The beginning of a new century provides an appropriate opportunity to take stock of our field of study and common endeavor. In this presidential address, I examine challenges and contributions. The challenges relate to our knowledge base, our approaches to the study of education and society, and what we do with that knowledge. Our strengths reside in what we as academics, policy makers, and practitioners can contribute to knowledge creation and dissemination, to improvements in education systems at home and abroad, and ultimately to a global consciousness in the various constituencies we serve. In other words, as the theme of the year 2000 San Antonio conference queried: "What do we know? What can we contribute?"

Very much in the tradition of Gary Theisen’s 1997 presidential address, I will attempt to stand on the shoulders of my predecessors—while also drawing inspiration from the writings of my contemporaries as well as those of new scholars.¹ My address is based on past presidential addresses, especially those of the past 10 years, the overarching themes of our annual conferences in recent years, Comparative Education Review (CER) articles selected as the recipients of the George Bereeday Award, dissertations chosen for the Gail P. Kelly Award, and commentary by the editors of CER in the 1990s.

Challenges

The decade of the 1990s began with Vandra Masemann’s award-winning presidential address challenging us to value alternative ways of knowing and to overcome “a false dichotomy between theory and practice and a communication gap between academics and practitioners.”² Val Rust’s presidential

address of the following year called upon the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) membership to take up the challenge of postmodernism by clarifying the metanarratives driving our work. The decade ended with Ruth Hayhoe's address, inspired by a comment of Masemann's that it is time for us to examine once again the metanarratives of our field and the moral and epistemological value they hold for our research. Hayhoe responded by discussing the challenge of modernity to two ancient cultures and societies, those of China and Japan.

In between, various CIES presidential addresses and major works of scholarship in our field have discussed the metanarratives of globalization and neoliberalism, their impact on the role of the state, and equality of educational opportunity and outcomes for variously situated populations (especially women, ethnic minorities, rural populations, and the working class); the emergence of nonstate actors, especially nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and social movements in the provision of basic as well as popular education that hold the potential for individual emancipation and social change; the role of major binational and international donor and technical assistance agencies in agenda setting; the struggles to forge and maintain individual, communal, and national identities in response to the forces of globalization and modernization; and the transnational migration of labor and issues related to the integration, accommodation, assimilation, or isolation of transitory, transplanted, and displaced millions of individuals. Very much related to these themes has been the call, particularly in the presidential addresses of Noel McGinn (1996) and Carlos Torres (1998), for democratic citizenship in increasingly multicultural and globalized societies.

What are the challenges to our panoply of epistemological approaches and methodological tools for studying these issues? Over the years there have been persistent calls for more systematic gathering of accurate comparative data on educational system performance and their correlates for purposes of theory building and problem solving. The calls have come from comparativists working within different and, at times, competing research paradigms. Not only improvements in large-scale quantitative cross-national studies have been constantly urged, but refinements in smaller-scale qualitative case studies as well. For those working within largely interpretive frameworks, the challenges have related to the need to study the lived, and often contested, reality of individual schools and education programs: how the interactions of stu-
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students, teachers, staff, parents, and various nonschool agencies affect the ways in which the world is interpreted, meanings are negotiated, decisions are made, and academic and occupational careers are constructed.

The 1998 Buffalo CIES conference called "for bringing culture back into" our scholarship, teaching, and policy work. The value of ethnographic studies was a theme raised as early as 1977 by Patricia Broadfoot and 1979 by Richard Heyman, who highlighted the need for microlevel ethnological studies of the processes of schooling. Subsequently, in 1982 Masemann made the case for critical anthropological studies of the everyday life of classrooms and how these transactions related to larger social structures. Contextual factors influencing the microlevel necessarily include, in my own writings on world-systems analysis, the workings of a global economy, strategic political alliances, and the asymmetrical power relationships between different blocs of countries.

Mark Bray and Murray Thomas, more recently, provided a useful framework for attempting to link different geographical/locational levels from that of the world/regions/continents to that of schools/classrooms/individuals. Their article recommends that comparativists contribute to improvements in theory and policy by introducing as many levels of analysis as possible to portray the complex interplay of different social forces and how individual and local units of analysis are embedded in multiple layered contexts. In doing so, they echo the call in anthropology for "multisited ethnographies."

There have been various calls for multilevel analyses of educational contexts, processes, and outcomes. William Cummings in his 1999 presidential address especially emphasized the need for studying the processes and institution(s) of schooling, drawing upon Weberian notions of ideal types of societies in which we can view the patterning of education in relation to major national traditions. He also urged us to "compare, compare, compare!"

In addition to the value of anthropological and institutionalist studies, Andy Kazamias has summoned us, on every occasion possible as past editor of the CER and president of our society, to bring historical, comparative perspectives to our research. In discussing what Nelly Stromquist has called

---


10 See, e.g., Andreas Kazamias, "Comparative Pedagogy: An Assignment for the 70s," *Comparative Education Review* 16 (October 1972): 406–11. Kazamias has been an ardent advocate not only for histori-
“the evolution and complexity of a given situation,” we also need to problematize the themes and issues we study. This is no more evident than with regard to the metanarrative of “globalization” and the assumptions about its inevitability, beneficial impact, and the desirability of markets replacing the role of the state in the allocation of goods and services. Similarly, the accompanying metanarratives and buzzwords of neoliberal economic and educational policies (“decentralization,” “effectiveness,” “privatization,” “choice,” and “partnership”) need to be studied. In her call for timely articles to the CER, Stromquist further noted, “We need to examine more closely the realities they assume, the realities they seek to create, the meanings they evoke among their proponents, and the shaky terrain upon which many are built.”

Earlier, Steve Klees, in his 1986 award-winning article in the CER, pointed out how the field of economics, which has dominated thinking about school-society relations, concerned itself almost exclusively with cost-benefit and rate-of-return analyses, which have serious shortcomings. In their stead, Klees advocates institutionalist and political economy approaches that offer radically different perspectives on how we conceive of and practice educational planning and policy analysis. Similarly, Peter Easton and Simon Fass, in their 1989 Bereday Award article on “Monetary Consumption Benefits and Demand for Primary Schooling in Haiti,” questioned the validity of national rate of return analyses that do not take into account the true costs and benefits of education for different subpopulations (specifically, middle-income and poor and homeless families) and what educational strategies are pursued by them for what ends.

