Comparative and International Education

Leading Perspectives from the Field

Edited by
Beverly Lindsay

palgrave
macmillan

Comparative and International Education

Beverly Lindsay
Editor

Comparative and International Education

Leading Perspectives from the Field

palgrave
macmillan

Editor
Beverly Lindsay
University of California
California, USA

ISBN 978-3-030-64289-1 ISBN 978-3-030-64290-7 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Our volume is dedicated to our mentors and supporters – whose creativity, critiques, enthusiasm, forewarnings, insights, inspiration, and resourcefulness – contributed immensely to our professional lives in the academy and diplomacy.
We also dedicate our work to students and emerging professionals as they enhance their talents in moving comparative and international education into the future to further equity and justice for all people.

Foreword: Reflections on International Affairs and Education

After graduating from high school in my hometown, Augusta, Georgia, I arrived at Lincoln University in Pennsylvania in fall 1943. During the spring of that freshman year – and having reached 18, the newly official draft age, in January – I was called to service in the United States Army. The entire academic year at Lincoln was to be my first extended trip away from both home and then abroad. And "extended" it was – virtually around the world, first, to England for a brief period and then, through the Panama Canal to the Philippines for a longer stay before returning to the United States nearly 18 months later.

These "travels" were, of course, in connection with World War II, a massive conflict which served, among other phenomena, to accentuate the issue of racial segregation under which Negroes (later African Americans) had grown up in the South and were called to serve in the United States military. Our units were racially segregated. While white Americans called and demonstrated for "Victory" in the war, Negroes, myself included as a young man growing up, did the same but also for "Double V": Victory at Home, and Victory Abroad! Both as a youngster and in the military, I took such issues seriously, resolving that one day I would be able to influence them. Make a difference. But first, I needed an education.

The war, which interrupted that pursuit, nevertheless introduced two factors that have greatly impacted my life and career. The experience in England, my first trip abroad, followed by even more time in the Philippines, acquainted me with cultures different from my own. Although I was not aware at the time, that was the beginning of my interest in different peoples and cultures and also in foreign affairs generally. Even more relevant to the last point was the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima. That occurred when we were in mid-ocean en route to Japan, bringing an end to the war and causing our vessel, the *Marine Panther*, to be diverted to Manila. That alternative introduced me to yet another culture, but also left a lasting impression of the tremendous suffering among people in Japan, after the bomb. Perhaps a person such as myself could do something to alleviate such excruciating pain and/or assist in preventing it. Also now having been exposed to Asian culture, I may in the recesses of my mind have vaguely thought of returning someday to Manila. Little did I realize that I would return decades later as a senior diplomat.

Actually, I had wanted to be a journalist and upon my discharge from the Army in June 1946 applied to several schools of journalism. As segregation and racial discrimination (even in the North) were still in vogue, none accepted me. I, therefore, returned to Lincoln and resumed my studies as an English major. As often happened in those days, Lincoln, like other Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), accommodated me (and a few other students) by organizing a course or two in a subject denied elsewhere. I enjoyed English literature. I was often moved by the beauty of expressions and, as a potential journalist, always intrigued by well-crafted sentences and paragraphs beautifully organized.

Upon my return to Lincoln, I discovered two major differences from pre-war days – a tremendous increase in the student body, fueled by returning veterans. Plus, the University had its first African American president. The famed educator, Dr. Horace Mann Bond, a Lincoln graduate who earned his Ph.D. in 1936 from the University of Chicago, succeeded Dr. Walter Livingston Wright. Dr. Bond was a no-nonsense scholar and administrator of powerful presence and distinction. He appeared to know, or know about, everything. Since I was associated with the student newspaper, *The Lincolnian*, becoming editor in my junior year, he and I were bound to clash from time to time. However, he was equally complimentary when things went "right" (well researched, verified, well reasoned, and stated). He was proud of Lincoln and its traditions and was very demanding of the all-male student body. "This is expected of Lincoln Men," Bond was always pleased to declare, particularly on issues involving national and international affairs.

With his wide-ranging interests and involvements, Dr. Bond was certainly the right "head of the institute." The campus was in post-war ferment, energized by a mixture of students in their late teens and early twenties together with more advanced age veterans who had seen it all! The Marshall Plan was being developed and the United Nations was in its infancy. And, of course, ever present was race. Others pressing issues were: the bomb; MacArthur and Truman Pacifism; women's rights and/or the return after the war to hearth and home by Rosie the Riveter. The Korean conflict was emerging, amid the rise of communism in the United States.

While some of these issues were nearly as close to my mind as they were at Lincoln, the following decade found me more involved in personal and career development than on the ramparts. One year after finishing college (1949), I completed a master's degree in English and comparative literature (1950) at Columbia University in New York and then accepted faculty positions: first at Southern University in Baton Rouge in Louisiana and afterward at North Carolina College (later North Carolinas Central University) in Durham. The stay in Louisiana lasted for three years (1950–1953), at the end of which my new bride (whom I met at Southern) and I took off for Durham. In the following decade, as had been the case at Southern, my focus was on teaching English and journalism and advising the student newspaper. Both our sons were born, and having taken two years of leave from NCCU, I received my Ph.D. in Journalism and Mass Communications at the University of Iowa (1961).

In those days, most southern states paid tuition fees for African Americans to attend universities in the North or Mid-West rather than admitting them to local or state universities in home states. On moral grounds, I strongly objected to this "out of state" segregation policy and refused to take advantage of it. This delayed my studies for several years until I could find other sources of funding, including loans and scholarships.

It was in connection with my doctoral study in Iowa City that my twin interests in education and international affairs fused. My dissertation focused on perceptions of the United States and Americans, harbored by international students arriving in this country for the first time; the sources of those perceptions; and possible changes occurring at the end of a year of residence. In the process of my research, I learned a great deal about media, education, and university systems, in many countries, even as my "subjects" learned through their experiences here. It was a pioneering mass communication study that came to the attention of Edward R. Murrow, one of the most renowned journalists of his day, whom President John Fitzgerald Kennedy had selected as director of the United States Information Agency (USIA) – one of the newly elected president's first appointments. Murrow's surprise visit to Durham to interview me was a local sensation, but also marked the beginning, in 1962, of a 25-year career in diplomatic service.

It started in Kampala, Uganda, where I was cultural attaché, in charge of educational affairs for the American Embassy, and continued in Lagos, Nigeria, where I had the same title but a far larger portfolio. Nigeria's size and six universities, at the time, were compared to Uganda's one. While in Nigeria, I assisted in the development of the School of Mass Communications at the University of Lagos. In Monrovia, Liberia, I was public affairs officer and director of the entire program in educational and cultural affairs, including the Fulbright Program and the press operation. At the conclusion of the Monrovia tour, I was recalled to Washington, having been selected for the yearlong Senior Seminar in Foreign Policy, designed for officers destined "for the senior most ranks of the Foreign Service." Throughout much of this seven-year period in Washington, I was also an Adjunct Professor in the School of Journalism at the University of Maryland, College Park.[1]

In all these endeavors, especially including the Seminar, the interaction between education and international affairs was paramount. The same was true on a regional basis when I was deputy assistant and then in charge of all information, education, and cultural affairs in Africa as assistant director for the Agency. This assignment was followed by my posting in 1976 as Minister of Public and Cultural Affairs in Manila, Philippines, one of the largest diplomatic missions in the US Foreign Service. This was the very city, in which 30 years earlier, as a 19-year-old army staff sergeant, I was on only my second trip abroad – underscoring once again the continuing interaction between education and service overseas. I note that the Fulbright Program, under the United States Information Agency, was one of the largest and most active such programs in the world.

While in Manila, "the call" came, notifying me that President Jimmy Carter was nominating me in 1979 to become US Ambassador to Botswana. During this exciting period of independence movements, "the winds of change," which had done so much in altering the face of Africa during the previous decade, were finally swirling south. Rhodesia was soon to become Zimbabwe, with our mission in Gaborone, Botswana,

[1] I made the choice to continue in diplomatic service, rather than a full-time faculty position.

providing facilitative services to the large American independence delegations. Namibia was waiting anxiously in the wings. In South Africa, the biggest prize of all, apartheid prevailed, and Nelson Mandela was still imprisoned on Robben Island. However, the handwriting was on the wall, and those of us fortunate enough to be assigned in the area would be witnesses to history. As the US Ambassador to Botswana, I was spokesman for the "Contact Group," comprised of ambassadors from Canada, France, Germany, Nigeria, and the United States, countries involved in moving along the peace process. On behalf of our "home offices," we made representations to the leaders of surrounding countries, bringing joint pressured efforts for national independence. As might be expected, some often delicate and highly confidential gatherings and activities involved political leaders, educators, and strategists connected with independence movements and the aftermaths and transitions to nationhood. Many educators and international affairs specialists continued after national independence and remain involved today in research and policy in education and sociopolitical factors affecting various nations in transitions.

During my first year in Botswana, the country experienced peaceful transfer of power with the death of Sir Seretse Khama, first and founding president, and the swearing in of his replacement, Vice President Dr. Quett K. J. Masire. Botswana continued its economic prosperity under Masire, who promoted development and strengthened ties with the West, particularly the United States and Britain. It remains a model in Africa for democratic rule, economic development, and peaceful change in government.

In addition to dealing with such issues, there were: the consequences of a seven-year drought; cattle hoof and mouth disease; the rapidly increasing dependence on diamonds; and away from beef as a major source of income. Such realities also necessitated attention during my nearly four years in Botswana, before returning to the United States in 1983. After serving for a year as a chief examiner for the Foreign Service, I headed the Agency's Office of Equal Employment Opportunity until retirement in 1989. As EEO Officer, I developed a special Foreign Service recruitment program for underserved minorities, a program which earned me one of the three Superior Service Honor awards during my Foreign Service career.

The day after my retirement from government, I joined the faculty in the School of Communications at Howard University. In a sense, I was returning to my earlier career where I could continue by working with undergraduate and graduate students in a range of disciplines. Before long, I was directing a public affairs program which led, strangely enough, to one in international affairs, demonstrating, once again, my passion for interdisciplinary education and activity. I spearheaded the development of a proposal to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation which resulted in a $3 million grant to begin a comprehensive university-wide program in international affairs. The program was ultimately converted into a center with a public affairs component and named in honor of Nobel Laureate Dr. Ralph Johnson Bunche, former Howard University Professor who established the political science department and was a founding member of the editorial board of the *Journal of Negro Education*. As founding director, I was in charge of the Bunche Center until my retirement from Howard, 20 years after my initial appointment.

In all of the activities chronicled above, undoubtedly in greater detail than warranted, I found inspirations as an individual seeking to make the world a better place through service among people of different backgrounds, cultures, and interests. I became convinced early in life that this was not only possible but also worthy of dedicating my life to its accomplishment. Education and international affairs are the areas in which I have found the greatest satisfaction for much of the effort exerted. And, it is profoundly gratifying to know that others, including the professors represented in this volume, have been similarly motivated.

The scholars, who write chapters in this book, have demonstrated distinctions in their pursuits as professors who tried continually to make the world a better place in the academy and numerous international venues. As observed in various chapters, biographical statements, and online platforms, they have utilized their academic, policy, and research skills to write numerous policy papers, publish articles and books, and administer multi-million dollar education and international programs. They have provided in-depth briefings and recommendations to the highest government officials such as presidents, prime ministers, cabinet ministers and secretaries, ambassadors, and congresses and national parliaments. The World Bank, United Nations, the European Union, Southern African Development Community, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development have utilized their extensive expertise. Their students have become ambassadors, presidents and prime ministers, chief executive officers of domestic and international bodies and private and philanthropic organizations, and university presidents. Yet, the contributors to this work have all sustained roots in the academic world as renowned professors who integrate sound scholarship with public engagement and service to address concrete challenges based upon multidisciplinary research.

Professor Lindsay and her colleagues skillfully blend critical theoretical and paradigmatic features in their articulations on comparative and international education in the several sections of their volume. Dr. Lindsay's initial chapter presents the structure and outlines the four main sections: (a) conceptual and theoretical frames that enrich comparative and international education; (b) gender and pedagogical epistemologies in relation to global engagements; (c) policies and paradigms that emerge from programs at select research universities; and (d) creative contemplations for future directions. I am familiar with several contributors and have used their works as a diplomat and upon return to teaching and administration at Howard University. Several share their personal and professional evolutions in comparative and international education, international affairs, and global challenges. They skillfully utilized the works of other researchers and policymakers from the humanities, social sciences, and sciences. While maintaining interest in these and related field, amidst official retirement from the University and international service (where I spent almost identical periods), I shall wholeheartedly recommend this volume to both diplomatic and university colleagues and friends and administrators in international organizations, in many nations, to enhance their understandings.

In summary, this volume rekindles memories as a young soldier and a student at Lincoln University when I was contemplating how I would make a difference in the world. These scholars have made and are making extraordinary differences through their writings and have been at the forefront of outstanding contributions to comparative and international education for over 30 years – a few for over 50. Dr. Lindsay and colleagues exemplify great administrative and intellectual skills for the magnificent ways that they, as fellows of the Comparative and International Education Society, have brought forth an impressive volume, ***Comparative and International Education: Leading Perspectives from the Field***. It is not just well done, but well, well, done!

Horace G. Dawson, Jr.
Howard University
Washington, D.C., USA

Horace G. Dawson, Jr. is a retired Ambassador and Executive Director and Professor Emeritus of the Ralph Bunche Center for International Affairs at Howard University. The Center focuses on international research and programs, and professional development. Ambassador Dawson held senior executive diplomatic appointments in France, Liberia, Nigeria, and Philippines. As an American Ambassador to Botswana, he labored continually toward ending apartheid in South Africa and moving toward democracy. Dr. Dawson was a Professor at Howard University, Adjunct Professor at the University of Maryland, and Professor at the University of Lagos where he fostered the establishment of the School of Mass Communication. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and has published extensively on international affairs and mass media. His Ph.D. research, completed at University of Iowa and Columbia University, concentrated on Comparative Mass Communications and Literature. Ambassador Dawson has mentored and/or taught thousands of university students, faculty, diplomats, and federal American Presidential executives via a range of domestic and international organizations regarding the interactive influences of university education, diplomacy, and communication – resulting in an honorary doctorate from Howard University.

Preface: Reflecting on the Past and Envisioning a Future[1]

The 2020s were looming as we began to consider which 2019 professional conferences could present options to reflect upon the first two decades and envision the new decade and future ones. What parameters should we consider in our deliberations as we remember the beginning of a new millennium where technological advances allowed many people to reach almost any area of the world within 24 hours? In addition, a new generation of students, the Generation Z or Zoom/Centennials, were entering kindergarten and some were still being born in 2000. What types of educational formal and informal structures would be available for them? How might they face social and educational conditions as they begin to enter adulthood 20 years later? To what extent could continuous global interactions enhance the lives of all residents?

As the second year of the 2000s and thereafter began, a series of colossal events captured our attention to include inter alia: (1) the September 11, 2001, or 911 attacks upon New York City, Washington, D.C., and rural Pennsylvania, as well as the 2002 bombings in Bali, Indonesia; (2) the introduction of Facebook, Skype, and other virtual

[1]Material for this publication is derived, in part, from a Ford Foundation grant, Fulbright fellowships, National Science Foundation grants, World Bank portfolios, and United States Agency for International Development contracts. Any findings, conclusions, opinions, and recommendations are those of the authors and do not represent those of multiple funding bodies.

modes of communication; (3) the massive migrations due to natural disasters and civil conflicts; (4) the election of the first African American president and then the first African American woman vice president; (5) the extensive creation of online educational courses and documents and remote digital access to libraries; (6) the appearance of podcasts and YouTube; (7) the global recession; and (8) the novel coronavirus – COVID-19. All of these aforementioned affected school and university enrollments, attendances, secondary school and college graduates, ethnic and racial compositions of student bodies and personnel, qualifications and salaries of faculty and administrators, and numerous other aspects of education.

In view of such monumental realities, the 2019 Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) Conference theme "Education for Sustainability" provided an avenue to address such positive and challenging global features. During the same timeframe, several colleagues and friends and I had extensive communications about the designation of Honorary Fellows within professional societies such as the CIES, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Psychological Association, American Educational Research Association, and others.

When I viewed websites of several professional associations, it did not appear that books or special publications, penned by Fellows, had been written recently. Thus, an idea emerged: produce a publication by current living CIES Fellows who could explicate their decades of work during numerous domestic and global changes. We floated this idea and prepared a proposal for the 2019 CIES Conference where we would present preliminary aspects for a publication. Afterward, an exploratory proposal for a special issue of CIES's*Comparative Education* was presented, i.e., that would be expanded into a volume. Different understandings of the field emerged and the proposals did not result in presentations and a distinct journal publication. We were not deterred and encouraged graduate students and emerging professionals to persist and not abandon their goals.

Fate stepped in at the 2019 annual conference of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) in Toronto, Canada. As usual, I spent time browsing the AERA book exhibits and chatting with editors from both university and other publishing houses. A pleasant discussion ensued with Palgrave Macmillan editor, Milana Vernikova. She was receptive to exploring further, since I had recently submitted a book proposal to another publishing house that was accepted. At the same time, a small group of CIES Fellows met and discussed directions and contents for a volume written by CIES Fellows. Fortunately, Milana Vernikova was also in charge of the Palgrave Macmillan book display at the 2019 CIES Conference in San Francisco. She was even more encouraging and expressed the desire to receive a proposal from CIES Fellows. The idea was quickly shared with all Fellows. Some could not participate due to retirements, professional obligations, and family and health conditions. This volume largely contains contributions from over half of the living Fellows, who were designated from 2003 to 2021. The Honorary Fellows recognition was approved in 1982 and the first Fellows were designated in 1987. The following website, https://www.cies.us/page/HonoraryFellows, lists CIES Fellows from 1987 to 2021, who had sustained exemplary work for over 30 years, at the time of their nominations.

Many of the chapters reflect the authors' introduction to the field, often when pursuing graduate degrees. My nascent interest in international experiences commenced in childhood. When I was a tiny preschooler, my mother taught me to read about Thurgood Marshall and the 1954 Supreme Court decision, *Brown v Board of Education*, that outlawed school desegregation. My father was an active member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). My parents' nightly discussion often blended domestic and international events covered in the media. Simultaneously, readings included newspaper articles on Kenya and other nations striving for independence from oppressive colonial rules. Additional conversations and readings heightened my curiosity, especially since my parents encouraged all their children to envision horizons beyond their local community after graduating from college. Living in a city with four military bases exposed me to the only people, I met, who traveled and lived on domestic and foreign soils. I had no childhood or teenage visions of joining the military or seriously thinking of becoming the spouse of one in order to investigate international venues.

Fortunately, the University of Massachusetts (UMass) Amherst, had a progressive School of Education ranked among the top national programs in international studies that combined conceptual and applied aspects. Doctoral students could engage in field assignments, particularly in emerging African, Asian, and South American nations. Thus, I transferred (after my M.A., doctoral leave of absence, and teaching sociology at the University of the District of Columbia) to the Center for Higher

Education and the Center for International Education. There, I experienced assignments in Anglophone and Francophone African nations that included a Ford Foundation Ed.D. dissertation fellowship for field research in Kenya, followed by a post-doctoral Ford Fellowship at the University of Nairobi. Hence, my programs combined courses in higher education, international affairs, and sociology – with professionals from two continents. Later, I completed my Ph.D. – while working at the US Department of State – concentrating on international administration and management, at American University that also included faculty at Howard University.

It has been an incredible experience for me to interact with all the contributors, beginning as a UMass doctoral student, via regional and annual committees and conferences of the CIES and the World Council of Comparative Education Societies. In particular, invaluable remarks have been offered for my budding research ideas that were developed into publications and grants from government and philanthropic organizations in the United States, Australia, and England. I express tremendous appreciate to the authors (who penned chapters for this publication) and other CIES Fellows for their dedication and writings that analyze previous and contemporary comparative and international education research, theories, and policies that, we hope, will lead to future educational improvements.

Special acknowledgment is extended to Ambassador (retired) and Professor Horace G. Dawson, Jr., who was a mentor to me and other young professionals at the US Department of State. Since he had been a university professor before entering the diplomatic corps, he was able to move comfortably between the "two worlds." After retiring as an Ambassador, he returned to the academy where he and colleagues contributed co-authored chapters to one of my books, while mentoring dozens of students at Howard University and other universities in the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area.

Appreciation is expressed to three scholars and university administrators – Michael Crossley, Jonathan Jansen, and Edmond Keller. They have contributed respectively to my research and subsequent policy publications via my experiences in England, South Africa, and the United States. Finally, gratitude is acknowledged to Suzanne M. Hickey, who worked diligently on logistics and general editing, along with Palgrave editors, Milana Vernikova and Linda Braus, who ensured that our proposal and manuscript became this volume.

In summary, we hope that our work will foster future advancements and positive solutions to the complexities of education throughout the world. If this occurs, equity and justice will be augmented among nations via educational institutions' missions of teaching, scholarship, and public engagement to enhance the lives of all people.

Beverly Lindsay, Ph.D., Ed.D.
University of California
California, USA

Reference

Comparative & International Education Society (CIES). (2018). Honorary fellows. Comparative & International Education Society. https://www.cies.us/page/HonoraryFellows. Accessed 14 August 2020.

Contents

Notes on Contributors

Beverly Lindsay is Principal Investigator and Co-Director of a Ford Foundation grant on women and university leadership in post-conflict and transitional societies – working with three University of California sites. Her scholarly endeavors have been sponsored by five Fulbright Fellowships in African and Asian nations, two National Science Foundation grants involving the United States and Great Britain, and applied research and policy briefings on six continents via US Department of State, Ministries of Education, and Ministries of Science and Research fellowships and grants. She has mentored Marshall and Rhodes Scholars. She has co-authored or edited eight books beginning with *Comparative Perspectives of Third World Women: The Impact of Race, Sex, and Class* and recently *Universities and Global Diversity: Preparing Educators for Tomorrow*. Over 140 scholarly and policy articles, chapters, and essays have appeared. She is a former President of the Comparative and International Education Society, a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and elected member of the Council on Foreign Relations. She held diplomatic postings in African and European nations and served as a Dean of International Policy Studies at Hampton University and Pennsylvania State University where she is professora emerita.

Robert F. Arnove Chancellor's Professor of Emeritus at Indiana University, Bloomington, is a former President of the Comparative and International Education Society. Winner of many distinguished teaching awards, he has been a visiting scholar at universities in countries ranging from

Argentina to Australia. Over the past two decades, his co-edited textbook with Carlos Torres, *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local* (2013, 4th edition), has been a leading English language introduction to the field. (The text has been translated into Chinese, Japanese, Spanish, and Portuguese.) His research has focused on sociopolitical and educational change, as well as on literacy campaigns and popular education, philanthropy and cultural imperialism, and world-systems analysis. Arnove's latest single-authored text is *Talent Abounds: Profiles of Master Teachers and Peak Performers*. He has been a teacher's union president, a candidate for the US Congress, and the president of an experimental theater company.

Martin Carnoy the Vida Jacks Professor of Education at the Stanford University Graduate School of Education, is a labor economist who specializes in comparative education and is a former President of the Comparative and International Education Society. He has published over 150 articles and more than 40 authored and co-authored volumes from early works such as *Education as Cultural Imperialism* and *Economy Democracy: The Challenge of the 1980s* and more recent books, *Faded Dreams: The Politics and Economics of Race in America*, *Cuba's Academic Advantage*, and *Transforming Comparative Education: Fifty Years of Theory Building at Stanford* (2019). During his years at Stanford, he has chaired 100 Ph.D. dissertations of students who have become leading educational researchers and reformers worldwide. He is an elected member of the National Academy of Education as well as of the International Academy of Education, and a Fellow of the American Educational Research Association.

David R. Evans served as the Founding Director of Center for International Education at the University of Massachusetts Amherst for over 45 years. His work combined academic and practical activities. He was directly involved in the design and management of dozens of educational projects in Latin America, Asia, and Africa and worked as a consultant on numerous development education projects. He taught graduate courses, published research, and worked with graduate students for over 50 years, chairing more than 80 completed doctoral dissertations. For years, he worked on projects in Anglophone Africa, after starting his career as a teacher and researcher in Uganda in the early 1960s. More recently, his experience has been in Malawi, Southern Sudan, and Afghanistan. From 2005 to 2019, he was the Principal Investigator of three large, higher education projects in Afghanistan. During his career, he worked in various capacities in over 30 countries. He has been a member of the Comparative and International Education Society since 1967 and is a former member of the Board of Directors of CIES.

Ratna Ghosh is Distinguished James McGill Professor and Sir W. C. Macdonald Professor of Education at McGill University where she was Dean of Education. She was featured in *Time Magazine,* Canadian Edition, October 13, 2003, in an article on "Canada's Best in Education." Her work in Multiculturalism has won her many awards and honors such as the Order of Canada, Order of Quebec, and Order of Montreal. She is a Fellow of Canada's National Academy, the Royal Society of Canada, and also a Fellow of the World Academy – for the advancement of science in the developing world (TWAS). Her last two books are *Redefining Multicultural Education* and *Education and the Politics of Difference*. She publishes regularly in books and journals. She is past President of the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES).

Mark Ginsburg retired in 2016 from FHI 360. He is currently serving as a Visiting Scholar at the University of Maryland (USA) and a Visiting Professor at the Universidad de Ciencias Pedagógicas (Cuba). He previously served as a regular faculty member at other universities: Aston (England) as well as Houston, Pittsburgh, and Columbia (USA). He also has been a Visiting Professor at George Washington University (USA), Kobe University (Japan), and University of Oslo (Norway) and was the Director of the Faculty of Education Reform component of the Educational Reform Program in Egypt (2004–2006). He served as President of the Comparative and International Education Society (1991) and Co-Editor of *Comparative Education Review* (2003–2013). He has written and co-edited eight books, co-edited four special issues of journals, and published over 125 journal articles and book chapters on topics including teacher education, teachers' work and political action, educational reform, and international organizations.

Ruth Hayhoe is a Professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. Her professional engagements in Asia include First Secretary for Education, Science and Culture in the Canadian Embassy in Beijing (1989–1991), Visiting Professor at Nagoya University (1996), and Director of the Hong Kong Institute of Education, now the Education University of Hong Kong (1997–2002).

Recent books include *China Through the Lens of Comparative Education* (2015), *Canadian Universities in China's Transformation: An Untold Story* (2016), and *Religion and Education: Comparative and International Perspectives* (2018). She received the Silver Bauhinia Star from the Hong Kong SAR Government and the title of Commandeur dans l'ordre des Palmes Académiques from the Government of France in 2002. She also holds honorary doctorates from the Hong Kong Institute of Education (2002), the Open University of Hong Kong (2015), and Victoria University in Toronto (2019). She was made an Honorary Fellow of the Comparative and International Education Society in 2011.

Steven J. Klees is Professor of International Education Policy and Distinguished Scholar-Teacher at the University of Maryland. He completed his Ph.D. at Stanford University and has been a faculty member at Cornell University, Stanford University, Florida State University, and the Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte in Brazil. He was a Fulbright Scholar on two occasions at the Federal University of Bahia in Brazil and has taught many short courses at universities around the world. He has worked on evaluations of education programs and policies in dozens of countries for a wide array of international agencies, ministries, and NGOs. Professor Klees' work examines the political economy of education and development with specific research interests in globalization, neoliberalism, and education; the role of aid agencies; education, human rights, and social justice; the role of class, gender, and race in reproducing and challenging educational and social inequality; and alternative approaches to education and development. Professor Klees has published dozens of articles and book chapters. Recent books include: *The World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives*; *Women Teachers in Africa: Challenges and Possibilities*; and *The Conscience of a Progressive*. He is a former President of the Comparative and International Education Society.

Joel Samoff an experienced educator, researcher, and evaluator, combines the scholar's critical approach and extensive experience in international development. From Kilimanjaro coffee farmers in Tanzania to militant bus drivers in Michigan to education activists in Namibia and South Africa, his work's orienting concern has been understanding how people organize themselves to transform their communities. He studies the links among research, public policy, and foreign aid. At Stanford

University since 1980, he has been a faculty member at the Universities of California (Los Angeles; Santa Barbara), Michigan, and Zambia and has taught in Mexico, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Tanzania, and Zimbabwe. He holds honorary doctorates from the University of Pretoria and the University of the Free State in South Africa. He is an Advisory Editor of the *International Journal of Educational Development* and on the editorial boards of the *Journal of Educational Research in Africa* and the *Southern African Review of Education.*

John Schwille is a Professor Emeritus and former Assistant Dean for International Studies in Education at Michigan State University. He had a 50-year career in international research in education. One of his primary interests has been in cross-national studies of educational achievement, primarily in civic education and mathematics. He was co-director of the 17-nation Teacher Education and Development Study in Mathematics (TEDS-M), the first international assessment of learning outcomes in any field of higher education based on representative national samples. He also worked extensively on international development in education, primarily in Africa. As a college administrator, he had responsibilities for developing an international dimension in research, teaching, and outreach throughout the college. In recognition of lifetime achievement, he has been designated as an Honorary Member of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) as well as an Honorary Fellow in CIES.

Nelly P. Stromquist is Emerita Professor and was H.W.R. Benjamin Professor of International Education Policy at the College of Education, University of Maryland. She specializes in public policy, which she analyzes from a sociological perspective. Her research covers a wide range of issues: gender and education, globalization and higher education, and popular and non-formal education, particularly in Latin America and West Africa. She is author of several books on women's literacy and non-governmental organizations, globalization's impact on education, and the professoriate. Her most recent book is *Women Teachers in Africa: Challenges and Possibilities* (Routledge, 2017). She has written over 100 refereed articles and over 150 book chapters. Her honors include the Kerstin Hesselgren visiting professorship by the Swedish

Research Council, serving as a Fulbright New Century Scholar, and being appointed CIES Honorary Fellow in 2017. She received her Ph.D. in Comparative and International Education from Stanford and her master's in Political Science from the Monterey Institute of International Studies.

Abbreviations

AAAS	American Academy of Arts and Sciences
AAAS	American Association for the Advancement of Science
AAU	Association of American Universities
AERA	American Educational Research Association
ANC	African National Congress
APEX	Accelerated Programme for Excellence
APLU	Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BAICE	British Association for International and Comparative Education
BCIES	British Comparative and International Education Society
CFR	Council on Foreign Relations
CIES	Comparative and International Education Society
COSATU	Congress of South African Trade Unions
DFID	Department for International Development
EFA	Education For All
G-7	Group of Seven
G-20	Group of Twenty
IEA	International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement
NAACP	National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress
NRC	National Research Council
NSF	National Science Foundation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
RCT	Randomized Controlled Trials

SADC	Southern African Development Community
SIG	Special Interest Group
THE	Times Higher Education
TIMSS	Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study; Third International Mathematics and Science Study
UMass	University of Massachusetts
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
US	United States
USA	United States of America
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WHO	World Health Organization
WOMP	World Order Models Project

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1

The Landscapes for Comparative and International Education

Beverly Lindsay

When penning this chapter, I listened intensively to a May 2020 webinar (and later an online interview) by the president of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), one of the world's preeminent think tanks for international policy where membership acceptance occurs after nominations and support by renowned specialists in multinational affairs. President Richard Haass' newest volume, *The World: A Brief Introduction* (2020) covers the waterfront. Not surprisingly, the host commentator begins with statements and questions about the overwhelming impact of the COVID-19 virus. In early February 2021, the World Health Organization (WHO) reports that the virus has globally infected approximately 105,805,951 individuals and left 2,312,278 deaths in its wake. (World Health Organization 2021a). In the United States, 26,654,965 cases were reported resulting in 458,544 deaths (World Health Organziation 2021b). Undoubtedly, national and world leaders will view this pandemic at the forefront of current challenges, for the next years of this decade and beyond. Even if safe vaccines and immediate treatments are developed and

B. Lindsay (✉)
University of California, California, USA

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_1

implemented, the devastating effects will continue. The pandemic must be addressed; but it places other challenges temporarily on the back burner.

