

Knowledge Globalization Within and Across the People's Republic of China and the United States: A Cross-National Study of Internationalization of Educational Research in the Early 21st Century

Robert J. Tierney
University of British Columbia
University of Sydney
Beijing Normal University
Wei Kan
Beijing Normal University

The study examines globalization within and across China and the United States in conjunction with a portrayal of the nature of the scholarly endeavors over the past 10 years in the two preeminent educational research journals of these countries. By extensive analyses of topics, methodology, and citations the research clarifies the global and local forces at work within and across countries, including the types of internationalization occurring between the United States and People's Republic of China. The findings suggest that globalization involves forces in transaction with one another—local forces addressing national interests and international forces seeking a comparative perspective primarily tied to local interests. The findings highlight

ROBERT J. TIERNEY is a professor of language and literacy education at the University of British Columbia, a Distinguished Visiting Professor at Beijing Normal University, and Honorary Professor at the University of Sydney, Australia; e-mails: rob.tierney@ubc.ca, rob.tierney@sydney.edu.au. Rob's interests are focused upon global research developments often in the area of literacy and especially as they pertain to historical ways of knowing.

WEI KAN is an associate professor of the Institute of Curriculum & Teaching, Faculty of Education, Beijing Normal University. He has published more than 20 papers in Chinese educational journals and a book by Springer in English *Constructivist Teaching in China: Transformation in the Chinese High School System*. His main research interests lie in the comparative curriculum and teaching theories and practices, classroom sociology and studies on teachers and pupils voices.

Tierney, Kan

the insularity of each country's scholarly endeavors and how research is skewed toward western scholarship.

KEYWORDS: globalization, internationalization, comparative, epistemologies

Our study occurs at the confluence of studies of the sociology of global knowledge—especially east-west constructions (e.g., Bourdieu, 1998; K. H. Chen, 2010; Collins, 1998), historical analyses of epistemologies (e.g., Elman, 1984), comparative studies of educational research developments (e.g., Manzon, 2011), contrastive rhetoric (Kubota & Lehner, 2004) and a transnational accounting of the mobility of people and ideas (e.g., Charle, Schriewer, & Wagner, 2004; Popkewitz & Rizvi, 2011). Our goal is to examine the epistemological leanings of western and eastern educational research in conjunction with critical reflections on the scholarly trajectories, especially related to internationalization and the interplay between local and global forces that are being manifested within the People's Republic of China (China) and the United States (US) over the past decade. To this end, we pursue comparative analyses of the internationalization of educational research within a corpus of research articles published over the past decade within preeminent journals of China and the US.

Some Background

What is often referred to as the global knowledge economy, in this age of connectedness and increasing global management, includes a shift toward expansive economic and social developments simultaneously intersecting at various levels. This shift involves individuals, institutions, and nations positioning themselves locally as well as within regional and global networks as they trade in the production and consumption of ideas. It is in this era of globalization that previous forms of imperialism are being replaced by what appears to be global government and media-driven western influences (K. H. Chen, 2010; Stack, 2016).

Contributing momentum to these developments are international agencies such as the World Bank, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)—originally the Office for European Economic Co-Operation—the United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, and other foundations. These groups have spurred new forms of global governance, national alignments and oversight of education tied to measures of knowledge production (Robertson & Dale, 2009; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). As Ka Ho Mok of the University of Hong Kong has suggested:

Against an increasingly competitive global context . . . schools and universities in different parts of the globe have been under

tremendous pressures from governments and the general public to restructure or reinvent the way that they are managed in order to adapt to the ever-changing socio-economic and socio-political environments and to maintain individual nation-states' global competitiveness. (2007, p. 307).

This managerialism is multilateral in nature and quite coercive. For example, it has involved the adoption, by international organizations such as OECD, the World Bank, and others, of forms of management based upon governments "buying into" indices to calibrate national and institutional performance that in turn may influence funding and institutional identity. The World Bank has introduced a *Knowledge Index* that attempts to measure and compare the ability of countries to generate, adopt, and diffuse knowledge, as well as a *Knowledge Economic Index* to assess and compare the economic readiness of countries (World Bank, 2012). Both indices afford countries a basis for assessing themselves based upon the state of education and human services, investment, and infrastructure, including information and communications technology. Likewise, OECD oversees the periodic tracking, development, and use of various educational indices and outcome measures (e.g., Programme for International Student Assessment, 2012) to monitor education progress in various countries. These indices and measures are used within and across countries to leverage change. Various international rankings groups (e.g., Times Higher Education's *World University Ranking*, 2015; QS's *World University Rankings*, 2015; Center for World-Class Universities' *Academic Ranking of World Universities*, 2014) and advisory groups (e.g., Academic Analytics) provide corollary support to institutions vying to advance their international rankings based upon their scholarship and reputations.

Simultaneous developments have occurred at the national level (in the United Kingdom (UK), Australia, Canada, and now increasingly in the US and China) with universities being subjected to detailed institutional or government-run audits of funding success and scholarly output to monitor and reward universities based upon their knowledge production. The influence is palpable, with research journals touting their international status based upon impact, university departments advertising their rankings in promotional material, and national media headlines declaring the advance or decline of higher education and future economic and social development based upon these rankings. The repercussions within and across the knowledge sector reflect an alignment of scholarly productivity with these developments as universities and various disciplines argue their *raison d'être* and basis for investment and decisions on faculty continuation and support. Given that the stakes are high, these measures become priorities with the potential to define, shift, displace, supplement, eliminate, or narrow the scholarship of universities, researchers, professional societies, journals,

and publishing houses. Citations indices (e.g., Thomson Reuter's Social Science Citation Index) serve as proxies to judge the quality and quantity of scholarly outputs of institutions and individual faculty members and, in turn, benchmarks which become rewards. In China and in some other countries, universities will provide financial rewards for faculty based upon its prestige as determined by its ranking (Shao & Shen, 2011). In the US, promotion and tenure deliberations on the quality and impact of a faculty member's research will be informed by such indices. Indeed, even skeptical examinations of their merit have offered pragmatic pronouncements of their worth. As James Ladwig (2008) concluded, despite the psychometric limitations of such measures, they have become equivalent to a form of important third party assessment. Ladwig went on to note that nations, especially Australia and others vying to advance, should recognize that "standing on the side-lines or playing the role of the critic is a luxury only the already dominant can afford" (2008, p. 13).

To a large extent, the currency of the realm is tied to western indices that equate success to an alignment with western intellectual traditions and not with eastern, southern, or indigenous. As Malaysian-born scholar Sayed Farid Alatas in his book *Alternative Discourses in the Asian Social Sciences* argued, "There is a Eurocentric bias in that ideas, models, problem selection, methodologies, techniques and even research priorities tend to originate from American, British, and to some extent, French and German works" (2006, p. 32). As Alatas suggested, Asian epistemologies are in danger of being trivialized as they travel across borders. As he stated, "There is a general neglect of local literacy and philosophical traditions. While there may be studies on local literature or philosophy, these traditions remain objects of study and are not considered as sources of concepts in the social sciences" (2006, p. 32).

Ka Ho Mok (2007), Simon Marginson (2000), and others lament the adverse effects of a form of western neoliberal and hierarchical hegemony whereby the education knowledge sector is heavily influenced by national government influences tied more to a western dominated market economy than to their historic traditions and local contexts. Drawing upon his comparative work in Asia, Mok has suggested: "The extreme form of globalization along the 'Anglo-Saxon' line may produce adverse effects and threaten the social, economic, political, and cultural developments of East Asian states." (pp. 312–313). Further, as Mok conjectured, globalization under western influences has the power to shift cultural and historical alignment or allegiances:

Against an increasingly competitive global context . . . universities in different parts of the globe have been under tremendous pressures from governments and the general public to restructure or reinvent the way that they are managed in order to adapt to the ever-changing socio-economic and socio-political environments and to maintain individual nation-states' global competitiveness. (Mok, 2007, p. 307)

In a similar vein, African (Zululand) scholar Dennis Ocholla has discussed that there may be marginalization of Indigenous African Knowledge (IK). As he stated:

in order for an individual/community to be admitted into “civilized” or modern society, that individual/community had to abandon practicing and using IK. IK was vindicated, illegitimated, illegalized, suppressed and abandoned by some communities, and the countries and peoples practicing it were condemned and associated with out datedness, a characteristic most people find demeaning. This form of marginalization produced a generation that for the most, does not understand, recognize, appreciate, value or use IK. Arguably, this situation has produced an intellectually “colonized” mindset. (Ocholla, 2007, p. 239)

Similarly, as Raewyn Connell (2007) discussed in her book, *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*, social science at its core is an undemocratic enterprise in its preference for the traditions of northern scholars. Fazal Rizvi and Robert Lingard (2010) offer a counterargument in suggesting that global developments are occurring in a form that is more filtered and negotiated than sometimes imagined by the colonial lens. They suggest that transformation rarely occurs purely in the image of the dominant partner, but happens in a fashion that is more transactional—akin to a form of hybridization of global influences. As they stated: “While the local is always transformed as a result of engagement with others, this transformation is never uniform across cultural sites; globalization produces new hybrid formations that are highly context-specific and localized.” (p. 167). Rizvi and Lingard concur with Piterese (2005), who has contended that the suggestion of homogenization and enculturation:

overlooks the counter-currents—the impact that the non-Western cultures have been making on the Western cultural practices. It downplays the ambivalence of the globalizing momentum and ignores . . . the indigenization of Western elements (Piterese, 2005, p. 87).