To the list of desired cultural, historical, critical perspectives that we need to incorporate into our various engagements, I wish to add the challenge of infusing philosophical, especially axiological, considerations in our work. The field of comparative and international education has long been concerned with issues related to values and valuing—how education systems both reflect and shape national value systems. What is critically important,
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12 Ibid., p. iv.
13 Ibid., pp. iv–v.
as is evident in the writings of those, like Rolland Paulston, who would map the various contours of our field, is our vision of the good society and polity, and what role education plays in achieving those desired ends.\textsuperscript{17} In shaping more attractive and just futures, we must be particularly sensitive to the ethical requisite and epistemological desirability of including the views of insiders and subaltern groups, who can and should be active coparticipants in our research engagements.

How do we disseminate the insights and knowledge that we gain from our scholarship to contribute to better informed and more effective educational policy and practice that benefit all? Particularly pertinent here are questions concerning the extent to which the latest advances in interactive, real-time telecommunications and the Internet can be used to represent the views from “the margins” and grassroots initiatives that challenge existing power structures.\textsuperscript{18} Will these technologies, for example, enable scholars, teachers, and classrooms around the world to share information and insights and contribute to greater international understanding, while avoiding elements of cultural imperialism and greater dependency on the metropolitan centers from which the technologies and programs are emanating? At a more general level, in addition to Masemann’s clarion call, various presidential addresses from Cole Brembeck in 1975, to Steve Heyneman in 1993, and to Theisen in 1997 have expressed concern about the divide between those of us in the academy and those in the world of policy and practice—between “the center” and the “periphery”—and have emphasized the need for greater articulation between the theoretical and pragmatic dimensions of our field.\textsuperscript{19}

\textbf{Contributions}

I believe that comparative and international education is well positioned to respond to these challenges. Perhaps more so than any other field, the systemic, multidisciplinary, cross-national and cross-cultural foci that characterize much of our work are ideal for illuminating the interplay between global contextual forces and education’s potential for effecting social change. Our intrinsically interrelated endeavors in comparative and international education in theory building, policy analysis, and evaluation, as well as our


commitment to public education on behalf of international understanding and peace, provide us with the vantage point and resources to make our contributions to educational reform and social change. It is very possible, as Cummings contended in his 1999 presidential address, that “we can be, should be, the field that leads in the study of contemporary education.”

*The Dimensions of Comparative Education*

Historically, the field of comparative education has comprehended three principal dimensions, which I designate as theoretical, practical, and international/global. These dimensions are closely related and, as I will argue, are converging to an ever greater extent.

*The theoretical or scientific dimension: The value of knowing “it ain’t necessarily so.”*—One major goal of comparative education has been to contribute to theory building and to the formulation of generalizable propositions about the workings of school systems and their interactions with their surrounding economies, politics, cultures, and social orders. As Joseph Farrell noted, all sciences are comparative. The goal of science is not only to establish that relationships between variables exist but to determine the range over which they exist. Further, as Bray and Thomas have pointed out, comparison enables researchers to look at the entire world as a natural laboratory for viewing the multiple ways in which societal factors, educational policies, and practices may vary and interact in otherwise unpredictable and unimaginable ways.

It is the range of experiences that come to light through comparison that enables us to question assumptions about school-society relations and the generalizability of major social science studies conducted in North America and Europe. I have subtitled this section of my address based on the lyrics of George Gershwin’s song, “It Ain’t Necessarily So.” That’s right. It ain’t necessarily so that family background is more important than the adequacy and quality of school resources, or that investments in higher education as compared with those in primary education do not have a high social rate of return or utility, or that teachers and schools are responsible for supposedly lagging achievement scores and stagnant economies, or that school systems are the primary determinants of equitable life chances and economic equality, or that schools necessarily reproduce social inequalities.

The value of a comparative perspective is illustrated in examining a frequently posed question by education researchers: What is more important in determining academic achievement—school related characteristics or the socioeconomic background of the student? Here I point out the limita-
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20 Cummings (n. 9 above), p. 414.
22 Bray and Thomas (n. 8 above), p. 486.
tions of studies such as those conducted by James Coleman and Christopher Jencks in the United States and Bridget Plowden in England that concluded that forces largely beyond the control of schools, namely, the characteristics of students and their families, are more significant determinants of what students learn.\(^{23}\) Studies conducted in places as far apart as Uganda and Chile reach different conclusions.\(^{24}\) Schools do matter but perhaps to a greater extent in less industrialized countries. Studies by Farrell and Ernesto Schiefelbein, Heyneman, and Bruce Fuller have indicated that given the great disparities in school resources in low-income countries, where rural schools as well as many urban ones may not have the most basic amenities and equipment, the provision of textbooks and the presence of a competent teacher who can work with well-designed learning materials can make a difference.\(^{25}\)

The value of cross-national, longitudinal data also is apparent in calculating social rates of return to investments in education. Although there has been a marked tendency in the international donor community to argue that the best education investment for a country is at the primary school level, followed by secondary, and last by higher education,\(^{26}\) comparative, longitudinal data suggest that in some countries secondary education now has the highest rate of return. A review of the literature by Martin Carnoy indicates that social rates of return in many of the so-called NICs (newly industrializing countries) rise with higher levels of schooling.\(^{27}\) Heyneman, when he was a staff member of the World Bank, found that “returns to higher education or vocational education . . . [were] greater than elementary education in Pakistan, Brazil, Botswana, China, Turkey, and Greece.”\(^{28}\) James Wolfensohn, president of the World Bank, himself admitted in March of this past year that the bank had seriously miscalculated the social rate of return to higher education, and therefore there are valid reasons for adequately funding this level of education.\(^{29}\) Moreover, higher-education


\(^{29}\) James Wolfensohn address given on March 1, 2000, at the World Bank, in relation to the completion of the report on “Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise,” *Joint World Bank/
leaders in developing countries have argued that what these societies need is not poorly funded universities but well-endowed, first-rate institutions capable of conducting the type of scientific research that helps them overcome their dependency on the metropolitan countries of the North, whose technologies are often inappropriate.  