Absent a global pandemic, the impetus for writing the volume sparked thinking about subjects offered in many American universities. While an array of courses is offered, various academic majors offer some flexibility that still can be limited in scope. Haass opined that international relations are accessible, but often as electives in many undergraduate majors. Glimpses into a Stanford University computer science students' knowledge bases were gleaned, by Haass's conversation with him. Similar views emerged from select conversations with others that sparked Haass' interest in writing the 2020 book. According to an informal question and dialogue between the two, the student skillfully articulated features of his computer science curriculum. Yet, when the CFR president queried him about several global and international issues, humanities courses, and social sciences, the student appeared unaware of such topics. Sound exposure and basic comprehension did not appear readily regarding interrelations among individual nations and regions. Non-indigenous language requirements, history of others nations, and social conditions in diverse regions were not voiced by the student. In essence, comprehending that interconnected worlds are ever-present as observed by pandemics, technological transfers, and political climates was not evident.

Students and graduates must be equipped to recognize dimensions of challenges and assess accurate ways to proceed. Still it would be difficult if myopic educational and social experiences are the norm. The best interest of individuals and nations would be served by comprehending multinational matters in modern life, grounded in multiple disciplines of the humanities, social sciences, sciences, and education. The last field provides pedagogical approaches, while blending concepts and paradigms from other disciplines. Graduates and professionals would have insights of how the world works. To paraphrase the late Speaker of the American House of Representatives, Tip O'Neill, politics are local; but they are inescapably linked to the global – as the COVID-19 pandemic illustrates.

To this author, the views of the Stanford student were surprising since my essay (Lindsay 2012) and National Science Foundation grant delved into the Stanford University and University of California, Berkeley curriculum and those at other major American comprehensive doctoral universities. While specific courses for every major are not required, there are comprehensive categories that exist that would expose undergraduate students to domestic and international affairs. A likely issue for limited worldviews may be related to their majors and the desire to complete a baccalaureate degree in a reasonable time without incurring extensive debts. Yet Berkeley and Stanford, elite public and private universities respectively, are "the standards" for American, Western European, Australian, and select other national universities. University leaders and Ministries of Education or Ministries of Science espouse remaining or becoming prominent national and/or global bodies with comparative and international focus as *sine qua non*.

This introductory chapter highlights the overall objectives and purposes of the volume, to articulate the research and significance of the field of comparative and international education and affairs experienced by Fellows of the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES). They will explicate critical components of their research and policy modalities and postulate how future directions of the field may evolve, based upon ongoing professional involvement in their specialties. Rationales for the subcategories are expounded regarding the salience of crosscutting and interdisciplinary themes. Important dimensions of the field include how the social sciences, humanities, and international affairs have affected the evolving nature of comparative and international education. Hence, the volume is centered around the following themes: (1) succinct history and selection of Fellows by professional societies; (2) conceptual, historical, and theoretical frameworks for enriching the field; (3) pedagogical epistemologies, teachers, and genders to deepen global engagement; (4) policies, practices, and paradigms emerging from applied research; and (5) movements in the new decade.

The Fellows

Before moving into the content of our volume, we depict the rationales for selection of individuals who are prominent national and international professionals. Such experts are the carriers, innovators, and transmitters of knowledge that foster comprehension of particular disciplines *vis-à-vis* global affairs. Our continuing goal is to ensure sound academic and policy environments for doctoral students, emerging and mid-career professionals, and senior scholars and policymakers. They form the cadres that will contribute to dimensions of education and the greater social good in domestic and international environments.

The senior professionals authoring chapters in this volume have been addressing educational issues and methods to ascertain multiple roles of education throughout the world. Both conceptual and theoretical paradigms, coupled with applied policies, are at the forefront. What has occurred for centuries, in Western Europe and the United States, are the recognitions of professionals who have devoted extensive and prolonged endeavors to expanding the knowledge base and enhancing societal conditions – through multidisciplinary approaches. Hence, we turn to how outstanding professionals have been acknowledged through the designations of "Fellow" in professional organizations.

In May 1780, men of the emerging American Republic, situated in the Massachusetts legislature, formed the American Academy of Arts and Sciences with a primary purpose to ensure that knowledge and practical ideas could address the needs of a new nation. Since its origin and continuing to contemporary era, membership is granted by election to those deemed, by current members, as among the most outstanding professionals in their fields encompassing *inter alia*: agriculture, journalism, law and government, medicine, and natural and social sciences. In the nineteenth century, educators and other applied professionals became elected members. Nearly 70 years later, the American Association for the Advancement of Science began in 1848 to emphasize the importance of science and engineering. A virtual "who's who" of scientists and engineers (overwhelmingly European American men) became members. In 1874, election to Fellows status exemplified the *crème de la crème*, since standing was based upon the likelihood of further extraordinary accomplishments. Hence, both AAASs commenced the formation of prestigious learned societies by active membership elected as Fellows. Both societies elect Fellows in almost all academic disciplines and applied policy research in non-academic settings such as government agencies and think tanks (American Academy of Arts and Sciences 2020; American Association for the Advancement of Science 2020).

Some national disciplinary societies were formed in the late 1800s and early 1900s, and primarily in the last half century these societies also then established Fellows statuses, following the traditions of the AAASs. For those in the broad fields of education, the American Educational Research Association (AERA) only began the selection of Fellows in 2007 although it was formed in 1916 (AERA 2020). In contrast, CIES, which began in 1956, created the Fellows designation in 1982. Senior members could be selected as Fellows based upon outstanding records in: scholarly research and publication; teaching and mentoring; or policy, planning, evaluation, technical assistance; and administrative activities – that is, public engagement (CIES 2018). In short, the three pillars of the academy are and were the criteria. The two initial CIES Fellows, C. Arnold Anderson and Claude Eggerston, designated in 1985, produced seminal works that are still widely read.

The work of CIES Fellows elucidates a range of frameworks and theoretical and applied perspectives in educational settings from preschool to doctoral and professional education. In addition, the endeavors of CIES Fellows move far beyond the academy, and exhibit sustained exemplary work for over 30 years. In short, they are the senior professionals who have influenced education throughout the world. Our volume includes chapters by CIES Fellows who obtained this status in the early 1990s through 2021. The Fellows examine the field via conceptual and theoretical frameworks from social sciences, educational development in emerging and advanced countries, empirical studies, diplomacy and education, cultural and sociological paradigms, and philosophical premises.

Invitations were extended to all current Fellows of the Comparative and International Education Society. For a variety of reasons, several were unable to participate due to health, retirements, and other professional engagements. We acknowledged that all Fellows represented in this volume are from North America, since Fellows have not been nominated from other continents. We recognize this as a limitation, since additional Fellows have researched areas not covered in this volume. Yet all these CIES contributors have lived and/or worked extensively on six continents for decades, thereby enabling them to appreciate and comprehend multiple educational, economic, political, and social systems.

Principles and Organization of the Volume

Comparative and international education is utilized in a variety of venues to include *inter alia*: schools, colleges, and universities; diplomatic corps; domestic and international government organizations; non-government organizations; and the corporate world. There are multiple complexities of the field often related to original doctoral research of authors. Numerous volumes and articles are published on such topics in relation to comparative and international education. Hence, this chapter will not delve into a traditional literature review since the authors have extensive references in their chapters. Instead, select historical and contemporary references are cited followed by questions (that can emerge from previous publications) therein that are examined in multiple modalities in our chapters.

The chapters highlight and expand upon salient works from the nineteenth century to the present and speculate how future directions of the field may evolve, based upon ongoing professional involvement in their specialties. Important dimensions of the field include how the social sciences, humanities, international affairs, and STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) have affected the evolving nature of comparative and international education. To repeat, the following components center on: (1) conceptual, historical, and theoretical frameworks for enriching the field; (2) pedagogical epistemologies, teachers, and genders to deepen global engagement; and (3) policies, practices, and paradigms emerging from applied policy research and graduate programs at comprehensive doctoral universities; and (4) moving forward in the new decade.

Conceptual, Historical, and Theoretical Frameworks for Enriching the Field

Themes and Questions

Section one portrays the authors' exposure to comparative and international education and their journeys from emerging scholars and policymakers to their current perspectives. In doing so, they address the following types of analytical illustrations and questions.

First, there are myriads of frameworks grounded in the social sciences, humanities, law, and sciences that have appeared and been modified for comparative and international education (Altbach 1991; Carnoy 2019; Cowen and Kazmias 2009; Crossley et al. 2016; Epstein 2016; Holmes 1981; Kelly and Slaughter 1991; King 2012; Lindsay 1980; Noah and Eckstein 1998; Phillips and Schweisfurth 2014; Wilson 1994). What promoted the emergence and salience of particular ones? For example, how have various conceptual and theoretical frameworks undergirded aspects of comparative and international education and their continuing impact? Illustrations encompass world-system analysis and theory (Wallerstein 2004); globalization (Sachs 2020); cultural and social capital (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990); imperialism (Carnoy 1974; Rodney 2018); and capitalism and Marxism (Bowles and Gintis 2012).

Education has been taught in colleges and universities for centuries, yet the "field" of comparative and international education is primarily a twentieth century phenomena, although there were writers in the 1800s (Epstein 2016; Fraser 1964). From historical periods to contemporary eras, forms of comparative education have been studied. Who were some of the earliest scholars or "fathers" of the field who were researching and teaching in multiple contexts and regions concerning educational purposes, systems? How did they derive their perspectives: from established disciplines; through novel observations in various cultures and environments; by attending particular graduate programs, where professors were steeped in international matters? Chapters by Martin Carnoy, Robert Arnove, and Ruth Hayhoe examine such questions. Was their identification linked to the prestige of their universities? Chapters by Carnoy and Hayhoe provide illustrations.

Second, civilizations and societies are in constant states of flux that affect educational components such as curriculum, educational finance, and international testing (Appiah 2006; Geiger and Sá 2009; Schleicher 2019). What historical and contemporary conditions help establish the field and its ever-expanding topics? What roles did global and/or regional wars such as World Wars I and II and civil wars (in countries that achieved formal independence in the twentieth century) influence the field? Chapters by Hayhoe, Arnove, Carnoy, and Steven Klees examine these questions from diverse perspectives.

Third, cross-national testing among several nations, particularly initiated by major Western organizations and bodies, related to conceptual and actual applications within educational environments (Crossley 2014). Within the United States, the 1983 seminal Federal government publication, *A Nation at Risk*, raised the issues of testing among nations (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983), along with current comparisons (National Center for Education Statistics 2020). What are fundamental rationales for testing by those who require tests: to determine learning outcomes and improve quality of lives; obtain additional funding sources; bolster the local, regional, and/or international status? Klees and Carnoy devote attention to such illustrative questions.

Educational testing has been utilized for centuries. Do national tests for entrance to postsecondary education, normal colleges, and universities actually measure subject knowledge needed in preparation for subsequent levels of education? Or are "civil service tests" (where teachers are regarded as civil/government employees) based upon different rationales? Or does comparing test results among nations point to authentic reasons for decision making by multiple audiences, e.g., senior public policymakers, government officials, university senior administrators and faculty, parents and students? Carnoy, Klees, and Hayhoe examine such matters.

Fourth, major social institutions and organizations, and components therein, are affected by adherence to particular economic models and financial distributions to university disciplines and programs in development agencies (Appiah 2006; Baber and Lindsay 2006; Klees 2017; Lindsay and Blanchett 2011; Loss 2014). How are economic models utilized in analyzing educational outcomes? What significant economic and financial matters constantly effect the field and the study of outcomes such as increased learning, resources for schools, or development projects? Chapters by Klees, Carnoy, and Arnove explore these issues.

Fifth, scaffolds of civilization shift from generations to generations via external factors such as globalization (Appiah 2008; Rizvi and Choo 2020). As multiple phenomena of globalization evince, how are alternative methods of study observed in comparative and international education? For instance, Hayhoe and Arnove discuss historical and contemporary manifestations from Asian and South American nations that have been increasingly influenced by Westerns social and political structures.

Religions, metaphysical perspectives, and other sociocultural features are bedrocks of civilizations. Yet credence is often overlooked and/or discounted regarding discoveries and knowledge contributions of some civilizations by civilizations in other geographical regions and internationals venues (Campbell 1976). Why are particular dominant views of the Western world favored, despite contributions of multiple civilizations? To what extent could or should comparative and international education alter these oversights or relegations? Might new analytical models emerge? Hayhoe's chapter delves into possible reasons.

Sixth, in the aftermath of World War II, colonial empires of Western countries crumbled and new independent nations emerged. To what extent did various forms of political and social activities contribute to the changes? Horace Dawson's foreword, Arnove's chapter, and later Beverly Lindsay's chapter explore how external pressures and activism contributed to the emergence of new nations.

Seventh, ultimate aims of social sciences and education espouse equity, fairness, and social justice. Yet how might these quests be tempered with research, analysis, and policies that recognize both the positive components and limitations of methodologies in comparative and international education? For example, what is the relevant blend of quantitative and qualitative approaches, empirical and ethical premises, and dominant and minority perspectives? Carnoy, Arnove, Klees, and Hayhoe touch upon such questions.

Abstracts: Conceptual, Historical, and Theoretical Frameworks for Enriching the Field

The following abbreviated abstracts are based upon contributions from the authors. Their longer original versions are located on the Palgrave website.

Martin Carnoy's chapter, "The Changing Face of Comparative Education: A Personal Retrospective," focuses on the way comparative education is conceptualized and undertaken. In chronological order, he presents research moving through decades to provide insight into this field. He compares how nations educate their populations, while theories are developed for educational change. In five decades, the world has become increasingly "smaller," interdependent, and networked. Thus, international education became more important as a source of educational knowledge, with globalization becoming more central to theories. Globalization has enabled the increased collection of data through international testing and the impact of evaluation. This has had a positive effect of increasing the knowledge base for comparative analysis, while simultaneously moving from theory. He appeals to younger generations of scholars to learn and teach theory and do empirical analysis based upon theory.

Robert F. Arnove's chapter, "The Dimensions and Uses of Comparative Education: Lessons Gleaned from a Five-Decade Journey," chronicles the intercept between his scholarly career and the guiding values and principal contours of the field of comparative and international education. He discusses his published research with regard to world-systems analysis; philanthropy and cultural imperialism; national literacy campaigns; revolution and education (in the case of Nicaragua); and his co-edited textbooks that highlight the scientific, pragmatic, and global understanding and world peace components of our field. He concludes with his recent work on the ethical and empirical dimensions of our research, teaching, and activism.

Steven J. Klees' chapter, "Economics, Development, and Comparative and International Education," states that the field of economics has been influential in comparative and international education theory and practice and, more generally, in international development. First, his chapter begins by discussing what is wrong with the approach taken by the dominant neoclassical economics paradigm and then considers alternatives. Second, he critiques the main quantitative methods, that economists and other social scientists use, and then examines the impact of education and other policy and program interventions on education and development outcomes. Third, the chapter explores alternatives related to these forms of impact assessment. The fourth section tackles "development" and the consequences that relegate billions of people to the margins of global society. Klees argues "There are Plenty of Alternatives." In conclusion, he presents implications for the field of comparative and international education.

Ruth Hayhoe's chapter "Comparative Education and the Dialogue Among Civilizations," challenges the domination of Western-derived theories in comparative education and suggests an enrichment that can be found through an embrace of dialogue with other world civilizations. It introduces the World Order Models Project founded by scholars such as Rajni Kothari and Ali Mazrui in the 1970s, as a value explicit approach to research that is rooted in African and Asian civilizations. She presents values of equity, autonomy, participation, and solidarity in envisioning a preferred future for humanity. The chapter ends with an emphasis on the need for inter-religious dialogue in comparative higher education.

Pedagogical Epistemologies, Genders, and Global Engagements

Themes and Questions

Section two posits rationales for the expansion of the field, to include issues pertaining to social cohesions, teachers, genders, and the impacts of nation states. While the authors' personal journeys in the field are discussed, they clearly articulate twenty-first century educational and social conditions that are or should be viewed through the lens of comparative and international education. In particular, they are concerned with both contemporary and emerging cross-national educational issues – especially several that have not received sufficient attention. Hence, the following comments and elucidatory questions, to enlarge the field, are posed.

First, as cited in the introduction, COVID-19 is at the forefront of countries throughout the world. COVID-19 was not on the radar of publishers and educators, when our book proposal was approved. Undoubtedly, the numbers of infections and deaths will increase substantially by the time our volume is published. In the future, it is likely that other types of coronavirus will mutate and produce strands disbursed throughout the globe, that is based upon past patterns of coronaviruses (Coles 2020; Lovelace 2020). Since this reality exists, how might teachers and university faculty include courses or modules fostering critical thinking to promote social cohesion in preparation for unknown disasters and pandemics? How might teachers and faculty help students think and research creatively in novel modes, given community health conditions that effect teaching and learning? Chapters by Ratna Ghosh and Mark Ginsburg view multiple components of teaching in view of urgent and unanticipated conditions.

Second, social cohesions, or the lack thereof, are observable in multiple environments. Yet the concepts and actual practices of social cohesions differ due to cultural norms, political systems, and economic realities (Bulmer and Solomos 2017; Loader and Hughes 2017). What may be the manifestations of the integration of gendered matters to social cohesion? Will teachers be able to foster social cohesions given restrictions imposed upon public educational systems? To what extent have the conditions of teachers in a variety of countries and social settings contributed to social cohesions? Ghosh's, Ginsburg's, and Nelly Stomquist's chapters examine such questions.

Third, concepts and terminologies such as diversity, inclusion, and parity began receiving notable research during the last quarter century, although social scientists examined them under other nomenclatures such as gender, race, socioeconomic status, and affirmative action. Indeed in 2008, the *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* began publications thereby lending additional importance to these areas of inquiry. Other twenty-first century illustrations include: Lindsay and Blanchett (2011), Sanger and Gleason (2020), Schuelka et al. (2019), and Tatto et al. (2016). How is diversity conceptualized and manifested in multiple educational systems within the same nation state in comparisons to observances elsewhere in the world? How should the field be viewed and conceptualized to help establish foundations for inclusion in the field? Stromquist and Ghosh explore such topical questions.

Fourth, the term gender is in vogue in universities, government bodies, and corporate enterprises. Women are approximately 55% of the undergraduate degree awardees in the United States, with over half in England, and notable percentages elsewhere (Higher Education Statistics Agency 2019; National Center for Education Statistics 2019). In fact, this author was surprised to observe, during her Fulbright Fellowships, that the vast majority of academic faculty were women at Myeik University in Myanmar. Similarly, another Fulbright (University of Lampung in Indonesia) portrayed substantial female academic and medical faculty – including the immediate former Dean of Medicine. My Ford Foundation grant in Palestine indicated the majority of math and science education students, pursuing Master's degrees at An-Najah National University, were women. Do equal or greater percentages of women mean equality? How are gender and gendered relations manifested in various nations, educational institutions, and formal and informal social structures? What constitutes numerical parity? Should parity be equated with equity in terms of genders that are not limited to the often-used binary classifications of female and male? What are generic definitions and concepts of genders; and how may they be expanded to encompass nuances in various contexts, e.g., formal and informal schools, universities, and workplaces? What are relative roles of the nation state on gender? Stromquist's and Ghosh's chapters delve into these topics.

Fifth, critical discussions of education *per se* are indispensable for comparative and international education. Yet teachers have not consistently been allotted critical integration into the field, by some (Ginsburg 2017; Straubhaar 2020). What evidence exists to support this contention? Should professionals move beyond books and articles in refereed journals to ascertain the relative presence of teacher education in comparative and international education? Ginsburg's and Ghosh's chapters seek answers.

Sixth, several chapters in section one discuss testing and its impact on educational outcomes. Section two continues the queries. How can the presence or absence of strong teacher organizations or unions be related to teaching conditions and curricular *vis-à-vis* society needs? To what extent are learning outcomes and cognitive achievement related to professional work conditions of teachers? Explorations occur via Ginsburg's and Ghosh's chapters.

Abstracts: Pedagogical Epistemologies, Genders, and Global Engagements

Ratna Ghosh's chapter, "Can Education Contribute to Social Cohesion?," seizes the opportunity provided by the coronavirus pandemic to explore education's role in building social cohesion and cooperation during a crisis and sustaining unity, post COVID-19. She asks: What kind of education is conducive to enhancing and sustaining social cohesion in societies which are increasingly diverse to deal with present and future challenges? The chapter touches upon educational roles enveloping ethical and global minded citizens who can work toward peace, social cohesion, and sustainable development in an interdependent world. She focuses on diversity in the classroom in terms of differences in ethnicity, culture, religion, gender, class, sexual identity, and dis/ability. She stresses the need for humanistic education (along with essential skills for economic security) and briefly touches select Southern philosophies that can guide non-violent, whole-child, and inclusion to facilitate social cohesion.

Mark Ginsburg's chapter, "Recognizing Teachers as a Key Focus for Comparative Educators," begins with the 1956 origin of the Comparative Education Society (renamed the Comparative and International Education Society) as a section of the National Society of College Teachers of Education. Beginning in the 1970s baccalaureate comparative education courses, as part of preservice teacher education, were less visible, while graduate courses and programs continued to grow and attract future professors and education practitioners. Similarly, the professional activities of teachers have not received adequate attention in educational systems and policies, and international organizations. The chapter focuses on the topics of preservice teacher preparation, inservice teacher development, teachers' work and occupational status, teachers' professional organizations/unions, teachers' engagement in educational reform, and teachers' involvement in community/societal change. The chapter argues that coursework in the field needs to devote more attention on teachers and their situations.

Nelly P. Stromquist's chapter, "Expanding the Field of Comparative and International Education: The Inclusion of Gender," contends that gender operates through evident and subtle structures, beliefs, and behaviors. Ideas on gender have evolved in terms of knowledge for transformation of a gendered society, along with the roles of the state in maintaining a gendered society, and subsequent fundamental task of making demands upon the state. These realizations also include the imperative of counting on women-led collective organizations and empowerment in strategic efforts to achieve change at institutional and national levels. Access by girls and women to formal education demands more than parity. Emerging as indispensable analytical tools are the development and application of gender theory that enables distinctions between deep causes and tangible manifestations, and action theory that identifies multiple factors to remove negative effects of gender.

Policies, Practices, and Paradigms Emerging from Applied Research

Themes and Questions

Section three concentrates on applications of comparative and international education that emerge (from) and contribute to applied policies, paradigms for international education in American universities, developing and emerging nations, and diplomacy. Moreover, evolving modalities and structural foci, in view of geopolitical and socioeconomic global conditions, are being transformed by leaders in universities and philanthropic organizations. Thus, university endeavors and the effects of philanthropy and diplomacy are discussed in view of illustrative questions.

First, university professors and professional organizations have long presented data emphasizing the importance of internationalizing (Altbach 2016; Commission on The Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program 2005; Crossley 2014; Crossley et al. 2018; Knight and de Wit 2018). To what extent does the field of comparative education contribute to internationalization of comprehensive research universities? Given the curricular demands of specific disciplines, how realistic is it for internationalization to engulf doctoral universities so that students and/or faculty have ample opportunities to participate? Chapters by David Evans, John Schwille, and Beverly Lindsay delve into such questions.

Second, university presidents, deans, and other executives often espouse the importance of internationalization of universities for globalization (Association of American Colleges and Universities 2018; Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities 2017). Are the theoretical frameworks of scholars, steeped in the social sciences and humanities, relevant to multiple features of internationalization of large comprehensive doctoral universities? To what extent are faculty and students in multiple academic colleges and disciplines, within the same university, receptive to outreaches from departments or divisions of comparative and international education? Schwille's and Evans' chapters explore such questions.

Third, multiple curricular models are necessary to enable graduates of masters and doctoral degree programs to assume leadership positions outside the academy. How are conceptual and theoretical features of the field combined with policy development and practical applications? How does or will these foci contribute to the preparation and mentoring of students for leadership within the academy and in government, philanthropic, non-government entities, and corporation entities? Evans', Lindsay's, and Schwille's chapters elucidate these issues.

Fourth, as generally accepted, research and scholarship and public engagement are central features of universities, tempered with external factors (Stevens 2015). What global or geopolitical factors are in the forefront when establishing and/or modifying graduate programs in comparative and international education that address applied research and public engagement? How does the presence or absence of private or public fellowships and grants influence decisions regarding program development? Evans' and Schwille's chapters examine these critical questions regarding content, while Lindsay's discusses the salience of external funding options.

Fifth, regional and/or national geopolitical conditions influence the establishment of extensive funding models by federal and/or national governments, philanthropic, and multilateral organizations in awarding international fellowships and grants to North American and Western European nations. In the meantime, academicians are promoted and lauded for their ability to secure national and international fellowships, grants, and contracts – especially those that provide some direct administrative financial resources to the university (Association of American Colleges and Universities 2018; Association of American Universities 2020). These types of international fellowships and grants vary from Fulbrights to the United States Agency for International Development. What are the relationships between such types of awards and foreign policy and diplomacy of the United States and other Western countries? How do such grants contribute to teaching, scholarship, and public engagement in universities? To what extent can academicians vigorously question the missions and goals of the funding sources, and simultaneously continue to seek funding from the organizations? Chapters by Evans and Lindsay explicate responses.

Sixth, India, Indonesia, and Nigeria are among the most rapidly growing populations in the world (Gramlich 2019). Plus, these nations are diverse in terms of cultures, languages, and racial and ethnic groups. Simultaneously in recent years, the chief executive officers of several major American philanthropic organizations, for example, Bloomberg, Ford, and Rockefeller, are people of color or women. How might rapidly changing demographics between emerging nations and developed countries affect geopolitical conditions as studied by professionals in international affairs and comparative and international education? With additional diversity occurring in philanthropic leadership levels, how might the field of comparative and international education be altered? Will philanthropic funding priorities shift? Lindsay's and Evans' chapters view such matters.

Abstracts: Policies, Practices, and Paradigms Emerging from Applied Research

John Schwille's chapter, "Eliminating Dysfunctional Boundaries and Mapping Educational Practice: Toward Integration, Infusion, and Inclusiveness in Comparative Education," discusses how comparative education was traditionally marginalized in American schools of education. He uses theories of Pierre Bourdieu to explain marginalization. Previously, the basic mapping of educational practice, which could have served as a basis for integration of comparative study, was neglected by CIES. Instead mapping was left to international assessment studies. Several examples illustrate what some have called important developments in comparative education. First, is the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) and its mapping educational practices and outcomes across countries. A second focuses on efforts at Michigan State University to reduce dysfunctional boundaries in developing international dimensions throughout the College of Education. Finally, the development of the CIES Special Interest Groups are discussed regarding practices of integration, infusion, and inclusiveness.

David R. Evans' chapter, "Training 'Deep Practitioners': 50 Years of the Center for International Education at the University of Massachusetts Amherst," presents a brief analytic history of the initial 50 years of the

Center for International Education (CIE) at University of Massachusetts Amherst. The goal is understanding what made CIE possible, and how its evolution can assist the development of CIE programs at other universities. The chapter begins with the unusual context in which CIE was created and its commitment to a synergistic linkage between academics and managing funded, development education programs. The discussion then describes CIE's defining characteristics, the challenges it faced, its current situation, and the insights that can be gleaned from its history. The chapter concludes with comments on the implications for the future shape of comparative education/international education graduate programs and centers at universities.

Joel Samoff's chapter, "Two Tales, Contending Perspectives, and Contested Terrain," explores the evolution of comparative and international education. Is it a catch-all for disconnected research about education outside the United States? A coherent field of study, with its own theory and methods? Border crossers, transcending disciplinary boundaries? Two parallel stories capture contending perspectives and academic roles. Rooted in notions of development, one highlights the links between research and foreign aid. The other wrestles with poverty, power, and liberation as it challenges that relationship. Comparative and international education becomes contested terrain, where not only findings but also approaches and methods are at issue, where review and validation require attention to power and authority, and where self-critical scholarship is essential.

Beverly Lindsay's chapter, "Evolving Nexus Between Diplomacy and Comparative and International Education," studies the linkages among universities to diplomacy and international affairs *vis-à-vis* the major functions of universities – teaching, scholarship and research, and public engagement. Are they quite distinct? Should they be related? This chapter explores such questions by: (1) articulating various concepts and dimensions of diplomacy and soft power; (2) examining select American and British university rankings and league tables; (3) explicating how various American and British government agencies and philanthropic foundations are affected by diplomacy and foreign policy via their missions and funding priorities for education; and (4) fusing diplomacy and international educational studies. Parent disciplines, from social sciences, are discussed in terms of aforementioned items. In essence, there are evolving nexuses among phenomena that influence the field.

Moving Forward in the New Decade

Beverly Lindsay's chapter, "Traversing Beyond the Contemporary to the Future," synthesizes preceding findings, articulates select areas that are not covered, and posits trends during the next decade. As this volume is being composed, two major overwhelming adverse phenomena are witnessed throughout the world that require critical attention in international affairs and comparative and international education. They are: (1) the novel global coronavirus that has infected residents throughout the world; and (2) massive marches and protests that have occurred from the United States to Great Britain to France to Germany to Brazil to Australia to New Zealand to South Korea to Indonesia to South Africa and the Caribbean in the wake of the brutal police killing of an unarmed African American man in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Indeed, on August 28, 2020, a massive demonstration occurred at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C. that then incorporated a 10-minute march to the Martin Luther King statue. The demonstration and march were planned on the exact date, when 57 years earlier, the 1963 March on Washington – organized by Martin Luther King and others – raised similar issues of inequities. Additional massive protests continued for months, in multiple nations, over the killings of unarmed people of color for minor infractions and often none – by police, security officers, and dominant groups of men over other individuals. Both of these different circumstances necessitate the fundamental issues of preserving human lives and how comparative education and international affairs can lend conceptual premises and applied research to the creation of new knowledge that, in turn, create viable policy solutions.

References

Altbach, Philip G. (1991). Trends in comparative education. *Comparative Education Review*, *35*(3), 491–507. https://doi.org/10.1086/447049.

Altbach, Philip G. (2016). *Global perspectives on higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

American Academy of Arts and Sciences. (2020). About the academy. https://www.amacad.org/about-academy. Accessed 13 July 2020.

American Association for the Advancement of Science. (2020). Mission and history. https://www.aaas.org/mission. Accessed 13 July 2020.

American Educational Research Association. (2020). Who we are. https://www.aera.net/About-AERA/Who-We-Are. Accessed 14 July 2020.

Appiah, Kwame A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Appiah, Kwame A. (2008). Chapter 6: Education for global citizenship. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, *107*(1), 83–99. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7984.2008.00133.x.

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2018). 2018–2022 strategic plan: Educating for democracy. https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/about/AACU_StrategicPlan_2018-22.pdf. Accessed 28 June 2020.

Association of American Universities. (2020). AAU by the numbers. https://www.aau.edu/who-we-are/aau-numbers. Accessed 14 July 2020.

