would seem that efforts at defining discourses have, as outlined by Goodson (1990; 1993; 1997), more to do with the establishment of turf and the process of gatekeeping. While it is nice to have a clear set of criteria that can govern a field, the danger is that such criteria are then used to deny access. Perhaps we are already seeing the outcome of this? We are happy to talk about the *international* while other communities with remarkably similar characteristics are referred to as *immigrant*? What really separates the two? Both typically operate outside their traditional home base, often operating in a second language. Both typically move for economic opportunity, the difference being that one group started with the economic advantage and cultural capital to exploit it, while the other group seeks such advantage. One group works from a position of hegemony, while the other is looking to escape from hegemony (Freire, 1993). From a social justice perspective, do both groups have equal opportunities (see McIntosh, 1988; McLaren, 2000; Ogbu & Simons, 1998; Williams & Chrisman, 1994)?

One of the dangers that international education needs to avoid, from my perspective, is being seen as a form of cultural hegemony. “[T]he influences which educate some into masters, educate others into slaves” (Dewey, 1966, p84). How will international education respond to Dewey’s claim? Establishing international education as something separate and distinct from “regular” education establishes a dangerous dualism in the field. The focus of international education on just those who willingly choose to be internationally mobile, while ignoring those who are forced into such mobility, will result in education being responsible for further hardening and entrenching the divisions that run contrary to the expressed aims of organizations seeking to promote international ideals.

Does the international education field suffer from a lack of definition? Is the lack of a definition necessarily a bad thing? Perhaps by applying a pragmatist mode of analysis, in the philosophical not political sense, we can gain some insight, for as stated by William James:

[E]thical treatises may be voluminous and luminous as well; but they never can be final, except in their abstractest and vaguest features; and they must more and more abandon the old-fashioned, clear-cut, and would-be “scientific” form (James, 1917, p210).

I would argue that, similarly, international education, other than in its most abstract and vague features, should actively seek to avoid a clear-cut definition of what it is. A more fecund discussion would be to regard the role of education generally. Given education’s link to cultural capital, a better focus of attention for “international” educators would be on education’s divide between public good and private gain. A further concern with the hegemonic influences of education in liberal democracies is the untheorized acceptance of the need to be more competitive in the global marketplace, and an ahistoricist approach to educational reform. We have, it would appear, uncritically accepted the notion that education generally is failing our children and that they are finishing schooling unprepared for a life of work. I say ahistorical because such claims of underpreparedness have been around as long as we have had formal compulsory education (Meier, 2000). What is perhaps new is the extent to which a training mentality has pervaded educational policymaking.

[T]he emergence of new global policy making processes in education, which are often linked more to the interests of global capitalism than to the needs of particular societies and specific individuals, and in the ways globalization shapes perspectives on educational reform ... may lead to the reproduction of social inequalities in and through education (Rizvi & Lingard, 2000, p421).

Why differentiate and reify good international education from good education? Being cynical, we could say that international education is nothing more than the education of a globally mobile, mercantile elite. Taking a critical literacy perspective we can identify it as another form of hegemony. Shouldn’t international education be seen as the exemplar for education, where its links to public education are clearly established and visible? Education has typically been for the upper and middle classes; of course we did have the Old Deluder Satan Act of 1647 in the New England colonies, though the act was little more than a religious indoctrination. The advent of the common and normal schools in America and universal public education in many other countries did little to encourage the movement of the upper and middle classes into public education. Rather, the use of private compulsory and post-compulsory education by these groups can be interpreted as a way of maintaining and entrenching class distinctions. In Massachusetts today, where the State Board of Education has introduced a far-reaching set of assessment criteria known as the Massachusetts

Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), the rhetoric of increasing standards and accountability has led to a narrowing of the curriculum to mathematics and literacy. This is particularly so in the fourth grade where public school students are first tested, the final outcome being that students are expected to pass tenth grade English and mathematics examinations in order to graduate from high school. Taken on face value such a proposal might be greeted with the affirmation that the Massachusetts Department of Education (MDOE) is demanding that standards be met. The MDOE is enforcing these standards by threatening schools that fail to show continual improvement with state take over or the appointment of administrators. Students who fail the “high-stakes” examination are denied a diploma and the possibility of entering the public higher education system. Tellingly, it is only the most vulnerable who are treated in this way; private school students do not have to take the MCAS examinations. Rather than providing for equity, one of the original premises of Massachusetts’ educational reform, MCAS examinations are driving the curriculum and reducing it to a compendium of facts and processes that are amenable to being operationalized and quantified.