John Meyer and David Baker offer another example of the need for longitudinal comparative studies that have policy relevance. Cross-national studies, as they point out, can provide important lessons and enrich our understanding of how various organizational arrangements improve school outcomes, especially those other than enrollment figures and achievement scores, and the trade-offs involved in reform efforts to increase national achievement levels. One such trade-off they discuss with regard to the United States is between the lowering of standards and "the short term costs of the achievement of particular students" with the long-term benefits of "enhanced attitudes towards education on the part of school leavers towards learning even decades after they leave school."  

Moreover, comparative data provide the basis for critiquing the validity of the common assertion that schools are the main culprit for lagging economic performance, whether in the United States or abroad. While the association between levels of educational attainment and lifetime earning streams is substantial and becoming stronger in industrialized societies, much more problematic is the relationship between national levels of education per se and overall measures of an economy's growth and productivity. And while the gap between the rich and the poor is getting greater within and across countries, comparative data (from Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom) also point out that wage policies and efforts made to provide high-level skills to those not receiving a higher education can lead to more equitable systems of income distribution.  

To return to the theme of "It Ain't Necessarily So," that schools produce social and economic inequality, Bradley Levinson's 10-year longitudinal, ethnographic study of a Mexican junior high school documents how the egalitarian ideology of the 1910 revolution enters the discourse and practices of

school personnel and is appropriated by students. The belief that Todos Somos Iguales (We are all equal) strongly shapes interactions between students and, contrary to much U.S. and European social and cultural reproduction theory, overrides the forces that would stratify students by social class, ethnicity, and gender.\(^{35}\)

The value of gathering comparative data guided by theory to reach reasonable propositions about the workings and outcomes of education systems in relation to their social, historical contexts is particularly pertinent when the second dimension of the discipline is taken into account. The practical or ameliorative dimension—to borrow or not to borrow? That is the question.—Another reason for studying other societies’ education systems is to discover what can be learned that will contribute to improved policy and practice at home.\(^{34}\)

David Phillips, in the edited collection Learning from Comparing, volume 2, underscores how comparative data can be illuminating in several ways. As he notes,

It can *inter alia*:

- demonstrate possible alternatives to policy “at home”;
- provide insights into the processes of policy formulation;
- clarify means of successful implementation used elsewhere; and
- serve to warn against adopting certain measures.\(^{35}\)

While potentially beneficial, transferring educational practices from one context to another, what Phillip Altbach has called educational “borrowing” and “lending” has its dangers as well.\(^{36}\) Particularly exciting research on this topic, which provides conceptual refinements to our understanding of the processes and human agency involved in why certain policy makers determine to lend or borrow educational practices, is found in the August 2000 issue of CER in an article by Gita Steiner-Khamsi and Hubert Quist, “The Politics of Educational Borrowing: Reopening the Case of Achimota in
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British Ghana.” The researchers, drawing upon Jürgen Schriewer’s writings on “externalized references” and Niklas Luhmann’s theories of “self-referential systems,” explain the reasoning by which the British colonizers transplanted an already outdated and highly criticized system of industrial education for blacks in the southern United States to Ghana.57

A modern-day parallel can be found in the attempts of conservative groups in the United States to advance an agenda of back-to-basics, rigorous national standards, and high-stakes examinations in an attempt to restructure U.S. schooling along the lines of the national education systems (notably those of Asia), whose students outscore U.S. students on the International Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) tests. The selective culling of data from these tests to “bash” schools and teachers is a classic case of what Harold Noah has called the “abuse” of comparative education.38 (It is especially interesting to note that while certain groups within the United States are trying to emulate elements of the Japanese, Taiwanese, and South Korean systems, these countries in turn are in the process of attempting to eliminate the excessive emphasis placed on national examinations and reform their systems more along the lines of U.S. education.)

Lyle Jones draws upon the lessons of other countries, particularly England and Canada, to question the current fascination in the United States with national testing as a means of fostering educational reform. As he points out, “The evidence from abroad... should lead us to be wary of high-stakes assessment based on a single test. Quite understandably teachers and students will concentrate on content anticipated to be included in the restricted sample of items,” narrowing the curriculum in ways “that can be detrimental to constructive teaching and learning.”39 More important, Jones draws attention to the strong correlation between poverty levels, school expulsions and suspensions, and achievement scores in the United States, Germany, and Japan to underscore the point “that within every one of the nations that participated, poverty is related to achievement... Based on these findings, there can be little basis for surprise when we discover that the U.S. [with more than double the level of children living in poverty] may lag behind Japan, Germany, and some other countries in average school achievement in mathematics.”40 But even the lower scores of certain U.S. 


38 Harold J. Noah (n. 16 above).


40 Ibid., p. 6.
populations on various tests included in the IEA studies at different grade levels are seriously misinterpreted for political ends as documented in the series of annual reports by Gerald Bracey in the *Phi Delta Kappan* and David Berliner and Bruce Biddle's *The Manufactured Crisis*.\(^{41}\)

Comparison not only provides a valuable vantage point for critiquing unwarranted assumptions of popular reform movements but also provides us with outlier cases (the so-called loose-fish of Noah's 1974 presidential address) that defy common sense assumptions concerning where we are likely to find examples of success.\(^{42}\) Take the case of Cuba, discussed in Rosa Maria Torres's Claude Eggertsen Lecture of last year: despite tremendous economic hardships resulting from the U.S. embargo of the island combined with the ending of massive Russian and Eastern European aid, Cuba significantly outperformed all other Latin American countries in third and fourth grade language and mathematics achievement tests administered by UNESCO in 1998.\(^{43}\) In addition, it had the highest secondary education net enrollment and completion rates of any country in the region and, I would add, literacy levels exceeding those of countries with a history of well-developed education systems.