Association of Public Universities and Land-Grant Universities. (2017). Declaration on university global engagement. https://www.aplu.org/projects-and-initiatives/international-programs/declaration-on-global-engagement/index.html. Accessed 2 June 2020.

Baber, Lorenzo D., & Lindsay, Beverly. (2006). Analytical reflections on access in English higher education: Transnational lessons across the pond. *Research in Comparative & International Education*, *1*(2), 146–155. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.2304/rcie.2006.1.2.146.

Bourdieu, Pierre., & Passeron, Jean-Claude. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. London: Sage.

Bowles, Samuel., & Gintis, Herbert. (2012). *Democracy and capitalism*. London: Routledge.

Bulmer, Martin., & Solomos, John. (Eds.). (2017). *Multiculturalism, social cohesion and immigration: Shifting conceptions in the UK*. New York: Routledge.

Campbell, Joseph. (1976). *The masks of God* (Complete four volume set). New York: Penguin Books.

Carnoy, Martin. (1974). *Education as cultural imperialism*. New York: David McKay Co. Inc.

Carnoy, Martin. (2019). *Transforming comparative education: Fifty years of theory building at Stanford*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Coles, Tony. (2020, August 10). *Confronting COVID-19: Updates on treatment and response* [On-the-Record Conference Call]. Council on Foreign Relations Member Conference Calls. https://www.cfr.org/conference-calls/covid-19-updates-treatment-and-response. Accessed 15 September 2020.

Commission on The Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. (2005, November). Global competence & national needs: One million Americans studying abroad. https://www.nafsa.org/sites/default/files/ektron/uploadedFiles/NAFSA_Home/Resource_Library_Assets/CCB/lincoln_commission_report%281%29.pdf. Accessed 12 July 2020.

Comparative and International Education Society. (2018). CIES awards. https://www.cies.us/page/Awards. Accessed 14 July 2020.

Cowen, Robert., & Kazamias, Andreas M. (Eds.). (2009). *International handbook of comparative education* (Vol. 22). New York: Springer.
Crossley, Michael. (2014). Global league tables, big data and the international transfer of educational research modalities. *Comparative Education*, *50*(1), 15–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2013.871438.
Crossley, Michael., Arthur, Lore., & McNess, Elizabeth. (Eds.). (2016). *Revisiting insider-outsider research in comparative and international education*. Oxford: Symposium Books Ltd.
Crossley, Michael., Gu, Qing., Barrett, Angeline M., Brown, Lalage., Buckler, Alison., Christensen, Carly., Janmaat, Jan Germen., McCowan, Tristan., Preston, Rosemary A., Singal, Nidhi., & Trahar, Sheila. (2018). Celebration, reflection and challenge: The BAICE 20th anniversary. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *48*(5), 801–820. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2018.1499219.
Epstein, Erwin H. (Ed.). (2016). *Crafting a global field: Six decades of the Comparative and International Education Society*. Hong Kong: Springer.
Fraser, Stewart E. (1964). *Jullien's plan for comparative education, 1816–1817*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Geiger, Roger L., & Sá, Creso M. (2009). *Tapping the riches of science: Universities and the promise of economic growth*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Ginsburg, Mark. (2017). Teachers as human capital or human beings? USAID's perspective on teachers *Current Issues in Comparative Education (CICE)*, *20*(1), 6–30. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1170256.pdf. Accessed 28 August 2020.
Gramlich, John. (2019, July 10). For World Population Day, a look at the countries with the biggest projected gains—and losses—by 2100. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/07/10/for-world-population-day-a-look-at-the-countries-with-the-biggest-projected-gains-and-losses-by-2100/. Accessed 3 June 2020.
Haass, Richard. (2020). *The world: A brief introduction*. New York: Penguin Press.
Higher Education Statistics Agency. (2019). Figure 18—HE qualifications obtained by subject area and sex. https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/17-01-2019/sb252-higher-education-student-statistics/qualifications. Accessed 6 July 2020.
Holmes, Brian. (1981). *Comparative education: Some considerations of method*. New York: Routledge.
Kelly, Gail P., & Slaughter, Sheila. (Eds.). (1991). *Women's higher education in comparative perspective*. New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
King, Edmund J. (2012). *Comparative studies and educational decision*. New York: Routledge.

Klees, Steven. (2017). Will we achieve education for all and the education sustainable development goal? *Comparative Education Review*, *61*(2), 425–440. https://doi.org/10.1086/691193.

Knight, Jane., & de Wit, Hans. (2018). Internationalization of higher education: Past and future. *International Higher Education*, (95), 2–4. https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.95.10715.

Lindsay, Beverly. (Ed.). (1980). *Comparative perspectives of Third World women: The impact of race, sex, and class*. New York: Praeger.

Lindsay, Beverly. (2012). Articulating domestic and global university descriptors and indices of excellence. *Comparative Education*, *48*(3), 385–399. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2011.613279.

Lindsay, Beverly., & Blanchett, Wanda J. (Eds.). (2011). *Universities and global diversity: Preparing educators for tomorrow*. New York: Routledge.

Loader, Rebecca., & Hughes, Joanne. (2017). Balancing cultural diversity and social cohesion in education: The potential of shared education in divided contexts. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *65*(1), 3–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2016.1254156.

Loss, Christopher P. (2014). *Between citizens and the state: The politics of American higher education in the 20th century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lovelace Jr., Berkeley. (2020 July 22). Dr. Anthony Fauci warns the coronavirus won't ever be eradicated. *CNBC.com*. https://www.cnbc.com/2020/07/22/dr-anthony-fauci-warns-the-coronavirus-wont-ever-be-totally-eradicated.html. Accessed 28 August 2020.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2019). Fast facts degrees conferred by race and sex. https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=72. Accessed 1 June 2020.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). The condition of education: International comparisons: Reading, mathematics, and science literary of 15-year old students. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cnu.asp. Accessed 1 June 2020.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/risk.html. Accessed 11 July 2020.

Noah, Harold J., & Eckstein, Max A. (1998). *Doing comparative education: Three decades of collaboration*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Phillips, David., & Schweisfurth, Michele. (2014). *Comparative and international education: An introduction to theory, method, and practice* (2nd Edition). London: Bloomsbury.

Rizvi, Fazal., & Choo, Suzanne S. (2020). Education and cosmopolitanism in Asia: An introduction. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *40*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1725282.

Rodney, Walter. (2018). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. London: Verso.

Sachs, Jeffrey D. (2020). *The ages of globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Sanger, Catherine S., & Gleason, Nancy W. (Eds.). (2020). *Diversity and inclusion in global higher education Lessons from across Asia*. Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan.
Schleicher, Andreas. (2019). PISA\2018: Insights and interpretations. https://www.oecd.org/pisa/PISA%202018%20Insights%20and%20Interpretations%20FINAL%20PDF.pdf. Accessed 30 May 2020.
Schuelka, Matthew J., Johnstone, Christopher J., Thomas, Gary., & Artiles, Alfredo J. (Eds.). (2019). *The SAGE handbook of inclusion and diversity in education*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
Stevens, Matthew C. (2015, February 19). Janet Napolitano urges 'passionate conversation" on higher education. *USC News*. https://news.usc.edu/76189/janet-napolitano-urges-passionate-conversation-on-higher-education/. Accessed 3 July 2020.
Straubhaar, Rolf. (2020). Teaching for America across two hemispheres: Comparing the ideological appeal of the Teach for All Teacher Education Model in the United States and Brazil. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *71*(3), 307–318. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487119845635.
Tatto, Maria T., Richmond, Gail., & Carter Andrews, Dorinda J. (2016). The research we need in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *67*(4), 247–250. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487116663694.
Wallerstein, Immanuel. (2004). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Wilson, David N. (1994). Comparative and international education: Fraternal or siamese twins? A preliminary genealogy of our twin fields. *Comparative Education Review*, *38*(4) 449–486.
World Health Organization (WHO). (2021a, February 8). WHO coronavirus disease (COVID-19) dashboard. https://covid19.who.int. Accessed 8 February 2021.
World Health Organization (WHO). (2021b, February 8). United States of America: WHO coronavirus disease (COVID-19) dashboard. https://covid19.who.int/region/amro/country/us. Accessed 8 February 2021.

PART I

Conceptual, Historical, and Theoretical Frameworks for Enriching the Field

CHAPTER 2

The Changing Face of Comparative Education: A Personal Retrospective

Martin Carnoy

In this essay, I use my position as a "senior" scholar and former president of the Comparative International Education Society (CIES) to reflect on the evolution of our field during my research lifetime (still ongoing at full steam). Let me admit from the get-go that as a graduate student and for some years beyond, I did not know I was "doing" comparative and international education. Thus, my retrospective analysis here is much more coherent than I could have pulled off in the 1970s when some of the biggest changes were taking place around me in real time. However, after the mid-1970s, there was never a question in my mind that I was in the business of disrupting the field and that the field was undergoing a drastic makeover.

M. Carnoy (✉)
Graduate School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA
e-mail: carnoy@stanford.edu

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_2

Three Historical Trends

In hindsight, I think that the transformation was the result of three historical trends, all with origins in the period just after World War II. Postwar reconstruction in Europe and Asia and the advent of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union contributed to a spike in foreign assistance and a growing interest in promoting economic development. US policy was based on influencing "hearts and minds" and stimulating US-style economic growth. Education as a potentially important factor in higher economic productivity, social mobility, and inculcating democratic values put comparative and international research on education front and center in influencing countries' – many of them newly independent – political and economic trajectories.

Social Science Comes to Comparative Education

The first trend during this period was that social science began to play a key role in studying education within and across nations. Within this context, in the 1950s and early 1960s, economists were researching the sources of economic growth, and, lo and behold, discovered human capital (the value of investment in education) as an important source of growth. This is where I began my scholarly career as Theodore Schultz's[1] student at the University of Chicago. Ultimately, good research is largely a result of curiosity and of choosing an interesting subject. Schultz asked me if I would be interested in measuring the value of human capital in Mexico and thus to do the first such study in a developing country. He chose the topic for me – it was his curiosity, not mine, that pulled me into international education.

Yet, four years later, driven by my own curiosity and an opportunity provided me by the World Bank, I did a similar study in Kenya, interviewing – as I had in Mexico – about 4,000 workers in factories and other establishments, and estimating the payoff to their education (Thias and Carnoy 1972). These Mexico and Kenya projects, carried out in the field in two very different countries, forced me to compare results, and that comparison provided me important insights about the relationship between students' schooling – primary to university – and labor markets. I had become, without realizing it, a comparative educational researcher.

[1] In 1979, Theodore Schultz won the Nobel Prize for his work in economics.

But I did realize almost immediately that comparative research was crucial to developing alternative perspectives on the relation between education and labor markets – perspectives that had me focusing much more on political and economic contexts than on the hard and fast universal economic rules driving human capital theory or on individualistic theories of how children learn.

Sociologists were also actively seeking new ways to look at education from a comparative and, as in human capital theory, functionalist perspective. Arnold Anderson (1966) and Philip Foster (1965) at the University of Chicago brought a new critical empiricism to comparative education in the 1960s, using data from foreign assistance projects to question long accepted understandings of the role of education in society. In the early 1970s, Alex Inkeles and his graduate student, David Smith, created a "modernity index" and estimated that working or studying in modern institutions such as factories and schools had a significant socializing impact on how people viewed the world, making them more productive (Inkeles and Smith 1974).

International Testing Brings More Data

The second trend in comparative education of the period derived from the new involvement of social scientists. They wanted more information, and they called for collecting systematic data on education across countries to develop more informed comparisons of educational systems. Thanks to UNESCO and a big grant from the US government, these data were indeed collected in the mid-1960s through the First International Mathematics Survey (FIMS). The project was organized by a group of psychometricians and social scientists that called themselves the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). They tested 13-year-old students' mathematics achievement in 10 European countries plus the United States and Japan, and applied detailed questionnaires to 130,000 students, 18,000 teachers, and more than 5,000 school directors.

The effort to test students internationally was consistent with the social science approach to comparative education being promoted at the University of Chicago (Anderson 1966) and by others, such as Harold Noah and Max Eckstein (Noah and Eckstein 1969). All were interested in the use of data to analyze the relation between education and society and, in the case of student achievement data, to test hypotheses about the relation between education policies and educational outcomes. All thought that comparisons between countries would provide a particularly interesting and useful prism through which to analyze this relationship.

There is little doubt that the construction of the test instruments and their application to thousands of students across different countries taught test constructors and psychometricians a great deal about the prospects and problems of such undertakings. Given the many technical difficulties with test applications in each country, those closest to the testing, at least in the IEA's first two decades, tried hard to dissuade policymakers from using test results to rank the quality of educational systems (Medrich and Griffith 1992). They have been largely unsuccessful in this effort – if anything, international test results have become even more viewed as a "horse race" among countries' education systems than in the 1970s and 1980s. Indeed, as I will discuss later, the "league table" approach to comparative and international education has come to dominate the field – in it, the very fact that students in a country score high on the international test means that this country must have a great education system, and therefore it should be emulated by other countries, although it is not really clear what they should emulate besides having smart, well-trained teachers (and not spend more money because that makes no difference).

New Theories of the Role of Education in Development

The third trend that influenced our field was also rooted in this postwar conception of education's role in economic and social development. But this trend emerged in the 1960s and 1970s in opposition to the earlier social science approaches to education – specifically to human capital theory and the social functionalism associated with US postcolonial postwar idealism. When the contradictions of US policy in developing countries became all too clear with the Vietnam War disaster, the role of education in those policies also took on a different meaning. "Winning hearts and minds" looked increasingly like a reinvented US version of imperialism. Comparative and international education was necessarily swept up in this contradiction, and soul-searching followed. This resulted in new theories of the complex role of education in capitalist development, some derived from neo-Marxist ideas and others from anti-functionalist institutionalism.

My book, *Education as Cultural Imperialism* (Carnoy 1974) and Bowles and Gintis' work two years later, *Schooling in Capitalist America*

(Bowles and Gintis 1976), were both manifestations of these new theories about schooling's role. The theories emphasized that schooling in capitalist countries was not primarily a source of merit-based human capital formation or social mobility, but rather a sociopolitical institution that reproduced social class hierarchies and power structures both nationally and internationally. Later, in the 1980s, Henry Levin and I rethought this reproductive function of schooling (Carnoy and Levin 1985). We realized that the instrumentalist analyses we had done in the 1970s did not reflect the complex role that education plays in the conflict between democratic ideals and capitalist inequalities. Even as schools reproduce unequal work roles and the class structure, they are also important expressions of these democratic ideals and sites of struggle for a more equal society. Internationally, this suggests that educational systems not only reflect the unequal power relations with core capitalist societies but also can represent peripheral nations' aspirations to challenge that power; that is, education can be a (public) institutional site of struggle to define national cultures and to build relatively independent economic development.

This reconceptualization of education as both reproductive of unequal social class and core-periphery power relations and a site of struggle for greater equality was necessarily situated in theories of the state. I consider the important understandings of education gained through state theory (see Carnoy 1984), which was so much part of the discourse in comparative and international education in the 1970s and 1980s, one of the major fatalities of neoliberal ascendance at the end of the twentieth century. Add the simultaneous explosion of test data and the movement toward impact evaluation, and state theory unfortunately faded into the deep background of our epistemology, even as the state retained or even became more important to understanding educational change or the lack of it. To get a taste of the kind of discussion we were having almost forty years ago, I recommend reading my and Levin's *Schooling and Work in the Democratic State* (1985) and Bowles and Gintis' *Democracy and Capitalism* (1986).

The institutionalist theory that emerged in parallel to the neo-Marxist analysis of educational systems was called World Society Theory (WST). In WST, the growth of formal education around the world occurred because education was a symbol of a modernized society. Mass education spread as part of the diffusion of the enlightenment conception of progress and of what it meant to be a nation state. From a world society perspective, education emerged and expanded not primarily because education solved socioeconomic contradictions generated by capitalism, but because education generated legitimacy for the nation state and for its leadership (Meyer et al. 1992; Ramirez 2012). The driving force explaining the nature of education everywhere in the world is therefore an ideology that was embedded in the emergence of nation states in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. WST is unabashedly a theory of convergence rather than of a dialectic process generated by an inherently unequal international and national economic system. WST is also a theory rooted in "agreement" rather than conflict. Education spreads, grows, and functions the way it does because of consensus, and the consensus is constructed around democratic notions of the individual, modern values, progress, equality, and, most important, power relations.

Further, in conversations I have had with the creators of WST here at Stanford, I came to realize that an underlying point of disagreement between the neo-Marxist and WST views of explaining the evolution of educational systems is whether democratic ideals or capitalist economic and social relations dominated the formation of modern nation states. Should we consider the Magna Carta, Parliament, the US Constitution, and the Rights of Man, as the institutional bedrock of capitalist nation states, or are capitalist markets and capitalist production, with their inherent inequality, the main definers of modern capitalist (and even post-capitalist) nations?[2] In either case, education can serve to legitimize the nation state and its capitalist or post-capitalist project, as well as the capitalist world-system itself. If democratic ideals are the principal definers of institutions in the nation state, then WST is the more robust theory to understand educational systems and their development; if capitalist relations of production or the bureaucratic state structure itself, as in Fascism and Soviet-style Communism, define the nation state, then neo-Marxist theories are the better choice for understanding the role of education in society.

[2] The argument that state capitalist countries such as the Soviet Union and China, largely abandoned free markets and more traditional class relations but greatly expanded their educational systems, seems to fit better with the role of education as a reproducer of class relations in capitalist production since, ultimately, post-capitalist societies use educational systems to create new types of class relations and to use the state to suppress voluntarily consensual notions of the nation state.

Globalization and Comparative Education

By the 1990s, globalization, the growing influence of international organizations as an outgrowth of globalization, and the new information economy as an important element in and definer of globalization, all added new dimensions and complexities to research in comparative education. Which new approaches did comparative education researchers develop to deal with globalization? The nation state had traditionally been the fundamental unit of analysis in comparative education, even in dependency, world society, and world-system theories, all of which saw comparative education in global terms. My view on this in the early 1990s and even today is that despite globalization, nation states retain considerable control over how they choose to finance and reform educational systems:

> Even as the world economy becomes increasingly globalized, the nation-state will remain as the crucial political structure where educational policy is played out, though under increased pressure from global forces at two levels: first, forces that impinge on the underlying politics of the nation-state, such as regional divisions exacerbated by uneven economic development in the global economy, and the increasing use of information technology at the global level to define nation-state politics; and second, global organizations that explicitly attempt to shift policy making from the nation-state to the global level. This is not the overarching ideological conception of the modern nation-state discussed in world society theory that converges nations' thinking about education, human rights, and the importance of science, but rather it is an explicit attempt by international organizations to apply uniform educational policies to all nation-states. (Carnoy 2019, p. 164)

The question then becomes: Why do these international organizations press nation states to apply uniform policies to their educational systems? One argument could be that the international organizations such as the World Bank and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) represent the interests of global capital, and it is in the interest of global capital to promote the production of more and better educated labor everywhere in the world. Yet, since organizations such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) were important international educational players, more nuanced explanations emerged for the growth of influence over education by these organization. Karen Mundy argued that:

> …education had emerged as part of the "embedded liberalism" of the post-World War II world order, and became a driver in the globalization of public policies. In the emergent international architecture, the right to education spread as an international liberal norm, and education became an increasingly important domain for international action - be this in the form of the creation of standards, international development projects, or advocacy campaigns to extend the "right to education." Educational policies and practices that had once been the putative domain of the nation state, were increasingly shaped by global institutions and interactions. This was particularly true for low-income developing countries, whose capacity to develop national policies was low and financial resources to expand enrollment lacking. The international organizations quickly filled these gaps with well-defined ideas about educational structures, curriculum, and evaluation. (Mundy 1998, quoted in Carnoy 2019, p. 168)

Was this role possible for multilateral agencies without the approval of developed capitalist countries? Probably not, and this is the reason that neoliberal views pushed by the most powerful of the developed countries, the United States, were so important in the policies promoted – especially decentralization, private education (private-public partnerships), increased testing, resistance to teachers' unions, reluctance to increase funding for schools, use of part-time teachers, and increased emphasis on technology in the classroom. Perhaps even more important, all these international organizations push the idea that more and better education can "solve" economic and especially social problems such as poverty and income inequality without discussing the underlying causes of these structural issues.

Mundy (1998) saw this as part and parcel of the hegemonic project of developed countries' ruling elites on a world scale. She chronicled how this political space – hence the hegemonic project, the conception of world order, and the role of the multilateral agencies as mediating institutions in that world order – changed as the world economy globalized and the international economic and political conditions shifted in the last two decades of the twentieth century.

International Testing Comes to Dominate Comparative Education

As far as we comparative education researchers are concerned, it is interesting how globalization played out. There is no doubt that international testing became the dominant theme in comparative education after 2000, and that the policy discussion in education internationally was dominated by the multilateral agencies, especially the OECD, which controlled the spread and use of testing. This was 1960s redux, but now that original call by social scientists for more data occurred in a much different (and more enabling) environment. The end of the Cold War, the explosion of information technology, the heightened level of competition in the globalized economy, the enormous expansion of educational systems worldwide, and enhanced legitimacy of multilateral organizations, elevated the IEA's Trends in International Mathematics and Science Survey (TIMSS) and the OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) to the forefront of comparative education. Not to be left behind, UNESCO also began its own regional tests in Latin America (LLECE), East and Southern Africa (SACMEQ), and former French colonies in Africa and Asia (PASEC). Thus, the most important manifestation of globalization in the field of comparative education was international testing on steroids.

The irony is that, as mentioned earlier, the psychometricians and social scientists who designed and applied the FIMS in the mid-1960s specifically argued against using the test to judge the quality of participating countries' educational systems. Rather, the surveys of students, teachers, and school directors were intended to provide data that would help compare schooling and test various hypotheses, such as the effects across these quite different systems of students' social class background and tracking on student achievement.

The "Simplistic" Comparative Analysis of International Test Results

Yet, these data gathering operations, useful as they might have been in describing similarities and differences across educational systems (more about that below), were used almost immediately and even today to draw simplistic quality comparisons based on average student performance on the test. After all, the tests were designed to measure student knowledge in mathematics and science – designed by "experts" who had apparently agreed on what forms of "latent" knowledge were important in each subject, whether that subject was being taught in Japan or the United States or Sweden. It therefore made sense that when 8th grade Japanese students scored higher in the mathematics test than students in the United States or Sweden, then it was safe to conclude that Japanese students had learned more mathematics in their schools by the 8th grade than students had learned in the United States or Sweden. Safe also to conclude that Japan's education system was "better," and that the United States and Sweden should look at how Japanese schools were teaching mathematics in order to make education better in the United States and Sweden.

Today's "league table" comparisons in TIMSS and PISA are the natural extension of this argument, except that in the case of PISA, this has taken on simplistic dimensions, with political overtones. Whichever countries are at the top of these league tables are touted as models of excellence in education, and the main message is that all countries must look to the educational systems of these top scorers for the mystical combination of school input and process reforms that are producing the high student scores on the test. The OECD's PISA analysis also plays down underlying social inequalities as a major shaper of educational structures, and, ultimately, the relation between education and socioeconomic outcomes.

There is obviously a lot to learn from the massive amount of data produced by these various tests (Schmidt et al. 2019). For example, the 1995 TIMSS test resulted in good analyses of mathematics curriculum differences between the United States and other countries (Schmidt et al. 1997) and a set of videotapes comparing mathematics teaching in Japan, Germany, and the United States (Stigler et al. 1999). Both TIMSS and PISA have generated interesting comparisons of social class gradients of student achievement, which in some sense reflect the possible equalizing or dis-equalizing effects of student educational experiences up to the school grade in which the test is applied. In some federal countries that randomly surveyed and tested students in states (e.g., Mexico, Australia, Germany, and – in a few states – the United States), it is also possible to make useful comparisons among the various decision units in the same overall system (Carnoy et al. 2015a; Morsy et al. 2017).

Problems of Inferring Education Policy Conclusions from International Student Surveys

However, there are also serious problems with these surveys – problems that were already apparent in the FIMS and that have not gone away. The tests are cross-section benchmark estimates of achievement,[3] and the information on interesting input and process variables is based on student, teacher, or school director reports of those variables, not direct observation. Both these characteristics of the surveys make it difficult to use them for accurately estimating which school inputs and processes are important in explaining student outcomes.

For example, when we applied the 2012 PISA mathematics and science tests in Russia to all the 9th grade students who took the TIMSS in 8th grade in 2011, it allowed us to control not only for 9th grade students' social class background but also for a measure of their accumulated mathematics and science knowledge up to the end of 8th grade. The results were rather different from just using the cross-section PISA results (controlling only for socioeconomic background) to estimate the effects on student achievement of teacher characteristics and classroom teaching practices (Carnoy et al. 2016).

Another problematic aspect of these benchmark surveys is that they cannot really explain why students in some countries have done better on the tests over the past 15–20 years (Germany, Poland, and Chile for example) and why in many other countries, students have done much worse (Australia, Netherlands, and Finland, for example). We asked policymakers in Australia why they thought the PISA math scores declined by 0.3 standard deviations in 2003–2015, and they came up with lots of reasons, but none of these proved true when we tested them empirically (Morsy et al. 2017). Finnish analysts are also befuddled – both by their country's initial PISA "miracle" (Niemi et al. 2012) and by the rapid decline in their test scores since 2009. The OECD has touted rising PISA scores in Brazil as a tribute to the many reforms Brazil has implemented in the past two decades, but it turns out, on closer examination, that most of the gain in math achievement is due to an increase in the

[3] The UNESCO PASEC survey applies a beginning of the year and end of year test, so it is possible to use gain scores (value added) in the grade as the measure of achievement. Since gain scores control for earlier achievement, the PASEC offers much greater possibilities for making less biased estimates of the effects of inputs and processes than other surveys/tests.

number of school years the average Brazilian 15 year old attended in 2018 compared to earlier years, not anything Brazilians did to improve the quality of education in a given year of middle school or high school during this period of time (Carnoy et al. 2015b).[4] If we cannot carefully identify why student achievement increases or decreases over time within a nation, there is reason to believe that figuring out the much more complex problem of why students in one country score higher than in another country is not going to be easy or even possible.

The league table mania generated by the international testing agencies does not stop with K-12 systems. Since the 1990s, during this globalization era, we have witnessed a tremendous increase in the number of university students globally, mainly because of the rapid expansion of higher education in Brazil, Russia, India, and China – the large countries known as the BRICs (Carnoy et al. 2013). Although the OECD's AHELO project, which wanted to measure the subject knowledge of economics and electrical engineering graduates in a number of countries, failed to gain traction, many different international university rankings have appeared that have given rise to a "world class university" movement, especially noticeable in places such as China and Russia, which devote many more resources to a limited group of elite universities, hoping to move them into the top 100 of the world's ranked institutions (Carnoy et al. 2013).

Again, these rankings may have meaning in terms of the amount and quality of research being done at such "world class" institutions, but they don't tell us much about the quality of the training they provide. AHELO would not have done that either, since the test being applied was to students in their final year, without consideration for the level of knowledge they brought with them from secondary school. There is some research that has estimated value added in US colleges and universities (see Arum and Roksa 2011 for example), and we have done the same for a very large sample of students in Brazil (Dalmon et al. 2019). My colleague at Stanford, Prashant Loyalka, has cooperated with the US Education Testing Service and others to develop surveys and tests and apply them to first and final year computer science and electrical engineering students

[4] Yet, analysis of the Brazilian national test, the SAEB, suggests that certain states in Brazil, such as Ceará, have implemented reforms, such as a literacy intervention and closer cooperative relations between state and municipal administrations, that have increased test scores at the primary and middle school levels (Carnoy et al. 2017).

in China, Russia, India, and the United States (Loyalka et al. 2019a). All these studies suggest that achievement gains vary across types of institutions and across countries, such that, for example, China's universities produce very low gains in student knowledge, and that US higher education institutions are able to produce computer science graduates with the highest level of knowledge in their field among these countries despite US students' lower mathematics entrance scores than their counterparts in China and Russia.

Gains in Learning and Impact Evaluation

Clearly, the studies that use *gains in achievement* either in K-12 or higher education get much closer to the truth on the quality of schooling than cross-section tests. In addition, such gain studies with their associated questionnaires are able to provide much clearer assessments of the possible reasons for quality differences. Yet even if we were able to get good estimates of what makes for higher gains in learning, it does not mean that these factors are transportable from society to society, as the OECD's PISA analyses explicitly claim. It is likely, for instance, that much of the high math achievement in East Asia is due to the considerable time students spend every week in math test cram courses outside formal school. If this were shown to be the case, would that mean, say, that California could successfully push a policy of promoting after school middle and high school math cram courses in place of team sports? This is more than a rhetorical question. It speaks to choices that societies make about what they want from their educational systems. Further, it may very well be that in the California education context there are other factors that make for lower mathematics scores and may be easier to "fix" politically than pushing students into test cram courses. Such factors could include training more mathematics teachers, reducing school violence, improving educational management and school accountability, etc. Seen this way, California policymakers might be better off taking their cues from higher math achievement in other US states with similar demographic and social conditions, such as Texas, than trying to emulate the educational practices in Korea or Taiwan.

I should also say a few words about impact evaluation, since, along with international testing, the "what works" movement, based on randomized control trials, has swept over international education research. Impact evaluation is very local and hardly comparative – it seeks internal, not external, validity. Were we to try to make "what works" truly comparative, we would have to do the same randomized control trial of an intervention in a number of different educational sites with varying social contexts. There have been some attempts at this – or at least attempted replications of an RCT (or quasi-RCT, such as a regression discontinuity) in a different context – and these have either shown similar results (which is what the researchers were hoping for) or not. One good example of this is Loyalka and his colleagues's study of teacher incentives in rural China, which replicated a study in Chicago (Loyalka et al. 2019b). The important outcome I would look for in these studies from a comparative perspective is finding the contextual factors that might explain variation in results for the same intervention. Knowing how educational context affects the outcomes of policy interventions would tell us a lot about what makes educational systems tick and the relationship between educational variables and social conditions. It would test whether the "one size fits all" assumptions underlying much of the economics of education are valid.

What Happened to Theory?

This is a nice segue into what I consider the biggest problem of the comparative and international education being overwhelmed by international testing and, to a lesser extent, by impact evaluation. We have lost all sense of the important theoretical discussions that so energized our field in the 1970s and 1980s. My concern is not a bad case of nostalgia – a hankering for the "good old days." We had test data in the good old days – in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s – and we did lots of empirical studies of school production functions, of school vouchers, and of the impact of educational radio, television, and computers in schools. Yes, both the data and the statistical methods are better now, but the real difference is that today, there is almost no accompanying discussion of the underlying theories that might explain what is going on in schools and outside of schools in various countries or why some interventions seem to produce relatively large effects and others do not.

Worldwide, education is largely provided by the public sector, and even private education exists largely in the context of a public regulatory framework. If we know this to be true, we cannot escape the reality that we need to have a theory of the sociopolitical and economic relations that define the meaning of "public" in each society and how that meaning is contested. There is a lot of disagreement about which theory best helps us understand these relations. I don't want to get into that discussion here; rather, I am arguing that without theory we are going to make lots of mistakes in our interpretation of the massive amount of data and empirical results being thrown at us. Better statistical (causal) analysis is helpful but it does not answer many of the most important questions surrounding our results.