With such stratification between public and private education at a national level, do we need to be adding another layer of privilege. Surely good international education is good education; if it is good enough for the daughters and sons of diplomats and international executives then isn’t it good enough for the regular public school student? Isn’t it good enough for the newest immigrant (that interestingly is called immigrant and not international)?

I am in no way asserting that we should not examine international education’s roots. My caveat is that these efforts should not be aimed at reifying the field. Such reification, while professionally appealing in terms of turf creation, should be resisted for it will only serve to ossify the field and deny access. If, as Altbach (1995) suggests, education in general is an aspect of cultural imperialism, and if it is a contributing factor for the maintenance if not further development of inequality between colonizing and colonized (Blackmore, 2000), then what does this say about international education? I am interested in looking at how those of us concerned with the international dimension of education can come to a broad understanding in our views of just what international education transmits and transforms for those lucky enough to benefit from its richness. It would then be interesting to see how we can apply these views to curriculum at the national level, both public and private, and just as importantly what effect this application would have on the questions of equity and justice.

References

- Altbach, PG. (1995). “Education and Neocolonialism”. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths & H. Tiffin (Eds). *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (452–456). London, Routledge.
- Apple, MW. (1992). “Educational Reform and Educational Crisis”. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 29(8), 779–789.
- Blackmore, J. (2000). “Warning Signals or Dangerous Opportunities? Globalization, Gender, and Educational Policy Shifts”. *Educational Theory*, 50(4), 467–486.
- Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (Third Printing March ed). New York, The Free Press.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, Continuum.
- Goodson, IF. (1990). “Studying Curriculum: Towards a Social Constructionist Perspective”. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 22(4), 299–312.

- Goodson, IF. (1993). *School Subjects and Curriculum Change: studies in Curriculum History* (3rd ed). Washington, DC, The Falmer Press.
- Goodson, IF. (1997). *The Changing Curriculum: Studies in Social Construction* (Vol. 18). New York, Peter Lang.
- James, W. (1917). *The Will To Believe: And Other Essays In Popular Philosophy*. New York, Longmans, Green and Co.
- McIntosh, P. (1988). White Privilege and Male Privilege: a personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies, *Working paper No. 189*. Wellesley, MA, Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.
- McLaren, P. (2000). "Unthinking Whiteness: Rearticulating diasporic Practice". In P. P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Revolutionary Pedagogies: Cultural Politics, Instituting Education and the Discourse of Theory* (140-173). London, Routledge Falmer.
- Meier, D. (2000). "Educating a Democracy: Standards and the future of Public Education". *Boston Review*, February/March.
- Ogbu, JU. & Simons, HD. (1998). "Voluntary and Involuntary Minorities: A Cultural-Ecological Theory of School Performance with Some Implications for Education". *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 29(1), 155-188.
- Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B. (2000). "Globalization and Education: Complexities and Contingencies". *Educational Theory*, 50(4), 419-427.
- Williams, P. & Chrisman, L. (Eds). (1994). *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. New York, Columbia University Press.

Artículo principal

Robert Sylvester ha sido profesor, director, capacitador docente y consejero pedagógico en Zambia, Botswana y Sri Lanka durante 25 años. Actualmente es catedrático adjunto de educación en el Bridgewater State College, Massachusetts, EE. UU.

A Historical Perspective in Defining International Education

Bob Sylvester, catedrático adjunto, Bridgewater State College, Massachusetts, EE. UU.

In this article I ponder the historical view of the field we know as international education. As international education proceeds into the 21st century it is becoming more apparent that, as a potential field of research, it suffers primarily from a lack of definition. However, this apparent lack of definition could be related to the lack of a comprehensive standard history of international education, especially covering the first half of the 20th century. I hope to be able, in a summary fashion, to give some indication to researchers where they may begin to look for the many historical precedents in their defining of international education.

Brickman's (1950) effort at establishing a bibliographic baseline of the historical antecedents of international education was the first substantive scholarly historical project related to the 20th century. Brickman's annotated bibliography of the history of international education indicated a rich field of documented research, activism and curriculum efforts that could be traced back to the middle of the 19th century with historical roots to the time of Comenius (in UNESCO 1957). Scanlon (1960) usefully assembled a series of revealing historical documents related to international education. Scanlon and Shields (1968) later confirmed that no comprehensive effort had ever been made to construct a scholarly approach to the history of international education. This complete lack of historical documentation has resulted in the perpetuation of a misconception surrounding not only the history of international education but also the meaning and definition of international education in terms of research and curriculum efforts.