Further illustrating the multifaceted nature of the forces at play and the complex transactional and differentiated nature of these developments, a number of studies have examined shifts in the nature of educational scholarship across time by scholars (e.g., Schriewer, 2004; Schriewer & Martinez, 2004; Yang & Chang, 2009; Zhao, Zhang, Yang, Kirkland, Han, & Zhang, 2008). Taken together, these studies suggest a complex relationship between internationalization, transnational, and intranational developments. In short, there are variations in response within the same community befitting the deep-rooted and complex histories and relationships to ideas, people, and places. For example, in a study of the topics addressed and citations across the articles within selected journals publishing Russian, Spanish, and

Chinese educational research, Schriewer and Martinez (2004) and Schriewer (2004) demonstrated marked differences over time within and across countries that appear to align with political developments within those countries. For example, in China, their topical analyses of articles in three of the leading educational research and policy journals (*Jiaoyu Zazhi* [Education Review], 1901–1949 excluding the war years; *Renmin Jiaoyu* [People's Education], 1950–present; and *Jiaoyu Yanjiu* [Educational Research], 1979–present) indicated an expansion and retraction in international topics versus historical topics from 1921 to 1997. Prior to 1957, predominately international topics accounted for more than 50% of the discussions; from 1964 through 1997, historical topics predominated, accounting for almost 100% of the articles from 1964 to 1965 and approximately 60% from 1995 to 1997. Schriewer and Martinez discerned that the orientation to internationalism in China before the 1950s was tied to an interest in John Dewey and the progressive educational movement; the alignment shifted toward socialism in the postwar period; and finally, with the opening of China in 1978, it shifted toward western and global developments. When Schriewer and Martinez compared scholarly references across the journals (1970–1990) against the *International Encyclopedia of Education* (Husén & Postlethwaite, 1994), their data suggested that there were major differences in terms of the origin of the references enlisted. In particular, very few non-western references were among the 31 baseline reference points in *The International Encyclopedia of Education* (Husén & Postlethwaite, 1994). *The International Encyclopedia of Education* included two references that were international organizations, 27 that were European or American, but none by Chinese scholars. In terms of instances of these reference points in China's journals, most were never referenced and only eight (John Dewey, Jean Piaget, Robert Glaser, Marlaine Lockhead, Benjamin Bloom, John Keeves, OECD, UNESCO) more than once.

The lack of correspondence between the citations in the *International Encyclopedia of Education* with citations in the Chinese, Spanish, and Russian journals suggests that it would be mistaken to assume that educational scholarship has the same antecedents across different countries. As Schriewer and Martinez (2004) concluded, educational knowledge is “refracted by each society's internal selection thresholds and needs for interpretation, which are the outcome of cultural traditions and collective mentality, as well as political forces and dominant ideologies.” (p. 50)

In a similar study, Yong Zhao et al. (2008) examined a subsample of articles published in 2003–2004 from *Jiaoyu Yanjiu* [Educational Research] (*JYYJ*) and the *American Educational Research Journal* (*AERJ*) in an attempt “to understand epistemological and methodological differences and similarities across countries” (p. 2). Their study reinforced the view that international issues receive considerably less emphasis than domestic matters (especially in the US) and that there are significant differences in scholarly

approaches across countries. They found that the proportion of empirical versus conceptual articles across the two journals was marked, with the majority of Chinese articles being more conceptual and aligned with more eastern traditions than western. Drawing extensively upon Nisbett's (2003) discussion of eastern versus western traditions, Zhao and colleagues speculated there was a tendency to enlist a "holistic" Chinese tradition versus the "analytic" western tradition. As they stated:

At a deeper level, empirical investigation and logical argumentation, which are integral to the western empirical tradition, are often at odds with the Chinese habits of mind, which is characterized by holistic, dialectal thinking that relies on personal experiences, wisdom and reflection. . . . Easterners inculcated with a holistic and dialectal mental habit tend to pay more attention to contexts and relationships than objects. They prefer experience- and context-based reasoning over applying pure logical rules. (Zhao et al., 2008, p. 15)

The impact of the predisposition to the local extends to the manner in which international scholarship is considered. A study of the infiltration of western critical educational thought upon China over time illustrates the refractive nature and overriding influence of local filters upon studies from abroad. Guang-cai Yang and Yin Chang, in an article entitled "The circumstances and the possibilities of Critical Educational Studies in China" (2009), explored the circumstances that contribute to China's selective consideration, and sometimes dismissal of western critical theory and Marxist scholarship. They detailed the historical conditions that have contributed to how Chinese scholars positioned western critical theories. Despite the interest that Chinese translations of their work have received, they claim that American Marxist scholarship is not seen as transferable. Instead, the work of Dewey (Dewey, 1916/2001; Wang, 2007) and constructivists has been given more prominence in terms of applicability to China's development. Yang and Chang emphasize the situatedness of scholarship within countries and the global knowledge systems across countries, including their ideological orientations across time, space, and circumstances. They offer a view of knowledge transfer, which is akin to complex, site-based forms of selective consideration and differential use rather than universal applicability.

Further highlighting the interplay between local and global forces, Yoshiko Nozaki's (2009) article, "Orientalism, the west and non-west binary, and postcolonial perspectives in cross-cultural research and education," argues that the creation of a "we" versus "you" characterizations of peoples represent forms of hegemonic categorizations. Nozaki suggests that cross-national research has a tendency to perpetuate a view of cultures and peoples as binaries, highlighting uniformity rather than complex hybridity that brings to the fore variability consistent with intranational differences versus cross-national elements befitting a more orientalist view. She further argues,

“researchers need to stress the variations, multiplicities, and contradictions within all Asian nations, peoples, and cultures. . . . Just like an individual’s identity, a national identity is multiple and contradictory” (Nozaki, 2009, p. 486).

Consistent with this view, a number of Asian scholars have discussed the complex nature of Asian identities, across different regions, over the past 50 years. For example, stemming from his analyses of different Asian regions, Taiwanese scholar Kuan-Hsing Chen (2010), in his book, *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization*, argues for the unpacking of the development of new forms of colonization and power relations in conjunction with the advent of forces across and within Asia. Chen describes the advent of new forms of imperialism on multiple fronts tied to historical antecedents and current circumstances, including emerging global forces, an amalgamation of western and eastern styles, and shifting power relationships across and within societies. In a different vein, Leo Ching (2000) in *Globalizing the Regional, Regionalizing the Global: Mass Culture and Asianism in the Age of Late Capital*, draws upon a consideration of cultural forces at play within and across nations in conjunction with mass media to suggest a form of globalization involving a conflating of global, regional, and local forces. He posits a form of cultural integration emerging not from colonization or imperialism, but in alignment with global, regional, and local transactions of mass identity

Our Study

The current study reports our efforts to delve into these issues by undertaking a comparative analysis of educational research from China and from the US, enlisting a framework that extends the analyses of Schriever and Martinez (2004) and Zhao et al. (2008) to address not only differences in goals, practices, methodological tendencies, specific topics, and citations, but also the extent and nature of internationalization within and across two of the most preeminent education journals in the US and China. In particular, we were keen to determine the nature and extent of international scholarship and how international pursuits were positioned alongside the local forces—especially the nuanced influences of local upon global and global upon the local. Our goal was to delve into how local traditions and internationalization interfaced with one another.

Our overriding questions were: What are the scholarly trajectories, especially related to internationalization, that are being manifested within China and the US over the past decade? What is the nature of the interplay between local and global forces? We posited that educational research publications would help us understand the forces at play in the high-status world of global dominance of information not unlike that which Pierre Bourdieu (1998) described in his analysis of the French academic world in *Homo Academicus*. As he stated:

Only a sociological self-analysis of this kind, which owes and concedes nothing to self-indulgent narcissism, can rally help to place the scholar in the position where he is able to bring the familiar word the detached scrutiny which, with no special vigilance, the ethnologist brings to bear on any world to which he is not linked by the inherent complicity of being involved in its social game, its *illusio*, which creates the very value of the objectives of the game, as it does the game itself. (Bourdieu, 1998, p. xii)

For this study, we presumed that the *American Educational Research Journal (AERJ)* would be representative of educational research in the US and *Jiaoyu Yanjiu* [Educational Research] (*JYYJ*) would be representative in China. They are parallel in many ways: both involve blind review of articles and are highly selective, with acceptance rates less than 20% of their submissions. *AERJ* is published four to six times per year by the American Educational Research Association, a nonprofit professional society with more than 25,000 members. The National Institute publishes *JYYJ* monthly for Educational Studies, a research office for the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. Apart from advancing government policy deliberations, *JYYJ* represents the premier venue for independent educational research of relevance to China.¹ We chose to examine all the articles published in each journal at the turn of the 21st century and 10 years later. This included 139 journal articles plus occasional editorials across 20 issues of *AERJ* (2002–2003, 2013–2014) and 464 articles across 12 issues of *JYYJ* (2003, 2013).