What may be learned from the study of the Cuban case, or any other country for that matter, is certain lessons or general principles. With regard to Cuba, we see (1) the high priority placed on education as part of a process of social transformation which extends opportunities to the most disadvantaged sectors of a society (especially women and rural populations), (2) the value placed on widespread literacy not only in the initial stages of social change but continually as the society develops and requires more sophisticated skills of its citizens, and (3) the very nature of literacy itself requires constant redefinition in relation to a rapidly evolving social context.

Perhaps the most important principle to be derived from studying the history of educational borrowing and lending is that there is no one best system, that all systems have strengths as well as weaknesses. Also, education systems, as noted above, reflect their societies—their many tensions and contradictions. Perhaps one may learn more from lessons of failure—what not to do—than from stories of success. Finally, mistakes are more likely to
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\(^{42}\) Harold J. Noah, “Fast-Fish and Loose-Fish in Comparative Education,” *Comparative Education Review* 16 (October 1974): 341–47; the references to different types of fish is drawn from Herman Melville’s *Moby Dick*.

\(^{43}\) UNESCO-OREAL. *Primer estudio internacional comparativo sobre lenguaje, matemática y factores asociados en tercer y cuarto grado* (First international comparative study on language and mathematics and associated factors in third and fourth grade) (Santiago de Chile: Laboratorio Latinoamericano de Evaluación de la Calidad de la Educación, 1998).
be avoided if theory guides and informs the more pragmatic, policy-oriented dimensions of our field.

*International education: The global dimension.*—A third and significant dimension of our field has been the concern with contributing to international understanding and peace. The roots of international education can clearly be traced to the philosophical and pedagogical writings of Erasmus (1466–1536) and Comenius (1592–1670) and are found in the more contemporary poetic visions of non-Western educators and philosophers such as Rabindranath Tagore. They are entwined with the nineteenth-century origins of comparative education, with the pioneering studies of Marc-Antoine Jullien of education systems for purposes of not only informing and improving educational policy but also contributing to greater international understanding. I believe the international dimension will become an even more important feature of comparative education as processes of globalization increasingly require people to recognize how socioeconomic forces, from what were previously considered distant and remote areas of the world, impinge upon their daily lives.

Discussions about the history of CIES often contrast the *(a)* international side of our field as the more descriptive one, concerned with the movement of scholars and students between countries and their various accounts of what they observed, with *(b)* the comparative side as the more explanatory one, concerned with theory building. But Erwin Epstein, whom I just paraphrased, also acknowledges the complementarity of the two sides, observing that the earlier practitioners of international education with “their observations of education in other countries . . . [provided] the foundation for comparative education.”

While a number of prominent scholars in our field have tended to maintain these distinctions, David Wilson’s monumental history of the institutions, individuals, and substance of our field reaches a very different conclusion. He answers the query of his 1994 presidential address, “Comparative and International Education: Fraternal or Siamese Twins?” with this statement: “Our twins have been inseparable since their birth, and both the names of each twin and their activities have been interchangeable at various periods in their life cycles.” Although Wilson’s address was a direct response to Heyneman’s presidential address of the preceding year concerning the growing breach and tension between the work of comparativists in the
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academy and those in public policy, Wilson would most certainly agree with Heyneman, as do I, that “we should reassert the principles of our professions, created when the two interests merged in 1968 to form a Comparative and International Education Society—one oriented to comparative education as a ‘social science,’ the other oriented to peace and cultural understanding through international education.”

48 Michael Crossley, more recently, also has endorsed this marriage or reunion of the twins: “We have, it is argued, much to gain from a more fundamental rapprochement between the international and comparative dimensions of our field. The strengths of the former tradition may indeed relate to its focus on policy issues and action but, especially in times of rapid globalization, the importance of taking cultural differences more fully into account is increasingly being recognized if educational development, in any context, is to be relevant, worthwhile and sustainable.”

49 For those attempting to introduce international perspectives not only into scholarly research but into teaching at all levels and forms of education, a global set of lenses is absolutely essential. Gerald Gutek notes that some proponents of global education see it as a field distinct from international education because of its emphasis on “humankind as inhabiting a global village, a biosphere that is ‘spaceship Earth.’” He goes on to note that “global educators tend to look for commonalities rather than differences among the earth’s peoples and nations and are concerned with ‘emergent trends’ that come from futuristic studies.”

50 Similarly, Chadwick Alger and James Harf differentiate international education—which they view largely as area studies or descriptive accounts of discrete countries and geographical regions—from global education, which they distinguish as emphasizing values, transactions, actors, mechanisms, procedures, and issues.

51 Briefly, according to their definition, values education teaches that people around the world have different and equally valid ways of viewing the world, reflective of their life circumstances. Particularly relevant to an ability to understand the everyday life of others is “consciousness perspective,” a concept based on the work of Robert Hanvey. While Hanvey emphasizes the need for appreciating differences, he also invites us to seek out and build upon what interests we have in common.

52 An example of this is Barbara Heyneman, “Quantity, Quality, and Source” (n. 19 above), p. 387.


50 Gutek, p. 29.

51 Chadwick F. Alger and James E. Harf, Global Education: Why? For Whom? About What? (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1986). ERIC Document EN 265107. Although I accept the distinctions they make between international and global education, it is certainly possible for international education to comprehend the various aspects of the Alger and Harf definition.

Piscitelli’s use of art to point out the common concerns of children all around the world, their fears and hopes, but also how they differ by societal context—why a Vietnamese eight-year-old might draw a picture of children working on a tea plantation as something very natural. In addition to art, literature—the stories told by people from around the world—is a useful medium for communicating across cultures without, according to Uma Narayan, objectifying people as “others.” As an example: my colleague Peg Sutton’s syllabus on school and society includes the novel, Nervous Conditions, a story of a young girl in colonial Southern Rhodesia who is the first in her family to be schooled. For teacher education students from largely middle-class backgrounds and small towns in the Midwest, the novel provides a compelling introduction at the personal level to the similarities and differences in educational experiences across cultures. Teaching from novels as well as poetry, film, and music is an effective means of conveying the existential world of colonialism and oppression that is likely to be beyond the experience—even the imaginations—of many of our students and public audiences.