The current view suggests that the roots of today's international education have risen from the ashes of the second world war and have been largely a western undertaking and product. This view of international education is not supported by the deep historical record of activities from the 1850s onward. Also, the definition of international education seems to be based on a complete lack of a commonly accepted focus in the field, and is not supported by the rich history of large-scale attempts to offer a conceptual definition of international education. Even at the dawn of the 20th century, a Hungarian educational researcher, Kemeny (1901) outlined a proposed framework of what he termed "international education". This included comparative education studies, international teacher conferences, international standards of curriculum design, human rights education and anti-racist education. Further efforts related to peace education in the first decades of the 20th century, and efforts in support of the League of Nations in the 1920s produced a wide variety of activities and sentiments.

In a comprehensive survey of international education programmes, institutions and activities by Harley (1931) of Stanford University, we can find a number of attempts to define international education. Specific frameworks of international education on a wide scale were also seen through the work of the World Federation of Education Association (WFEA, 1926), which was established in 1923 and operated until the opening hours of the second world war. Of special interest was the establishment of an international education committee by the WFEA in 1939 as a result of an international curriculum development plan (The Herman-Jordan Plan) that was developed by the president of Stanford University, David Starr Jordan, in 1923.

The next significant document that addressed the meaning and definition of international education was Rossello's (1943) history of the "forerunners" of the International Bureau of Education in Geneva. Building on such works as these, and on the concurrent rise in the global activities in international education in the 1950s and 1960s, UNESCO, from its earliest days, took an active and quite natural interest in international education (which was, even then, widely understood to be equivalent to "education for international understanding"). Over the next two decades, various levels of UNESCO experts developed conceptual approaches to international education that resulted in an operational definition being adopted by UNESCO (1974). This may be considered as the only large-scale effort to provide a definition of the term "international education" by a widely recognized international educational body. The definition, agreed at UNESCO General Conference level, combined the elements of international understanding, cooperation and peace with the range of focal points of international education under the overall rubric of "education for international understanding". The same document outlined the following relevant educational objectives for international education:

1. a curriculum with a global perspective
2. understanding and respect for other peoples and cultures
3. human rights and obligations
4. communication skills
5. awareness of human interdependence
6. necessity for international solidarity
7. engagement by the individual in the local, national and global scale (UNESCO 1974 p2).

Two other UNESCO documents are of special interest in the development of an operational definition of international education: document no. ED 142, Paris, 1955 and document no. 17c/19, Annex II of 1972. These can be found on the UNESCO web site (www.unesco.org).

Another landmark attempt to approach the problem of defining a conceptual framework for international education was undertaken in 1969 by James Becker. The first chapter of his report, a full 60 pages long, was devoted solely to the problem of defining international education. It should be noted that this report, which was sponsored by the Foreign Policy Association based in Washington DC, came face-to-face with a mythology about the level of the nation-state that was largely reinforced by an abiding sense of self (as he reported it) on the part of the citizens of that nation. Global interdependence gradually undermines the mythology of self-sufficiency and this erosion of a narrow civic mythology results in strident attempts, as Becker relates it, to save or return to a former state of national pride. This also results in a reluctance to view human processes in a global context.

As Becker noted:

We confront the hard and complex question of what basic purposes underlie and guide our efforts to educate young humans about the world into which they have been cast. Can the underlying purpose of international education be restricted to the development of an aggregated fund of knowledge about the different elements that make up the world, or, should our ambitions extend to the development of some understanding of the world perceived as a totality? (Becker, 1969)

The implications of this conceptual approach to the problem of defining international education are, in principle, clear. A definition appropriate to the needs of the time should illuminate the global interconnectedness that characterizes the contemporary world, and point to a form of international understanding required by the citizen of the future that must comprise some understanding of the world perceived as a whole.