As we have stated, we directed our analyses toward uncovering the visible manifestations of internationalization based upon and compared with the aspirations as declared by the editors of the journals, the composition of the editorial board, and actual articles examining international issues that reached across countries. We were especially keen to address the nature, type, and amount of international research appearing in the two journals and how such work is positioned. Were there parallels or crossover in the scholarship within and across the two journals, the topics covered, and the methodologies employed?

To these ends, our analyses involved extracting and presenting the key features of the two journals from the information provided by the editors, from fact sheets included on the official websites or front matter of the journals. Some of the analyses were tied to simple counts such as page numbers or the nature and number of references and other material, all of which were checked and easy to verify. The categories and coding employed to assess topic coverage and methodologies involved an iterative process with the two researchers developing, redeveloping, and revising categories based upon an initial scoping of categories from related research. We adjusted the categories based upon our observations of the characteristics of the articles that we encountered. As our discussion of findings suggest, the

coding systems were applied consistently; however, the complexity of their development and nuances brought to the fore some notable cross-national differences. Based upon a check of our coding across 10% of the articles in both journals, we agreed upon our categorization at a level of 92%. Whenever we differed, we reached a consensus on the application of a single category while noting factors that might account for the disagreement, especially if they were rooted in cultural constructions. As David Clarke (2015) has elucidated, tensions reflecting cultural differences arise whenever one is making comparisons across countries using categories or measures fitted to one and not quite to the other. As he stated, “The danger is that the commensurability demands of such comparisons conceal major conceptual differences” (p. 5). Indeed, in our study, matters of fit often revealed differences that we were keen to discern.

Our examinations of internationalization are threaded throughout our various analyses. We listed all instances of studies that we deemed international—that is, studies that reference data from countries other than the home country of the journal. Second, we examined how these studies served the interests of the home country. Indeed, oftentimes international work exists on the seams of the local as a way of supplementing, confirming, or comparing and contrasting local inquiries. Third, we examined the crossover in terms of topics, methodology, and citations between the two countries and the extent to which scholarship from another country (especially the US and China, respectively) informed the other. Fourth, we examined the editorial philosophy and infrastructure of each journal.

Findings

Stated Purpose of the Journals, Especially in Terms of Internationalization

By examining the front matter and occasional editorial comments in each journal, we were able to extract declarations that espoused the overall goals of each journal, including whether and how internationalization might be a goal. We found explicit statements that suggest that internationalization represents a stated goal, but, as a pursuit, we noted that it appeared to take a “backseat” to, or is not viewed as, serving the core goal to publish original research of relevance to their own countries.

The website of the National Institute of Education Studies makes clear that the focus of *JYYJ* is China. As they state:

Since its foundation in 1979, Educational Research has played a leading role in disseminating knowledge of educational policies of the Communist Party of China (CPC) and the Ministry of Education, and has provided theoretical support and underpinning for China's educational reform and development. Educational Research offers deep insight into educational theory, advocates academic innovation and pays close attention to and focuses on key educational issues.

The journal functions as a platform for significant academic discussion and numerous high-quality articles on educational theory have been published. (National Institute of Education Studies, 2015)

The editors of *JYYJ* state that their goal is to address the significant problems of Chinese educational reform and development, promoting the publishing of original educational research that attends to localized challenges. To this end, they advocate for educational science with Chinese characteristics: educational science that is informed rather than governed by communications with foreign educational studies (Zeng & Gao, 2009). In terms of the latter, they stress the importance of learning from other nations' educational policies and practices, understanding their strengths and weaknesses of education in the service of identifying areas of improvement for China. Befitting this orientation, a number of articles including international references were published in *JYYJ* in the 1990s, as was a recurring column entitled "Comparative Education." This column was replaced in 2010 by a new section entitled "International Perspectives." We would conjecture that this partitioning into a column or section was a means of also dealing with international perspectives, but in the interest of supporting local development.

Over the past 10 years *AERJ*'s editorial teams has explicitly declared that their overriding goal was the publication of original reports of theoretical and empirical work. Their website states:

The *American Educational Research Journal (AERJ)* publishes original empirical and theoretical studies and analyses in education. The editors seek to publish articles from a wide variety of academic disciplines and substantive fields; they are looking for clear and significant contributions to the understanding and/or improvement of educational processes and outcomes (*AERJ*, 2015).

This goal has been maintained under the leadership of different editorial teams as well as during shifts in the journal itself. In terms of internationalization, *AERJ* recognizes that a large proportion of its subscribers (individual and institutional) are from overseas, including a significant number of Asians and Africans.² Relative to scholarship, efforts to internationalize have been voiced especially with *AERJ* editors offering broad statements about the merits of internationalization, but in the interest of, or complementary to, the local. For example, in 2006, in an editorial overview of the "Social and Institutional Analyses" section of the journal, incoming editors Sandra Hollingsworth and Margaret Gallego stated "their deep commitment to diversity across geographical and cultural spaces . . . and international perspectives" (p. 3). In 2014, the new editors of the "Social and Institutional Analyses" section declared an interest in publishing articles that dealt with how the local is "intertwined with the global" in responding to "global

phenomena,” and suggested the need for “a view of schooling as a world cultural phenomena” (McCarty et al., 2014, p. 5) and for scholarship to be “making a difference in the world” (p. 6). In 2014, Harold O’Neil, Jr., the new editor of the “Teaching and Learning” section, made some mention of internationalization in conjunction with suggesting areas of research, including issues of privacy on a global scale and noted that they would expect “a probable increase” in articles from scholars outside of the US (O’Neil, 2014, p. 114).

Composition of Editorial Boards Especially in Terms of International Representation

Our examination of the nature of the commitment to internationalization extended to an analysis of the editorial board of each journal. We were interested in the countries or international regions represented by the institutional affiliation of those scholars listed as the editors and editorial review board members. We questioned whether there was significant representation of scholars from outside the US for *AERJ* and from outside of China for *JYYJ*, and whether the selection of editors and the editorial review board members of *AERJ* and *JYYJ* extended beyond Euro-American representation.

We found that neither the listed institutional affiliations of the editors nor the editorial board of either *AERJ* or *JYYJ* suggested that a conscious or concerted effort had been made to internationalize. Both journals have had a very limited number of editorial associates and editorial board members with international backgrounds, but rarely do they reach beyond Euro-Americans or the American continent. Indeed, international representation appeared very limited across both journals. In particular, despite the recent appearance of scholars from outside North America as associate editors of *AERJ*, the number of international scholars from nonwestern countries as members of the *AERJ* editorial board and inclusive of any non-American country has been less than 10 percent for some time. In 2014, *AERJ*, for one of the two sections (i.e., Social and Institutional Analysis) appointed two associate editors from overseas: an American-born Australian and a New Zealander. For the second section (i.e., Teaching and Learning), *AERJ* appointed a New Zealander and a Korean. But the international editorial board representation has remained limited to a handful of international scholars. Furthermore, with only a couple of exceptions, over the past 12 years, all of the scholars serving as editorial team members have been from western countries. In terms of *JYYJ*, the editorial team included only two international scholars, who were Hong Kong academics.

International Scope of the Journals in Terms of Articles

Based upon the aforementioned analyses, we would suggest that neither *AERJ* nor *JYYJ* has been overt in their support of international submissions.

Hence, we were not surprised that the journals tend to include only international pieces that served national perspectives or interests. In *JYYJ*, discussions of educational developments in other countries or comparative studies were focused upon the implications for China; likewise, in *AERJ* studies of educational developments in other countries or comparative studies were focused on the relevance to the US alone. With few exceptions, international comparisons published in *JYYJ* were focused on the US with occasional comparisons to other western countries; in *AERJ*, international work extended to Canada, North and South America, and other western nations. Comparison rarely extended to Asia or African countries. Again, it is as if there are strong local forces at play and the global forces have a predominantly western bias.

In *JYYJ*, articles that are international or comparative have a small foothold and are relatively stable with 24 (12.5%) international in 2003 and 28 (10.5%) in 2013, with approximately 3% of these articles involving comparative studies.³ In terms of the specific character of the international topics, as we have suggested, *JYYJ* mainly focused on themes deemed relevant to China and restricted international discussions to a few countries—usually the UK and the US.⁴ For example, in 2003, *JYYJ* published international studies that focused on topics of interest to the Chinese (e.g., moral education, higher education, educational finance, and rural education). They included studies with the following foci:

- Characteristics of western moral education in the 20th century,
- Shifts in the moral education system at American elementary schools,
- Curricula (e.g., art education) and curriculum reform in the UK,
- History of western higher education, and
- Educational investment—Europe & the US.

In 2013, 28 articles focused on developments outside of—but aligned with—issues also arising in China of interest to Chinese scholars (e.g., school reform: K–12, higher education, assessment matters, international organization, and teacher education) including:

- Higher education in the US (e.g., student-based assessment, reviews systems),
- American teacher education professional standards,
- International organizations (e.g., UNESCO),
- Strategies and approaches of international aid organization, and
- School improvement pursuits in New York schools.