In this regard, my appeal to younger generations of comparative educators is to learn and teach theory and to do intelligent empirical analysis that is based on theory. Just to leave you with a couple of examples of how to do that, I would suggest that we use all these data from international and national testing (and other data we can bring to bear on international or intra-national comparisons) to try to understand *why* students in some countries score higher on tests. And we should not limit ourselves to school factors. I would hope that researchers with different theoretical perspectives would tackle this question, making explicit their perspective.

The other side of that coin is to push our psychometrician colleagues to incorporate into international and national tests measures of socio-emotional skills, such as mindset (this is already beginning to happen) and other types of skills (teamwork, empathy, tolerance for social differences, entrepreneurship, etc.) as a way to understand what educational systems in different nations or regions are prioritizing, and therefore to understand better the nature of sociopolitical economic relations in each society as reflected in the educational system. Some educational systems may produce few of any of these different outputs and others high levels of all outputs, yet we may find a great deal of variation in what educational systems are actually teaching students and variation in what different groups of students are learning in school. Again, we can come at this from different theoretical perspectives. The important thing is to get away from the kind of consciously mindless comparative analyses driven by international (or national) surveys/tests and by typical impact evaluations.

References

Anderson, Arnold C. (1966). The University of Chicago program in comparative education. *International Review of Education, 12*, 80–91. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01417067.

Arum, Richard., & Roksa, Josipa. (2011). *Academically adrift: Limited learning on college campuses*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bowles, Samuel., & Gintis, Herbert. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books.
Bowles, Samuel., & Gintis, Herbert. (1986). *Democracy and capitalism*. New York: Basic Books.
Carnoy, Martin. (1974). *Education as cultural imperialism*. New York: David McKay Co.
Carnoy, Martin. (1984). *The state and political theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Carnoy, Martin. (2019). *Transforming comparative education: Fifty years of theory building at Stanford*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Carnoy, Martin., & Levin, Henry M. (1985). *Schooling and work in the democratic state*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Carnoy, Martin., Loyalka, Prashant., Dobryakova, Maria., Dossani, Rafiq., Froumin, Isak., Kuhns, Katherine., Tilak, Jandhyala B.G., & Wang, Rong. (2013). *University expansion in a changing global economy: Triumph of the BRICs?* Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Carnoy, Martin., García, Emma., & Khavenson, Tatiana. (2015a). *Bringing it back home*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute. https://www.epi.org/publication/bringing-it-back-home-why-state-comparisons-are-more-useful-than-international-comparisons-for-improving-u-s-education-policy/. Accessed 19 July 2020.
Carnoy, Martin., Khavenson, Tatiana., Fonseca, Izabel., Costa, Leandro., & Marotta, Luana. (2015b). A educação brasileira está melhorando? Evidências do PISA e SAEB. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 45(157), 450–485.
Carnoy, Martin., Khavenson, Tatiana., Loyalka, Prashant., Schmidt, William H., & Zakharov, Andrey. (2016). Revisiting the relationship between international assessment outcomes and educational production: Evidence from a longitudinal PISA-TIMSS sample. *American Educational Research Journal*, *53*(4),1054–1085. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216653180.
Carnoy, Martin., Marotta, Luana., Louzano, Paula., Khavenson, Tatiana., Recch Franca de Guimarães, Filipe., & Carnauba, Fernando. (2017). Intranational comparative education: What state differences in student achievement can teach us about improving education—The case of Brazil. *Comparative Education Review*, *61*(4), 726–759. https://doi.org/10.1086/693981.
Dalmon, Leite Danilo., Fonseca, Izabel., Avena, Cláudio Pondé., Carnoy, Martin., & Khavenson, Tatiana. (2019). Do students make greater achievement gains in some higher education institutions' programs than others? Insights from Brazil. *Higher Education*, *78*, 887–910. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00376-6.
Foster, Philip J. (1965). The vocational school fallacy in development planning. *Education and Economic Development*, *32*, 142–166.

Inkeles, Alex., & Smith, David Horton. (1974). *Becoming modern: Individual change in six developing countries*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Loyalka, Prashant., Liu, Ou Lydia., Li, Guirong., Chirikov, Igor., Kardanova, Elena., Gu, Lin., … Tognatta, Namrata. (2019a). Computer science skills across China, India, Russia, and the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *116*(14), 6732–6736. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1814646116.

Loyalka, Prashant., Sylvia, Sean., Liu, Chenfang., Chu, James., & Shi, Yaojiang. (2019b). Pay by design: Teacher performance pay design and the distribution of student achievement. *Journal of Labor Economics*, *37*(3), 621–662. https://doi.org/10.1086/702625.

Medrich, Elliot A., & Griffith, Jeanne E. (1992, January). *International mathematics and science assessment: What have we learned?* Washington, DC.: National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement. NCES 92-011. https://nces.ed.gov/pubs92/92011.pdf. Accessed 19 July 2020.

Meyer, John W., Ramirez, Francisco O., & Soysal, Yasemin N. (1992). World expansion of mass education, 1870–1980. *Sociology of Education, 65*(2), 128–149. https://doi.org/10.2307/2112679.

Morsy, Leila., Khavenson, Tatiana., & Carnoy, Martin. (2017). How international tests fail to inform policy: The unsolved mystery of Australia's steady decline in PISA scores. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *60*, 60–79.

Mundy, Karen. (1998). Educational multilateralism and world (dis) order. *Comparative Education Review*, *42*(4), 448–478.

Niemi, Hannele., Toom, Auli., & Kallioniemi, Arto. (Eds.), (2012). *Miracle of education: The principles and practices of teaching and learning in Finnish schools*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Noah, Harold J., & Eckstein, Max A. (1969). *Toward a science of comparative education*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Ramirez, Francisco O. (2012). The world society perspective: Concepts, assumptions, and strategies. *Comparative Education, 48*(4), 423–439. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2012.693374.

Schmidt, William H., McKnight, Curtis C., & Raizen, Senta A. (Eds.). (1997). *A splintered vision: An investigation of U.S. science and mathematics education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Schmidt, William H., Houang, Richard T., Cogan, Leland S., & Solorio, Michelle L. (2019). *Schooling across the globe: What we have learned from 60 years of mathematics and science international assessments.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stigler, James W., Gonzales, Patrick., Kawanaka, Takako., Knoll, Steffen., & Serrano, Ana. (1999). The TIMSS videotape classroom study: Methods and findings from an exploratory research project on eighth-grade mathematics instruction in Germany, Japan, and the United States. *Education Statistics Quarterly*, *1*(2), 109–112.

Thias, Hans H., & Carnoy, Martin. (1972). *Cost-benefit analysis in education: A case study of Kenya*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

CHAPTER 3

The Dimensions and Uses of Comparative Education: Lessons Gleaned from a Five-Decade Journey

Robert F. Arnove

In his influential treatise, *The Sociological Imagination* (1959), activist scholar C. Wright Mills discusses the value of analyzing social phenomena as the interplay of biography and history. In my own case, much of my scholarly work is grounded in field experiences in Latin America related to studying the structural inequalities I observed and to my coping with the futility of inadequate conceptual frameworks for understanding and remedying failing education systems. Among the theoretical approaches I have found useful in my scholarly career is world-systems analysis. I have employed this analysis in conjunction with comparative, sociocultural, historical, and philosophical perspectives in undertaking research on education-society relations. I also have advocated for viewing research and teaching in the field of comparative education as involving three

R. F. Arnove (✉)
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA
e-mail: arnove@indiana.edu

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_3

interrelated dimensions that I call the scientific/theoretical, the pragmatic/ameliorative, and international/global understanding and peace.

World-Systems Analysis

Between 1969 and 1971, I served as a member of the Ford Foundation staff in Bogota, Colombia. My role was to assist with designing an education research and development strategy that would benefit disadvantaged populations from preschool through adulthood. In that role, I became aware of the power of the Ford Foundation, along with other major foundations, especially Rockefeller and Carnegie, to set policy agendas for reforms in important domains – education, health, urban and rural development, and civil rights. As I wrote in the introduction to my edited volume, *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism*: *The Foundations at Home and Abroad* (1982), "Through funding and promoting research in critical areas. . . [they] have been able to exercise decisive influence over the growing edge of knowledge, the problems that are examined and by whom, and the uses to which generated information is put" (p. 17).

In my 1980 article on "Comparative Education and World-Systems Analysis," I illustrated how these foundations further played the role of catalysts and brokers of ideas and programs, which better-endowed national and international agencies then assumed the responsibility for funding. In the 1970s, there was a division of labor by which Ford and Rockefeller put up "seed money" for pilot projects; multinational and national agencies like the World Bank, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) provided the funding to sustain projects; and private and quasi-public agencies like the International Consortium for Education Development (ICED) and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) undertook long-ranging planning and conducted field studies (Arnove 1980).

A prominent example of interagency cooperation was that of the eleven international research centers in tropical agriculture and livestock – centers whose research on new high-yield varieties of rice, wheat, and maize ushered in a "green revolution." Initially funded by the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, the burden of funding these centers shifted to encompass a larger number of donor agencies known as the Consultative Group of the World Bank on International Agricultural Research (Arnove 1980, p. 52).

In accord with world-systems analysis, these policy trends and the worldwide expansion of education systems in the post-World War II period could not be adequately explained by various national level characteristics. Rather, for John W. Meyer and his colleagues (1975), explanations resided in the workings of transnational social and cultural systems concerning notions of what constituted a legitimate modern nation state. International universalistic norms about the rights of individuals and the nature of societal development were integrally related to the institutionalization of education systems that were equitably available to all.

Although I was a student of John W. Meyer, a pioneering scholar of neo-institutionalism and world-culture theory, I followed a different path by advocating for a more comprehensive approach to the origins, functioning, and outcomes of education systems. A principal critique I had of neo-institutionalism was that it largely neglected power relations and the roles played by major institutions, such as the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, as well as the World Bank and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), in determining education policies and practices.

Instead, I chose the theoretical framework of "world-systems analysis" propounded by Immanuel Wallenstein (1974). This approach examined the development and underdevelopment of countries from a historical perspective that placed societies in a stratified transnational economic system – namely, global capitalism. According to their location – core, semi-periphery, or periphery – countries had different degrees of freedom and levels of resources to determine public policy as well as different forms of government and labor relations. Countries, over time, could move up or down in this hierarchy from strong states with robust sovereignty to weak dependent states.

In shifting scholarly analysis of education systems from a national to a global focus, I noted that "World-systems analysis not only expands macro analyses to take into account the actions of educational agencies in a truly international system, but it enhances our understanding of the sources of change and conflict in the micro system of school and classroom" (Arnove 1980, p. 62). Among those issues that I hoped world-systems would better explain were how "expansion and reform, in so many cases, had failed to effect structural changes in education or society, and why externally induced educational innovations may have contributed to perpetuation of existing stratification systems within and between countries" (Arnove 1980, p. 62).

In 2009, I was invited by Robert Cowen and Andreas Kazamias (who were compiling a two-volume *International Handbook of Education*), to revisit my writings on world-systems analysis (Arnove 2009). By then "world cultural theory" had become a major stream of research in the field of comparative education. In the chapter, I distinguished between the world-culture/institutionalist and the world-systems approaches as, respectively, belonging to "consensus" and "conflict" paradigms of social analysis. Each approach, I maintained, had great value for explaining the global expansion of state-sponsored education. The two approaches enabled scholars, policymakers, and practitioners to better understand emergent multidimensional, transnational trends in social and education policy. I maintained, that understanding the world is a key to changing it for the better (Arnove 2009).

The overarching theme of the 2009 essay was that the two streams of sociological analysis could be subsumed under the more comprehensive umbrella of globalization, now considered to be the dominant theme of research in the field of comparative and international education. Not surprising, globalization – the dialectic of the global and the local – has been the title of my co-edited textbook with Carlos Alberto Torres. In my introduction, I identified a process of give-and-take, an exchange in which international trends are reshaped to local ends. I maintained that "understanding this interactive process, the tensions and contradictions, is central to recasting or 'reframing' the field of comparative and international education" (Arnove 2013, p. 1).

Three Dimensions: Scientific, Pragmatic, and International Understanding and Peace

Perhaps the most important contribution of the preceding introduction was to delineate three major dimensions or vectors of the field of comparative and international education: the scientific/theoretical, the pragmatic/ameliorative, and the international/global peace. I argued that these three components are interrelated in that powerful theories and conceptual frameworks are necessary to understand better how different social systems work. In doing we should be able to contribute to better informed and, it is hoped, more just public policies benefitting historically disadvantaged populations. My writings on world-systems theory are examples of trying to combine theory with social policy advocacy. The third dimension is related to linking insights into the values a society holds, as manifest in its education system as to what programs and practices benefit the most disadvantaged populations. It is my hope that an empathic understanding of a common humanity transcending national borders will lead to a less hostile – perhaps, even, to a more peaceful – world. The challenge to achieving these noble goals will necessarily involve engaging the best conceptual, theoretical, and policy frameworks in the field of comparative and international education.

Nicaraguan Case Study

I endeavored to combine these three dimensions in my field research in Nicaragua over two decades. Between 1980, when I studied the country's national literacy campaign, and 1993, when I chronicled the dramatic regime changes occurring in the country. Among the theoretical frameworks I employed to study these changes was world-systems analysis. The value of doing so was that education policies were significantly shaped by Nicaragua's position in the world-capitalist system and by strategic political alliances – for example, the revolutionary Sandinista regimes close engagement with the Socialist bloc of countries between 1979 and 1990. I further employed historical and comparative perspectives to understand the transformations occurring in all dimensions of the society. During this period, as I explained:

> Education was used by a revolutionary regime to bring about a new social order and then by the conservative government that replaced it to restore elements of the previous status quo. Education became a battleground of opposing social forces and historical projects: one aimed at setting the country on a socialist path to development; the other at reintegrating the country into the world capitalist economy. (Arnove 1994, p. 1)

Despite these dramatic changes, education completion rates by urban and rural students and the percentage of unqualified teachers remained essentially the same. Furthermore, the impressive gains of a massive 1980 campaign, that had reduced illiteracy by more than half, had eroded significantly.

The Nicaraguan case study led me to reach some sober conclusions about the possibility of radical political change to immediately bring about a new political economy or a transformed political culture, and the formation of a new person – that is, "the socialist man [sic]" (Arnove 1994). Instead, I concluded that, an education system required an appropriate amount of autonomy from partisan politics that used it as an agency of political indoctrination. Under the best of conditions what could be reasonably expected was this:

> What schools could do best, if they are given the leeway and support to do so, is teach communicative and computational competencies, and cultivate the reasoning power, ethical commitments, and aesthetic sensibilities of individuals of all ages. Moreover, certain ideals, no matter how elusive, are worthy of pursuit. The goal of education for democracy, for critical, participatory citizenship is one such ideal. Another would be an education that teaches respects for human differences and opposing points of view. (Arnove 1994, p. 211)

Earlier, in *Education and Revolution in Nicaragua* (1986), I had gleaned several significant lessons about the aims, processes, and results of the Nicaraguan national literacy campaign. I identified several outcomes that could be considered as important as the number of individuals who could read or write several simple passages in Spanish or in one of the three indigenous languages (English, Miskito, and Sumo) of the Atlantic Coast Region. The key outcomes for societies undergoing radical transformations were the following: strengthening mass organizations concerned with providing basic social services … the integration of rural and indigenous populations into national life … improving the status of women … and engaging youth in change processes (Arnove 1986).

Literacy Campaigns in Historical and Comparative Contexts

The Nicaraguan study led me to collaborate with distinguished literacy scholar Harvey Graff (Arnove and Graff 1987) compiling an edited collection on the history of more than a dozen literacy campaigns, beginning with the Protestant Reformation and ending with twentieth century socialist campaigns. In an introductory chapter, we summarized lessons learned from employing both historical and comparative perspectives – for example, there is usually a triggering event – a reformation or revolution that leads to a large-scale mobilization to incorporate individuals into a more comprehensive moral or political community. Another lesson was this – if literacy programs are imposed on people and not related to local conditions, they have little chance of improving people's lives. Campaigns need to last long enough, often decades, to be effective. When literacy campaigns end, there is usually a large demand for formal schooling. In a follow-up article (Arnove 1990, p. 32), I reached this conclusion: "Illiteracy must be viewed in relation to political, economic, cultural, and social factors that encourage or limit the development and expression of human talent generally, and communicative competencies in particular."

Combining Ethical and Empirical Approaches

In addition to my highlighting the importance of both historical and comparative perspectives to analyzing national case studies of education and sociopolitical change, I have collaborated with Indiana University colleague Barry Bull, over the past five years, in writing on the value of combining philosophical and social science perspectives in studying and teaching about education systems. We have referred to these perspectives as the normative and the empirical. I have made the case for the contributions of the social sciences. As I have argued (Arnove and Bull 2016), social science research can provide both quantitative and qualitative data on the patterning of who gets what types of education, where and when, and with what consequences, as well as the sources of education policy. I noted that "The social sciences can provide insights into why and how different sets of individuals respond to education initiatives based on the ways they affect their individual and collective identities (for example, as teachers), the satisfactions they receive from the roles they play, and the values they hold dear" (Arnove and Bull 2016, p. 34).

What social sciences generally do not provide is a set of ethical guidelines for determining the justice of the patterns that are described. In presenting the case for philosophical perspectives, Bull (Arnove and Bull 2016) maintains that normative perspectives come into play in evaluating the fairness of who pays and benefits from the goals, governance structures, functioning, and outcomes of an education system. Among the questions to be asked are these: What values does an education system transmit through its curricula, and in whose languages with what consequences for what social groups? Are education systems passing on local values or more cosmopolitan ones that come from centers of power within and across national borders? What is the ethical justification for the differential roles that individuals being prepared for in a society and for differences in who enters and completes various levels of an education system with what outcomes related to occupation, income, social status, and influence in the political sphere?

As Bull notes, philosophy is the discipline that deals systematically with such normative issues (Arnove and Bull 2016). The tradition in moral philosophy, particularly in the West, has proposed and attempted to justify ethical systems that are both universal and comprehensive. Universal ethical systems claim that their values are legitimate for all people, in all places, and at all times. Systems that are both universal in application and comprehensive in scope claim that their values apply to all human activities. Such systems have no place for the contrary ethical judgments reached by either individuals or cultures. Philosophers and social scientists have long noted correctly that these systems do not respect individual agency or especially cultural traditions. In light of this, our essay on "Education as an Ethical Concern in the Global Era" (Arnove and Bull 2015) explores

> the philosophical resources that have been developed in the last twenty years or so that can help us reach normative judgments about global and international educational policies and practices in light of a detailed and sympathetic understanding of the circumstances in which they occur. (p. 76)

In our writings (Arnove and Bull 2016, pp. 23–24), we have made the case for "universal but not comprehensive theories of justice," as articulated in the work of such authors as Nobel Laureate Amartya Sen (1999, 2009). While there are for Sen specific *injustices* that we all can recognize as imposing universal moral obligations to prevent and correct, Sen (2009) does not believe that any particular conception of *justice* can be justified as universally valuable. Therefore, in Sen's view, the specific aims of a society beyond the avoidance of patent injustices are to be determined by the members of that society, and those aims may vary considerably from one society to another.

Sen is only one example of recent universal but non-comprehensive moral theories that take the international context seriously; the works of John Rawls (1971, 1999), Martha Nussbaum (2000), Amy Gutmann (1999), and Kwame Anthony Appiah (2006), are other examples (Arnove and Bull 2016). At any rate, we recommend that students read, come to understand, and apply various such frameworks to the empirical material that they study in comparative education courses. In addition, because these frameworks often reach different conclusions on particular cases, it is important to discuss with students the criticisms that may be made of each and whether a particular framework is especially appropriate for the normative analysis of specific cases or issues.

As a result of these considerations, case studies that are attentive to local cultures and understandings of education, and that also speak to what philosophical frameworks tell us are universally valuable features of education systems, are particularly appropriate for teaching comparative education in a way that is relevant to normative concerns.

We (Arnove and Bull 2016; Arnove et al. 2019), for instance, discuss Nicaragua and South Africa to illustrate how philosophical and social science approaches can be used to judge the fairness and effectiveness of education reforms introduced in conjunction with major changes in the political and social structures of the countries.

The selection of South Africa for case study was based on my consulting experience in the country in 1993. My research on the history of national literacy campaigns led to an invitation to address a conference of major South African and international donor agencies. Its purpose was to determine how approximately $1.5 billion in social development funds could be used for literacy and other major reforms in a post-apartheid society.

While there was interest among some donors in the possibility of the country launching a massive campaign similar to the Cuban and Nicaraguan ones I described, the greatest enthusiasm for a national mobilization was manifest at the grassroots level. During my visit, I also had the opportunity to give talks about my field research and writings to community-based literacy and adult education programs in Johannesburg, Cape Town, and Durban. The programs focused on providing adult learners with the motivational, organizational, and communication skills to address the most pressing issues facing them related to jobs, land, housing, food, water, sanitation, crime, and domestic violence.

These grassroots efforts would have been benefitted from a large-scale campaign channeling resources to them. Instead, the Nelson Mandela government ultimately decided to support the provision of highly programmed, literacy materials in short courses that issued different certificates of achievement leading to employment. This policy was a concession to the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU), the strongest political force aligned with the African National Congress (ANC) at the end of the apartheid regime.

I mention my South African experience to illustrate how my writings on the various dimensions of the field of comparative education – in this case, the scientific/theoretical and pragmatic/ameliorative – had relevance for informing policies that could benefit the most disadvantaged populations. These dimensions continue to form a core of my scholarly publications on topics related to radical political and educational change, literacy campaigns, and current neoliberal reform initiatives.

Promising Trends

My current research and publication engagement centers on updating the co-edited introductory textbook, *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local* (Arnove 2013). It involves a new co-editor, Lauren Misiaszek, that will have a second volume introducing emergent significant trends in theoretical frameworks and policy reforms, as well as largely neglected subjects, such as early childhood education and programs for immigrant and refugee children and their families, and out-of-school youth in conflict zones. Notions of "sustainability" in the international donor community will be examined, as well as pedagogical approaches with an environmental focus or promising curricular innovations, for example, using the arts to teach STEM subjects. Another fascinating topic is the impact of social media on education systems. Several chapters will illustrate the relevance of research paradigms, rooted in the Global South, that provide insights, for example, into the continuance of post-colonial, highly racialized societies.

These are promising trends. As I have advocated, there is

> not only the need for different perspectives, based on different cultural traditions, to be infused into the literature but also, ultimately, a multidirectional flow of scholarship and ideas to improve not only educational policy and practice but also our ability to generalize about education-society interactions. (Arnove 2013, p. 13)

Following this point, I further made the case for:

> the need to learn from one another, to view the strengths and limitations of different theoretical and methodological approaches to the study

> of education. . . . 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 contributes to improved policy and practice. (Arnove 2013, p. 17)

Conclusion

To summarize, I have endeavored over the course of the past five decades to bring the concepts and methodological tools of the field of comparative education to contributing to more equitable, high quality education for all, and, in turn, to more just and democratic societies. Furthermore, as I underscored in my 2001 Presidential Address to the Comparative and International Education Society: members of the comparative education community "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" (Arnove 2001, p. 503). I concluded my address, as I have done on many subsequent occasions, with the exhortation that "We should be grateful for such a challenge because there is so much we as educators can contribute" (Arnove 2001, p. 503).

References

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Arnove, Robert F. (1980). Comparative education and world-systems analysis. *Comparative Education Review*, *24*(1), 48–62. https://doi.org/10.1086/446090.

Arnove, Robert F. (Ed.). (1982). *Philanthropy and cultural imperialism: The foundations at home and abroad*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Arnove, Robert F. (1986). *Education and revolution in Nicaragua*. Westport: Praeger.

Arnove, Robert F. (1990). National literacy campaigns in historical and comparative perspectives: Issues, lessons, and legacies (pp. 17–34). *Louisiana literacy forum 1990: The proceedings of a statewide conference on literacy theory and practice*. Louisiana Endowment for the Humanities.

Arnove, Robert F. (1994). *Education as contested terrain: Nicaragua, 1979–1993*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Arnove, Robert F. (2001). Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) facing the twenty-first century: Challenges and contributions. *Comparative Education Review*, *45*(4), 477–503. https://doi.org/10.1086/447689.

Arnove, Robert F. (2009). World-systems analysis and comparative education in the age of globalization. In Robert Cowen & Andreas M. Kazamias (Eds.), *International handbook of comparative education, part one* (pp. 101–119). Dordrecht: Springer.

Arnove, Robert F. (2013). Introduction: Reframing comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local. In Robert F. Arnove, Carlos Alberto Torres, & Stephen Franz (Eds.), *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (4th ed., pp. 1–25). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Arnove, Robert., & Bull, Barry L. (2015). Education as an ethical concern in the global era. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education*, *2*(2), 76–87. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1133866.pdf.

Arnove, Robert F., & Bull, Barry L. (2016). The roles of the social sciences and philosophy in teaching comparative education. In Patricia K. Kubow & Allison H. Blosser (Eds.), *Teaching comparative education: Trends and issues informing practice* (pp. 19–40). Oxford: Symposium Books.

Arnove, Robert F., & Graff, Harvey J. (Eds.). (1987). *National literacy campaigns: Historical and comparative perspectives*. New York: Plenum Press.

Arnove, Robert., Bull, Barry., & Kubow, Patricia. (2019). Ethical and empirical dimensions of teaching comparative and international education. In Michael A. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Teacher Education* (pp. 1–6). Singapore: Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-1179-6_305-1.

Gutmann, Amy. (1999). *Democratic education* (rev. ed.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Meyer, John W., Boli-Bennett, John., & Chase-Dunn, Christopher. (1975). Convergence and divergence in development. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *1*(1), 223–246. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.01.080175.001255.

Nussbaum, Martha C. (2000). *Women and human development: The capabilities approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511841286.

Rawls, John. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rawls, John. (1999). *The law of peoples*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sen, Amartya. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York: Anchor Books.

Sen, Amartya. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel M. (1974). *The modern world-system*. New York: Academic Press.

Wright Mills, C. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

CHAPTER 4

Economics, Development, and Comparative and International Education

Steven J. Klees

I am going to take advantage of this "elders speak" book for this elder to speak of what I see as the "big picture," implied by what I have been writing about for the past four decades. My work has centered on the role of economics in education and development, critiquing dominant perspectives. Below I try to capture what is wrong with these dominant views and what are the alternatives to it. In addition to looking at economics and development, I also examine approaches to impact assessment which have been a crucial part of both fields as they try to find evidence that supports their policy recommendations. In conclusion, I consider implications for comparative and international education.

S. J. Klees (✉)
University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA
e-mail: sklees@umd.edu

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_4

Economics

What's Wrong?

Adherents to the prevailing neoclassical economics paradigm can be split into two broad camps: liberals who dominated in the United States (and other countries) in the 1960s and 1970s (and earlier) and who believe that economic efficiency and equity demand strong government intervention in the economy; and conservatives/neoliberals who have dominated from the 1980s to the present who argue that reliance on the market will yield greater efficiency (and perhaps equity) without much government interference. While I have major criticisms of the market fundamentalism of the latter (to be discussed), the views of both camps are completely dependent on the very problematic idea of economic "efficiency" that is almost impossible to understand for non-economists. Efficiency to a neoclassical economist is a property of a whole economic system that operates according to the few, but totally unrealistic, assumptions of what they call "perfect competition." However, economists own "second best" theory says that if even one assumption is slightly violated, the system is inefficient, and we have no idea how close we are to efficiency (Rakowski 1980)! In the real world, none of the assumptions are even close to being true, and so I find this idea of efficiency bankrupt (Klees 2008, 2016a). Of course, we may use the word "efficient" to talk about how one way of reducing school dropouts may be more effective or cost-effective than another (although uncovering this may be difficult, as I discuss below), but it is utterly meaningless to make common statements like primary education investments are more efficient than investments in higher education. Without economic system efficiency as a touchstone, to me, neoclassical economics becomes rather useless.

Neoclassical economics is such a fragile house of cards that, as Mark Blaug (1975, p. 429) said many years ago, economists: "fight tooth and nail when faced with an empirical refutation…[that challenges]…perfect competition…for what is threatened is…the entire concept of 'efficiency.'" In the 1980s, I had a series of debates with George Psacharopoulos, an economist at the World Bank, and still remember his remark when I asked him about some of the critiques offered by the very well-known liberal neoclassical economist, Lester Thurow: "at the World Bank, we call him 'Less Thorough.'" Michael Piore (1983, p. 249), another defector around that time, wrote of the "fury, disdain, resentment, sarcasm, and condescension" with which his ideas on labor markets were greeted by neoclassical colleagues. Such derision, especially of anyone who questions neoliberal orthodoxy, continues (Cohen 2007).

For me, the essential problem with neoclassical economics is captured in a story that progressive political economist Martin Carnoy tells. Milton Friedman was a professor of Martin's at the University of Chicago. When Friedman came to Stanford University twenty years later, Martin made an appointment to see him, with no real agenda. Friedman, knowing of Martin's radical proclivities, started talking to him about the "seven sisters" oil companies. While this oligopoly is a clear violation of economists' notions of a competitive marketplace, Friedman proceeded to offer a detailed argument why they really mirrored a perfectly competitive market. Martin left there astonished, partly because of the topic Friedman chose and partly because of Friedman's analysis. In the end, Martin says that he realized that his only chance of refuting Friedman's argument was if he had stopped him at the very beginning and questioned his starting assumptions. That's the fundamental problem with neoclassical economics. If you don't challenge their initial assumptions, neoclassical economists are off to the races, spinning yarns about the fictitious idea of the overall economic efficiency for society as a whole. I think that this is how neoclassical economics turns out so many economists uncritical of the framework. They begin the first few weeks of their doctoral coursework making a set of totally unrealistic assumptions and then spend the next four or five years assuming them to construct an amazing set of false implications and conclusions. By the time they get their Ph.D., the assumptions are unquestioned.

Few neoclassical economists are open to critiques or alternatives. One well-respected neoclassical economist who has been open was Mark Blaug. In 1976, in a famous review article, he concluded: "Human capital theory has no genuine rival of equal breadth and rigor" (Blaug 1976, p. 852). However, after reading and considering screening and political economy arguments, by 1985, Blaug was disillusioned and wrote "Where are we now in the Economics of Education?" In it, he argued that the "vital parts" of the field lie outside human capital theory (p. 130) and that there is a need for a new economics of education that uses the views of its critics to challenge the old "Neanderthal" version (p. 140). In subsequent years, I asked several prominent neoclassical economists what they thought of this article (published in a top journal). All knew of it, none had read it, and all indicated a resistance to doing so, knowing it departed from the neoclassical orthodoxy. With the neoliberal turn since the 1980s, if anything, the field has gotten even more insular and more resistant to criticism.

What's the Alternative?

Despite its dominance, there are many alternatives to neoclassical economics, which is sometimes called orthodox economics. Critics of neoclassical economics talk of heterodox economics which is an umbrella term that can include Marxian, Austrian, Sraffian, post-Keynesian, feminist, socialist, ecological, evolutionary, institutional, and anarchist schools of thought (Harvey and Garnett 2008). Perhaps the most well-developed alternative is the intersection of some of these schools of thought that goes by the name of radical, progressive, or just simply "political economy."[1]

While political economy perspectives used to focus on class and capitalism, they are now an intersection of contributions from "various neo-Marxist, feminist, postmodern, poststructural, postcolonial, queer, disability, environmental, and other communities" (Apple 2006, p. 54). While these theories do not offer identical perspectives, there is often a common focus on marginalization. They see the world as composed of systems and structures that reproduce and legitimate existing inequalities. While reproduction is pervasive, there is agreement that there are spaces for progressive actions through exercising individual and collective human agency. In education, there is a lot of work that critiques human capital theory and offers an alternative view (e.g., Apple 2006, 2013; Carnoy and Levin 1985; Klees 2016a; Robertson and Dale 2015).