In pointing out the importance of actors and transactions, Alger and Harf call attention to the multiplicity of actors (at all levels from the international to the local, governmental as well as nongovernmental) involved in countless interactions across national boundaries in areas including telecommunications, meteorology, emergency relief, health, and education. Certainly, we, in our various capacities as consultants, visiting scholars, and researchers crossing national boundaries, are an element in the constellation of transnational actors, as are the students who travel to other countries to pursue their studies, with the potential to effect significant social change because of their skills in communicating across cultures.

The study of mechanisms and procedures provide us with insights into what, for example, an international agency like the International Monetary Fund, an important transnational actor, does when it enters a country experiencing debt and currency crises and attempts to stabilize the economic situation. These issues face all of humanity—environmental destruction, the spread of disease, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the increasing impoverishment of populations and the growing disparity of wealth between regions and within nations.


Alger and Harf's global framework can help us understand, for example, the economic crises, commencing in 1997, in the four Asian nations of Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, and Thailand. The interconnected nature of the global economy has meant that as the currencies of these countries were greatly devalued, banks collapsed, and investors withdrew capital, economies all around the world were negatively affected. Headlines not only warned of the loss of jobs in export industries and tourism resulting from the Asian crisis but how university student enrollments abroad would diminish. While some university officials in countries ranging from Australia to the United States lamented the damaging budgetary effect of a decrease in full-paying students, others scrambled to see how they could assist international students who were in dire financial need and under great economic stress. In the meantime, mechanisms and procedures for coping with the economic instability in the four nations, that is, the conditionalities imposed by the International Monetary Fund, led, for example, to food riots, ethnic violence, and the eventual toppling of the Suharto government.

Thomas Klak has remarked that globalization, in effect, may be a "dangerous euphemism for the current restructuring of international capitalism" or, as noted by Gill, an international "apartheid system" with major winners and losers. Among those excluded from the so-called benefits of international market forces and policies of privatization and decentralization are: large sectors of Africa, as documented by Joel Samoff in such appropriately titled pieces as "No Teacher Guide, No Textbooks, No Chairs: Contending with Crisis in African Education," as well as the article by Assie-Lumumba, corecipient of this year's Joyce Cain Award; Latin America, as described in the recently edited collection by Fernando Reimers, Unequal Schools, Unequal Chances; and Russia and Eastern Europe, where, according to Maria Bucur and Ben Eklof, "freedom and opportunity beckon, but equity has declined."

The challenges to equality of opportunity are those that we as academics, policy makers, and practitioners must confront in studying, advising, implementing, and evaluating educational programs in our own countries and


around the world as well as teaching and writing about them. Having briefly reviewed the basic dimensions of our field (the theoretical-scientific, the practical-ameliorative, and the international-global) that position us to contribute to greater understanding of the interactions between education systems and their various contexts, I next address what I believe to be promising trends in research in our field, including signs of growing institutional strength.

**Current Trends and New Directions**

According to Epstein, the requirements for establishing comparative education as a legitimate academic discipline have involved developing a body of thought, fashioning "proper methodological tools to test theories about schooling," employing analyses "sufficiently broad to enable proper use of these tools," and establishing a scholarly "infrastructure that would include communication networks and professional associations to bring comparativists together to share their knowledge, and institutional centers to train future scholars." 58 The following sections document the extent to which we have established our legitimacy and value as a field of study.

**Institutionalization of Comparative Education**

I believe that the institutional base of our field is not only secure but that academic programs will continue to grow, if not flourish. Familiarity with developments in the field suggest that higher education institutions are increasingly offering courses and instituting programs in recognition of the relevance of comparative and international perspectives and insights to both pre- and in-service teacher education programs as well as the liberal preparation of students in the sciences and arts. While some comparative programs may have been cut back or integrated into larger policy studies units of schools of education in various countries, there also is evidence of its continued vitality and growth in a number of countries, especially in Asia.

There also has been a growth in local, national, and regional societies over the past decade. There are currently 28 associations belonging to the World Council of Comparative Education Societies (WCCES). The Asian societies are exceptionally vibrant and in the case of China and Korea are growing rapidly. Outside Asia, Latin American countries (notably Argentina and Venezuela) are in the process of forming or reviving national comparative and international education societies. The Southern African Comparative and History of Education Society hosted the 1998 World Congress in South Africa, and there is a growing presence of African scholars at annual meetings of the CIES. A similar presence and interest in our field is noted.
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58 Epstein, "Editorial" (n. 46 above), pp. 411, 413.
among scholars from Eastern Europe and the former republics of the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{59}

A review of the changing composition of CIES membership between 1989 and 2000 indicates several noteworthy trends: principally, that our society’s membership is becoming younger and more international. During this 11-year period, student membership increased by 61–53 percent overall for U.S. students, and 120 percent for international students!\textsuperscript{60} I believe these are very positive signs for the continued vitality of our society.

The increasingly international base of our society also has implications for who is publishing in our society’s journal, the \textit{Comparative Education Review}. Over the 11 years between 1990 and 2000, approximately 40 percent of the articles were by academics based in institutions outside the United States. Between March of 1998 and March of 2000, 54 percent of single- or multiple-authored articles published in the \textit{CER} were by individuals based in institutions outside the United States. (Another 7 percent were jointly authored by scholars based both in the United States and abroad).\textsuperscript{61} It also should be noted that many of the authors identified as being affiliated with a U.S. or non-U.S. institution were not actually citizens of the country where they wrote the articles, another indication of an increasingly cosmopolitan field of study characterized by the international mobility of its members.

Here it is important to point out the dominance of English as the language of scholarly communication and publication as both a fact and a point of contention. Particularly pertinent is Barbara Wallraff’s recent article in the \textit{Atlantic Monthly}, on the problematic nature of English as a global language.\textsuperscript{62} While English, for now, occupies a hegemonic position in international scholarship, there also is a marked growth in Chinese,\textsuperscript{63} as well as in Spanish language publications, and a substantial literature in Russian.