For *AERJ*, the number and nature of international studies represented a similar percentage and the same bias toward comparisons with western countries. Over the past 10 years, *AERJ* did not publish a substantial number of articles with an international focus. The number of articles dealing with non-US or non-Canadian matters represented only 10% of the articles

published in 2002–2003. Only one article dealt with a nonwestern country. In 2013–2014, international pieces accounted for 12.5%, but again only one included data from a nonwestern country.

During the period 2002–2003, *AERJ* articles dealing with international matters included the following: a study on class size by four UK authors; a paper coauthored by Canadian and US scholars on alternative assessment reform; a paper by US authors on tracking in the US, Germany, and Japan; a study focused on Hong Kong students' self-concept by an Australian and Hong Kong authors; two studies by Canadian authors on programs for young women and a study dealing with issues of pacing in teaching skills; a study by an Israeli author on cooperative learning; and a paper on globalization and citizenship by a US-located author.

In 2013–2014, the number of international contributions or non-American studies appearing in *AERJ* was slightly higher at 12.5%, but again only one study included a nonwestern country. Topics appeared to be tied to US interests (e.g., streaming) and some issues that also had some resonance with global developments or concerns (e.g., indigenous education, immigration, teacher education). Specifically, the international contributions included a study by a New Zealand and an Australian author on a Maori-based educational model; a German study on preservice teachers; a Dutch study on teacher development; a UK historical analysis of examinations; a German development study of young migrant children; a paper focusing on educational researchers and “practicality”; a study by a Singaporean and Australian-based scholars on streaming in Singapore; and a cross-national comparison by US and Mexican scholars of US and Mexican students learning to read in Spanish.

If one compares the state of international scholarship across the two journals, there is a sense of the local overriding the global currents. Additionally, global currents, if they exist, tend to flow between or toward western countries. For example, in the US, most international work was western, originating in Canada, Europe, Australia, or New Zealand; in China, comparisons and international benchmarking were tied to western versus other Asian or southern countries. Without discounting the difficulty journals might have in procuring international submissions, we would posit there is a form of national-centrism and western bias in knowledge exchange verging on free-trade zones among western countries and especially between selected countries (e.g., Canada).⁵ We would speculate that the failure to facilitate exchanges with eastern and southern scholars is limiting. Indeed, we would suggest that there are unrealized potentials as authors and editors fail to connect to scholars pursuing similar issues across the globe—east and west, north and south. Overall, across both journals there appeared to be a limited commitment to international articles, and those that appeared were subordinated to the domestic interests of the country of origin of the journal.

Areas of Study

A subset of articles from both journals was read by both researchers as we formulated topic areas and in conjunction with checks on our reliability. Once the topic areas were agreed upon, each of us was responsible for discerning the primary topic of each article based upon a reading of each article published within *AERJ* or *JYYJ* for four years. The discernment was based upon the full text, abstract, and listing key words.

Our examinations of the areas of study across all the articles within each journal during these time periods helped us delve into the nature of the scholarship within each country and possible parallels. In both countries, our analyses supported the view that educational research was inextricably tied to and served an important role in addressing national matters. The primary topics across the two journals appeared to signal the importance of educational research studies in China and the US and recognition of their role as tools for and barometers of societal developments aligned with the values and policies of each country.

In both countries, there was a similar emphasis upon teacher education, school reform, higher education, and curriculum, instruction, and learning across the two journals. At the same time, there were some areas such as moral education, educational finances, and rural education that represented a major focus of China versus the US. For the US, there was a strong interest in issues of diversity, with a large percentage of papers across the various topics focused upon race, gender, minority groups, economic differences, and matters of equity and cultural differences.

As shown in Table 1, *JYYJ* covered a wide range of topics. Teacher education (7.7% in 2003; 7.1% in 2013), higher education (10.7% in 2003; 15.1% in 2013) was the focus of a substantial number of studies along with the emergence of studies focused upon K–12 education (especially if one combines the research on schooling with the emergence of papers describing projects in local schools). Educational psychology (7.1% in 2003; 2% in 2013) declined perhaps with the emergence of other outlets for this work in China. Comparative educational studies declined in terms of the relative number of overall percentage of articles, but not in terms of the actual number (17 or 10.1% in 2003; 22 or 8.7% in 2013).

As shown in Table 2, *AERJ* had a similarly large number of teaching and teacher education articles as well as articles on school management, curriculum, instruction, and learning. At times these areas overlapped. For example, educational policy, educational reform, and school management overlapped with one another and sometimes with other categories. Missing from *AERJ* were studies focused on moral development.

Essentially, the scholarship in both countries focused on policy and reform, but *AERJ* seem to reflect shifts in the focus of the reform agenda in the US (e.g., increased attention to the role of teachers). We would

Table 1
Areas of Study for *JYYJ*

Topics	<i>JYYJ</i> 2003		<i>JYYJ</i> 2013	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Educational philosophy & theory	25	14.8	29	11.5
Teacher education & teaching	13	7.7	18	7.1
Moral education/schooling	9	5.3	7	2.8
Higher education	18	10.7	38	15.1
School management & policy	8	4.7	8	3.2
Professional education	4	2.4	12	4.8
Continuing education	0	0	3	1.2
Rural education	5	3.0	1	0.4
Non-gov't education & charter ed.	5	3.0	2	0.8
Educational psychology & dev.	12	7.1	6	2.4
Educational technology	0	0	2	0.8
Early childhood	0	0	4	1.6
Basic education (K–12) & policy	0	0	26	10.3
Educational assessment	3	1.8	5	2.0
Educational economy & finance	8	4.7	0	0
Educational history studies	11	6.5	12	4.8
Comparative educational studies	17	10.1	22	8.7
Other				
Arguments	8	4.7	19	7.5
Essays	8	4.7	6	2.4
Book reviews	4	2.4	6	2.4
Conference/review	11	6.5	7	2.8
Projects	0	0	19	7.5
Total	169		252	

contend that in both 2002–2003 and again in 2013–2014, the number of articles dealing with educational policy and reform was significant, but distributed slightly differently. To judge the stability of a focus on policy and reform, we combined some of the categories (e.g., school management, educational policy, and educational reform) and also extended the combination in 2013–2014 to include teacher studies, which became part of the reform agenda in the US during this period. If combined, the number of articles dealing with interrelated policy/management/reform issues in 2002–2003 and 2013–2014 would approach 33%—that is, they remained similar across the decade.

Perhaps the most salient feature in this analysis of *AERJ* was the sustained focus on equity, poverty, and differences. While this is not reflected directly in the categories, we found ourselves making special note of the significant number of papers that adopted a critical lens in examining schooling

Table 2
Areas of Study for AERJ

Topics	<i>AERJ</i> 2002–2003		<i>AERJ</i> 2013–2014	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Educational philosophy & theory	10	16.9	3	3.9
Teacher education & teaching	7	11.9	11	14.3
Moral education/schooling	0	0	1	1.3
Higher education	3	5.1	14	18.2
School management & policy	10	16.9	14	18.2
Professional education	0	0	1	1.3
Continuing education	0	0	0	0
Rural education	0	0	1	1.3
Non-gov't funded, charter schools	3	5.1	2	2.6
Educational psychology & dev.	0	0	4	5.2
Educational technology	4	6.8	0	0
Early childhood	5	8.5	6	7.8
Basic education (K–12) & policy	0	0	2	2.6
Educational economy & finance	0	0	0	0
Curriculum & teaching	12	20.3	12	15.6
Educational history studies	3	5.1	5	6.5
Comparative educational studies	2	3.4	1	1.3
Other: arguments, essays, projects etc.	0	0	0	0
Total	59		77	

across genders, race, language minority groups (including Asian-American, Mexican-American, or other immigrant groups), and economic circumstances in conjunction with discussions of schools and society, especially matters of equity, access, opportunity, and difference. Indeed, more than 50% of the articles delved into the data across diverse learners, particularly in the context of research focused on curriculum, school reform, teaching and teacher education, and school management.⁶ In terms of cross-national differences, whereas in the US, research studies were interfaced with concerns around ethnicity, gender, and poverty, in China, studies were often coupled with concerns around rural issues and economic disparities. The findings befit the trend identified by past comparative studies—namely, the nature of and variations in topics addressed in the key research journals reflect historical developments within nations, including governmental leanings and local concerns (Cheek, 2016; Schriewer, 2004; Schriewer & Martinez, 2004). They also align with the sentiments of educational leaders—including journal editors—in China and the US who tout local and national interests as priorities ahead of international pursuits unless directed to serve local needs. Such notions are not inconsistent with perhaps China’s leading comparative

Table 3
**The Number of Separate *JYYJ* Citations of Western Authors:
 Top 10 Frequently Cited**

Rank	2003	Citation Frequency	2013	Citation Frequency
1.	Marx, K.	20	Burton, R. C.	17
2.	Dewey, J.	17	Dewey, J.	17
3.	Hegel, F. G. W.	7	Marx, K.	12
4.	Tyler, W. R.	6	Whitehead, A. N.	7
5.	Foucault, M.	5	Fullan, M.	9
6.	Pinar, W.	5	Hegel, F. G. W.	8
7.	Bell, D.	4	Bourdieu P.	6
8.	Burton, R. C.	4	Leithwood, K.	5
9.	Giddens, A.	4	Hallinger, P.	5
10.	van Manen, M.	4	Bridges, E.	5

educator, Mingyuan Gu (2014), who in his discussion of the future of Chinese scholarship, has argued that there is need to balance respect for education's cultural roots with a form of integration of selected western ideas with Chinese thought and practice.