From a political economy perspective, the most promising source for progressive change is through social movements – such as the women's movement, the civil rights movement, alter-globalization movement, landless movement, Dalit movement, the human rights movement, the children's rights movement, and others – which bring the power of collective action to confronting the unfairness and irrationality of pervasive marginalization. In terms of education, in Brazil, for example, where I have worked extensively, the Citizen School movement has built a sizeable democratic, participatory, Freirean-based education system (Fischman and

[1] The term political economy has a long history, and today is sometimes claimed by the right and the left. I use it in the latter sense.

Gandin 2007). In Brazil, there are also the landless movement schools, founded by some of the poorest people in all the world, often living off agricultural labor, now forming an organized and politically influential social movement, with a large system of very participatory, democratic, Freirean-based schools (Tarlau 2019). These schools teach – and exemplify by their very structure – the role of education in preparing people for a much more participatory and democratic economy and society. So do many examples of alternative critical pedagogy practices from the United States and other countries (McLaren and Kincheloe 2007; Picower 2012).

Impact Assessment

What's Wrong?

All fields concerned with policy and practice are concerned with the impact of interventions and conditions on outcomes of interest, perhaps none more so than neoclassical economics. In most fields, this is the subject of research methodology, while in economics, they even give it a special name: econometrics. In education, economists have devoted a lot of effort to looking at the impact of inputs on outcomes like learning and on the impact of the quantity and quality of education on income, gross domestic product (GDP), and other measures of individual and societal outcomes. While such efforts are understandable, unfortunately, they are fundamentally flawed.

Some form of regression analysis is the statistical procedure most used to find the impact of an independent variable on a dependent variable of interest. There are three conditions that are needed to trust the results: all independent variables affecting the dependent variable are included in the model; all variables are measured correctly; and the functional interrelationship of the variables is correctly specified. These stringent conditions can *never* be met for any real-world process: we never know all the independent variables, and there are too many to include in the regression model; variable measurement is usually ad hoc, and we don't know how to choose between alternative measures; and we have little idea of the functional form, mostly using an obviously incorrect linear formulation. Unfortunately, when these assumptions are not met, the resulting regression coefficients are not indicators of impact but are biased in an unknown direction to an unknown extent.[2] In practice, this yields literatures in which there is never any agreement; researchers can almost always find their favored variable significant whereas those with different views do not (Edwards 2018; Klees 2016b; Leamer 1983).

For example, there is a vast literature on the impact of education inputs on cognitive achievement. Eric Hanushek, a noted neoclassical economist, has spent much of his professional career assessing this literature. For decades, his conclusion was that this literature had no consistent findings. The implications of that for him were that we shouldn't "throw money at schools" because what we spend it on doesn't seem to "work" (Hanushek 1986). To the contrary, my conclusion is that lots of things we spend money on "work" to improve educational outcomes, including cognitive achievement; it is just that the statistical methods we have are unable to sort out causal relationships in what are very complex processes.

Some researchers, sometimes even sympathetic to my view above, argue that for impact assessment, we need to rely much more heavily on randomized controlled trials (RCTs), that is, field experiments. RCTs don't have to try to model the complexity of real-world processes since they can just vary one factor and see if it makes a difference in relevant outcomes. However, RCTs have their own problems. Even if one trusted the results, their generalizability is suspect since whatever recommendations they come up with will be implemented in uncontrolled real-world environments. Moreover, controls in the field are notoriously problematic, and many factors may vary between control and experimental samples besides the treatment. To deal with that, researchers resort to statistical controls, but this brings us back to the problems of model specification in regression analysis.[3] Finally, in practice, as with regression analyses, where multiple RCTs are done, there is often disagreement about the results of any given treatment (e.g., conditional cash transfers) (Deaton and Cartwright 2016; Edwards 2018). Thus, while policy

[2] The failure of the theory behind regression analysis has always reminded me of the failure of neoclassical economic theory of perfect competition. If the assumptions of neoclassical economics hold, then prices are accurate indicators of economic value. However, under real-world conditions, prices are not even approximations; they utterly lose their social meaning, as do regression coefficients.

[3] I think that a fundamental problem is that for complex processes there are often more potentially relevant variables than the number of people in our samples, making these processes impossible to model and estimate.

decisions require judgments about the impact of proposed policies or programs, our empirical ability to discern those impacts is very limited.

For example, in a recent study, my colleagues and I critique the massive effort the World Bank has been engaged in to determine "what works" in education (Klees et al. 2020). The Bank purports to have analyzed over 16,000 practices to identify universal, global "best practices" through their Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER). SABER relies heavily on impact assessment methods, but it is fundamentally flawed because of the problems discussed above. We offer many examples of how, while the impact literature is contested, the Bank cherry-picks results that conform with their ideological biases (also see Klees et al. 2012). Moreover, the whole idea of universal solutions to problems ignores context.

What's the Alternative?

It is tempting to argue that the response to this problem of trying to assess universal impact is to assess impact in a specific context. However, the quantitative causal impact assessment methods above are still fundamentally flawed even when focused on local solutions, and multiple studies in the same locale would likely yield conflicting results. The problem is not quantification *per se*. While quantifying factors always is an approximation, often a very simplified proxy for complicated concepts (e.g., socioeconomic status/SES, literacy, etc.), such simplification can be useful, and we can definitely learn things from looking at quantified variables. The essential problem with these impact assessment methods is that it is not possible to mechanically and mathematically strip the very complex causal relations away to discover the effect of one variable on another.

Quantitative data can be very useful to look at associations. Cross tabulations can drill down to allow us to consider how variables are related as long as we recognize that correlation is not causation. Yes, it is necessary to make some assumptions about causation to inform policy choices, but that requires human judgment and debate, not a reliance on significant regression coefficients (or even RCTs). For example, correlations can tell us that women earn 75% of what men do and, drilling down, that for those with a college education that goes up to 85% and, drilling down further, how that may vary by race. But why these associations exist and what can be done about them must come from participatory debate not from mathematical models, and debate that draws on the richness of more qualitative approaches to research (Klees 2016b). Educational researchers and other social scientists can contribute to these debates but cannot resolve them by exhortations to the kind of "evidence" usually put forth.

Development

What's Wrong?

For neoclassical economists, very often development is narrowly conceived as synonymous with growth in GDP, and therefore the search for development policies focuses on what has an impact on GDP.[4] Relatively recently, improved education has been touted as a miracle cure for development. Almost single-handedly, Hanushek (along with a few colleagues) has been responsible for this conclusion, based on some regression analysis studies he did on the impact of education quality (as measured by Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) scores) on GDP. Hanushek and Woessmann (2008, 2015) found that an increase in education quality directly impacted GDP and argued that, if a country improves its education over the next 20, 30, or 50 years, its GDP could grow by several orders of magnitude. While I believe that education can and does contribute to development, I also believe that Hanushek and Woessmann's empirical results are nonsense. Hanushek ran a few poorly specified regressions when the empirical literature on what determines GDP is voluminous, and, as with other impact studies, comes to no clear conclusions on model specification, with different specifications yielding different results. Then, to project his very contestable short-term findings decades into the future is simply impudence (Hanushek and Woessmann 2015; Klees 2016b).

Perhaps the dominant view of development is that, although much remains to be done, we have been making progress. It is argued that we made progress toward meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and continue to do so toward meeting their successor, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In education, it is common to point out that we have made progress toward achieving Education for All (EFA) goals. However, to me and many others, this "glass half-full"

[4] Development is a very problematic term, but I use it for lack of an acceptable alternative (see Esteva et al. 2013, for a discussion).

story is Pollyanna wishful thinking. In my university classes, I sometimes share an old newspaper article entitled "Productive Wealth is Sweeping the World," in which an economist argues that living standards around the world are rising even though it may take 100 years for the developing world to "catch up" (Singer 1988). Think of the continuing misery, death, and destruction that this would entail. To me, none of the 2000 MDGs were achieved by 2015; while some argue extreme poverty was cut in half, that is only because of a very inadequate definition of what is extreme poverty was used. The 2015 SDGs, while admirably expanding what is covered, simply kicked the can down the road to 2030, and, as it is widely recognized, we already know they are unlikely to be achieved. In education, the 1990 EFA goals were not achieved by 2000; they were then postponed to 2015 and now, once again, have been postponed to 2030. The international community has been promising a most basic goal, universal primary education, since the 1960s and estimates are that present trends make this unlikely until 2070 or later, even before the pandemic (Klees 2017).

To me, this isn't a story of progress but of a continuing disaster. As dependency and world-system theorists have argued, this is not a world heading toward some "modern" future but one in which successes in one part depend on failures elsewhere (Wallerstein 1984). A principal culprit is capitalism, especially neoliberal capitalism (Klees 2020a). The more liberal capitalism of the 1960s and 1970s at least talked a good game, recognizing that poverty and inequality needed concerted national and global action. The neoliberal sea change of the 1980s, through to the present day, emphasized market solutions and the inefficiency and inadequacy of government action. Neoliberalism brought us the so-called Washington Consensus and its implementation in structural adjustment programs (SAPs) that emphasized privatization, deregulation, cutting government, and liberalizing trade. When the deleterious consequences for those marginalized by SAPs became obvious, the search was on for a post-Washington Consensus that has argued for better safety nets and greater participation by civil society and others in policy formulation. But little changed in practice as has been evident in the World Bank and International Monetary Fund's response of a Poverty Reduction Strategy Process (PRSP) whose results, in practice, look very much like the SAPs.

Today, instead of the extensive national and global government efforts that are needed, the dominant belief is that private investment, business know-how, and new approaches to philanthropy will be the key to achieving the SDGs. The criticism and dismissal of government efforts, the idea that we need to disrupt present approaches, focus on atomistic market solutions, and recognize that business leaders can be instrumental in solving our social problems is simply neoliberal ideology talking. Anand Giridharadas' (2018) book, *Winners Take All: The Elite Charade of Changing the World*, should be required reading for all edu-preneurs:

> Elite networking forums like the Aspen Institute and the Clinton Global Initiative groom the rich to be self-appointed leaders of social change, taking on the problems people like them have been instrumental in creating or sustaining….The question we confront is whether moneyed elites, who already rule the roost in the economy and exert enormous influence in the corridors of political power, should be allowed to continue their conquest of social change and of the pursuit of greater equality. The only thing better than controlling money and power is to control the efforts to question the distribution of money and power. The only thing better than being a fox is being a fox asked to watch over the hens. (pp. 6–10)

Giridharadas exposes the paucity of "win-win-ism," the belief that these elites can solve all our social problems by doing good through doing well:

> By refusing to risk its way of life, by rejecting the idea that the powerful might have to sacrifice for the common good, it clings to a set of social arrangements that allow it to monopolize progress and then give symbolic scraps to the forsaken - many of whom wouldn't need the scraps if the society were working right. (2018, p. 7)

So-called "impact investment" will only yield small, uncoordinated, self-interested efforts distorted toward easily measurable objectives; while it may help some people, it will be no help in confronting our major social problems. The four decades of fervor with the privatization of education and other public services is not supported by evidence but by greed and ideology. And it can be scary. The World Economic Forum, the annual gathering for global elites, has proposed a Global Redesign Initiative to essentially turn the United Nations into a gigantic public-private partnership with substantial corporate governance – and this is being implemented (Gleckman 2019; World Economic Forum 2010). And, at bottom, an unregulated capitalist market economy, is evil. Consider that we pay pennies a day for sugar which requires back-breaking, health-destroying labor that pays $2 a day when others make millions in a world where this is seen as natural. Someday, I hope people will look back in astonishment and disgust at how such a world could be considered moral or civilized (Klees 2020b).

What's the Alternative?

We live in a world that could provide a decent standard of living for everyone, but we have an economic system that offers no way of doing that. Margaret Thatcher uttered the famous TINA: There is No Alternative. To the contrary, as Bollier (2015) says, the relevant acronym should be TAPAS: There are Plenty of Alternatives! There are lots of small-scale alternatives around the globe: cooperatives, worker-owned firms, alternative monetary systems, participatory budgeting, solidarity economies, and much more (Hahnel and Wright 2016). And there are many countries that, although capitalist, offer a social capitalism that is much fairer than the neoliberal capitalism that dominates. But to me, any form of capitalism is likely to exacerbate, not ameliorate, our global social problems. Despite creating wealth for some, capitalism is the most inefficient system in history leaving billions of people at its margins, destroying our planet, and feeding a war machine.

While there are no blueprints for alternatives,[5] a lot of people are thinking about and working on larger scale alternatives. As examples, look at the work of Michael Albert and Robin Hahnel on participatory economics – google Parecon. Or the organization started by Gar Alperovitz and Gus Speth – google the amazing Next System Project. Or the new initiative started by Yanis Varoufakis and Jane (wife of Bernie) Sanders to bring all of us together – google Progressive International. Or google the work of Gustavo Esteva – on what he and others are calling Crianza Mutua (Mutual Upbringing) in which representatives of the Zapatista community have been meeting with other alternative communities to flesh out principles and approaches to living very differently on this planet in what some call a radical pluralism. Finally, google the wonderful Global Tapestry of Alternatives which has taken this approach worldwide.

Most of my students were born into a world dominated by neoliberal capitalism and have never even seen the more liberal era of the 1960s and 1970s (at least in some countries). But I tell them that history is

[5] Nor should there be blueprints. Alternatives must be constructed on the ground in context. But there can be visions.

long and structures change. Capitalism is a recent development in human history. I like the quote from Ursula LeGuin: “We live in capitalism. Its power seems inescapable. So did the divine right of kings.”[6] It is hubris to think that we are at the end of history, that we have found the one-best system. And the multiple crises and fundamental problems that come with capitalism may move us toward alternatives sooner than we think![7]

Although I don’t know what a twenty-first century socialism will look like, I see at least three transformations that are necessary (for elaboration, see Klees 2020b). We need to transform work so that workplaces are more democratic and so that everyone has a decent, sustainable livelihood. We need to transform politics to reduce the role of money in it and make it more participatory at every level from the local to the global. And we need to transform ourselves to move beyond self-interest in ways that bring to the fore and challenge the planetary precariousness of our current situation. All three, especially the latter, require transforming education. While there are many problems with life on Earth, I often reflect on three big ones: massive environmental destruction; widespread poverty and inequality; and ongoing war and violence, most especially, the threat of nuclear war. We need a green education to combat environmental destruction, a critical pedagogy to challenge poverty and inequality, and a peace education to respond to violence and war – perhaps an integrated critical peace eco-pedagogy!

Implications for Comparative and International Education

I wish to conclude this analysis by mentioning a few of the implications for our field and our work. Comparative and international education, as a field, and the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES), as a central organization, are a crossroads where many perspectives meet. That is why it has been difficult at CIES to get the organization to take what many see as political positions on the issues of the day. Nonetheless, I have learned that political positions are implicit or explicit in all our work, and that, at the end of the day, we are always taking sides

[6] https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/3238058-we-live-in-capitalism-its-power-seems-inescapable-so-did.

[7] Naomi Klein (2014) called climate change a civilizational wake-up call. Perhaps COVID-19 will be one as well.

whether we recognize it or not. At the very minimum, much more of our work should be subject to explicit debates. But to me, for the human race to thrive, and perhaps even to survive, we need a lot more people taking the kind of critical progressive alternative visions I outlined above. I see hopeful signs. Below, for example, are the themes of recent CIES meetings:

2015: Ubuntu! Imagining a Humanist Education Globally
2017: Problematizing (In)Equality: The Promise of Comparative and International Education
2018: Re-Mapping Global Education: South-North Dialogue
2019: Education for Sustainability
2020: Education Beyond the Human

All indicate an explicit concern with critical progressive concerns. For the 2020 CIES meeting, I was one of 10 organizers who got together to make these concerns more explicit and put out a call for papers on the theme: "21st Century Socialism and Education: Global Alternatives to Patriarchy, Racial Capitalism, and Climate Change." We got a very strong response and wound up putting together 20 panels on this theme for the conference (unfortunately the in-person conference was canceled because of the coronavirus). We need to bring these alternative visions to the fore at future conferences. We need our journal editors to publish such views. We need to make sure our students are exposed to such views. We live in an academic world that pretends at neutrality and that argues that attention to "evidence" will enable us to choose best policies. Yet we also live in a real world where evidence is always contested and is always embedded in politics. In today's world, many more of us need to become engaged in this collective struggle to transform our very dysfunctional reality.

References

Apple, Michael W. (2006). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Apple, Michael W. (2013). *Can education change society?* New York: Routledge.

Blaug, Mark. (1975). Kuhn versus Lakatos, or paradigms versus research programmes in the history of economics. *History of Political Economy*, *7*(4), 399–433. https://doi.org/10.1215/00182702-7-4-399.

Blaug, Mark. (1976). The empirical status of human capital theory: A slightly jaundiced survey. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *14*(3), 827–855.
Blaug, Mark. (1985). Where are we now in the economics of education? *Economics of Education Review*, *4*(1), 17–28.
Bollier, David. (2015). Foreword to the new edition. In Derek Wall, *Economics after capitalism: A guide to the ruins and a road to the future* (pp. x–xiv). London: Pluto Press.
Carnoy, Martin., & Levin, Henry M. (1985). *Schooling and work in the democratic state*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Cohen, Patricia. (2007, July 11). In economics departments, a growing will to debate fundamental assumptions. *New York Times*.
Deaton, Angus., & Cartwright, Nancy. (2016, November 9). *The limitations of randomised controlled trials*. VoxEU CEPR. http://voxeu.org/article/limitations-randomised-controlled-trials. Accessed 11 August 2020.
Edwards Jr., D. Brent. (2018). *Global education policy, impact evaluations, and alternatives: The political economy of knowledge production*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
Esteva, Gustavo., Babones, Salvatore., & Babcicky, Philipp. (2013). *The future of development: A radical manifesto*. Bristol: Policy Press.
Fischman, Gustavo E., & Gandin, Luis A. (2007). Escola cidadã and critical discourses of educational hope. In Peter McLaren and Joe L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 209–222) New York: Peter Lang.
Giridharadas, Anand. (2018). *Winners take all: The elite charade of changing the world*. New York: Knopf.
Gleckman, Harris. (2019, July 2). *How the United Nations is quietly being turned into a public-private partnership*. Open Democracy. https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/oureconomy/how-united-nations-quietly-being-turned-public-private-partnership/. Accessed 11 August 2020.
Hahnel, Robin., & Wright, Erik Olin. (2016). *Alternatives to capitalism: Proposals for a democratic economy*. London: Verso.
Hanushek, Eric A. (1986). The economics of schooling: Production and efficiency in public schools. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *24*(3), 1141–1177. http://hanushek.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Hanushek%201986%20JEL%2024%283%29.pdf. Accessed 9 August 2020.
Hanushek, Eric A., & Woessmann, Ludger. (2008). The role of cognitive skills in economic development. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *46*(3), 607–668. http://hanushek.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Hanushek%2BWoessmann%202008%20JEL%2046%283%29.pdf. Accessed 9 August 2020.

Hanushek, Eric A., & Woessmann, Ludger. (2015). *Universal basic skills: What countries stand to gain*. Paris: OECD. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264234833-en.

Harvey, John T., & Garnett, Robert F. (Eds.). (2008). *Future Directions for Heterodox Economics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Klees, Steven J. (2008). Reflections on theory, method, and practice in comparative and international education. *Comparative Education Review*, *52*(3), 301–328. https://doi.org/10.1086/589978.

Klees, Steven J. (2016a). Human capital and rates of return: Brilliant ideas or ideological dead ends? *Comparative Education Review*, *60*(4), 644–672. https://doi.org/10.1086/688063.

Klees, Steven J. (2016b). Inferences from regression analysis: Are they valid? *Real-World Economics Review*, (74), 85–97. http://www.paecon.net/PAEReview/issue74/Klees74.pdf.

Klees, Steven J. (2017). Will we achieve education for all and the education sustainable development goal? *Comparative Education Review*, *61*(2), 425–440. https://doi.org/10.1086/691193.

Klees, Steven J. (2020a). Beyond neoliberalism: Reflections on capitalism and education. *Policy Futures in Education*, *18*(1), 9–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210317715814.

Klees, Steven. (2020b). *The conscience of a progressive*. Alresford: Zero Books.

Klees, Steven J., Ginsburg, Mark., Anwar, Hiba., Baker Robbins, Melanie., Bloom, Heidi., Busacca, Cameron., Corwith, Anne., DeCoster, Brendan., Fiore, Amanda., Gasior, Stephanie., Le, Hang M., Primo, L. Heidi., & Reedy, Timothy D. (2020). The World Bank's SABER: A critical analysis. *Comparative Education Review*, *64*(1), 46–65. https://doi.org/10.1086/706757.

Klees, Steven J., Samoff, Joel., & Stromquist, Nelly P. (Eds.). (2012). *The World Bank and education: Critiques and alternatives*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Klein, Naomi. (2014). *This changes everything: Capitalism vs. the climate*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.

Leamer, Edward E. (1983). Let's take the con out of econometrics. *The American Economic Review, 73*(1), 31–43.

McLaren, Peter., & Kincheloe, Joe L. (Eds.) (2007). *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* New York: Peter Lang.

Picower, Bree. (2012). *Practice what you teach: Social justice education in the classroom and the streets*. New York: Routledge.

Piore, Michael J. (1983). Labor market segmentation: To what paradigm does it belong? *The American Economic Review*, *73*(2), 249–253.

Rakowski, James. (1980). The theory of the second best and the competitive equilibrium model. *Journal of Economic Issues*, *14*(1), 197–207.

Robertson, Susan L., & Dale, Roger. (2015). Towards a 'critical cultural political economy' account of the globalising of education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *13*(1), 149–170. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2014.967502.

Singer, Max. (1988, February 3). Productive wealth is sweeping the world. *Los Angeles Times*.

Tarlau, Rebecca. (2019). *Occupying schools, occupying land: How the landless workers movement transformed Brazilian education*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. (1984). *The capitalist world-economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

World Economic Forum. (2010, June 15). *Everybody's business: Strengthening international cooperation in a more interdependent world*. *Report of the Global Redesign Initiative*. http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GRI_EverybodysBusiness_Report_2010.pdf. Accessed 24 March 2020.

CHAPTER 5

Comparative Education and the Dialogue Among Civilizations

Ruth Hayhoe

This chapter reflects on Comparative Education and Comparative Higher Education in relation to the emergence of the Dialogue of Civilizations after the end of the Cold War. It challenges the domination of Western-derived theories, whether those of modernization or Marxism, and reflects on the enrichment that can be found through an embrace of dialogue with other world civilizations. It suggests a value explicit approach to comparative education research, drawing on the vision of scholars who founded the World Order Models Project in the 1970s, most of whom had their roots in Asian and African civilizations. This approach anticipated a recognition of the continuing importance of religion in the emergence of a dialogue of civilizations after the end of the Cold War.

I will begin by sharing insights from 35 years of research using theoretical frames and tools from comparative education to create a bridge and explore differences between Confucian heritage societies in East Asia and the Western world. My initiation into the field came first in Hong

R. Hayhoe (✉)
O.I.S.E., University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada
e-mail: hayhoe@me.com

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_5

Kong, where I pursued a certificate of education at the University of Hong Kong, and then at the University of London Institute of Education, where I took MA and Ph.D. degrees in Comparative Education under the guidance of scholars such as Brian Holmes and Robert Cowen. Comparative Education was viewed as an interdisciplinary field that had its roots in the work of Marc-Antoine Jullien of Paris in the early nineteenth century and his idea of a science of education parallel to August Comte's science of society (Fraser 1964), also in the work of Michael Sadler who had insisted on the understanding of context in educational learning across different societies with his famous metaphor of the garden and processes of transplantation (Grier 1952).

One of the main concerns was relating education to social change in different contexts, and the two most widely used theoretical frames were those of modernization (Parsonian functionalism), or neo-Marxism, whether dependency or world-system variations. While these provided valuable though opposite frames for comparative analysis across different societies, both assumed a process of secularization as the inevitable direction of modernization or socialist construction. There was little intellectual anticipation of the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the end of the Cold War or the impact this would have on the field. Having already spent 15 years in Hong Kong, Shanghai, and Beijing by this time, I was frustrated by the Western-centric derivation of both versions of social change, and the sense that the West had little interest in learning from Eastern civilizations. This was evident in aid programs that tended to involve "helping" the educational development of countries in Asia or Africa, without any intention of learning from their rich cultural resources.

Returning to Canada from Beijing, where I had headed educational and cultural programs in the Canadian embassy from 1989 to 1991, I saw the beginning of a new interest in the East and organized a conference on "Knowledge Across Cultures" in 1992. We invited scholars from Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, as well as Europe and North America. The purpose was to explore the contributions made by these civilizations to the European enlightenment and consider what Western universities could learn from them. Two years later, in 1994, we held a follow-up conference in China's Yuelu Academy, founded in 970 CE, where we focused on alternative institutions of higher education to the Western university, with scholars such as Ali Mazrui, Ashis Nandy, and Syed Alatas making presentations (Hayhoe and Pan 1996).

Between these two events, Samuel Huntington's article on the "Clash of Civilizations" came out and soon became one of the most widely read and translated articles of the decade (Huntington 1993). It warned that future conflict would arise from profound differences in religion and civilization, rather than the more superficial ideological conflicts between capitalism and socialism that had shaped the Cold War. While our efforts focused on dialogue and learning from other civilizations, Huntington anticipated the need for the West to prepare for a potential explosion of deep-rooted conflict. Ironically, the year 2001 was declared by the United Nations as the year of "Dialogue among Civilizations," yet turned out also to be the year of the 9/11 terrorist attack in New York. On September 10th of that same year, I had submitted an updated version of the volume from our 1992 conference entitled "Knowledge Across Cultures: A Contribution to Dialogue among Civilizations" to the University of Hong Kong's Comparative Education Research Centre with numerous chapters by scholars from the Islamic world (Hayhoe and Pan 2001). This book was an important resource as we focused on pursuing pathways of dialogue at a time when many were absorbed with the shock of this clash. It had now become clear that religion remained important to communities as well as individuals and needed to be given attention in comparative education research. The revival of the World Parliament of Religions in Chicago in 1993, a century after its founding in 1893, had made the point that world peace would be impossible without peace among the religions. Its six subsequent meetings in Cape Town (1999), Barcelona (2004), Melbourne (2009), Salt Lake City (2015), and Toronto (2018) made possible a sustained and deepening dialogue among world religions that has had significant educational implications.

Lenses for Viewing Comparative Education

In the last few years, there has been considerable critique of the dominance of Western-centric theories and frames of reference in comparative education (Park 2017; Takayama et al. 2016) and of the notion that comparative education as a university discipline or field should trace its founding to Jullien of Paris and his 1816 plan for comparative education. This places it firmly in relation to the emergence of nation states in Europe, with post-Revolution France being seen as a leading example, and theories of Western modernity shaping patterns of imperialism and colonialism around the world. Both functionalist and neo-Marxist theories of social change are firmly rooted in this historical period with Europe and North America at its center. Recent critiques of leading comparative scholars, such as Isaac Kandel at Teachers College Columbia, have shed new light on their complicity in American imperialist adventures (Takayama 2018). The University of London's Institute of Education had departments not only of Comparative Education but also Education in Developing Countries, with scholars who were involved in Britain's colonial and neocolonial projects. So, a critical rethinking of the history of the field in these major Western centers is already underway.

On the other side, the emergence of the World Order Models Project (WOMP) led by scholars affiliated with the nonaligned movement of the 1970s extended the Marxist critique beyond the history of capitalism to the Soviet empire with Galtung's "structural theory of imperialism" (Galtung 1971). This provided a frame that was particularly helpful in reflecting on China's experience. The imposition of Soviet patterns there in the 1950s proved even more bruising than those of European powers earlier in the century and resulted in an unprecedented eruption of violence in the Cultural Revolution. I have therefore always felt regret that WOMP theories never found their way into the mainstream of comparative education, since they are not West-centric and were pioneered by scholars such as Ali Mazrui, Rajni Kothari, Ashis Nandy, Samuel Kim, and other leading social theorists from Asia and Africa (Hayhoe 1986a; Kim 1984; Mazrui 1975). Their journal *Alternatives* was established in 1975 and edited out of the Centre for Developing Societies at the University of Delhi in India for several decades (Kothari 1975). Nandy once told me that in principle he never participated in a conference labeled by such Western social science disciplines as sociology, economics, or political science, as they had been shaped by Eurocentric views when they emerged in the nineteenth century (Nandy 1996; Wallerstein 1984).

WOMP scholars pioneered a more holistic and value explicit approach to social theory, distinct from either the value neutrality of functionalist modernization or the Marxist tendency to the economic determinism of values. They believed scholars had the responsibility of establishing a set of agreed upon human values for a preferred future or relevant utopia and then analyzing social change processes on the basis of how far education or other social reform endeavors moved toward these preferred values. The values of equity, autonomy, solidarity, and participation were agreed upon at an early period. I found this framework extremely helpful for collaborative research with Chinese scholars on China's experience of development projects with a range of Western countries and Japan after Deng Xiaoping's opening up in 1978. This took us beyond what are often seen as value neutral measures of efficiency and effectiveness emerging from functionalist theories of modernization to a value explicit exploration of the degree of mutuality of learning and development in the pursuit of these shared human goals (Hayhoe 1986b).

While there are reasons for tracing the history of comparative education as a university discipline to France in the early nineteenth century, I believe it should rather be seen as part of the history of world civilizations and their interactions over a lengthy time period. The writing of Lê Thành Khôi, a Vietnamese scholar at the Sorbonne in Paris, took this approach in his influential 1986 article, "Toward a General Theory of Education." He felt the development of a general theory of education should be carried out on the basis of a comparative study of education and society across all of the world's civilizations over human history, with a focus given to peoples, ethnic groups and languages, the natural environment, modes of production, ideas and values, and international relations (Lê 1986). Unfortunately, very little of his work has been translated from French into English, and his approach has not had much influence on the mainstream of comparative education in the Anglophone world. However, it clearly foregrounded the emergence of the clash and dialogue of civilizations in 1991, and the new space for reflection on the contributions of non-European civilizations, as well as a recognition of the continuing importance of religion in the modern world. The dominant twentieth century theories of modernization and neo-Marxism that had anticipated an inexorable process of secularization in social and educational change were challenged by these discourses around the dialogue of civilizations. It became clear that what does not change – or changes very slowly – are deep-rooted belief systems such as Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism, to mention only a few. Taking religion into account thus remains crucially important for understanding education's role in our present and future society.

Even though Max Weber's sociological thought has been criticized in relation to the imposition of Eurocentric theories on the field, it seems to me that Weber's development of ideal types as a sociological tool for comparative analysis of the values of major religions, and also of such core concepts as that of the nation state, are extremely useful for comparative analysis within a civilizational approach (Weber 1949). Although Weber's conviction that the Confucian ethic was antithetical to modern development (Weber 1951) was clearly disproven later by Harvard sociologist Ezra Vogel (1991), Weber's interest in the persisting and differential influence of various religions in social and educational development remains inspirational.