\textit{Transforming the Boundaries of the Field}

The growing body of literature from different regions of the world, whether in English or not, will continue to expand the existing theoretical and conceptual framework of comparative and international education, eventually transforming the very boundaries of the field. Just as Latin Ameri-

\textsuperscript{59} Information about the number of associations that belong to the World Congress of Comparative Education Societies and their current status was provided in e-mail messages of December 30, 2000, and March 1, 2001, by Mark Bray, secretary general of the WCCES. Also see Mark Bray, “Comparative Education Research in the Asian Region: Implications for the Field as a Whole,” \textit{Comparative Education Bulletin} (Comparative Education Society of Hong Kong) 2 (May 1998): 6–9.

\textsuperscript{60} Information provided by Julie Noblit, publications manager, journals division, University of Chicago Press.

\textsuperscript{61} Information provided by Andrea Brewster, managing editor, \textit{Comparative Education Review}, University of California, Los Angeles.


\textsuperscript{63} Bray, p. 9.
can scholarship has contributed dependency theory and Freirean notions of education for critical consciousness and liberation, the literature of Asia and Africa will help offset the hegemony of European and North American scholarship. What does teaching and learning mean in societies imbued with Confucian, Taoist, and Zen notions? How, for example, can North American and European art educators learn from traditional Japanese and Chinese forms of instruction in these areas, and, conversely, what can Asian educators learn from new curricular approaches to art education in the West? What can North American universities, desiring to achieve greater diversity in education and inclusion of minority students, learn from the example of historically white higher-education institutions in South Africa as they attempt to incorporate students of color, especially black South Africans, who comprise a majority of the population? And are the experiences of North American universities attempting to desegregate their institutions pertinent to South African higher-education institutions?

If we are to imagine preferred futures for societies, we have much to learn, as suggested by Hayhoe in her 2000 presidential address, from Arabic, Indian, and East Asian perspectives, to achieve a more humane and just global society. What is being advocated here is the need for different perspectives, based on different cultural traditions, to be infused into the literature and, ultimately, a multidirectional flow of scholarship and ideas to not only improve educational policy and practice but also our ability to generalize about education-society interactions.

A Cornucopia of Approaches

The whimsical title of the 1998 Western Region meeting of the CIES, “Dancing on the Edge,” captured the tumult as well as renaissance that our field is enjoying—the plethora of new research approaches and the challenges to dominant discourses in comparative and international education. If there is a constant in the field of comparative education, it is its constantly changing nature. Since its institutionalization in the academy, the field has undergone marked shifts in paradigms and approaches to the field—from
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modernization theory and structural functionalism combined with attempts to create a science of education based on the rigorous gathering of comparative data to test theoretically based hypotheses; to neo-Marxist, world-systems, and dependency theories of school-society relations; to ethnomethodological and ethnographic approaches to a variety of "isms"—poststructuralism, postmodernism, and postcolonialism coupled with feminist perspectives.68

New developments in comparative education further include incorporation of theories of multiculturalism, social movements and the state, the politics of transition and curriculum reform, as well as critical race theory and critical modernism.69 The populations studied range from preschool children through adults in literacy programs, from students and teachers to national and international decision makers. The levels of analysis range from the actions of small groups of individuals and the contested terrain of single schools, to the decisions of communities facing the challenges of modernity, to the workings of the international donor community. The materials of analysis vary from videotape footage and school textbooks to archival documents and large international data sets.

These diverse currents are reflected in the work of new scholars in our field. A brief review of the outstanding dissertations that have won the Gail P. Kelly Award reveal this diversity of conceptual frameworks in studying subjects ranging from racial and gender identity formation in working-class girls in a French vocational high school (Raissigieur, 1994), to negotiating Australian Aboriginal identity in an urban context (Taylor, 1995), to the nature and implications of literacy programs in revolutionary and postrevolutionary Grenada (Hickling-Hudson, 1996), to the politics of educational reform in Brazil during the tenure of Paulo Freire as secretary of education in the Municipality of São Paulo (O'Cadiz, 1998), the struggles of female teachers in Argentina (Fischman, 1998), and a teacher empowerment program in India (Stacki, 1999)—all aimed at achieving more equitable education; to a discourse analysis of dominant concepts concerning education and development in our field (McGovern, 1997); to a south-south transfer: a study of Sino-African exchanges (Gillespie, 2000); and, most recently, to Qur'anic schools in Morocco as agents of preservation and change (Boyle, 2001).

For the most part, as is true of most studies in our field, these were qualitative case studies in naturalistic settings. Rust et al. in their review of over
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69 For further discussion of these critical theories, see Carlos Alberto Torres and Theodore R. Mitchell, eds., Sociology of Education: Emerging Perspectives (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998).
eighteen hundred articles in the *Comparative Education Review, Comparative Education*, and the *International Journal of Educational Development* between 1955 and 1997 found that over 70 percent of reported studies were qualitative in nature and relied mainly on natural settings.\(^7\) Case studies are likely to continue to be the most commonly used approach to studying education-society relations. Given the limited resources of most researchers working in the academy, the tendency of most individuals is to study that with which they are most familiar. More than just convenience, Charles Ragin argues that "the comparative method is essentially a case-oriented strategy of comparative research" because of the need to take into account the contingencies of particular sociocultural milieus and historical formations.\(^7\) The value of case studies resides in their contribution to the refinement and modification of extant theory and ultimately to the creation of new theory when existing explanatory frameworks are not applicable. They are particularly important, according to York Bradshaw and Michael Wallace, because much of extant social science theory, formulated in a few select countries of the North, tends to be of questionable validity for much of the world.\(^2\) Case studies, however, have their limitations and pitfalls. Ragin, Bradshaw and Wallace, and others are well aware that there is a danger in attempting to generalize from one case to other instances that are not appropriate and to view the world only from the lens of that which is most familiar.