Citations

The insularity and biases of each country were most apparent in their enlistment or lack thereof of nonwestern scholars. Our analyses of the citations provided evidence of national-centric tendencies within the two countries, but especially for the US. Whereas American scholars appearing in *AERJ* did not cite Chinese scholars (i.e., scholars located in the People's Republic of China), Chinese scholars in *JYYJ* did cite a small, but slightly increasing number of American scholars and other western sources.

Table 3 lists a subset of the most cited western scholars in *JYYJ* for 2003 and for 2013. They tend to be western scholars whose work has been translated for Chinese audiences and aligned with Chinese interests in social philosophy, curriculum theory, and school leadership.

It is important to note that the local filters in effect influence not only what scholarship might be cited, but also how it is used. Chinese authors tend to mention and adapt rather than impose foreign frameworks upon their work. Western thinking, methods, and findings are selectively considered and, if enlisted, adjusted in ways that befit Chinese circumstances and Chinese ways of knowing. For example, Marx and Engels along with Foucault tend to be referenced as broad ideological perspectives befitting China's underlying values. As Yang and Chang (2009) argued in their assessment of the influence of western sociological studies, such work is seen as

relevant, but not directly or “mechanically” since they fail to “fit the reality of Chinese society and education” (p. 375).

As we have specified, our examination of the citations within *AERJ* indicated that authors located in the People’s Republic of China were not cited. Instead, *AERJ* authors cited other American scholars or scholars from other western countries. They did so in a manner that was quite focused—that is, many of the citations were specific to the nature of the study itself. For instance, studies of history education might cite Peter Seixas and other history educators; in mathematics education, studies might cite mathematics educators such as Hilda Borko, Alan Schoenfeld, or others. Likewise, studies of teaching and teacher education tended to cite research related to teacher education scholars such as Marilyn Cochran-Smith, Kenneth Zeigler, and Virginia Richardson. Studies of reform in this period drew from David Tyack and John Dewey, but more recently from David Berliner, Michael Fullan, Andy Hargreaves, Linda Darling-Hammond, and Anthony Bryk.

Given the prevalence of *AERJ* articles dealing with diversity, school reform matters, and matters of equity, many of the articles drew upon socio-cultural theorists, including critical theorists focused upon race, gender, and class, as well as discussions of diversity. Across the decade, *AERJ* authors drew upon critical theorists such as Michael Apple, Paulo Freire, Henry Giroux, Joseph Kincheloe, Patti Lather, Peter McLaren, Thomas Popkewitz, Shirley Steinberg, and others. Their perspectives were informed by North American and South American critical theorists as well as a number of European scholars, including Basil Bernstein, Pierre Bourdieu, Norman Fairclough, Michel Foucault, Mikhail Bakhtin, Gilles Deleuze, and others who had unpacked dimensions of power and identity. Selected articles involved critical discussions related to the following: issues of race with citations from scholars such as Gloria Ladson-Billings, Carol Lee, Stuart Hall, Carl Grant, bell hooks, Hillary Jenks, Michelle Fine, and Carol Weiss; matters of cultural diversity drawing upon Kris Gutiérrez, James Banks, J. Hill, G. Valdes, Norma Gonzales, Luis Mull, A. Valenzuela; issues of gender drawing extensively upon Bronwyn Davies and Nancy Fraser; issues of class and poverty drawing upon a range of authors including David Berliner, Henry Ginsburg; critical treatments of a combination of race and class issues tied to matters of choice, tracking, privatization, desegregation, immigration, and urban–rural divide, drawing upon Larry Cuban, Linda McNeil, Jeannie Oakes, James Coleman, and others; and most recently indigenous research drawing upon the work of scholars such as Teresa McCarty, Graham Hingangaroa Smith, and Linda Tuhiwai Te Rina Smith. It should be noted that many American studies drew upon media reports; scholars in both China and the US drew upon Chinese government or US government reports respectively. In the US, a great deal of secondary analyses of national data sets was apparent as well as some involving the Trends in International

Mathematics and Science Study or the Programme for International Student Assessment.

Taken together, the findings for the US are quite stark especially if one considers differences between the length and number of citations of the articles in *AERJ* versus *JYYJ*. Each *AERJ* article was significantly longer with three to four times the number of citations as compared with the *JYYJ* articles. *AERJ* articles include a significant number of citations per article (25 to 100+). Compared with the citations of *AERJ*, only three out of 21 articles (less than 15%) sampled from *JYYJ* had more than 25 citations. Most of the articles (slightly over 60%) cited six to 20 references. As we mentioned, in the January 2014 issue of *JYYJ*, for example, 13 papers (62%) listed fewer than 10 citations. In addition, seven articles (nearly 33%) had lists of fewer than five citations. Due to the brevity of the articles and the lack of extensive reference lists in articles published in *JYYJ*, discerning patterns among citations was difficult. Most of the articles (slightly over 60%) cited just six to 20 references. For example, in the January 2014 issue of *JYYJ*, the majority of articles had fewer than seven citations.

Given the sparseness of references in *JYYJ*, citation patterns within *JYYJ* over the past decade are more suggestive than definitive. Nonetheless, we would argue that Chinese scholars are less national-centric, even taking into account their preference for citing other Chinese scholars. In terms of the latter, among Chinese scholars, two books by Zhongying Shi were most highly cited in 2013 by Chinese educational researchers: *Transformation in Knowledge Growth Mode and Educational Reform* (2000) and *On the Logic of Educational Practices* (2006), which was cited 23 times in *JYYJ*. In addition, in the area of teacher education and educational methodology, Xiangming Chen's works were frequently cited: X. M. Chen (2000; 2003) were cited 20 times in *JYYJ* in 2013.

Methodologies

As we have indicated, we were keen to explore the scholarly traditions in some depth. To do so, we wanted to go beyond what was explored and who informed the research, to how it was studied. To this end, we attempted to sort the articles by the methods employed. We did so while recognizing that pigeonholing almost any study was quite problematic, as increasingly studies employed a variety of methods tied to different theoretical frameworks (sociocultural, critical, etc.). Methodologies were interfaced with the nature of the arguments offered and the role of research from an epistemological perspective.⁷

Our examinations of the methodologies employed yielded interesting findings for each country and across the two countries. For the US, we had anticipated that the behavioristic vestiges of the past would be apparent in *AERJ*, especially along with the reappearance of positivistic

Table 4
AERJ Methodologies

Methodology	<i>AERJ</i> 2002–2003		<i>AERJ</i> 2013–2014	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Experimental	6	10.00	9	11.39
Case study	20	33.33	15	18.98
Discourse analysis, document & historical study	10	16.66	9	11.39
Comparative research	3	5.00	8	10.13
Survey	0	0	5	6.33
Ethnographic study	3	5.00	5	6.33
Secondary analysis	13	21.67	20	25.31
Mixed methodology	4	6.67	7	8.86
Reflections, interpretation	1	1.67	1	1.26
Total	60		79	

experimentation as a result of a narrowed view of research mandated by governments and the privileging of randomized trials of interventions. Instead, we found a rich mix of research pursuits within *AERJ*, including a mix of qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Qualitative studies often enlisted ethnographic tools coupled with historical analyses and discourse analysis. In terms of quantitative leanings, *AERJ* authors appeared to be more intent on advancing understandings by delving into issues with more of a case study orientation that involved explorations of large-scale data, a region, school, or select populations. Many of the articles focused on the generation and testing of complex, multidimensional models based upon a composite of variables. Indeed, approximately 50% of the case studies, comparative research, survey research, and secondary analyses involved testing and building hierarchical models or were examined against qualitative data from interviews or follow-up surveys. In turn, the articles were provocative and historical rather than claiming wide generalizability. Again, over the past decade, *AERJ* published only a limited number of traditional empirical intervention studies focused upon specific teaching strategies or approaches. More common were studies involving surveys or existing data sets, which are subjected to more extensive analyses and follow-up, oftentimes enlisting a mix of qualitative probes of a subset of the participants related to the broader quantitative findings of the fuller population. It is noteworthy that many of the articles appearing in *AERJ* referenced or drew upon national or regional data sets and findings. Across most *AERJ* articles, various national and state reports released by government authorities or private foundations as well as the media were often cited.