Weber's ideal types were emphasized by Brian Holmes, **a** leading comparativist at the University of London Institute of Education, for their usefulness in comparative analysis. While Western sociological theory has tended to focus strongly on social change, Holmes constantly reminded us that what does not change, or what changes only very slowly, may provide the deepest insights into educational development. Thus, being able to clarify core features of a persisting religious or philosophical system and identify its views of society, knowledge, and the human person may provide deeper comparative insights than political or economic theories of change (Holmes 1981). For example, how could it be that the eight Confucian heritage societies of East Asia could exhibit very similar patterns of classroom organization, teacher-student relations, and parental involvement in education, in spite of the fact that six were capitalist and two were socialist? And how could this similarity be so evident, given that the colonial or neocolonial influences of England, France, Portugal, the United States of America, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) had shaped the modern education systems of these societies in very different ways over the twentieth century (Hayhoe and Li 2017)?

Ideal types are often most illuminating when they are applied critically in order to show how they do not fit. If you take the concept of nation state, clarify its core features by reference to nations such as nineteenth century France, Prussia, and Italy, and then apply it to India or China, it soon becomes clear how poor is the fit. One of my doctoral students developed a fascinating argument for defining India as a "state nation" rather than a "nation state," through a doctoral thesis on India and the progress of Education for All (EFA) over the last five decades (Panthaki 2016). Martin Jacques suggested the term "civilization state“ rather than nation state for China (Jacques 2009). Instead of imposing Eurocentric frames on Asian civilizations in ways that denigrate or hide their unique educational heritage, everything that does not fit the ideal type can be highlighted in the process of developing and refining such alternative concepts. Perhaps the most significant lesson to be learned in using ideal types is that they are "made to be broken" and it is in the breaking of them that deep insights of comparative understanding can be gained (Hayhoe 2011).

Not only can ideal types be used to clarify core values of different religions, or core sociopolitical concepts, but sociological theories can also be presented and applied in an ideal typical form. Weber's Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism was presented as a challenge to the economic determinism of the classical Marxist explanation of capitalist development in Europe (Weber 1958). In parallel ways, it is possible to take other Western-derived theories and "break them" through identifying all that does not conform to the theory in a wide range of historical contexts. A similar critical approach suggested by Holmes is the Popperian notion of seeking to falsify rather than prove the theories one may adopt for exploratory purposes. Then only that which survives rigorous critical testing is seen as tentatively true in a defined context (Holmes 1981).

Given China's bitter experiences of imperialism over a period of 150 years, one would expect that dependency theory would be useful in understanding the development of education over the twentieth century. However, what is most revealing when this frame is used to analyze China's experience is all that it fails to explain (Hayhoe and Bastid 1987). While Britain was the main colonial power in terms of economic influence in early twentieth century China, it had minimal influence on Chinese education for reasons relating to the approach of British missionaries. It was France, Germany, and the USA whose ideas had the strongest influences on China's higher education development, and some were purposefully chosen by leading Chinese intellectuals. Only in the 1950s, with a massive Soviet reconfiguration of China's higher education system, were external influences imposed such that education consolidated economic, political, and social patterns of domination. This contradicted dependency theory, which posited that it was under capitalism that educational influences were seen to reinforce economic and political domination. The Chinese chose to name it "Soviet social imperialism" when they sent all the Soviet experts home in 1958 (Hayhoe 1996, p. 98).

Lenses for Viewing Comparative Higher Education

If comparative education has suffered from the domination of West-centric sociological theories since it became an established university subject or field in the early twentieth century, comparative higher education has been even more Western dominated. It arose as a separate field in the 1950s and 1960s with the work of scholars such as Burton Clark and Martin Trow. Probably it was the worldwide move to mass higher education after World War II, and the huge investment this involved on the part of governments, that stimulated the comparative study of higher education. Clark's (1983) definition of the continental and Anglo-American models of higher education, parallel to Guy Neave's (2001) Roman and Saxon models, is helpful for comparative purposes. The continental or Roman model characterizes systems of higher education that are integrated within the nation state, where professors have civil service status, and the university's property belongs to the state, while the Anglo-American or Saxon model allows for greater independence from the state in terms of the status of faculty members and the ownership of university property. All are seen as developed from the medieval European university tradition, however, with a range of hybrid versions. So far there has been no serious study of how China's ancient civil service system might have influenced the development of the continental model in France and the widespread adoption of written entrance examinations in contrast to the oral examinations of the European tradition, what Nakayama (1984) defined as the rhetorical tradition as against the documentary tradition of East Asia. Yet there is clear evidence of the interest of influential European intellectuals in the reports produced by Jesuit missionaries about China's early and long-lasting higher education system (Mungello 1989).

With the rapidly increasing economic globalization that followed on the end of the Cold War, governments around the world have increasingly seen their higher education systems as a resource for competition in a global knowledge economy, and given escalating importance to the global ranking systems of higher education that emerged in the twenty-first century when deciding on funding allocations for their universities. The pursuit of "world class" status for the top layer has followed a common model, the so-called global research university. This is clearly a Western model rooted in Humboldt's nineteenth century German university and American institutions which adapted this model to their context in a variety of ways, beginning with Johns Hopkins. It has increasingly focused on the value of measurable research achievements, especially in the STEM disciplines, and led to an all-out Westernization of the top level of higher education around the world. Inadequate attention is given to the quality of teaching, the student experience, and the nurturing of global citizens who are motivated and capacitated for service in what might be defined as a global knowledge society rather than a global knowledge economy. Fortunately, there has been a recent revival of interest in the role of the liberal arts, including moral and spiritual forms of knowledge that can empower young people to address current concerns around the environment, social cohesion, and world peace (Boyle 2019). This calls for an approach to comparative higher education rooted in the contributions of diverse civilizations, including those of the Middle East, Asia, and Africa.

One approach to this is to identify alternative models of the university which have arisen historically and clearly embraced a combination of Eastern and Western values. In searching for a suitable university title for Hong Kong's Institute of Education as it was being upgraded to university status, I stumbled on the deep parallels to Confucian values that could be seen in France's écoles normales, founded after the revolution for the preparation of teachers to serve the first state-sponsored system of elementary education in the new republican nation. This was a distinct alternative to the European university model and embodied such features as a focus on moral formation, an approach to knowledge that emphasized application and interdisciplinarity, close personal relations between teachers and students, and direct accountability to the state (Hayhoe 2002). No wonder normal schools and normal universities were widely adopted in East Asian societies as they modernized. Nevertheless, my challenge to Beijing Normal University to introduce a "global normal university" to the world stage, when its leaders hosted the World Congress of Comparative Education in 2016 (Hayhoe 2017), was not easy to carry out. Like most governments around the world, the Chinese government distributes funding to universities on the basis of their status in global ranking systems which unilaterally uphold the so-called global research university as the recognized gold standard. The normal university offers an attractive alternative, but it has been largely forgotten in the Anglophone world. Only a country with China's rising economic and cultural influence would be able to promote it globally if it so chose.

Another approach is to go deep into the spiritual traditions of the Indian monastic universities, first founded in Taxila in 700 BCE, and consider the enrichment they brought to Southeast Asia and China over a long historical period, also the ways in which their combination of spiritual values and scientific understanding enriched the societies that learned from them. A recent keynote paper I presented when the Comparative Education Society of Asia met in Cambodia in May of 2018 illustrated the crucial contributions Indian monastic institutions made to Chinese higher education. These included the expansion of opportunities for women's scholarship, support for the empowerment of women and service to the most needy, values which were reinforced at a later period by Christian missionaries, especially women (Hayhoe 2019). One can see the potential influence of this approach in Malaysia's Accelerated Programme for Excellence (APEX), where "the idea of being world class is not defined by dominant neo-liberal concerns of occupying better positions in university rankings or league tables but in terms of addressing and providing sustainable solutions to the more immediate global problems in the areas of health care and poverty" (Wan et al. 2015, p. 273).

Conclusion: Religion and the Dialogue Among Civilizations

In conclusion, let me emphasize how both comparative education and comparative higher education can be enriched, both in terms of theory and content, by opening up the West-centric views which have tended to dominate their development and embracing the rich spiritual resources found in the dialogue of civilizations that emerged after the end of the Cold War. Most recently, I co-edited a volume on religion and education under the leadership of a younger colleague who brought together a range of perspectives from different regions of the world on this topic (Sivasubramaniam and Hayhoe 2018). We hope it will be widely used to bring both a holistic and a spiritual dimension into teaching and research and encourage genuine mutuality of learning across different religions and regions as well as economic and political systems.

In his recent presidential address, David Baker noted how religion and spirituality had remained strong, in spite of predictions that the educational revolution would result in greater secularization (Baker 2014). This book gives examples that show the importance of religious actors in serving some of the greatest needs of groups such as refugees and displaced populations (Marshall 2018). It also highlights the ways in which religious education can contribute to conflict resolution in societies such as Northern Ireland (Barnes 2018) and to countering religious extremism in diverse societies (Ghosh and Chan 2018).

My chapter looks at several periods in Chinese history when intellectuals were in a position to create a dialogue in which rich interfaith and intercultural learning took place, in the face of rising geopolitical threats from imperialist forces. Italian Jesuit Matteo Ricci was the first to translate the Confucian Classics into Latin for Europe, while bringing Catholic teaching to China in the sixteenth century at a time when Portuguese traders were viewed as a threat by China. In the nineteenth century, when China was experiencing multiple imperialist pressures, Welsh Baptist missionary Timothy Richard supported Chinese colleagues in establishing Shanxi University in Taiyuan, drawing on Boxer Indemnity funding. In spite of the fact that the funding came from Britain, this institution refused to identify with British imperialist interests but promoted both science and interreligious understanding in ways that could strengthen China's national standing and ability to resist foreign domination (Hayhoe 2018; Johnson 2014).

Finally, let me say that the Dialogue among Civilizations, formalized by the United Nations in the name given to the year 2001, might be seen as a turning point for both comparative education and comparative higher education. Assumptions about secularization being a key feature of modern capitalist societies or their socialist alternatives are no longer tenable, and it is urgent that we bring issues of religion and spirituality into the heart of our comparative research. This will be crucial to realizing the Sustainable Development Goals set forth by the United Nations, also to peace building and the nurturing of citizens able to serve a global knowledge society.

References

Baker, David P. (2014). Minds, politics, and gods in the schooled society: Consequences of the education revolution. *Comparative Education Review*, *58*(1), 6–23. https://doi.org/10.1086/673973.

Barnes, Philip L. (2018). Religious education in Northern Ireland: Conflict, curriculum and criticism. In Malini Sivasubramaniam and Ruth Hayhoe (Eds.), *Religion and education: Comparative and international perspectives* (pp. 273–288). Oxford: Symposium Books.

Boyle, Mary-Ellen. (2019). Global liberal education: Theorizing emergence and variability. *Research in Comparative and International Education, 14*(2), 231–248. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499919846010.

Clark, Burton R. (1983). *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fraser, Stewart. (1964). *Jullien's plan for comparative education, 1816–1817*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Galtung, Johan. (1971). A structural theory of imperialism. *Journal of Peace Research, 8*(2), 81–117.

Ghosh, Ratna., & Chan, W.Y. Alice. (2018). The role of religious education in countering religious extremism in diverse and interconnected societies. In Malini Sivasubramaniam and Ruth Hayhoe (Eds.), *Religion and education: Comparative and international perspectives* (pp. 335–350). Oxford: Symposium Books.

Grier, Lynda. (1952). *Achievement in education: The work of Michael Ernest Sadler, 1885–1935*. London: Constable.

Hayhoe, Ruth E.S. (1986a). China, comparative education and the World Order Models Project. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *16*(1), 65–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305792860160104.

Hayhoe, Ruth. (1986b). Penetration or mutuality? China's educational cooperation with Europe, Japan, and North America. *Comparative Education Review*, *30*(4), 532–559. https://doi.org/10.1086/446635.

Hayhoe, Ruth. (1996). *China's universities 1895–1995: A century of cultural conflict*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Hayhoe, Ruth. (2002). Teacher education and the university: A comparative analysis with implications for Hong Kong. *Teaching Education*, *13*(1), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047210120128555.

Hayhoe, Ruth. (2011). Made to be broken: Universal theories as ideal types. In Anders Örtenblad, Roshni Kumari, Muhammad Babur & Ibrahim Ahmed Bajunid (Eds.), *Are theories universal?* (pp. 91–99). Malaysia: ELLTA.

Hayhoe, Ruth. (2017). China in the center: What will it mean for global education? *Frontiers of Education in China*, *12*(1), 3–28. https://doi.org/10.3868/s110-006-017-0002-8.

Hayhoe, Ruth. (2018). Inter-religious dialogue and education: Three historical encounters between Christianity, Buddhism and Confucianism. In Malini Sivasubramaniam and Ruth Hayhoe (Eds.), *Religion and education: Comparative and international perspectives* (pp. 131–150). Oxford: Symposium Books.

Hayhoe, Ruth. (2019). The gift of Indian higher learning traditions to the global research university. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *39*(2), 177–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2019.1621799.

Hayhoe, Ruth., & Bastid, Marianne. (Eds.). (1987). *China's education and the industrialized world: Studies in cultural transfer*. Armonk: M. E. Sharpe.

Hayhoe, Ruth., & Li, Jun. (2017). Philosophy and comparative education: What can we learn from East Asia? In Kathy Bickmore, Ruth Hayhoe, Caroline Manion, Karen Mundy, & Robyn Read. (Eds.), *Comparative and international education: Issues for teachers* (2nd ed.). (pp. 29–58) Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Hayhoe, Ruth., & Pan, Julia. (Eds.). (1996). *East-West dialogue in knowledge and higher education*. Armonk: M. E. Sharpe.

Hayhoe, Ruth., & Pan, Julia. (Eds.). (2001). *Knowledge across cultures: A contribution to dialogue among civilizations*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong.

Holmes, Brian. (1981). *Comparative education: Some considerations of method*. Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Huntington, Samuel P. (1993). The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, *72*(3), 22–49. https://doi.org/10.2307/20045621.

Jacques, Martin. (2009). *When China rules the world: The rise of the middle kingdom and the end of the western world*. London: Allen Lane.

Johnson, Eunice V. (2014). *Timothy Richard's vision: Education and reform in China, 1880–1910*. Eugene: Pickwick Publications.

Kim, Samuel S. (1984). *The quest for a just world order*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Kothari, Rajni. (1975). Introduction. *Alternatives*, *1*(1), 1–5.

Lê, Thành Khôi. (1986). Toward a general theory of education. *Comparative Education Review*, *30*(1), 12–29. https://doi.org/10.1086/446565.

Marshall, Katherine. (2018). Global education challenges: Exploring religious dimensions. In Malini Sivasubramaniam and Ruth Hayhoe (Eds.), *Religion and education: Comparative and international perspectives* (pp. 29–50). Oxford: Symposium Books.

Mazrui, Ali. (1975). The African university as a multinational corporation: Problems of penetration and dependency. *Harvard Educational Review*, *45*(2), 191–210. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.45.2.h62846n66230j150.

Mungello, David E. (1989). *Curious land: Jesuit accommodation and the origins of Sinology*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Nakayama, Shigeru. (1984). *Academic and scientific traditions in China, Japan, and the West*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Nandy, Ashis. (1996) The politics of indigenous knowledge and contending ideals of the university. In R. Hayhoe & J. Pan (Eds.), *East-West dialogue in knowledge and higher education* (pp. 296–307). Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.

Neave, Guy. (2001). The European dimension in higher education: An excursion into the modern use of historical analogues. In Jeroen Huisman, Peter Maassen, & Guy Neave (Eds.), *Higher education and the nation state: The international dimension of higher education* (pp. 13–75). Amsterdam: Pergamon.

Panthaki, Neville. (2016). *Conceptualizing the state-nation via education reform: From multicultural to intercultural citizenship* [Ph.D. thesis]. University of Toronto.

Park, Jae. (2017). Knowledge production with Asia-centric research methodology. *Comparative Education Review*, *61*(4), 760–779. https://doi.org/10.1086/693980.

Sivasubramaniam, Malini., & Hayhoe, Ruth. (Eds.). (2018). *Religion and education: Comparative and international perspectives.* Oxford: Symposium Books.

Takayama, Keita. (2018). Beyond comforting histories: The colonial/imperial entanglements of the International Institute, Paul Monroe, and Isaac L. Kandel at Teachers College, Columbia University. *Comparative Education Review, 62*(4), 459–481. https://doi.org/10.1086/699924.

Takayama, Keita., Sriprakash, Arathi., & Connell, Raewyn. (2016). Toward a postcolonial comparative and international education. *Comparative Education Review*, *61*(S1), S1–S24. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdf/10.1086/690455.

Vogel, Ezra F. (1991). *The four little dragons: The spread of industrialization in East Asia*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. (1984). *The politics of the world-economy: The states, the movements and the civilizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wan, Chang Da., Sirat, Morshidi., & Razak, Dzulkifli Abdul. (2015). The idea of a university: Rethinking the Malaysian context. *Humanities, 4*, 266–282. https://doi.org/10.3390/h4030266.

Weber, Max. (1949). *The methodology of the social sciences.* (Edward A. Shils & Henry A. Finch, Trans. & Eds.). New York: Free Press.

Weber, Max. (1951). *The religion of China: Confucianism and Taoism* (Hans H. Gerth, Trans. & Ed.). Glencoe: Free Press.

Weber, Max. (1958). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (Talcott Parsons, Trans.). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

PART II

Pedagogical Epistemologies, Genders, and Global Engagements

CHAPTER 6

Can Education Contribute to Social Cohesion?

Ratna Ghosh

Introduction

When I wrote the abstract for this chapter several months ago, the topic of social cohesion at the local and global levels, and the implications for education were not nearly as obvious as they are today when a pandemic has hit the globe. "It's Never Been Clearer: We Are All Global Citizens" says the Global Citizen (2020): We must together fight for survival; and world leaders must join forces because COVID-19 knows no borders. The rapid escalation and global spread of the virus have reached all corners of this world. This has led to an unprecedented level of collaboration across borders, and the amount of civic engagement is greater than usual among scientists, healthcare workers, neighbors, volunteers, among universities, governments, and the private sector. Globally, the definition of what it means to be a superpower has changed. Small Asian countries such as South Korea and Taiwan, New Zealand in the Southern hemisphere, and Germany in Europe (coincidently, the latter three have women leaders)

R. Ghosh (✉)
McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada
e-mail: ratna.ghosh@mcgill.ca

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_6

have had remarkably higher rates of success in containing the spread of the virus than did superpowers like the USA and UK, for example. The spotlight has been on inequalities around the globe and on the negligence of elder care in advanced Western countries where unusually high mortality rates in long-term care facilities for the old have shown cracks in their social systems. Countries caught unprepared have been helped with essential equipment from unlikely sources.

This crisis has reminded the world community that humility and humanity will be necessary for social cohesion as we reshape our global future. This humanitarian challenge underscores the fact that we are interconnected, that what we do as individuals affects each one around us. Each individual in each country is aware that we are fighting a common battle against an invisible enemy. Countries are exchanging best practices and protocols. They are reimagining collaboration because the shared experience of this giant storm across the world will only work when we help each other. The weeks of the pandemic have tested our strength and resourcefulness and the crisis has emphasized the willingness and ability of people to adapt to a world of dramatic and unpredictable change. While this has shown peoples' resilience, it has also shown how much we need to have social cohesion. Resilience is the capacity in people, communities, and organizations to overcome challenges and acquiring coping skills that resist negative attitudes and behavior such as hate and discrimination by working in compassionate and ethical ways (see Aldrich 2012; Goldstein 2011; Richardson et al. 1990; World Bank 2013). Although we have experienced before the need for concerted action at times of crisis – terrorism, natural disasters, and several health pandemics which have threatened personal, national, and global security – a shock of this magnitude involves all corners of the world. Historically, when people have shared experiences (war, natural disasters), they have come together. The question is, how can we sustain this social cohesion and cooperation by different groups in a post-coronavirus world? How can we get people to understand that when one is sick, others are in danger too? In other words, how can we make our global and national societies more cohesive so that we can deal with crises more effectively?

Globalization has indeed made the world more vulnerable to the spread of infectious diseases, because the rapidity and frequency of travel intensifies the potential for catastrophic worldwide epidemics. During times of crisis emotions run high, and emotions are contagious (Weinschenk 2016). This becomes especially dangerous when limited knowledge can lead to panic. Global fear about the current pandemic has stoked the spread of misinformation and racism. Unfortunately, misinformation is purposefully circulated by certain politicians and media outlets, and among others via social media. The destructive force of violent scapegoating of certain groups during epidemics is a "strategy with an ancient pedigree" (Matache et al. 2020), and certain groups have experienced racism during this period. Public education is essential to address psychological abuse and develop critical thinking in people to distinguish facts from fake news. There are stories about how countries are trying to get the first vaccine just for themselves, or people stocking up on sanitizers to sell in the black market. In a peaceful little town in Quebec, police had to be called in to manage the traffic in a supermarket where people were hurriedly stocking up, although there is no shortage in supply chains. Conflict and instability in society and among nations can arise when humility and intercultural communication are in short supply. People need to understand what is happening and consider others' needs. Media and authorities are advising us or requiring us to be socially cohesive while keeping physical distance. People need to work collectively, not against each other if they are to survive: "COVID-19 doesn't discriminate. Neither should you" (CRARR 2020). In individualistic cultures that is difficult to do. We need global-minded citizens because social cohesion and cooperative, coordinated actions will keep us safe and strong as a species. We cannot now, think in terms of our cities only or our countries and ourselves first. As Bill Gates has argued: "Pandemics remind us that helping others isn't just the right thing to do; it's also the smart thing to do. Humanity, after all, isn't just bound together by common values and social ties. We're also connected biologically, by a microscopic network of germs that links the health of one person to the health of everyone else. In this pandemic we are all connected" (Gates 2020).

This chapter will touch on the significant role of education in developing resilient, ethical, and critical global-minded citizens who work toward sustainable peace and social cohesion in an interdependent world. It will focus on one of the many aspects that education must confront and effectively address, namely, the increasing population diversity in Western societies. It will stress the need for humanistic education (along with the essential skills for economic security), benefitting majority groups in society as much as minority students. It will briefly touch on a few

Southern philosophies that can guide non-violent, whole-child, and inclusive education which focus on resilience and social cohesion. The chapter reflects the evolution of my critical understanding of education and diversity for social cohesion over the years, based on Canada's federal policy and Act on Multiculturalism which is recognized in its Constitution. Recently, I have been involved in the broader issue of education's responsibility in developing resilient citizens in the area of education and security.

Context

COVID-19 has shown us, like never before, that we need to cooperate in this health emergency. The need for social isolation does not imply individualism, which will only lead to conflict. The local is the global. We need to learn to understand that no country comes first, and the rich and powerful are not immune to the virus – it can hit everyone. Yet the effect of the crisis is often intensified among the most vulnerable groups which are at greater risk than the more privileged because they have limited resources to protect themselves. Countries with low levels of education will be hit more severely because scientific knowledge, basic literacy in health and safety, life skills such as resilience and empowerment, social inclusion such as global citizenship, social responsibility, and ethics are paramount. In economically disadvantaged countries financial and material resources are in shorter supply at the individual, government, and societal levels. For economically disadvantaged people in all societies "shelter-at-home" is only possible when one has a home. Furthermore, in this particular emergency, physical distancing is requiring us to develop new ways of living and communicating which will involve new technologies. In poorer households, communities, and countries access to the Internet is limited, even when cell phones, televisions, and radios are increasingly available.

People need to be resilient and respond easily to change such as keeping physical distance and working online. The focus on digital ways of communicating requires that we do not neglect the human and emotional qualities of care and compassion. This pandemic has shown us the advantages and the problems with technology, but it has also given us the opportunity to connect with friends, family, and loved ones and focused on our need for each other's support.

From the point of view of education, the issue of social cohesion is rather complex because it raises a variety of issues dealing with policy, process, practice, as well as outcome as they relate to diversity, difference, and equality in societies. The impact is also on school culture in a variety of ways. The overall question is how can education develop resilience and strong values of ethical and critical global citizenship (Ghosh 2017; Tarozzi and Torres 2016) that will insure a cohesive society in future generations? Resilience is a developmental process (Lightsey 2006), a skill that involves behaviors, thoughts, and actions that anyone can learn and develop (APA 2012). These are all directly connected with the quality of education in a given society.

On this occasion, however, there has been a giant leap in the virtual environment for a variety of work, information dissemination, and educational activities. Schools as well as tertiary institutions have gone online. As I prepare for online teaching at the graduate and undergraduate levels, I am overwhelmed by the variety of resources and platforms available to make the educational experience for the student qualitatively comparable to the face-to-face experience on campus. But online teaching needs a degree of trust, acceptance, and flexibility. As we work together with students from our global community in many parts of the world across cultures, there will need to be perspective taking because each person's experience is different. To have a socially cohesive class we need inclusive education.

Education and Social Cohesion

If indeed, we need to enhance social cohesion in order to deal more effectively with present and future challenges like the current one, what kind of education is conducive to peace and stability in societies which are increasingly diverse? Can an education in which the process is framed in purely mechanical terms – as just the cultivation of knowledge and skills (for the job market) – lead to understanding the challenges of a globalized world in which diversity is provoking fear and hate? Can such an education counter the social and psychological factors that push or pull youth and adults alike toward antisocial activities?

In a turbulent world, the role of education is not only to develop knowledge and skills (at the individual level), but more importantly to attempt to reduce social inequalities in order to guarantee political and economic stability (at the societal level) and contribute toward the making of resilient communities (ICDE 1972).[1] Education, then, is not only a cognitive function: It must also have a moral purpose and address the affective and ethical domains of human development, caring pedagogy, and compassion (Mahmut et al. 2019; Noddings 2002; UNESCO 2015).

The socialization of children and youth takes place through formal as well as informal means. Countries in the geographical North (Western industrialized countries) have universal education, and many countries in the South (less economically developed countries, mostly former colonies) have at least aspirations for universal education. This implies children spend their developmental years in school when they seek to uncover their own identity, form a worldview, and search for meaning in their lives. So, the school (formal education) is an obvious tool with which to develop resilience in children and youth to face challenges they will encounter in a fast-changing world.

Previously, education was known to be a moral enterprise (Nord and Haynes 1998) that develops and shapes minds. With decolonization, the demand for education and the revolution of rising expectations triggered the belief in education as a panacea for removing social inequalities. But the focus is increasingly on skills and training rather than on values of compassion, cooperation, individual dignity, and worth. In the volatile world of rapid globalization, both in the countries of the global North and South the role of education is increasingly moving away from values and becoming training for the job market by the expansion of neoliberal ideals: focus on developing job skills (at the individual level) and for human resource development (at the national level). The neoliberal influence on an instrumentalist form of education eclipses education's allegiance to humanistic values (Oladi 2013). The focus is on the individual rather than the collective, on skills vs values, competition and not cooperation. While job skills are essential, we can and should pay more attention to the well-being and mental health of our students so that they can be resilient and develop values as ethical, dynamic, caring, and critical citizens who will build peaceful cohesive societies that are sustainable. The current crisis has shown that we need to be resilient but it has also shown us how much we need to work collectively (to find a vaccine, to develop effective treatments) and how much we need each other's support

[1] The Report of the International Commission on the Development of Education (1972), *Learning To Be* warned of the risks of inequality in society and education about four decades ago.

(to obtain efficient protective gear) and adapt to a world in constant and unpredictable change. Cognitive skills and social and emotional skills can both be developed in schools; they are not mutually exclusive. Social-emotional learning (SEL) is crucial for both immediate and long-term positive outcomes on academic achievement as well as student well-being by reducing emotional distress (Dusenbury and Weissberg 2017). SEL has been called the missing piece in education (Elias 1997). It is the process through which individuals acquire knowledge, attitudes, and skills to effectively deal with emotions, feel empathy for the vulnerable, and maintain good relations with people as well as set achievable goals for themselves and make responsible decisions. Only an education that cultivates these soft skills can contribute to the improvement of social cohesion in our globalized world (ICE 1996).[2]

Diversity

The accelerated pace of international migrations and refugee flows along with the impact of globalization have increased diversity and its complexity in societies around the world, and consequently in school populations. The word "diversity" refers to variety, and it means different things to different people. For example, it could mean diverse fields of study, or differences in ideas. I am using the term here to refer to differences among people in terms of their ethnicity and culture, their socioeconomic status, their gender, religion, language, sexual identity and preference, and dis/abilities. Super-diversity (Vertovec 2007) involves more than focus on ethnicity and culture, because these characteristics cannot be seen in a homogenous and static way since members of each ethnic group have different experiences due to their social class, gender, religion, language, and other differences. The multi-dimensional complexity of diversity (and their intersections) poses a significant challenge to schools and teachers in providing fair and equitable learning experiences to students that would prevent inequality and instability in society and create social cohesion (Flecha 2015; Joshee 2004) and peace.

Matters of diversity and difference in education involve power issues and their intersections. These concerns focus on differences in culture,

[2] The Report of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (1996), *Learning: The Treasure Within* emphasized the need for humanistic education and social cohesion almost 25 years ago.

ethnicity, and the social concept of race but also on gender, class, religion, language, sexual orientation, physical and mental challenges and their relationships. The meanings given to differences are socially constructed and need to be addressed in education. Students need to understand difference because markers of difference may provoke hate, which is often evident due to lack of knowledge and intolerance of something different (Ghosh and Abdi 2013; Taylor 1994). Intolerance not only creates hatred but also alienates the "other" and leads them to engage in antisocial behavior which disrupts social cohesion.

Difference is a comparative term, and the meanings attributed to differences are social constructions. Who is seen as different? It is the other who is different: the woman who is different from the male; the black or brown person from the white; and gays and lesbians from heterosexuals (Pandey 2010). Why is the black student different, not the white in Western countries (Delpit 1995)? Difference here is an expression of dominance and subordination, hierarchy in social, political, and economic power. Thus, the construction of meanings of differences is a way of legitimating, normalizing, and reinforcing hierarchical power relations (Ghosh 2012). Theoretical developments in the postcolonial revolution point to "an engagement with difference that makes a difference to what was initially thought" (Bhambra 2007, p. 880). Given that classrooms reflect society, and diversity is an important characteristic of all these societies, the students who differ from the norm and are not White, Christian, middle class, heterosexual males and females are different and are judged inferior. The power relations involved in the understanding of difference must be examined, deconstructed, and reconstructed in relation to privileges for some groups that have become normalized in societies (e.g., white people in North America, upper-castes in South Asia, men in Saudi Arabia, and all over the world with very few exceptions). Diversity is an asset, not a problem because confronting different ideas and cultures can only strengthen resilience. Teachers must learn to use diversity of perspectives and ideas to make transformative classrooms and societies.

Human beings are "diversely different" (Sen 2006, p. xiv) because of the pluralities of human identities. Diversity is influenced by our various locationalities (historical, global) and positionalities (race, gender, language, religion, class, sexual orientation), because where and how a person is situated in a society leads him or her to live through a particular set of experiences and to encounter distinctive power relations. For example, people are positioned by language and position themselves in and through language. The intersections of one's positionality make identities complex and fluctuating (Ghosh 2012). This makes difference fluid. Teachers most of all, need to have an understanding of these realities so that they can validate identities, understand discrimination, and the impact that prejudice and discrimination have on children's lives and life-chances (Delpit 1995). Most Western countries that were previously ethno-culturally homogeneous are now heterogeneous and diverse in terms of culture, religion, language, not to mention socioeconomic and gender divisions. Since identities are constructed relationally, it is of utmost importance how teachers treat difference. While educators are likely to believe that all human beings have equal rights, they are also aware that social and economic assets are not equally distributed among children. Difference is not discussed enough in teacher education programs and it is often equated with deficiency. But differences in skin color and in religion are simply variances; they do not imply better or worse. In education, as in society, this difference is measured against a certain norm.