Large-scale variable-oriented studies, whatever their limitations in decontextualizing data, also have great value in contributing to theory building as well as more informed and enlightened policy making. For example, there is much to be gained from the research of Carnoy and his doctoral students who, for the past 6 years, have been analyzing (with large, multinational data sets) the impact of structural adjustment on the employment and training of teachers and the constellation of variables that are associated with the relative status and remuneration of teachers in different contexts.\(^7\)

\(^7\) Val Rust et al., "Research Strategies in Comparative Education," *Comparative Education Review* 43 (February 1999): 86–109, 101, 105, 107. Although some would question whether these qualitative case studies are of a largely nonpositivist nature, I would argue that these studies are much more contextually and historically situated and of an interpretive nature than "variable-oriented" studies, as described by Charles C. Ragin, *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987); for discussion of the value of variable-oriented research for theory building, see Max A. Eckstein and Harold J. Noah, *Toward a Science of Comparative Education* (New York: MacMillan, 1968). The recipients of the Gail P. Kelly Award exemplify the move toward revealing the insiders' view of the world and the social construction of reality.

\(^7\) Ragin, p. 16.


There is great utility in the wealth of information generated by the series of studies conducted under the auspices of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. As Torsten Husén and others have pointed out, the great range of examples provided by such studies enables researchers and policy makers to examine the effects of introducing different subject matter (e.g., foreign languages) at certain points in the curriculum, of permitting early specialization in certain disciplines (such as mathematics and sciences), or taking different pedagogical approaches to instruction (e.g., inquiry-oriented versus more didactic science education). Large-scale research can reveal, for example, what conditions favor the educational careers and life chances of females or successful literacy and adult basic education programs. While such studies are useful in illuminating general patterns, I also believe the general tendencies revealed by them need to be studied in greater detail through individual cases of educational institutions and programs within their unique contexts, as proposed by Theisen et al. in their award-winning article in the 1983 CER.

Unlike those who fear that our field has lost a sense of coherence with this multiplicity of research strands, that our field is in danger of being divided among competing and antagonistic traditions, I have argued, along with Altbach and Kelly, that this diversity is one of the great strengths of comparative and international education. Now more than ever, there is a

Compared to Other Selected Occupations" and Lucrecia Santibanez, "Relative Teacher Salaries in Mexico: Wage Premiums and Other Considerations" (both papers were presented as part of the panel on "What Do We Know about Teachers' Salaries in Latin America?" at the 44th annual meeting of CIES, San Antonio, Texas, March 8, 2000).


need—and I believe a recognition—of the need to learn from one another, to view the strengths and limitations of different theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of education. Small-scale case studies and large-scale research demonstrate increasing sophistication in attempting to combine different levels of analysis (from the world system to the local context), quantitative and qualitative data to reach more precise conclusions about the nature of what is being studied and what may be generalized. If a discipline is based on systematic, cumulative increases in knowledge, with studies building on previous research to refine and expand our understanding of the social world, comparative education is indeed becoming more of a discipline that can contribute to improved policy and practice.

What Needs to Be Done

I return to the theme of what can we contribute. Heyneman, in his 1993 presidential address, noted that where persons work “can explain a great deal about the nature of the emphasis they are required to place in their products.” As Wilson noted in his presidential address the following year, the products of many of our efforts are graduates who work in both the academy and public policy and frequently traverse the two.

Among the excellent examples of members of our society who move back and forth between these two domains and who combine their consulting and advocacy work with contributions to scholarship I will cite but a few: Nelly Stromquist and her studies of the potential and limitations of the international donor community and especially NGOs in contributing to greater gender equality; the work of Robert J. Myers (based in Mexico) in drawing attention to the vital importance of early childhood programs and designing more enlightened policies for this population; the work of Christine Fox in pointing out how various educational interventions (in Australia, Papua New Guinea, and Sri Lanka) affect the identity and self-worth of ethnic minorities and women in a variety of countries and her colleague, Anne Hickling-Hudson, in illuminating the ways in which literacy programs (particularly in Grenada) can be domesticating or liberating for subaltern populations; the studies of Birgit Brock-Utne and Jonathan Jansen (in postcolonial Nambia) to promote, respectively, maternal language instruction and more relevant curricula; the tireless efforts of Rosa Maria Torres, who delivered last year’s Claude Eggertsen Lecture, to mobilize the international academic community and influence policy makers to implement a more


truly enlightened vision of Education for All and the follow-up World Education Forum in Dakar this past year; the public education efforts of Sheryl Lutjens, who annually takes groups of educators to Cuba and whose studies challenge the myths that are perpetuated about that embattled nation; and Mark Ginsburg, whose activism on behalf of social justice in all the communities in which he has taught and lived was evident in his 1992 presidential address. In his speech, which focused on teachers as political actors, Mark ended with a call for us as educators to see the power we have to expand the ways in which people view the world.\textsuperscript{80}

In the very research we conduct and the ways in which we engage the subjects we study, we can empower people. Heidi Ross, who now assumes the presidency of the CIES, has written on how the process of interviewing school girls in China led to teachers viewing their students in new ways and contributed to the young women believing they had a voice worthy of being heard.\textsuperscript{81} Similarly, Rosemary Preston and Budd Hall and colleagues have suggested ways in which we can support participatory action research that enables third world researchers to question hegemonic development discourse and policies.\textsuperscript{82}

Many of us are teacher educators. Frequently the courses we teach, at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, revolve around multicultural


and international/global themes. Whether we are forming future teachers, offering professional development courses, or engaging in research and consulting activities with local schools, we can have a major impact on public education concerning the nature of the world we live in.