Table 5
JYYJ Methodologies

Methodology	<i>JYYJ</i> 2002–2003		<i>JYYJ</i> 2013–2014	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Experimental	3	1.53	6	2.21
Case study	4	2.04	12	4.48
Discourse, historic analysis	4	2.04	10	3.73
Comparative research	6	3.06	19	7.09
Survey	1	0.51	7	2.61
Ethnographic study	0	0	3	1.12
Secondary analysis	9	4.59	16	5.97
Mixed methodology	2	1.02	17	6.34
Reflections/interpretations ^a	167	85.20	178	66.42
Total	196		268	

^aMost of these papers are theoretical interpretations or reflections on the researchers' arguments without statistics, data, or other qualitative or quantitative evidences.

In contrast, our analyses of *JYYJ* suggested a more limited range of research in the Chinese journal than was found in *AERJ*—especially the extent to which American scholars engage in data-based examinations, mixed methods design, and model testing. We discerned that the majority of the *JYYJ* articles were not empirical or data-based studies, especially in 2003. The overwhelming majority (close to 85%) of the articles published in *JYYJ* were essays, reviews of the literature, or interpretative or argumentative pieces. In 2013, despite a significant reduction in those numbers, 178 articles, some 66%, were still interpretative essays. In 2013, nearly 17% papers reported experiments, case studies, discourse analyses, or mixed methodology studies; 7% were case studies and surveys. Most data-based studies in *JYYJ* lacked the mix of qualitative and quantitative data that is now common in *AERJ*.

The results of our attempt to examine the various scholarly dimensions (topics, citations, and methodologies) yielded what we contend are some provocative findings, including significant differences across *AERJ* and *JYYJ*. While there was some overlap in areas of study, there were significant differences in the methodologies employed and the scholarly works framing their inquiries—including their use or lack of use of foreign scholarship. Our data substantiated differences in research practices aligned with each country's historical disposition and antecedents, not unlike those discussed in efforts to portray and trace Chinese scholarly traditions by Lloyd and Sivin (2003) and Nisbett (2003). As they have argued, Chinese scholarship has

a tendency toward pursuing persuasion aligned with public interest, rather than western forms of rationalistic empiricism in competition with existing ideas (see Lloyd and Sivin, 2003).

They also suggest changes may be afoot as new dynamics emerge. For example, the increase in the proportion of empirical studies in China appearing in *JYYJ* may reflect the shifting goals of the journal in terms of its competitiveness globally. It may also represent an attempt by the journal to respond to and accommodate Chinese scholars returning from the west equipped with western tools and dispositions. However, these differences may also have their antecedents in mundane elements. For example, some of the prevailing differences may be reinforced or accounted for by editorial practices. For instance, there are major differences in the length of articles: *AERJ* articles are three to four times the length of *JYYJ* articles.

Discussion

What are the scholarly trajectories, especially related to internationalization, that are being manifested within China and the US during what we deemed as a period of heightened global forces over the past decade? Although there is voiced support for internationalization and globalization among those editing educational research journals, there are similar forces in US and China that are shaping the nature of the internationalization of scholarship. The primary forces in effect are local forces tied to expectations that the primary audience of the journal remains American or Chinese, rather than a global or regional audience. Predominately, the two journals publish work that is tied to national agendas often based upon national data sets, but with minimal reference to global developments. Even when international scholarship appears, it is viewed as supporting the advancement of American or Chinese education and is expected to relate to education issues in those countries. Global forces exist but are subjected to local filters; for example, whereas Chinese scholars attend to developments in the US and around the globe, they do so in a fashion that is selective and differentiated. *JYYJ* articles include occasional references and discussions of American scholarship, but in a fashion that is discerning with consideration to its fit or relevance to Chinese circumstances. *AERJ* advances some global research, but very little or none at all from China. Indeed, the exclusion of Asian and African work from *AERJ* is notable and stark. We found no research originating from mainland Chinese scholars among any of the articles appearing in the four years examined for the present study. That is, no mainland Chinese scholar was referenced across the 139 *AERJ* articles analyzed. It seems that local forces dominated and filtered the international forces at play. Further, across both journals, these international forces should not be considered truly global as they represent mostly European and American endeavors rather than research from eastern or southern nations.

Essentially, assuming our analyses of *JYYJ* and *AERJ* are credible and representative of current practice, internationalization seems on the margin of scholarship in the US and China. Scholars seem to publish in *JYYJ* and *AERJ* without substantial regard for one another's scholarship and without the apparatus needed to shift their positioning of international scholarship in each of their journals. Despite global trends and a large proportion of non-US subscribers, very little accommodation of nonwestern scholarship has occurred within *AERJ*. With *JYYJ*, the incorporation of international perspectives seems to be occasional, differentiated, and occurring in a manner that is refractive. Mostly, they seem indifferent to the possibilities that knowledge of one another's scholarship might yield.

We would posit that the end result of such insularity is unrealized potential. Scholars proceeding without regard for one another or their pursuits or advances—uninformed and unsupportive of the possibilities that knowledge of one another's scholarship might yield and the merits of advancing a global disposition that advances diversity and situation-specific differences versus the exclusivity of the west.

While the editors of the journals extol the merits of international studies and comparative work, their pursuit of this goal verges on the disingenuous as it is skewed toward self-interest and has a strong bias toward western scholarly endeavors and form. While China may have revealed more cross-fertilization than the US, both countries operate in ways that appear more insulated than either collective or integrated. We would suggest that our broad analyses revealed forms of globalization that remain skewed in both countries. International studies appear to be interpreted, filtered, or published if the national interests of the journal of origin are served. Additionally, there appears to be a preference, if not reverence, for Euro-American scholarship. *AERJ* appears to be quite American-centric and certainly dominated by western scholarship and is either ignorant or neglectful of nonwestern scholarship. *JYYJ* appears to be China-centric but again with some infiltration of western scholarship applied in ways distinctive to China. For instance, critical theoretic work in the US is referenced but in a fashion tethered to American circumstances. As in the US, there seems to be a reverence or preference for Euro-American scholarship with no references to either scholarly endeavors of other Asian (non-Chinese) scholars or African countries. If we can generalize from *JYYJ* to China, then China seems to be on course to selectively consider and incorporate western scholarship without discounting its own practices and local circumstances (Mingyuan, 2014).

If we can generalize from *AERJ* to the state of academic educational publishing in the US, then the US appears to be quite insulated. Apart from occasional references to European scholarship, *AERJ* seems to exclude nonwestern or international work done for non-US purposes. Why is this the case? Is there a failure to recognize the merits of global work? Does it

not serve local needs? And if not, why not? Whereas Chinese scholars appear to be informed of American scholarship (as a result of translations of selected works,⁸ their English language abilities, studies in western countries or exchanges with western scholars) and their reputational aspirations as participants in the global economy, their American counterparts seem to be mostly stymied despite increasing contacts with Chinese scholars and memoranda of understanding declaring support for collaboration. We surmise that, unfortunately, American scholars are poorly informed and their current approach to China is largely grounded in a form of detachment from “other” as they focus on the problems and issues of education development within their respective countries. Indeed, we would surmise that the conditions have yet to emerge for the US to make the significant shifts needed to move beyond what appears to be a rather insular, skewed approach to internationalization and forms of transnationality anchored in one’s own country.

Certainly global rankings and reputational measures appear to be tied to maintaining the status and the privilege of western journals, a sidelining of other voices and scholarly sources, and the perpetuation of a tolerance of ignorance for others. As Arjun Appadurai (2002) suggests in his article, “Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination,” western and northern scholars tend to take for granted their ways of knowing and proceed with others without examining their own epistemologies. Along the same vein, Keita Takayama contends:

Given that the existing unequal structure automatically warrants Western scholars the right to speak “on behalf of the world,” they have ethical responsibility to bring in sophisticated theoretical work from the margin that should immensely contribute to the discussion in the center. . . . Democratic space must be generated . . . where non-Western scholars and activists can participate in theoretical knowledge production on an equal footing with Euro-American counterparts. (2009, p. 364)

If we could accept an imaginary place where internationalization became an aspiration for the US, there are other matters that need to be addressed. For instance, we suspect that there are differences in the rhetorical expectations for Chinese versus American publications that will make the exchange more difficult. The work of Zhao et al. (2008), Lloyd & Sivin (2003), and our ongoing work (Tierney & Kan, 2014) with Chinese authors suggest that there are differences in how claims or proclamations are warranted that represent historical traditions of authorship, author intentionality, and audience that have a bearing on persona and ethos. Whereas American authors are expected to warrant each claim with detailed arguments or data, Chinese authors often will make claims tied to historic values and reverence for noted scholars. While American authors tend to adopt an objective, somewhat detached, third-person stance, Chinese scholars would often

enlist “we” as if to align with a societal or collective persona. Whereas Chinese scholars tend to make pronouncements to justify their research, American scholars tend to offer a more incremental, expanded, and detailed rationale, including findings and approaches to related studies leading to the need for the current study. Likewise, Chinese scholars presented findings without as much or the same type of backup evidence compared with American scholars.