The problems facing schools – the struggle with quality and provision of equal opportunity to all – are common in countries of the geographical North as in the South. Although education is thought to be an equalizing force, educational institutions can perpetuate the inequalities (Bowles and Gintis 2011; Coleman 2019) in societies with respect to socioeconomic class, race/ethnicity and culture, gender, religion (caste in India), and other markers of difference in both the global North and the South.

But countries of the South face different challenges due to the unprecedented demand for education, the urgency to have education for all (especially where poverty poses insurmountable barriers), high attrition rates, low-quality institutions, and so on. The need there is not only the expansion of educational opportunities but also the maintenance, if not enhancement of quality along with equity which involves many challenges.

The problems in schools in North American and European countries (Cole 2018; Hollins 2015) as well as in Australia and New Zealand are different. Many challenges arise because international migration and displacement of populations, as well as globalization which bring cultures in close proximity, increase diversity issues and make education particularly difficult in societies where assimilation to the host society has been the tradition. The challenge for education is to find the means to balance equity among diverse groups along with maintaining quality (Darling-Hammond and Rothman 2015). The tension between the need for integration of various cultural, ethnic, and religious identities conflicts with the traditional practice of assimilation into the host society by attempting to alter children's identities, and this poses a tremendous problem. All these tensions can give rise to divisions in society and are reflected in schools resulting in discrimination, hate, and violence.

The Need for Humanistic Education

A report on *Education and Security* (Ghosh et al. 2016) indicates that education can be a very effective tool to counter hate and violence but that the type of education is crucial because not all forms of education will prevent hate, discrimination, and violence of various kinds. Training for technological and career skills does not address the psychological, intellectual, and emotional needs of youth. Specific teaching aimed at a holistic, humanistic education that develops critical thinking, values for citizenship, care and respect for values such as human rights, social justice, and diversity is vital for countering fissures in society. It is important to recognize that the benefits of humanistic education serve the interests of majority groups in society as much as it supports marginalized students. For teachers to become effective in organizing this kind of humanistic education, both preservice and inservice teacher education programs will need to provide opportunities to teachers to acquire the relevant knowledge, skills, and values (Burns et al. 2019; Glickman and Burns 2020; Green 2014; see also Stromquist, this volume).

In the Anglo-American world child-centered education has been the focus of famous educators like Rousseau (1979), Dewey (1916), and Piaget (1973). Several educational philosophers have called for bringing humanistic values such as cooperation, empathy, and caring in education for the development of the whole child. Some indigenous belief systems and reformers have stressed the importance of interdependence with nature, and between the individual and the community (Waghid and Smeyers 2012) which can be a source of guidance for humanistic education.

The humanistic philosophy of Ubuntu education (the theme of the 2015 CIES Conference) has a moral purpose, with an inclusive, integrative viewpoint and collective ethos shared across the African continent and most recently popularized by Nelson Mandela. Ubuntu is a worldview that introduces values of morality and interdependence of people which has a collective rather than only an individualistic approach.

As early as the sixth century BC, Confucius (Creel 1949) stressed key moral elements such as justice and sincerity through education. For Rabindranath Tagore, Asia's first Nobel laureate (1913), the cardinal principles of his educational philosophy were freedom and joy for the child as well as "creative self-expression and communion with nature" (Salkar 1990, p. 20). Education to him signified freedom: freedom from ignorance, prejudice, dogma, tyranny, and poverty. All barriers to learning are to be removed so as to unleash creativity and make schools inclusive and transformative spaces through the emancipation of the human being. In his socially inclusive vision, the aim of education, which would involve a system of free and creative enquiry, was to liberate the mind from the shackles of colonialism as much as from oppressive traditions, poverty, and ignorance: Education is that which Liberates the Mind (the theme of the CIES 2011 conference). The aim of Tagorean education was to develop the whole child, complete with faculties of reason as well as emotion because he saw an inseparable connection between the faculties of mind and body. Like Freire (1970), for Tagore the teacher is not there to pour down cauldrons of knowledge on students' heads hoping that some of it will be absorbed. Rather the teacher is a facilitator for learning and to bring out the self-expression in the child, and does not interact with the child from a position of power. He himself dropped out of school (in India as well as in England) because he "fled the classes which *instructed*, but which did not *inspire* me" (Tagore 1961, p. 206; emphasis mine). He found elitist education insipid, constraining, and unimaginative. Wrong educational methods and policies, according to Tagore, rob children of joy as well as mystery, two of the creative impulses (Ghosh and Naseem 2003).

Tagore's ideas on education are most relevant in today's world. In an essay "The Stream of Indian Civilization" (*Bharatvgarshe Ithihaser Dhara* 1906) he points to two guiding principles: unity in diversity and continuity in the midst of change (see Hobson 2004). He believed that the true unity of cultures could only be based on real diversity and dialogue through human relationships (Jahanbegloo 2007). His focus on human relationships speaks directly to the social cohesion we need to nurture at this time.

He was a proud Indian but critiqued narrow patriotism in favor of finding refuge in humanity and cosmopolitanism: the ability to assimilate and accept several paths leading to a common goal, and conviction in the convergence of basic values such as truth, beauty, goodness, love, freedom, and tranquility (Jahanbegloo 2007, p. 4). For Tagore, art and music were essential to life. As we experience the lockdown, we are lucky to have advanced technology bring music and art to us. In Montreal the "*Chanter sur les balcons de Montreal*" (singing on the balconies of Montreal) – a socially distanced concert series in the city is giving hope and inspiration to many. While Tagore focused on the arts, he did not hesitate to clash with Gandhi on the importance he gave to science and scientific verification. Today we are totally dependent on science – tests, equipment – as we hold our breath for the discovery of a COVID-19 vaccine. Tagore's ideas of independent thinking and experiential learning, which have become so popular today and are often attributed to other thinkers such as Freire half a century later, were basic to his own idea of the purposes of education. They focus on the relevance of what is learned. Like Franz Fanon (1985), he thought much about the deformation of the mind brought about by colonial education. Tagore was more spiritual rather than religious. He was a staunch believer in keeping religious dogma out of the schools and believed that all religions were to be respected. He was truly inclusive of all religious groups and the co-education of girls in all aspects of education including dance and other activities. To him religion was to be lived not taught. His glass meditation mandir still stands today in the international university, Vishwa Bharathi, which he built in 1921, as a meeting point of the East and the West. A true cosmopolitan in his worldview which was rooted in his love of the motherland, to him: "East is East and West is West. God forbid that it should be otherwise - but the twain must meet in amity, peace and understanding, their meeting will be all the more fruitful because of their differences …" (quoted in Salkar 1990, p. 8).

Tagore's philosophy of education needs much deeper analysis. Like Paulo Freire (1970) in Latin America who defined education as conscientization (raising awareness), Tagore thought of education as a phenomenon that frees the mind from ignorance and vulnerability. These thinkers believed that education involves a moral engagement that implies the development of a compassionate collective ethos toward consciousness and awareness of existing inequalities and injustices in the world at various levels.

These ideas have implications for teacher education. Teachers must develop a student-centered philosophy of teaching so that students see the relevance of what they learn, and be able to develop a critical understanding of the world, develop a sense of belonging to the society/country and world, what it means to be interdependent and a sense of responsibility toward preserving the planet (Glickman and Mette 2020; Guajardo et al. 2016).

The moral values suggested by humanistic philosophies would be developed through dialogue, examples, questioning, and reasoning so that values are constructed by the student. Critical thinking and critical media literacy skills are essential components of a humanistic education because questioning leads students to develop their values, and distinguishing between fake news and fact is essential. To a great extent, focus on compassion and care for the other will preempt some of the triggers that push and pull vulnerable students on to the dangerous paths to anti-social behavior. Care and compassion, and showing one's human side is disarming for some, but professionalism and authenticity do not have to be mutually exclusive. They provide opportunity for a deeper personal connection and can be factors that strengthen the skill of resilience (APA 2012).

Conclusion

Social institutions, like schools and universities, have not been sufficiently supported to effectively foster resilience in students for social cohesion in thwarting the negative attitudes toward diversity. Education's role should be proactive and preventive rather than reactive to problems that need to be fixed. The potential of education to both counter and promote conflict in society reinforces the salient value and role of education overall. In the long term, education must be considered in the discourse on solutions for the major challenges in society. This form of education must promote a critical understanding of the world and develop the values and skills of critical and resilient citizenship. True education cannot be devoid of an ethics of care, compassion, altruism, and peaceful human relationships (Gilligan 1982; Noddings 1984). Despite the politicization of science in this pandemic, most people and leaders understand that cooperation among scientists is imperative. In our current crisis we must not make unscientific judgments about the coronavirus, we should not make racist statements against people who originate in certain countries, but we must have social cohesion even when we maintain physical distance. In Quebec, "*Ça va bien aller*" (all will be well), a slogan under a colorful rainbow borrowed from Italy, is the rallying cry for unity and hope during this crisis. The pandemic is a call to action to create a socially cohesive world that is "more just, more compassionate and more humane" (Fortier quoting Charles Taylor 2020). The benefits of humanistic education serve the interests of majority groups as much as they serve the interests of the minority groups in society. Ultimately, education's role is to promote unity and enable citizens to counter any action that stifles human dignity.

Acknowledgements I would like to thank Professor Emeritus Carl Glickman for his valuable suggestions and comments on my chapter.

References

Aldrich, Daniel P. (2012). *Building resilience: Social capital in post-disaster recovery*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

American Psychological Association (APA). (2012). *Building resilience*. https://www.apa.org/topics/resilience. Accessed 14 February 2020.

Bhambra, Gurminder K. (2007). Sociology and postcolonialism: Another 'missing' revolution? Sociology, *41*(5), 871–884. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0038038507080442.

Bowles, Samuel., & Gintis, Herbert. (2011). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Burns, Rebecca West., Jacobs, Jennifer., & Yendol-Hoppey, Diane. (2019). A Framework for naming the scope and nature of teacher candidate supervision in clinically-based teacher preparation: Tasks, high-leverage practices, and pedagogical routines of practice. *The Teacher Educator*, *55*(2), 214–238. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2019.1682091.

Center for Research-Action on Race Relations (CRARR). (2020, April 1). CoVid19 doesn't discriminate. Neither should you!" Slogan of CRARR for campaign against COVID-19 related discrimination. http://www.crarr.org/?q=node/20091#attachments. Accessed 2 April 2020.

Cole, Mike. (Ed.). (2018). *Education, equality and human rights: Issues of gender, 'race', sexuality, disability and social class* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.

Coleman, James, S. (2019). *Equality and achievement in education* (1st ed., Kindle). London: Routledge.

Creel, Herrlee Glessner. (1949). *Confucius: The man and the myth*. New York: John Day Company.

Darling-Hammond, Linda., & Rothman, Robert. (2015). *Teaching in the flat world: Learning from high-performing systems*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Delpit, Lisa. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.

Dewey, John. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Macmillan.

Dusenbury, Linda., & Weissberg, Roger. P. (2017). *Social emotional learning in elementary school: Preparation for success.* Edna Bennett Pierce Prevention Research Center, Pennsylvania State University. https://healthyschoolscampaign.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/RWJF-SEL.pdf. Accessed 2 August 2020.

Elias, Maurice. (1997, December 3). 'The missing piece': Making the case for greater attention to social and emotional learning. *Education Week, 17*(15), 36–38. https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/1997/12/03/15elias.h17.html. Accessed 2 August 2020.

Fanon, Frantz. (1985). *The wretched of the earth*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Flecha, Ramon. (Ed.). (2015). *Successful educational actions for inclusion and social cohesion in Europe*. Cham: Springer.

Fortier, Suzanne. (2020, April 22). *Principal and Vice-Chancellor message to the McGill community regarding COVID-19*. https://www.mcgill.ca/principal/communications/statements/message-mcgill-community-regarding-covid-19-april-22-2020. Accessed 25 April 2020.

Freire, Paulo. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Gates, Bill. (2020, April 13). Three critical things the G20 needs to do to get a COVID-19 vaccine. *National Post*. https://nationalpost.com/opinion/bill-gates-there-are-three-critical-things-the-g20-needs-to-do-to-get-a-covid-19-vaccine. Accessed 14 April 2020.

Ghosh, Ratna. (2012). Diversity and excellence in higher education: Is there a conflict? *Comparative Education Review, 56*(3), 349–365. https://doi.org/10.1086/666545.

Ghosh, Ratna. (2017). Gandhi and global citizenship education. *Global Commons Review,1*,12–17.https://www.globalcommonsreview.org/download/b972f6ad34fcd2e333076464558 38a6a189728.pdf. Accessed 2 August 2020.

Ghosh, Ratna., & Abdi, Ali A. (2013). *Education and the politics of difference: Select Canadian perspectives* (2nd ed.). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Ghosh, Ratna., & Naseem, Ayaz. (2003). Education is that which liberates: Educational philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore. *Journal of Post-Colonial Education (Special Issue), 2*(1), 87–100.

Ghosh, Ratna., Manuel, Ashley., Chan, W. Y. Alice., Dilimulati, Maihemuti., & Babaei, Mehdi. (2016). *Education & security: A global literature review on the role of education in countering violent religious extremism*. Tony Blair Faith Foundation. https://institute.global/sites/default/files/inline-files/IGC_Education%20and%20Security.pdf. Accessed 2 August 2020.

Gilligan, Carol. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Glickman, Carl., & Burns, Rebecca West. (2020). *Leadership for learning: How to bring out the best in every teacher* (2nd ed.). Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, Carl., & Mette, Ian M. (2020). *The essential renewal of America's schools: A leadership guide for democratizing schools from the inside out*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Global Citizen. (2020). Stand together to beat Coronavirus. https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/campaign/stand-together-to-beat-coronavirus/. Accessed 14 April 2020.

Goldstein, Bruce Evan. (Ed.). (2011). *Collaborative resilience: Moving through crisis to opportunity*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Green, Elizabeth. (2014). *Building a better teacher: How teaching works (and how to teach it to everyone)*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Guajardo, Miguel A., Guarjardo, Franscisco., Janson, Christopher., & Militello, Matthew. (2016). *Reframing community partnerships in education: Uniting the power of place and wisdom of people*. New York: Routledge.

Hobson, John M. (2004). *The Eastern origins of Western civilisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hollins, Etta, R. (2015). *Culture in school learning: Revealing the deep meaning*. (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (ICE). (1996). *Learning: The treasure within*. Report to UNESCO. Paris: UNESCO Publishing. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000102734.

International Commission on the Development of Education (ICDE). (1972). *Learning to be: The world of education today and tomorrow*. Paris: UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000223222?posInSet=10&queryId=bc46ff96-be30-47a4-8647-561b5e27c749. Accessed 2 August 2020.

Jahanbegloo, Ramin. (2007). Tagore and the idea of civilization. *India International Centre Quarterly, 34*(1), 64–73.

Joshee, Reva. (2004). Citizenship and multicultural education in Canada: From assimilation to social cohesion. In James. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 127–156). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lightsey, Owen Richard. (2006). Resilience, meaning, and well-being. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *34*(1), 96–107. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000005282369.

Mahmut, Dilmurat., Dhali, Helal H., & Ghosh, Ratna. (2019). The radicalization of youth in the West: How can Canadian teachers effectively approach this issue in their classrooms? In Allyson Jule (Ed.), *The compassionate educator: Understanding social issues and the ethics of care in Canadian schools* (pp. 229–250). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Matache, Margareta., Leaning, Jennifer., and Bhabha, Jacqueline. (2020, May 5). The shameful resurgence of violent scapegoating in a time of crisis. *Open Democracy*. https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/can-europe-make-it/shameful-resurgence-violent-scapegoating-time-crisis/. Accessed 20 May 2020.

Noddings, Nel. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Noddings, Nel. (2002). *Starting at home: Caring and social policy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nord, Warren. A., & Haynes, Charles C. (1998). *Taking religion seriously across the curriculum*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Oladi, Soudeh. (2013). The instrumentalization of education. *The Atlantic Journal of Graduate Studies in Education*. Special Edition. https://ejournal.educ.unb.ca/pdfs/23-93-1-PB.pdf. Accessed 2 February 2020.

Pandey, Gyanendra. (2010). Politics of difference: Reflections on Dalit and African American struggles. *Economic and Political Weekly, 45*(19), 62–69.

Piaget, Jean. (1973). *To understand is to invent: The future of education* Chicago: Grossman Publishers.

Richardson, Glenn E., Neiger, Brad L., Jensen, Susan., & Kumpfer, Karol L. (1990). The resiliency model. *Health Education, 21(*6), 33–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/00970050.1990.10614589.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. (1979). *Emile, or on education* (Allan Bloom, Trans.). New York: Basic Books.

Salkar, Kalyan R. (1990). *Rabindranath Tagore: His impact on Indian education*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited.

Sen, Amartya. (2006). *Identity and violence: The illusion of destiny*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Tagore, Rabindranath. (1961). Talks in China: To students. In A.C. Chakravarty (Ed.), *A Tagore Reader* (pp. 206–212). Boston: Beacon Press.

Tarozzi, Massimiliano., & Torres, Carlos A. (2016). *Global citizenship education and the crises of multiculturalism: Comparative perspectives*. London: Bloomsbury.

Taylor, Charles. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutman (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (pp. 25–73). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2015). *Rethinking education: Towards a global common good?* Paris: UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232555. Accessed 2 August 2020.

Vertovec, Steven. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(6),1024–1054. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465.

Waghid, Yusef., & Smeyers, Paul. (2012). Reconsidering Ubuntu: On the educational potential of a particular ethic of care. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 44*(2), 6–20. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2011.00792.x.

Weinschenk, Susan. (2016, June 1). Emotions are contagious. *Psychology Today*. https://www.psychologytoday.com/ca/blog/brain-wise/201606/emotions-are-contagious?eml. Accessed 2 February 2020.

World Bank. (2013). *Resilience in education systems: Rapid assessment manual*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

CHAPTER 7

Recognizing Teachers as a Key Focus for Comparative Educators

Mark Ginsburg

Continued Importance Globally of Teachers for Achieving Quality Education

The *Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action* (UNESCO et al. 2015), which informed the establishment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Goal 4 (UN 2015), emphasizes that:

> Teachers are the key to achieving all of the Education 2030 agenda … As teachers are a fundamental condition for guaranteeing quality education, teachers and educators should be empowered, adequately recruited and remunerated, motivated, professionally qualified, and supported within well-resourced, efficient and effectively governed systems. (UNESCO et al. 2015, p. 21)

Of course, this is only the most recent example of international policy statements stressing the importance of teachers for achieving quality

M. Ginsburg (✉)
International Education Policy Program, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_7

educational outcomes. For instance, the International Labor Organization (ILO) and UNESCO (1966, para 4, p. 21) *Recommendation Concerning the Status of Teachers* expresses: "It should be recognized that advance in education depends largely on the qualifications and ability of the teaching staff in general and on the human, pedagogical and technical qualities of the individual teachers." And such policy pronouncements have been reinforced by an extensive body of empirical investigations undertaken in a variety of societies, documenting the link between teachers' qualifications and behavior and educational outcomes, such as the learning and attainment of female and male students (e.g., Aslam and Kingdon 2007; Barber and Mourshed 2007; Bruns and Luque 2014; OECD 2005; UNESCO 2004; UIS 2006; Vegas et al. 2012). Thus, there is a solid foundation for Sinyolo's (2007, p. 16) conclusion that "the achievement of Education for All targets … depends, to a very large extent, on the availability of properly trained and qualified teachers. The educational quality imperative cannot be met without quality teachers."

Declining Focus on Teachers and Teacher Education in Comparative Education in the United States

The first professional organization of comparative educators was founded in the United States in 1956. Initially, the Comparative Education Society (which changed its name to the Comparative and International Education Society in 1968) was launched as a section of the National Society of College Teachers of Education (Brickman 1977; Swing 2007). This organizational link indicates that in the early years many comparative educators, at least in the United States, taught undergraduate courses included in preservice teacher education programs. The explicit connection with teachers and teacher education also reflects the longer European history of the field of comparative education. For instance, Marc Antoine Jullien (1775–1848), who is frequently identified as one of the founders of the field of Comparative Education, at least in Europe and North America, highlighted the importance of teachers and teacher education. In his "plan for comparative education, which he published in 1816, … he called for a Normal Institute of Education for Europe, which would educate teachers in the best-known methods of teaching" (Hayhoe et al. 2017, p. 4; see also Fraser 1964).

However, beginning in the 1970s in the United States, undergraduate courses in comparative education were less frequently offered,[1] while graduate courses and programs in comparative and international education continued to grow in number, attracting future professors of comparative education as well as international education practitioners (researchers/evaluators, international education development professionals, and foreign exchange and study abroad administrators). As Tretheway (1976, p. 4) explains:

> From being one of the subjects of the standard courses of initial teacher education in the 1940s and 1950s, … comparative education was often dropped, subsumed into such other studies as 'education in society' or the 'social foundations of education,' or offered as an optional extra or elective study. (see also Ginsburg et al. 2019, p. 3; Kubow and Fossum 2003, pp. 17–18)[2]

Similarly, in recent decades the occupational group and the activities of teachers, while remaining visible, have not really received the attention in coursework in the field of comparative education as have educational systems, educational policies, and international organizations. This point is highlighted by:

> In the United States, … [i]ncreasingly, the doctoral-level academic programs have been serving students with more practical interests, including many overseas students who will return to positions in government ministries, planning agencies related to education and academic institutions. … [Similarly,] comparative education has … served educational planners, policy makers, and others involved with the applied aspects of educational policy making … in ministries of education, international agencies, [and] aid organizations …. (Kelly et al. 1982, p. 508; see also Kubow and Fossum 2003, p. 17)

The minimal focus on teachers, teaching, and teacher education is also illustrated in Table 7.1. In Table 7.1 one notes that during the 100 year

[1] For example, of the 85 course syllabi they collected in 1994 from CIES members, only 8 "course outlines were designed for undergraduate students in education" (Ross et al. 1995, p. 4).

[2] Kubow and Blosser (2016, pp. 7–8) explain that such shifts occurred "in locations as diverse as Germany, Singapore, the United Kingdom and the United States … [because of a] technicist or utilitarian impulse in teacher education …".

Table 7.1 Proportion of comparative education books with chapters focused on teachers or teacher education

Time period	*Proportion of books with chapters on teachers or teacher education*
Pre-1950	1/3
1950s	1/3
1960s	6/13
1970s	1/4
1980s	0/4
1990s	4/7
2000s	4/9
2010s	0/8
Pre-1950–2010s	18/51

period (1918–2017) in which English-language textbooks, which focus generally on comparative education, have been published, only approximately one-third (18/51) of them included even one chapter focused on teachers or teacher education. Moreover, of the seventeen general comparative education textbooks, fourteen had only one such chapter and the other three had two chapters, with the overall percentage of chapters with a focus on teachers or teacher education in such comparative education textbooks being 3.1% (21/676) (see more details in Table 7.2 in the Appendix).[3]

Additionally, even though there was a spike in the 1990s and 2000s in the number of comparative education textbooks containing at least one chapter focused on teachers or teacher education, a survey of CIES members undertaken during these decades indicates the relatively low level of attention to teachers and teacher education in courses in the field. The 2001 survey found that teachers, teaching, and teacher education were neither among the 10 themes most frequently reported by CIES members nor the 10 themes most often mentioned as not adequately accounted for in comparative education courses (Cook et al. 2004, pp. 136–137).

In this chapter, I summarize other colleagues' and my own work in the field of comparative and international education that has focused on

[3] Note that the number of textbooks published with at least one such chapter spiked somewhat in the 1960s (6/13), 1990s (4/7), and 2000s (4/9), and then bottomed out in the 2010s (0/8).

teachers. Attention is given to the topics of preservice teacher preparation, inservice teacher development, teachers' work and occupational status, teachers' professional organizations/unions, teachers' engagement in educational reform, and teachers' involvement in community/societal change. Even limiting the focus to book-length authored or edited volumes that focus on at least two countries, one will see that there are many published works that illuminate various aspects of teachers' situations.

Preservice Teacher Preparation

There are many books published reporting cross-national studies of preservice teacher preparation or initial teacher education. Some of these volumes stem from the work undertaken by individuals or a team of scholars (Dove 1986; King 1970; Lynch and Plunkett 1973), including an ambitious effort to carry out a study of mathematics teacher education programs in 17 countries carried out under the aegis of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) (Ingvarson et al. 2013; Tatto et al. 2012). Others are based on chapters compiled by one or more editors (Darling-Hammond and Lieberman 2012; Gilroy and Smith 1993; Ginsburg 2012; Gumbert 1990; Leavitt 1992; Sharpes 1988; Tisher and Wideen 1990). A number of these books focused on teacher education in specific geographical regions: (a) Africa (Griffin 2012; Mulkeen 2010; Sanyal 2013), (b) Asia (Cheng et al. 2004; Morris and Williamson 2000); (c) Europe (Lomax 1976); or (d) Latin America (Duthilleul 2005). Several books highlighted political or social justice issues in teacher education (Ben-Peretz and Feiman-Nemser 2018; Ginsburg and Lindsay 1995; Popkewitz 1987; Schwarzer and Bridglall 2015). And nine other volumes examined challenges and directions for teacher education reform (Freeman-Moir and Scott 2007; Goodings et al. 1982; Karras and Wolhuter 2010; Kimonen and Nevalainen 2017; Popkewitz 1993; Schwille and Dembélé 2007; Thomas 2002; Townsend and Bates 2007; Wideen and Grimmett 1995).

Inservice Teacher Development

Books reporting on cross-national analyses of inservice teacher development – including induction programs, professional development workshops and other activities, and supervisory support and guidance – were published mainly during the current century. Some of these volumes included attention to preservice as well as inservice teacher education (Ginsburg 2012; Schwille and Dembélé 2007), although four focused specifically on the organization, content, and outcomes of inservice teacher development (Cordingley et al. 2015; Day and Sachs 2004; Mena et al. 2019; Villegas-Reimers 2003). Developing country contexts in general were emphasized in one of these books (Craig et al. 1998), while two volumes focused specifically on Africa (Mulkeen 2010) or Latin America (Duthilleul 2005).

Teachers' Work and Occupational Status

A sizeable number of books have focused on teachers as workers (i.e., their contexts, practices, and professional status), including those that examine the status and classroom and school activities in one country but with reference to the situation and experiences of educators in other countries (Connell 1985; Robertson 2000; Vavrus and Bartlett 2013). Four other volumes examined teachers' work in a range of countries (Ginsburg 1995, 2012; Lawn and Grace 1987; Saha and Dworkin 2009). More specifically, these publications gave attention to (a) European societies (Barton and Walker 1981; Ozga 1987), (b) developing countries (Dove 1986; Rust and Dalin 1990), and (c) African nations (Adedeeji and Olaniyan 2011). Additionally, the gendered nature of teacher' work and lives has been subjected to comparative studies in six volumes (Dale et al. 1981; DeLyon and Migniuolo 1989; Luke and Gore 1992; Schmuck 1987; Stromquist et al. 2017; Weiler 1988). Finally, two volumes have explicitly discussed teachers' work in various countries within a globalizing world (Niemi et al. 2018; Smyth et al. 2000).

Teachers' Professional Associations and Unions

Related to the teachers' work and occupational status, a small number of volumes have provided comparative insights into the structure, functioning, and impact of teachers' professional associations and unions. These include books published in (a) the 1960s (Blum 1969), (b) the 1990s (Cooper 1992), and (c) more recently (Bascia 2015; Moe and Wiborg 2017).

Teachers' Engagement in Educational Reform

While much of the focus of the comparative studies of teacher organizations has been on how they address educators' concerns about remuneration and working conditions, attention was also given to organized teachers' efforts to promote (Bascia 2015) or block (Moe and Wiborg 2017) various educational reform initiatives. In general, scholars included in several volumes have documented how teachers have been involved in the politics of educational reform or been the targets of such reforms (Akiba 2013; Fontdevilla and Verger 2015; Ginsburg 1991; Menlo and Collet 2015; Verger et al. 2013).

Teachers' Involvement in Community/Societal Change

That teachers, individually or organizationally, engage in actions to shape educational reform is seen by some as integral aspect of their professional responsibilities. However, teachers' involvement in more general social change efforts represents, for some, a more controversial extension of their professional work and lives. Because of this, the three books that have explored teachers' involvement in community or societal change efforts across a range of societies and historical periods make an important contribution to the field of comparative education (Dove 1986; Ginsburg 1995; Ginsburg 2012).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I argued that courses and texts focused on comparative education should devote more attention to teachers and their situations (e.g., their preservice preparation, inservice development, work and occupational status, professional organizations/unions, engagement in educational reform, and involvement in community/societal change). I have documented much of the book-length literature in English that could be drawn upon by instructors and authors/editors in the field to accomplish this.

I conclude this chapter by highlighting two points. The first is to acknowledge that my argument is not without precedent among scholars in comparative education. For example, Isaac Kandel, in his book, *Comparative Education,* originally published in 1933, identifies three sets of "questions fundamental to the progress of education," with the third "centering round the teacher." He identifies these questions in the following quote:

> [What] is the place of the teacher in society and in the educational system? What should be the character of teacher preparation and the relation of academic to professional training [?] … [W]hat should be the part of the teacher in promoting educational progress? How much freedom should the teacher enjoy? … How much supervision and inspection are desirable and by what standards should effective teaching be measured? (Kandel 1933, 1970, p. xxii)

Second, as shown in Table 7.1 (and Table 7.2) over a 100-year period (1918–2017) some – approximately one-third of – authors and editors of comparative education volumes have included at least one chapter explicitly focused on teachers and their situation. My view that this is not sufficient is also shared by other comparative educators. For instance, Kubow and Fossum (2003, p. 16) suggest that comparative education as a

> field has not opened its arms to mainline educational practitioners—teachers—whose work "in the trenches" has once again apparently relegated practitioner knowledge and perspectives to a lesser status. … Comparative education's potential use as a catalyst for educator reflection and analysis has not yet been realized.

And Hayhoe et al. (2017, p. 2) explain:

> At its most basic, comparative education offers a starting point for improving our educational systems and our classroom practices. It also challenges us to think broadly about the link between local practices and global issues, and to explore the overlapping values and social systems that underpin the educational enterprise itself. For teachers, an understanding of the comparative education literature helps for reflection on issues of concern in their own classrooms …

I strongly believe that the value of comparative education for teachers – but also administrators, teacher educators, policymakers, and teacher organization leaders – will be enhanced if teachers and their situation are given more attention in the texts and courses in the field.