To return to Masemann's call at the beginning of the 1990s for us to overcome the "false dichotomy between theory and practice and a communication gap between academics and practitioners," she noted how, in offering in-service workshops, the themes that most captured teachers were those related to a general philosophy that they could draw upon in resolving various issues they faced. According to Masemann, "multiculturalism has been such a philosophy in the past, and global perspectives in education are more prevalent today." 83

Very appropriately, James Banks's keynote address to the 2000 CIES San Antonio conference discussed the need for a developmental education for multicultural citizenship that clarifies local cultural communities as well as national and global identities. Building on the work of Carlos Diaz et al. concerning the desirability of developing within students not only global knowledge and awareness but a sense of efficacy, Banks, in his latest writings, calls for an education that both clarifies and stimulates critical reflection, ultimately leading to action to transform the world: "To help students acquire reflective and clarified cultural, national, and global identifications, citizenship education must teach them to know, to care, and to act. . . . They must acquire higher levels of knowledge, understand the relationship between knowledge and action, develop a commitment to act to improve the world, and acquire the skills needed to participate in civic action. . . . Multicultural citizenship education helps students learn how to act to change the world." 84 Over 30 years ago my dissertation research on university students in eastern Venezuela similarly found significant positive relationships between knowledge and political efficacy and, ultimately, activism aimed at social change. 85

To develop a critical stance on one's own existential world and that of those in distant lands, as the German philosopher Hegel pointed out over 190 years ago in his Nürnerberger Schriften, one "must make a home in the other." 86 For Hegel, a "proper education would be impossible without a fully

83 Masemann, "Ways of Knowing" (n. 2 above), p. 466.
86 G. W. Hegel, "1809 Address," in Nürnerberger Schriften, ed. J. Hoffmeister (Leipzig: Felix Miner, 1938), p. 312; cited on pp. 6-7 in Luise McCarty, "On Internationalizing a Curriculum: Some Philosophical Considerations" (paper presented for Brescia College Professional Development Day, March 16,
international course of study." Only by knowing other realms of being, by real and vicarious travel (e.g., through literature and the stories of others) can one begin to gain distance on one's own daily existence, what is unique about it, and what is shared with others. This is a significant step in developing critical reflection on the way things are and the way they could be or should be.

The arguments made on behalf of developing a global awareness and competence in our students do not have to be made in consequential terms that hold, for example, that students will be better positioned for the types of jobs that will materialize. Nor does a rationale for international education have to be made in the narrow instrumental terms of world leadership, national security, and competitive economic advantage espoused in memora-nda issued last year by the Clinton White House in collaboration with the Departments of State and Education. As my colleague and philosopher Luise McCarty has argued, the rationale can be made "in principle": "Instead of asking, 'What is the future really going to be like and how should we alter education to accord with it?' we might ask, 'What kind of future people do we most rationally desire and how can we educate accordingly?' Another way to put it is this: instead of trying to map the real in the future, we should be constructing, right now, the ideal future." As she notes, "Education is one of the principal means by which we bring about the future—or, at least, attempt to bring the future about."

Understanding the global forces that impinge upon our daily lives, I consider to be one of the central competencies that all individuals should have to participate as effective citizens in local, national, and transnational communities. The development of multicultural-global efficacy I would consider to be one of the fundamental competencies, in accordance with the writings of Martha Nussbaum, that are essential to a just society.

Thus, we as comparative and international educators have a role to play in the liberal education of teachers and the generations of students they will influence. We also have a role to play outside our faculties of education in

1992) (available from Luise McCarty, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405), and also her "Out of Isolation: Philosophy, Hermeneutics, Multiculturalism," in Philosophy of Education 1993, ed. A. Thompson (Urbana, Ill.: Philosophy of Education Society, 1994), pp. 62–63, in which the Hegel statement is translated slightly differently to read, "I must recognize my own in the alien." It should be noted that Hegel gave this address while still a high school teacher.

87 McCarty, "Internationalizing."
89 McCarty, "Internationalizing," pp. 5–6.
90 Ibid.
working with colleges of arts and sciences and professional schools, and more broadly with public education, in imparting global perspectives and an understanding of the major international forces that have an impact on our communities and daily lives. There are few communities that have not been seriously affected by corporate restructuring to maximize profits, by the flight of high-paying jobs, or the creation of economic enterprise zones largely exempt from fair labor practices and adequate health and safety regulations, by the large influx of migrant labor from other countries who often face hostile climates for themselves and their children in neighborhoods and schools not prepared to welcome them. Few of us are unaware as well of the potential of current advances in telecommunications that enable us to link up our classrooms with students and teachers from around the world to share common concerns and the ways in which the Internet can connect us to the struggles of peasants and workers to organize and defend their lands and rights whether in the rain forests of Brazil or the mountains and jungles of Chiapas or the shop floors of contracting factories of major multinational companies such as Nike in Indonesia, Cambodia, and Vietnam. Just as these global forces can divide and fragment communities and social movements, they provide opportunities for unifying peoples engaged in common struggles for human dignity. One such example is the “No Sweat [Shop]!” student-led movement on over two hundred campuses across the United States, in which students together with faculty, administrators, and local labor unions have joined forces to monitor and bring to an end exploitative labor conditions in factories supplying articles carrying university logos.

We can play a significant role in sharing our international expertise and comparative perspectives with such social movements for economic justice, just as we can with local school districts in developing more effective education programs for new immigrants. Our field, far from being distant from the centers of decision making, can very much be a major player in working on behalf of a better world. Although comparative and international education may be a loosely bounded field, and there may be disdain on the part of many for “metanarratives,” I have argued, with Altbach and Kelly, that our field is nonetheless held together by a “fundamental belief that education can be improved and can serve to bring about change for the betterment of all nations.”

92 An excellent article by Jo Ann Wypjewski, in the February 12, 2001, issue of the Nation, “GE Brings Bad Things to Life: For Downsized Workers in Bloomington, It’s Time to Start Thinking Globally,” pp. 19–23, describes what is happening in my community of Bloomington, Indiana, as a result of major manufacturing plants closing down and moving their operations to Mexico, where workers are paid $2 an hour as compared with $16 plus benefits. The author concludes that Marx is alive and well not only in Soho, London, and New York, but in the old mill towns of Massachusetts and south-central Indiana. (Reference to Marx is related to the performance of Howard Zinn’s play, Marx in Soho, the preceding night of March 15, at the 45th annual meeting of the CIES in Washington, D.C.).

which comparative and international education can help effect positive change is by contributing to a more realistic and comprehensive understanding of the transnational forces influencing all societies and education systems—both their potentially deleterious as well as beneficial features. In ending the 2001 presidential address, I wish to state that comparative and international education can—and should—play a significant role in contributing to the possibility that new generations will use their talents on behalf of international peace and social justice in an increasingly interconnected world. We should be grateful for such a challenge because there is so much we as educators can contribute.