We would surmise that the publishing apparatus across the two countries might account for some of these tendencies. Whereas the *JYYJ* publishes a large number of articles, their length is restricted and hence the articles are briefer and contain fewer elaborations, citations, background, explication, and exploration of findings. In contrast, *AERJ* publishes a limited number of articles of considerable length, which affords more expansive description of the research endeavor and typically more extensive analyses. Whereas *JYYJ* publishes a large number of essays, *AERJ* publishes the exploration ideas typically accompanied by data-based examination of these issues, including exploration of viability of models that might account for complex data based upon a combination of qualitative and quantitative analyses. Also, size, nature, the frequency of editorial and editorial board shifts, the philosophies, and the narrowness of both groups should be considered. While there are no notable differences in international representation, or lack thereof, on their editorial boards, there are differences in the tenure and size of their boards. Whereas the tenure for *AERJ* editors has involved three sets of turnovers in the past 10 years, with corresponding shifts in a sizeable editorial board, the editor, associate editors, and editorial board for *JYYJ* have remained the same across the past 10 years. Twenty-four persons participate in *JYYJ*'s editorial boards, compared with 100+ editorial board members on *AERJ*.

Despite strong global pressures at the national level, local traditions are deep rooted. Indeed, our study highlights the cultural specificity of studies with ties to foci, norms, and expectations of their disciplinary traditions and form of inquiries. The cross-national integration and filtered hybridization of foreign ideas witnessed in the internationalization movement in China seem to befit forms of “glocalization” (Robertson, 1992)—that is, organic antecedents anchored in local and national historic developments. The need, as Schriewer has noted, is to “reckon with varying relations between the globalized communication of the sciences . . . and . . . educational system-reflection’s commitment to processing meanings that are deeply rooted in distinctive political and cultural settings.” (2004, p. 532)

Perhaps there is the possibility of significant change with some of the key forces emerging. In the physical and natural sciences, as Juana Moiwo and Fulu Tao (2013) have noted, citations of Chinese research have increased significantly as Chinese scientists have begun to position their work through translations, westernization of editorial boards etc. As

Anthony Welch (2015) noted, while we have yet to see a large number of Chinese journals in English, there is a growth of other Chinese publications intended for western audiences.⁹ Within Chinese faculties of education there is an increase in foreign faculty and the number of faculty with overseas credentials and experiences. Likewise, we see western institutions with faculty having Chinese scholarly backgrounds. Chinese institutions are increasing their recruitment of international students and faculty as well as offering courses focused on western scholarship. Western institutions are competing for Asian students and are adjusting their offerings in a fashion that suggests there is some accommodation of scholarly traditions. For example, in Australia we are seeing deliberate attempts to integrate Asian knowledge with western knowledge in the doctoral experiences of Asian students enrolled in western institutions (see Singh, 2011). In addition, a number of studies are serving to introduce western scholars to Chinese educational leaders, scholarly developments, and educational developments (Hayhoe, 1999; Yongling & Hayhoe, 2004). Pinar (2014) has been attempting to trace the history of curriculum development in China by unpacking the intellectual history of Chinese scholars. Schulte (2004) has unpacked the emergence of cultural linguistics in China; others are focusing upon forms of transnational socialization drawing upon contrastive linguistics to examine the complexity of learning to engage in different scholarly discourse communities (e.g., Kubota & Lehner, 2004). A number of books explore China's own history of science including China's historic influence upon the west (e.g., Goody, 2010; Hobson, 2004).

The present study raises questions with a degree of currency for the US—in particular, at a time of heightened embrace of global developments, it questions whether and how the west and particularly the US is embracing internationalization. Certainly the US and other western universities are actively engaging in recruiting international students from eastern and southern countries. Growing numbers of Asian and other international attendees participate at annual meetings located in the US. As noted earlier (see footnote 2) institutional subscriptions for the American Educational Research Association and other western journals are nowadays predominately African and Asian. Despite growing numbers of scholars and publications touting global and transnational interests as well as the establishment of the World Educational Research Association, it remains to be seen whether these shifts and other changes in practice will result in the internationalization of scholarship beyond the current Eurocentric disposition. Based upon our interviews of select recognized Chinese scholars, many have reservations about writing for a western audience. They have suggested that they would be unlikely to have an article accepted for publication in the west without western citations, stylistic adjustments, and background information on China for a western readership. Given their speculation on the lack of wide international representation on the editorial boards of western journals,

they are unsure as to whether their submission would be considered by empathetic reviewers with the cultural knowledge to provide a credible review.

Closing Remarks

Our study befits a tradition of studies on the history of science over time, but it also responds to these times in this place. We concur with Connell (2007), who suggests that there is a need to learn from, of, about, and with those who are historically marginalized, such as eastern and southern scholars, as well as to increase our understanding of how the intersecting local and international forces operate to contribute to or detract from a form of collective accommodation. We would argue with some urgency for a fuller interrogation of these issues and additional research. In particular, we would hope for research that builds upon and extends the present study and responds to some of the calls by leading comparative educators, sociologists, and global epistemologists. As Maria Manzon (2011) has argued in her most recent discussion of the future of comparative education, we would hope that other studies are launched that interrogate the sociological and epistemological dynamics occurring across time and place and shaping intellectual endeavors specifically and institutionally. As sociologists Randall Collins (1998) and Jürgen Schriewer (2004) posit, drawing upon Niklas Luhmann's (1982) suggestion of self-referential systems, we see a need for further ongoing reflexive forensic work to ascertain the dialogical connections between regionalization and globalizations across societies and ways of knowing.

Certainly, the political nature of this work should not be overlooked. We fear that internationalization will remain skewed without a fuller interrogation of how it is positioned. The interrogation needs especially to address the international forces that marginalize others and the local forces in countries such as the US that result in apparent insularity, and perhaps ignorance and lack of respect for "non-western" scholarship. Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2007a, 2007b, 2013) argues we should move beyond a representational orientation to a form of ecological intervention. He suggests that there is need for an ecological approach to epistemologies that challenge the hegemony of the west and support epistemological diversity. In the name of what de Sousas Santos has termed "cognitive justice," the politics of colonialization, domination, and violence against the epistemologies of non-western groups should be made visible and challenged. To do so, de Sousa Santos argues that we need to position epistemologies as interventions of the present and future rather than as just representations or relics of the past. Cross-national research on ways of knowing should recognize the interface with language diversity and the shifts to status and use of knowledges occurring in nonwestern settings—their value or loss of worth and

possible extinction, or as de Sousa Santos suggests, the possibility of epistemicide (de Sousa Santos, 2007a, 2007b, 2013).

As Kuan-Hsing Chen proposed in *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization* (K. H. Chen, 2010), we may be at a pivotal global time for both Asia and the west for interrogating, deliberating developing, and recognizing our own as well as each other's diverse epistemologies—shifting our gaze to embrace each other as subjects rather than objects—in ways that are not colonizing or imperialistic. To do so through our venues for scholarship might become a “third space” that affords a form of fertile diversity (Bhabha, 2004; Gutiérrez, 2008) and a space that studies, nurtures, and develops the enlisting of a range of approaches that might help us unravel, understand, but not override the local, organic mutations, meanings, coalitions, and networking (e.g., Abbott, 1999; Cheek, 2016; Collins, 1998).

We would hope that our study prompts a recognition that change needs to occur on all sides (east-west, north-south) and at different levels (government, institutional, disciplinary fields, and the engagements of scholars) synergistically and complementarily to one another rather than in fashion that is competitive, marginalizing, or exclusionary.

Notes

¹Further, we wished to link to Schriever & Martinez (2004) who chose *JYYJ* and Zhao et al. (2008) who chose *AERJ* and *JYYJ* for their comparative analyses.

²In 2011, institutional subscribers included Africa (24%), Europe (23%), Asia (17%), the US (16%), South America (12%), the Middle East (5%), Australasia (2%), and Canada (1%). In terms of submissions, the greatest number of manuscripts came from the US (73% with an acceptance of 10%), followed by Europe (10% with an acceptance rate of 10%), Australasia (2.4% with 0% acceptance), the Middle East (3.5% with 0% acceptance), Asia (5.2% with 0% acceptance), and other countries (> 1% of total submissions) (Sage, 2012).

³The international articles in *JYYJ* include two categories: (1) foreign authors translated into Chinese by Chinese researchers and (2) the papers focused on international issues. The comparative articles are defined as two types in *JYYJ*: (1) comparative studies between China and other countries and (2) studies of international issues applicable to China.

⁴The comparative studies in 2003 only focused on developed nations, e.g., the UK, the US, Korea, or Japan. There were no comparative studies between China and other southeast Asian countries or any African countries.

⁵Despite differences in Canadian educational research developments, US scholars enlist the work of selected Canadian scholars extensively (e.g., Michael Fullan) as if the countries are less bordered and differences less profound.

⁶Our topical assessments were hampered by our attempt to pigeonhole each study into a single primary topic. Most articles deal with more than one topic (e.g., school management, curriculum, teaching in rural areas, etc.).

⁷The authors examined each article to ascertain its methodology. A subset was reviewed for reliability.

⁸As Li (2015) reports, 28, 500 books were translated into Chinese during 1978 to 1990, 94,400 during 1995—2003 and 12,000 in 2011.

⁹Currently, the only social science international journal in English published in China is the *Frontiers of Education in China*. It is not covered by SSCI.