References

- Becker, JM. (1969). An Examination of Objectives, Needs and Priorities in International Education in U.S. Secondary and Elementary Schools. Final Report. (Eric DocumentED 031612).
- Brickman, WW. (1950). "International Education". In Monroe, WS (ed), Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Macmillan.
- Harley, JE. (1931). International Understanding: agencies educating for a new world. Stanford University Press.
- Scanlon, DG. (1960). International Education: a documentary history. Columbia University, Bureau of Publications.
- Scanlon, DG. and Shields, J. (1968). Problems and Prospects in International Education: Teachers College Press.
- Comenius, J A (1957). John Amos Comenius, 1592-1670: Selections, UNESCO, Paris, cited in Scanlon, DG. 1960. International Education: a documentary history. Columbia University, Bureau of Publications.
- Kemeny, F (1901). Entwurfeiner Internationalen Gesamt Akademie: Weltakademie
- Rossello, P (1943). "The International Bureau of Education", in Forerunners of the International Bureau of Education, (Tran.) Marie Butts, Evans Brothers, London, pp114-118, cited in Scanlon, DG. 1960. International Education: a documentary history. Columbia University, Bureau of Publications.
- UNESCO (1974). Recommendations Concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms: adopted by the General Conference at its eighteenth session in Paris, November, 1974. UNESCO, Paris.

Se invita a los lectores a expresar sus opiniones sobre estos artículos y la respuesta a los mismos en los foros de debate del Centro pedagógico en línea (<http://online.ibo.org>). Dentro de estos foros existe uno llamado **Apuntes de investigación**, destinado a los intercambios de opinión sobre los artículos publicados en los apuntes. En futuros números de los *Apuntes de investigación del BI* aparecerá un resumen de los comentarios recibidos en dicho foro.

Respuesta a los artículos principales

Martin Skelton, cofundador de Fieldwork Education, Londres, Reino Unido

Bob Sylvester says that “as a potential field of research” international education “suffers primarily from a lack of definition”.

Greg Carroll says that “international education, other than in its most abstract and vague features, should seek to avoid a clear-cut definition of what it is”.

So, there are no problems in distinguishing the differing thrust of each of these articles.

However, Bob Sylvester, while showing that the historical attempts to construct such a definition have taken place over a longer period of time than many of us might realize, also shows just how difficult it has been to come up with a definition that is secure enough to be a basis for long-term action. His response that we need “a definition appropriate to the needs of the time” is fine, except that by the time we have refined it, agreed it and decided what to do for the benefits of students in the messiness of the classroom, times may well have changed.

This would matter less if we adopted a literal interpretation of Bob Sylvester’s remark that he is talking about international education as “a potential field of research”. But it would be based on an assumption that research and action are not linked. This may be true of some fields but I don’t believe that Bob Sylvester means it to be true of international education.

But here lies the paradox of these two articles. If Bob Sylvester’s piece indicates that getting to a definition of international education is difficult, Greg Carroll’s, surprisingly, tells us why it is important.

He says that, “Being cynical, we could say that international education is nothing more than the education of a globally mobile, mercantile elite”. This sounds suspiciously like a definition to me. (He doesn’t have to agree with this definition, of course. He just needs it to make his point.)

And his argument that we invoke a cultural hegemony in distinguishing between *international* and *immigrant* sounds like a plea for a more inclusive definition of international education rather than no definition at all.

Why these two articles side by side are so helpful is that they remind us that those who have an interest in international education are engaged in something “ambiguous, imperfect and uncertain”. (Pascale and Athos, 1982)

Eisner (1977) reminded us more than 30 years ago of the difference between “instructional” and “expressive” objectives, a difference we can usefully apply to definitions as well. An *instructional* definition would be unambiguous and contain its own clarity; an *expressive* definition would lack immediate clarity and require indicators of meaning to help us get the sense of the thing. It seems to me that international education is just more expressive than instructional.

Bob Sylvester tells us that definitions are important. He is right. But so is Greg Carroll in reminding us not to look too hard for absolute definitional clarity. What we need is to continually explore the messiness and come up with something good enough that, for now, enables us to “go on”.

If not, how are school-based advocates of international education to help students in all classrooms “benefit from its richness” (Carroll) in a way that “must comprise some understanding of the world perceived as a whole”? (Sylvester)

Eisner, E. (1977). “Instructional and expressive objectives”, in Hamilton et al (eds), *Beyond the Numbers Game*, Macmillan Education Ltd, Berkely, CA 91-94.

Pascale, R. and Athos, A. (1983). *The Art of Japanese Management*, Penguin Books, London.