References

- Abbott, A. (1999). [Review of the book *The sociology of philosophies: A global theory of intellectual change*]. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(2), 528–531.
- Alatas, F. S. (2006). *Alternative discourses in Asian social science. Responses to Eurocentrism*. New Delhi: Sage.
- American Educational Research Journal. (2015). *American Educational Research Journal* statement. Retrieved from <http://www.aera.net/Publications/Journals/AmericanEducationalResearchJournal/tabid/12607/Default.aspx>
- Appadurai, A. (2002). Grassroots globalization and the research imagination. In A. Appadurai (Ed.) *Globalization* (pp. 2–21). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bhabha, H. K. (2004). *The location of culture*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Center for World-Class Universities of Shanghai Jiao Tong University. (2014). Academic ranking of world universities. Retrieved from <http://www.shanghairanking.com/index.html>
- Charle, C., Schriewer, J., & Wagner, P. (2004). *Forms for academic knowledge and the search for cultural identities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cheek, T. (2016). *The intellectual in modern Chinese history*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, K. H. (2010). *Asia as method: Toward deimperialization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Chen, X. M. (2000). *Qualitative methodology and social science research*. Beijing: Educational Science Publishing House.
- Chen, X. M. (2003). Practical knowledge: Basement of teachers' professional development. *Educational Review of Beijing University*, 14(1), 12–19.
- Ching, L. T. S. (2000). Globalizing the regional, regionalizing the global: Mass culture and Asianism in the age of late capital. *Public Culture*, 12(1), 233–257.
- Clarke, D. (2015). The challenge of international comparison: Seven variants of the validity-comparability compromise. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Collins, R. (1998). *The sociology of philosophies: A global theory of intellectual change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- de Sousa Santos, B. (Ed.). (2007a). *Another knowledge is possible*. London: Verso.
- de Sousa Santos, B. (2007b). Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledge. *Eurozine*, 33, 45–89.
- de Sousa Santos, B. (2013). *Epistemologies of the south: Justice against epistemicide*. London: Paradigm.
- Dewey, J. (1916/2001) *Democracy and education: An introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (Chinese translation). Beijing: People's Education Press. (Originally published in 1916 in New York by the Macmillan Company).
- Elman, B. A. (1984). *From philology to philology: Intellectual and social aspects of change in late imperial China*, Cambridge, MA: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, distributed by Harvard University Press.
- Goody, J. (2010). *The Eurasian miracle*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(2), 148–164.

- Hayhoe, R. (1999). *China's universities 1895–1995: A century of cultural conflict*. Hong Kong Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong, 1999.
- Hobson, J. (2004). *The Eastern origins of Western civilization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hollingsworth, S., & Gallego, M. A. (2006). A Message From the New *AERJ/SIA* Editors *American Educational Research Journal*, 43, 3–4.
- Husén, T., & Postlethwaite, T. N. (Eds.) (1994). *The international encyclopedia of education*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Kubota, R., & Lehner, A. (2004). Toward critical contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 7–27.
- Ladwig, J. G. (2008). *The paper tiger, the waking giant and the ants: On the international ranking of higher education and its implications for the Antipodes*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, NY.
- Li, J. R. (2015). Translation projects on western social and culture books since 1990s, *China Pulising* (in Chinese), 9(5), 74–19.
- Lloyd, G., & Sivin, N. (2003). *The Way and the word: Science and medicine in early China and Greece*. New Haven, CT; Yale University Press.
- Luhmann, N. (1982). The world society as a social system. *International Journal of General Systems*, 8(3), 131–138.
- Manzon, M. (2011). *Comparative education: The construction of a field*. Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
- Marginson, S. (2000). Entrepreneurial universities. *Comparative Education Policy Occasional Paper Series 1*, 1–15, Comparative Education Policy Research Unit, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.
- McCarty, T. L., Faircloth, S. C., Glass, G. V., Ladwig, J., Lee, S. L., McNaughton, S., . . . Villenas, S. A. (2014). As we embark on a new editorship: A statement from the AERJ-SIA editors. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51, 4–6.
- Mingyuan, G. (2014). *Cultural foundations of Chinese education*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill.
- Moiwo, J. P., & Tao, F. (2013). The changing dynamics in citation index publication position China in a race with the USA for global leadership. *Scientometrics*, 95(3), 1031–1050.
- Mok, K. H. (2007). Withering the state? Globalizations, challenges and the changing higher education governance in East Asia. In W. T. Pink & G. W. Noblit (Eds.), *International handbook of urban education* (pp. 305–320). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- National Institute of Education Studies. (2015). National Institute of Education Studies statement. Retrieved from English.nies.net.cn/Publications/Journals_and_Newspapers/201405/t20140523_314983.html
- Nisbett, R. (2003). *The geography of thought: How Asians and westerners think differently . . . and why*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Nozaki, Y. (2009). Orientalism, the west and non-west binary, and postcolonial perspectives in cross-cultural research and education. In M. Apple, W. Au, & L. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 382–390). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ocholla, D. (2007). Marginalized knowledge: An agenda for indigenous knowledge development and integration with other forms of knowledge. In proceedings of the first African Information Ethics conference. *International Review of Information Ethics*, 7, 236–245.
- O'Neil, Jr., H. F. (2014). Editorial. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51, 114–116.

- Pinar, W. F. (2014). *Curriculum studies in China: Intellectual histories, present circumstances*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Piterese, J. N. (2005). Globalization and culture. London: Routledge.
- Popkewitz, T., & Rizvi, F. (Eds.) (2011). *Globalization and the study of education. Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 108*(2), Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Programme for International Student Assessment. (2012). The programme for international student assessment. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/>
- QS. (2015). QS world university rankings. Retrieved from <http://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings>
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing educational policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Robertson, S. L., & Dale, R. (2009). The World Bank, the IMF, and the possibilities of critical education. In M. Apple, W. Au, & L. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 23–35). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schriewer, J. (2004). Multiple internationalities: the emergence of a word-level ideology and the persistence of idiosyncratic world-views. In C. Charle, J. Schriewer, & P. Wagner (Eds.), *Transnational intellectual networks: Forms of academic knowledge and the search for cultural identities* (pp. 473–533). Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.
- Schriewer, J., & Martinez, C. (2004). Constructions of internationality in education. In G. Steiner-Khamsi (Ed.), *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending* (pp. 29–53). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Schulte, B. (2004). East is east and West is west? Chinese academia goes global. In C. Charle, J. Schriewer, & P. Wagner (Eds.), *Transnational intellectual networks: Forms of academic knowledge and the search for cultural identities* (pp. 307–322). Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.
- Shao, J., & Shen, H. (2011). The outflow of academic papers from China: Why is it happening and can it be stemmed? *Learned Publishing, 24*, 95–97.
- Shi, Z. Y. (2000). *Transformation of knowledge and educational reform*. Beijing: Educational Science Publishing House.
- Shi, Z. Y. (2006). *On the logic of educational practices*. Beijing: Educational Science Publishing House.
- Singh, M. J. (2011). Learning from China to internationalise Australian research education: Pedagogies of intellectual equality and ‘optimal ignorance’ of ERA journal rankings. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 48*(4), 355–365.
- Stack, M. (2016). *Global university rankings and the mediatization of higher education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Takayama, K. (2009). Progressive education and critical education scholarship in Japan: toward the democratization of critical educational studies. In M. Apple, W. Au, & L. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 354–367). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tierney, R. J., & Wei, K. (2014). *Confronting global knowledges: Chinese and US educational researchers in the 21st century*. Paper presented at World Educational Research Association, Edinburgh, Scotland, November 21, 2014.
- Times Higher Education. (2015). World university rankings. Retrieved from <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings>

- Wang, J. C-S. (2007) *John Dewey in China: To teach and to learn*. Albany: State Universities of New York Press.
- Welch, A. (2015). A new epistemic silk road? The Chinese knowledge diaspora, and its implications for the Europe of knowledge. *European Review*, 23(S1), S95–S111.
- World Bank. (2012). Knowledge assessment methodology. Retrieved from <https://knoema.com/WBKEI2013/knowledge-economy-index-world-bank-2012>. Retrieved November 3, 2016.
- Yang, G.-C., & Chang, Y. (2009). The circumstances and the possibilities of critical educational studies in China. In M. Apple, W. Au, & L. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 368–385). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Yongling, Y., & Hayhoe, R. (2004). Chinese higher learning: The transition process from classical knowledge patterns to modern disciplines, 1860–1910. In C. Charle, J. Schriewer, & P. Wagner (Eds.), *Transnational intellectual networks: Forms of academic knowledge and the search for cultural identities* (pp. 269–306). Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.
- Zeng, T. S., & Gao, B. L. (2009). Analysis on the current research findings and their influences (in Chinese), *Educational Research (JYY)*, 30(8), 34–41.
- Zhao, Y., Zhang, G., Yang, W., Kirkland, D., Han, X., & Zhang, J. (2008). A comparative study of educational research in China and the US. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28(1), 1–17.

Manuscript received June 18, 2015

Final revision received July 25, 2016

Accepted September 29, 2016