Reseña de un miembro del Comité de investigación

Samir Chammaa

Samir Chammaa nació en el Líbano el 1 de abril de 1940. Finalizó sus estudios de secundaria en 1958 en la sección francesa del American International College de Beirut, Líbano, donde contó con la ventaja de una exposición bien integrada a las influencias culturales árabes, francesas y anglosajonas.

Se matriculó entonces en la división de Beirut de la Universidad de Lyon, donde cursó estudios de matemáticas, y más tarde se unió al International College como profesor de esta asignatura. En 1972, Samir Chammaa recibió la invitación de presidir el comité nacional libanés encargado del currículo de matemáticas. Fue cofundador del CEPREM (Centre de Promotion de l'Enseignement Mathématique) y participó activamente en el desarrollo curricular, la publicación de libros de texto y la capacitación docente durante más de diez años.

De 1975 a 1985 desempeñó funciones administrativas para los colegios de enseñanza media y secundaria del International College, y tomó parte en las actividades de consulta del Educational Resources Center. En concreto, fue nombrado director de enseñanza secundaria de 1980 a 1982, y director del Educational Resources Center en 1982. En 1985, abandonó el Líbano a causa de la guerra civil y se marchó al Golfo Pérsico. En 1988 se unió al Ibn Khuldoon National School, en Bahrein. Su primera tarea fue dirigir el colegio en el desarrollo de su programa de secundaria, su acreditación en Estados Unidos y su nombramiento como colegio del BI.

En el Líbano, fue tesorero de Jeunesses Musicales du Liban entre 1960 y 1965, y cofundador y vicepresidente de la Society of the Friend del American University Museum durante seis años.

Samir ha ocupado varios puestos en el comité internacional y los comités regionales de IBO. Entre los años 2000 y 2003, fue presidente del comité consultivo regional de África/Europa/Oriente Medio, vicepresidente del comité regional de representantes de directores de colegios (CRRD), y secretario del comité internacional de representantes de directores de colegios (CIRD). En 2002, entró a formar parte del comité de investigación. Actualmente, además de sus responsabilidades como docente, Samir es miembro de un grupo de educadores dedicado al estudio de iniciativas que fomenten el entendimiento y la cooperación internacionales.

Noticias de investigación

Journal of Research in International Education

Si desea más información sobre esta publicación, visite: <http://www.sagepub.co.uk>.

Trabajos de investigación

MACKENZIE, P.; HAYDEN, M.; THOMPSON J. "Parental Priorities in the Selection of International Schools". *Oxford Review of Education*. Vol. 29, Núm. 3, pp. 299-314. 2003.

HICKS, D. "Thirty Years of Global Education: a reminder of key principles and precedents". *Educational Review*. Vol. 55, Núm. 3, pp. 265-275. 2003.

JENKINS, C. *Perceptions of the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme: A report of an inquiry carried out at UK universities and institutions of higher education*. International Baccalaureate Organization: Cardiff, 2003.

International education research database

Esta base de datos ya se encuentra disponible y cuenta con más de 1900 artículos de investigación sobre educación internacional y sobre los programas de la Organización del Bachillerato Internacional. Se puede acceder a ella desde el sitio web de IBO, en www.ibo.org. En la sección **Investigación**, a la que puede acceder desde el menú de atajos, encontrará un enlace a la base de datos de investigación, que le permite realizar búsquedas.

Sitio web público de IBO

El sitio web público de IBO (<http://www.ibo.org>) proporciona información general sobre la organización y sus programas.

Centro pedagógico en línea

El Centro pedagógico en línea (<http://online.ibo.org>) está disponible para todos los profesores de colegios del BI que estén suscritos al sitio web. El Centro pedagógico en línea constituye una valiosa fuente de información para todos aquellos que estén considerando realizar investigaciones relacionadas con los programas del BI.

Conferencia de Alliance for International Education

Esta conferencia tendrá lugar en la ciudad cosmopolita de Düsseldorf, Alemania, del 1 al 3 de octubre de 2004. La conferencia tratará el tema de la educación como forma de promover una mentalidad internacional (*Education for International Mindedness*). Para más información, póngase en contacto con Beatrice Larose, responsable de desarrollo, International School of Düsseldorf, Niederrheinstrasse 336, D-40489 Düsseldorf (Alemania). Tel.: +49 (0) 211 9406 712; fax: +49 (0) 211 9406 804.

Esta conferencia se ha organizado con el auspicio de la Universidad de Bath y de la Organización del Bachillerato Internacional.