Appendix

Table 7.2 Chapters in comparative education textbooks focused on teachers or teacher education

Book	*Number of chapters on teachers*	*Total number of chapters*	*Percentage of chapters on teachers (%)*
Peter Sandiford, William Russell, Isaac Kandel, Arthur Hope, & Harold Foght (1918). *Studies of Education Systems in Six Modern Nations*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons	0	6	0
Paul Monroe (1927). *Essays in Comparative Education*. New York: Teachers College Press	0	12	0
Isaac Kandel (1933, 1970). *Comparative Education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin; Westport: Greenwood Press	2[a]	10	20
Arthur Moehlman & Joseph Rouček (eds.) (1951). *Comparative Education*. New York: The Dryden Press	0	19	0
Isaac Kandel (1955). *The New Era in Education: A Comparative Study*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin	1[b]	10	10
Nicholas Hans (1958, 1961). *Comparative Education: A Study of Educational Factors and Traditions*, 3rd edition. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul	0	16	0
Vernon Mallinson (1960). *An Introduction to the Study of Comparative Education*. London: Heineman	1[c]	10	10

(continued)

Table 7.2 (continued)

Book	*Number of chapters on teachers*	*Total number of chapters*	*Percentage of chapters on teachers (%)*
Edumund King (1962). *World Perspectives in Education*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company	1[d]	14	7.1
Theodore Reller & Edgar Morphet (1962). *Comparative Educational Administration*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall	0	21	0
Arthur Moehlman (1963). *Comparative Educational Systems*. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education	0	7	0
George Bereday (1964). *Comparative Method in Education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston	1[e]	12	8.3
Brian Holmes (1965). *Problems in Education: A Comparative Approach*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul	1[f]	11	9.1
Andreas Kazamias & Brian Massialas (1965). *Tradition and Change in Education: A Comparative Study*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall	0	10	0
John Cramer & George Browne (1965). *Contemporary Education: A Comparative Study of National Systems*, 2nd edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World	0	20	0

(continued)

Table 7.2 (continued)

Book	*Number of chapters on teachers*	*Total number of chapters*	*Percentage of chapters on teachers (%)*
Don Adams (1966). *Introduction to Education: Comparative Analysis*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing	2[g]	9	22.2
Robert Havinghurst (ed.) (1968). *Comparative Perspectives on Education*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company	0	22	0
Edmund King (1968). *Comparative Studies in Educational Decision*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company	0	6	0
Andreas Kazamias & Erwin Epstein (1968). *Schools in Transition: Essays in Comparative Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon	0	28	0
Harold Noah & Max Eckstein (1969). *Towards a Science of Comparative Education*. New York: Macmillan	0	18	0
Edmund King (ed.) (1969). *Essays on World Education: The Crisis of Supply and Demand*. New York: Oxford University Press	1[h]	18	5.6
Joseph Fischer (ed.) (1970). *The Social Sciences and the Comparative Study of Educational Systems*. Scranton: International Textbook Company	1[i]	13	7.7
Alan Trethewey (1976). *Introducing Comparative Education*. Rushcutters Bay, New South Wales, Australia: Pergamon Press	0	8	0

(continued)

Table 7.2 (continued)

Book	*Number of chapters on teachers*	*Total number of chapters*	*Percentage of chapters on teachers (%)*
Antonina Kloskowska & Guido Martinotti (1977). *Education in a Changing Society*. Beverly Hills: Sage	0	14	0
Edmund King (1979). *Other Schools and Ours: Comparative Studies for Today*, 5th edition. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston	0	12	0
Brian Holmes (1981). *Comparative Education: Some Considerations of Method*. London: Allyn & Unwin	0	10	0
Philip Altbach, Robert Amove, & Gail Kelly (eds.) (1982). *Comparative Education*. New York: Macmillan	0	18	0
Ingemar Fägerlind & Lawrence Saha (eds.) (1983). *Education and National Development: Comparative Perspectives*. Oxford: Pergamon Press	0	9	0
Philip Altbach & Gail Kelly (eds.) (1986). *New Approaches to Comparative Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press	0	23	0
R. Murray Thomas (1990). *International Comparative Education*. Oxford: Pergamon	1[j]	12	8.3
William Halls (1990). *Comparative Education: Contemporary Issues and Trends*. London: J. Kingsley Publisher; Paris: UNESCO	0	10	0
Saul Robinsohn & Hilda Robinsohn (1992). *Comparative Education: A Basic Approach: A Selection of Writings by Saul Robinsohn*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press	1[k]	11	9.1

(continued)

Table 7.2 (continued)

Book	*Number of chapters on teachers*	*Total number of chapters*	*Percentage of chapters on teachers (%)*
Robert Burns & Anthony Welch (1992). *Contemporary Perspectives in Comparative Education*. New York: Garland Publishers	0	16	0
Robert Arnove, Philip Altbach, & Gail Kelly (eds.) (1992). *Emergent Issues in Education: Comparative Perspectives*. Albany: State University of New York Press	1[l]	18	5.6
Joseph Zadja (ed.) (1995) *Education and Society*. Albert Park, Australia: James Nichols Publishers	1[m]	16	6.3
Robert Arnove & Carlos Torres (eds.) (1999). *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield	0	16	0
Nelly Stromquist & Karen Monkman (eds.) (2000). *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation across Cultures*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield	0	17	0
Nicholas Burbules & Carlos Torres (eds.) (2000). *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge	0	14	0
Michael Crossley & Keith Watson (2003). *Comparative and International Education: Globalisation, Context and Difference*. London: RoutledgeFlame	0	8	0
Patricia Kubow & Paul Fossum (2003). *Comparative Education: Exploring Issues in International Context*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education	1[n]	8	12.5
Jurgen Schriewer (ed.) (2003). *Discourse Formation in Comparative Education*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang	0	10	0

(continued)

Table 7.2 (continued)

Book	*Number of chapters on teachers*	*Total number of chapters*	*Percentage of chapters on teachers (%)*
Mark Bray (ed.) (2003). *Comparative Education: Continuing Traditions, New Challenges, and New Paradigms*. Dordrecht: Kluwer	0	13	0
Peter Ninnes & Sonia Mehta (eds.) (2004). *Re-Imagining Comparative Education*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer	1[o]	14	7.1
David Phillips & Michelle Schweisfurth (2006). *Comparative and International Education: An Introduction to Theory, Methods and Practice*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group	0	8	0
Robert Arnove & Carlos Torres (2007). *Comparative Education: Dialectic of the Global and the Local*, 3rd edition. New York: Rowman and Littlefield	0	17	0
Patricia Kubow & Paul Fossum (2007). *Comparative Education: Exploring Issues in International Context*, 2nd edition. Columbus: Prentice-Hall	1[p]	8	12.5
Karen Mundy, Kathy Bickmore, Ruth Hayhoe, Megan Madden, & Katherine Madjidi (2008). *Comparative and International Education: Issues for Teachers*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press	2[q]	11	18.2
Fran Vavrus & Lesley Bartlett (eds.) (2009). *Critical Approaches to Comparative Education: Vertical Case Studies from Africa, Europe, the Middle East, and the Americas*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan	2[r]	13	15.4
Margaret Larsen (2010). *New Thinking in Comparative Education: Honouring Robert Cowen*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers	0	10	0

(continued)

Table 7.2 (continued)

Book	*Number of chapters on teachers*	*Total number of chapters*	*Percentage of chapters on teachers (%)*
Maria Manzon (2011). *Comparative Education: The Construction of a Field*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre	0	6	0
Jurgen Schriewer (ed.) (2012). *Discourse Formation in Comparative Education*, 4th edition. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang	0	10	0
Robert Arnove, Carlos Torres, & Steven Franz (eds.) (2013). *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local*, 4th edition. New York: Rowman and Littlefield	0	18	0
Colin Brock (2013). *Education Around the World: Comparative Introduction*. New York: Bloomsbury	0	8	0
Nelly Stromquist & Karen Monkman (eds.) (2014). *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation across Cultures*, 2nd edition. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield	0	18	0
David Phillips & Michelle Schweisfurth (2014). *Comparative and International Education: An Introduction to Theory, Methods and Practice*. London: Bloomsbury	0	9	0
Patricia Kubow & Allison Blosser (eds.) (2016). *Teaching Comparative Education: Trends and Issues Informing Practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books	0	12	0

(continued)

Table 7.2 (continued)

Book	*Number of chapters on teachers*	*Total number of chapters*	*Percentage of chapters on teachers (%)*
Kathy Bickmore, Ruth Hayhoe, Carly Manion, Karen Mundy, Robyn Read, & Josseph Farrell (eds.) (2017). *Comparative and International Education: Issues for Teachers*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars	0	13	0

[a]Chapter VII: The Preparation of Elementary Teachers; Chapter IX: [The Preparation of] Secondary School Teachers
[b]Chapter 9: The Preparation of Teachers
[c]Chapter VII: The Training of Teachers
[d]Chapter 9: Teachers and Their Recruitment
[e]Chapter Five: Teacher Performance in Three Countries: England, France, and Germany
[f]Chapter VIII: Teacher Training and the Profession of Education (The U.S.A.)
[g]Chapter 6: Good Teachers and Teaching; Chapter 7: Roles and Status of Teachers
[h]Chapter 7 in Part I: Teacher Education and Modernization
[i]Chapter 10: Teachers in Politics: The Southern Nigerian Case
[j]Chapter 7: Teacher-Supply Systems
[k]Educating the Educators
[l]Chapter 13: A Cross-National Study of Teachers
[m]Chapter 15: An Alternative Culture for Teaching
[n]Chapter 6: Teacher Professionalism
[o]Chapter 7: Making the 21st Century Quality Teacher: A Postfoundational Comparative Approach
[p]Chapter 6: Teacher Professionalism
[q]Chapter Five: Teaching and Learning to Teach; Chapter Six: Understanding Pedagogy: Cross-Cultural and Comparative Insights from Asia
[r]Chapter 6: Transformative Teaching in Restrictive Times: Engaging Teacher Participation in Small School Reform during an Era of Standardization; Ch. 11: Perpetuated Suffering: Social Injustices in Liberian Teachers' Lives

References

Adedeji, Segun Olugbenga., & Olaniyan, Olanrewaju. (2011). *Improving the conditions of teachers and teaching in rural schools across African countries*. Addis Ababa: UNESCO International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000216062. Accessed 1 August 2020.

Akiba, Motoko. (Ed.). (2013). *Teacher reforms around the world: Implementations and outcomes*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Aslam, Monazza., & Kingdon, Geeta. (2007). *What can teachers do to raise pupil achievement?* Oxford: Centre for the Study of African Economies.

Barber, Michael., & Mourshed, Mona. (2007). *How the world's best-performing school systems come out on top*. McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/~/media/McKinsey/Industries/Social%20Sector/Our%20Insights/How%20the%20worlds%20best%20performing%20school%20systems%20come%20out%20on%20top/How_the_world_s_best-performing_school_systems_come_out_on_top.pdf. Accessed 29 July 2020.

Barton, Len., & Walker, Steve. (Eds.). (1981). *Schools, teachers and teaching*. Lewes: Falmer.

Bascia, Nina. (Ed.). (2015). *Teacher unions in public education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ben-Peretz, Miriam., & Feiman-Nemser, Sharon (Eds.). (2018). *Political transformations and teacher education programs*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Blum, Albert A. (Ed.). (1969). *Teacher unions and associations*: *A comparative study*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Brickman, William W. (1977). Comparative and international education society: An historical analysis. *Comparative Education Review, 21*(2/3), 396–404. https://doi.org/10.1086/445950.

Bruns, Barbara., & Luque, Javier. (2014). *Great teachers: How to raise student learning in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group.

Cheng, Yin., Chow, King., & Mok, Magdalena. (Eds.). (2004). *Reform of teacher education in the Asia-Pacific in the new millennium: Trends and challenges.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Connell, Robert. (1985). *Teachers' work*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Cook, Bradley J., Hite, Steven J., & Epstein, Erwin H. (2004). Discerning trends, contours, and boundaries in comparative education: A survey of comparativists and their literature. *Comparative Education Review*, *48*(2): 123–149. https://doi.org/10.1086/382619.

Cooper, Bruce S. (Ed.). (1992). *Labor relations in education: An international perspective*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Cordingley, Philippa., Higgins, Steve., Greany, Toby., Buckler, N., Coles-Jordan, D., Crisp, B., Saunders, L., & Coe, Rob. (2015). *Developing great teaching:*

Lessons from the international reviews into effective professional development. London: Teacher Development Trust.
Craig, Helen J., Kraft, Richard J., & du Plessis, Joy. (1998). *Teacher development: Making an impact*. Washington, DC: USAID and World Bank.
Dale, Roger., Esland, Geoff., Fergusson, Ross., & MacDonald, Madeleine. (Eds.). (1981). *Education and the state: Politics, patriarchy and practice*. London: Taylor & Francis.
Darling-Hammond, Linda., & Lieberman, Ann. (Eds.). (2012). *Teacher education around the world: Changing policies and practices*. London: Routledge.
Day, Christopher., & Sachs, Judyth. (2004). *International handbook on the continuing professional development of teachers*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
DeLyon, Hilary., & Migniuolo, Frances. (Eds.). (1989). *Women teachers*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
Dove, Linda A. (1986). *Teachers and teacher education in developing countries*. London: Croom Helm.
Duthilleul, Yael. (2005). *Teacher education, professional development and certification policies in Latin America*. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.
Fontdevila, Clara., & Verger, Antoni. (2015). *The World Bank's doublespeak on teachers: An analysis of ten years of lending and advice*. Brussels: Education International. http://download.ei-ie.org/Docs/WebDepot/World_Banks_Doublespeak_on_Teachers_Fontdevila_Verger_EI.pdf. Accessed 1 August 2020.
Fraser, Stewart. (1964). *Jullien's plan for comparative education, 1816–1817*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Freeman-Moir, John., & Scott, Alan. (Eds.). (2007). *Shaping the future: Critical essays on teacher education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Gilroy, Peter., & Smith, Michael. (Eds.). (1993). *International analyses of teacher education*. Abingdon: Carfax Publishing Company.
Ginsburg, Mark B. (Ed.). (1991). *Understanding educational reform in global context: Economy, ideology, and the state*. New York: Garland Publishing.
Ginsburg, Mark B. (Ed.). (1995). *The politics of educators' work and lives*. New York: Garland Publishing.
Ginsburg, Mark. (Ed.). (2012). *Preparation, practice, and politics of teachers: Problems and prospects in comparative perspective*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Ginsburg, Mark., & Lindsay, Beverly. (Eds.). (1995). *The political dimension in teacher education: Comparative perspectives on policy formation, socialization and society*. New York: Falmer.
Ginsburg, Mark., Massón Cruz, Rosa María., Rodríguez Alfonso, Emigdio., & García Isaac, Yuitana. (2019). Teaching comparative education in Cuba and

the United States. In Michael A. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of teacher education* (pp. 1–6). Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-1179-6_306-1.

Goodings, Richard., Byram, Michael., & McPartland, Michael. (Eds.). (1982). *Changing priorities in teacher education*. London: Croom Helm.

Griffin, Rosarii, (Ed.). (2012). *Teacher education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Closer perspectives*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Gumbert, Edgar B. (Ed.). (1990). *Fit to teach: Teacher education in international perspective*. Atlanta: Georgia State University.

Hayhoe, Ruth., Manion, Caroline., & Mundy, Karen. (2017). Why study comparative education? In Kathy Bickmore, Ruth Hayhoe, Caroline Manion, Karen Mundy, & Robyn Read (Eds.), *Comparative and international education: Issues for teachers* (2nd ed., pp. 1–26). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Ingvarson, Lawrence., Schwille, John., Tatto, Maria T., Rowley, Glenn., Peck, Ray., & Senk, Sharon L. (2013). *An analysis of teacher education context, structure, and quality-assurance arrangements in TEDS-M countries: Findings from the IEA teacher education and development study in mathematics (TEDS-M)*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. https://www.iea.nl/sites/default/files/2019-04/TEDS-M_Findings.pdf. Accessed 15 January 2020.

International Labour Organization (ILO) & United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (1966). *Recommendation concerning the status of teachers*. Paris: UNESCO. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0016/001604/160495e.pdf. Accessed 1 August 2020.

Kandel, Isaac L. (1933, 1970). *Comparative education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company; Westport: Greenwood Press.

Karras, Konstantinos G., & Wolhuter, Charl C. (Eds.). (2010). *International handbook of teacher education worldwide*. Athens: ION Publishing Group.

Kelly, Gail P., Altbach, Philip G., & Arnove, Robert F. (1982). Trends in comparative education: A critical analysis. In Philip G. Altbach, Robert F. Amove, & Gail P. Kelly (Eds.), *Comparative education* (pp. 505–533). New York: Macmillan.

Kimonen, Eija., & Nevalainen, Raimo. (Eds.). (2017). *Reforming teaching and teacher education: Bright prospects for active schools*. Leiden: Brill Sense.

King, Edmund J. (1970). *The teacher and the needs of society in evolution*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kubow, Patricia K., & Blosser, Allison H. (Eds.). (2016). *Teaching comparative education: Trends and issues informing practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books Ltd.

Kubow, Patricia K., & Fossum, Paul R. (2003). *Comparative education: Exploring issues in international context*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education.

Lawn, Martin., & Grace, Gerald (Eds.). (1987). *Teachers: The culture and politics of work*. London: Falmer Press.

Leavitt, Howard B. (Ed.). (1992). *Issues and problems in teacher education: An international handbook*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Lomax, Donald. E. (1976). *European perspectives in teacher education*. London: Wiley.

Luke, Carmen., & Gore, Jennifer. (Eds.). (1992). *Feminisms and critical pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.

Lynch, James., & Plunkett, H. Dudley. (1973). *Teacher education and cultural change: England, France, West Germany*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.

Mena, Juanjo., García-Valcárcel, Ana., & García-Peñalvo, Francisco (Eds.). (2019). *Teachers' professional development in global contexts*. Leiden: Brill Sense.

Menlo, Allen., & Collet, LeVerne (Eds.). (2015). *Do teachers wish to be agents of change? Will principals support them?* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Moe, Terry., & Wiborg, Susanne. (Eds.). (2017). *The comparative politics of education: Teachers unions and education systems around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morris, Paul., & Williamson, John (Eds.). (2000). *Teacher education in the Asia-Pacific region*. New York: Falmer Press.

Mulkeen, Adrian. (2010). *Teachers in Anglophone Africa: Issues in teacher supply, training, and management*. Washington, DC: World Bank Publications.

Niemi, Hannele., Toom, Auli., Kallioniemi, Arto., & Lavonen, Jari (Eds.). (2018). *The teacher's role in the changing globalizing world*. Leiden: Brill Sense.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2005). *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Ozga, Jenny (Ed.). (1987). *School work: Approaches to the labor process of teaching*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. (Ed.). (1987). *Critical studies in teacher education*. New York: Falmer Press.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. (Ed.). (1993). *Changing patterns of power: Social regulation and teacher education reform*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Robertson, Susan L. (2000). *A class act: Changing teachers' work, the state, and globalisation*. New York: Falmer Press.

Ross, Heidi., Post, David., & Farrell, Joseph. (1995). Prologue to the investigation of comparative and international education graduate programs, Part II. *CIES Newsletter*, September (110), 1, 4–5.

Rust, Val D., & Dalin, Per (Eds.). (1990). *Teachers and teaching in the developing world*. New York: Garland.

Saha, Lawrence., & Dworkin, Anthony G. (Eds.). (2009). *International handbook of research on teachers and teaching*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Sanyal, Bikas C. (2013). *Quality assurance of teacher education in Africa*. Addis Ababa: UNESCO: International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa. http://www.iicba.unesco.org/sites/default/files/Fundamentals%20of%20Teacher%20Education%20Development%20No5.pdf. Accessed 1 August 2020.

Schmuck, Patricia A. (Ed.). (1987). *Women educators: Employees of schools in western countries*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Schwarzer, David., & Bridglall, Beatrice L. (Eds.). (2015). *Promoting global competence and social justice in teacher education*. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Schwille, John., & Dembélé, Martial. (2007). *Global perspectives on teacher learning: Improving policy and practice*. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000150261. Accessed 1 August 2020.

Sharpes, Donald K. (Ed.). (1988). *International perspectives on teacher education*. London: Routledge.

Sinyolo, Dennis. (2007). *Teacher supply, recruitment and retention in six Anglophone Sub-Saharan African countries*. Brussels: Education International.

Smyth, John., Dow, Alastair., Hattam, Robert., Reid, Alan., & Shacklock, Geoffrey. (2000). *Teachers' work in a globalising economy*. New York: Falmer Press.

Stromquist, Nelly P., Klees, Steven J., & Lin, Jing. (Eds.). (2017). *Women teachers in Africa: Challenges and possibilities*. New York: Routledge.

Swing, Elizabeth S. (2007). The Comparative and International Education Society (CIES). In Vandra Masemann, Mark Bray, & Maria Manzon (Eds.), *Common interests, uncommon goals: Histories of the World Council of Comparative Education Societies and Its members* (pp. 94–115). Hong Kong: Springer and the Comparative Education Research Centre of the University of Hong Kong.

Tatto, Maria Teresa., Schwille, John., Senk, Sharon L., Ingvarson, Lawrence, Rowley, Glenn., Peck, Ray., Bankov, Kiril., Rodriguez, Michael., & Reckase, Mark. (2012). *Policy, practice, and readiness to teach primary and secondary mathematics in 17 Countries: Findings from the IEA teacher education and development study in mathematics (TEDS-M)*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED542380.pdf. Accessed 27 July 2020.

Thomas, Elwyn. (Ed.). (2002). *Teacher education: Dilemmas and prospects*. London: Kogan Page.
Tisher, Richard P., & Wideen, Marvin (Eds.). (1990). *Research in teacher education: International perspectives*. Lewes: Falmer Press.
Townsend, Tony., & Bates, Richard. (2007). *Handbook of teacher education: Globalization, standards and professionalism in times of change*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Trethewey, Alan R. (1976). *Introducing comparative education*. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Pergamon Press.
United Nations (UN). (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld. Accessed 22 August 2020.
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Global Education Monitoring Report Team. (2004). *Education for all: The quality imperative*; *EFA global monitoring report, 2005*. Paris: UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000137333. Accessed 1 August 2020.
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Institute for Statistics (UIS). (2006). *Teachers and educational quality: Monitoring global needs for 2015*. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics. http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/teachers-and-educational-quality-monitoring-global-needs-for-2015-en_0.pdf. Accessed 1 August 2020.
UNESCO, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNWomen, & World Bank Group. (2015). *Education 2030: Incheon declaration and framework for action: Towards inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning for all*. http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/ED/ED_new/pdf/FFA-ENG-27Oct15.pdf. Accessed 1 August 2020.
Vavrus, Frances., & Bartlett, Lesley (Eds.). (2013). *Teaching in tension: International pedagogies, national policies, and teachers' practices in Tanzania*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Vegas, Emiliana., Loeb, Susanna., Romaguera, Pilar., Paglayan, Agustina., Goldstein, Nicole, Ganimian, Alejandro., Trembley, Andrew., & Jaimovich, Analía. (2012). *What matters most in teacher policies? A framework for building a more effective teaching profession*. Washington, DC: World Bank. https://olc.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/SABER-Teachers-What_matters_most_in_teacher_policies-Framework_paper_0.pdf. Accessed 1 August 2020.
Verger, Antoni., Altinyelken, Hülya., & de Koning, Mireille. (Eds.). (2013). *Global managerial education reforms and teachers*. Brussels: Education International.

Villegas-Reimers, Eleonora. (2003). *Teacher professional development: An international review of the literature*. Paris: UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning. http://www.cndwebzine.hcp.ma/cnd_sii/IMG/pdf/HTTP__~4.PDF. Accessed 1 August 2020.

Weiler, Kathleen. (1988). *Women teaching for change: Gender, class and power*. Westport: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Wideen, Marvin F., & Grimmett, Peter P. (Eds.). (1995). *Changing times in teacher education: Restructuring or reconceptualization*? New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

CHAPTER 8

Expanding the Field of Comparative and International Education: The Inclusion of Gender

Nelly P. Stromquist

My ideas on women, gender, and education have undergone substantial evolution over my professional life, moving from parity to content, from disciplinary cognition to empowerment, from state policy to women's collective agency. I also have learned to recognize the importance of adult education and literacy, to see women's organizations as indispensable actors in the process of social change, and to view international agencies working in the education development field as another manifestation of state behavior. With the forceful impact of globalization, my attention has also focused on higher education and its functioning as a gendered institution.

Although there were already women's studies programs when I was a student, I did not take such courses thinking that I stood little to learn from them. It was later, when I entered into contact with numerous

N. P. Stromquist (✉)
University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA
e-mail: stromqui@umd.edu

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_8

research organizations across the world as part of my job with an international development semi-governmental agency (the International Development Research Centre, Canada), that I learned the importance of gender if national well-being and crucial individual capabilities were to be attained. It was in the Dominican Republic, way back in 1982, that a charismatic feminist leader and sociologist (Magaly Pineda) took me through the details and complexities involved in the concepts of production and reproduction. Since then, my learning has been persistent, a combination of assiduous reading, ongoing contact with feminist scholars, and self-reflection on both my immediate environment in a highly industrialized country (the United States) and more distant experiences in parts of the world facing poverty, totalitarian government, and cultural/religious beliefs restricting women's roles in society.

My training in comparative and international education has helped me to recognize similarities and differences across cultures and nation states along multiple areas of human action: public policy, law, the sexual division of labor at home and work, the cult of motherhood, physical violence against women, among others. But my evolution has not been linear but rather frequently challenged by the tentative nature of knowledge as well as the imperative of corrective, if not transformative, action. This has meant that, in my thinking, theory has gained prominence and methods of knowing have become more eclectic. However, while considering the importance of subjectivity in knowledge and the role of historical and social contexts in shaping what "truth" is, I endeavor to demonstrate that gender asymmetries are universal and operate mostly to the disadvantage of women.

My engagement within CIES has combined both theory/research with practical action. Such action has been linked primarily to the Gender and Education Committee of the Society. In the text that follows, I treat all of these issues under their respective subheadings.

The Use of Theory

Women are not a homogenous group, feminists are not a homogeneous group, conceptualizations of democracy vary. Diversity is central to life and to the social sciences as well. But a scientific endeavor is one that can identify key patterns and capture the complexity of phenomena in a parsimonious way. Over time, the fundamental importance of working with a coherent theory of how gender operates in society has become paramount in my thinking. The understanding of gender and the efforts to modify its negative features call for two types of theory: a theory of gender and a theory of social change. Applied to gender, theory has meant to differentiate between cause and effect, to identify root causes, and to consider the level of resource and leverage needed for successful outcomes of particular efforts. We must not confuse sexism (based on a gender ideology) and sexual discrimination (a social practice justified by gender ideology).

Most organizations, as subsets of society, are gendered (Acker 1990). Educational institutions are thus also gendered, with institutional decision-making and management dominated by men and organizational structures and procedures tending to reproduce culturally and historically constructed gendered social relations (Acker 1994). Schools and universities reflect ideologies that create and maintain values, norms, and behaviors. In this context, "discrimination against women's education" is but a symptom of deeper, and pervasive notions about women's inferiority to men in physical and intellectual terms. The social sciences have captured this ideology through the concept of "patriarchy" – a system that organizes society along multiple structures, is stable, and has a large number of individuals (mostly men) who benefit from it (for a nuanced version of patriarchy, see Connell's (1995) treatment of masculinities). Patriarchy is supported by state action and one of its key vectors is the home and its sexual division of labor. While patriarchy does respond to social demands, it is slow to change so multisector, concerted, and persistent action is indispensable to alter it (Stromquist 2017).

Regarding social change, contributions from researchers outside education have been enormously helpful. The work of James Rosenau (1990) and Carol Weiss (1995) on the concept of "theory of action" illuminated the connection between the micro and the macro realities of our social life, noting how the constant interaction between structure and agency must be examined to understand predictable and unexpected outcomes. Fundamental were Rosenau's mapping of micro and macro-level actors and the recognition of hierarchy and authority as key instruments of control as well as Weiss's attention to the implicit assumptions in a change process and the imperative to examine all linkages between the steps in the process of change. The work of Antonio Gramsci (1971) was transformative as it opened my eyes to the construction of consent (through which ideology becomes "common sense") in preserving the status quo and the possibility of change through education outside the school system and via collective action. Michel Foucault's writings (1980) enabled me to recognize power at micro-levels and to identify how resistance is exerted in both explicit and subtle ways. The work by Nancy Fraser (1995, 2000, 2009), operating at both philosophical and practical political levels, has been instrumental in helping me to distinguish between claims for representation, redistribution, and recognition.

Educational Access Parity

When the second wave of the feminist movement started, generally acknowledged to have begun in the 1970s, school access showed a clear advantage for boys and men. The poorer the family and the country, the less girls tended to enroll in primary schools; the poorer the country and the more orthodox its religious ideas, the more girls failed to transition from primary to secondary school. Regardless of income, the participation of women in higher education was much lower than that of men. No doubt, it was crucial to seek the integration of women into public education systems as well as to ensure that integration occurred for girls and women across all social classes, residence (not only urban but also rural), ethnicity, and "race."

Educational progress has taken place. Gaps between girls and boys in primary enrollment have decreased notably over time. By 2016, two-thirds of the countries in the world had achieved gender parity in primary education, although only one in two countries had achieved gender parity in lower secondary education and only one in four countries in upper secondary education (UNESCO 2019). Globally, *completion* rates among girls have been improving and are close to parity in all regions, except in sub-Saharan Africa (UNESCO 2017), an area in which gender intersects with adolescence and high levels of poverty, and cultural norms foster marriage and motherhood before adulthood. Women, despite a continued segregation by field of study, have made advances in *tertiary* education (which combines university and short-cycle post-secondary vocational and technical studies); today, there are 111 women enrolled in tertiary education for 100 men enrolled at that level across the world. Notwithstanding several persistent inequalities in education, schooling and health are the areas in which the gender gap has most notably been reduced across nations (96% closed in both cases) compared to slight improvement in the economic and political spheres (58 and 25%, respectively, World Economic Forum 2019).

Two questions could be asked in this regard: Why are educational parity gains so much easier to attain than women's access to economic and political power? Is this a consequence of barriers mounted by men or, although women are now more knowledgeable than before, women have not taken direct action to improve their conditions? A partial explanation can be found in the fact that most often greater access by women to schooling has been a by-product of the increase in the number of schools. Such access has been also facilitated through four crucial measures: (1) the training in gender-related issues of new teachers and the retraining of teachers already in service, (2) the redesign and production of educational materials to provide students a progressive gender content, (3) the elaboration of strategies to link education to the mass media and social media to counter patriarchal messages, and (4) the allocation of financial resources to bring the preceding measures to the scale needed to mount an effective intervention. Clearly, more opportunity for successful intervention exists at meso (institutional) than macro-levels (societal). Such interventions are growing in number and, while they seek to modify institutional practices, they characteristically have a very limited reach and thus are unable to modify school cultures that require deeper and more widespread gender consciousness and forming a large cadre of gender-sensitive teachers and administrators.

School Knowledge

In our long years as students partaking in formal education, we learn many useful things: to read, write, speak better, think more soundly, develop civility, and think beyond ourselves. From a gender perspective, this knowledge is partial and does not prepare us directly for greater self-reflection about the roles women and men are made to play in society. The issue of the curriculum was paramount for me as I became aware, as many other feminists did, that key issues such as menstruation, abortion, sexual harassment, rape, domestic violence, and incest (a practice more common than is usually admitted, particularly in high-poverty contexts) were simply not addressed in schools. Also not covered in the curriculum were legal aspects regarding marriage, access to credit, and property rights. In other words, women were not given the knowledge needed to become full citizens. Since then, I have been critical of efforts to focus exclusively on numerical parity in enrollment (see also Ghosh chapter, this volume). The incorporation of this fundamental knowledge in a curriculum adjusted to cover kindergarten to college levels remains an unfulfilled task.

Non-Formal Education

Although I was exposed to non-formal education through my graduate studies, it was only when I came into contact with women's organizations and women-led NGOs that I appreciated its enormous importance. The use of out-of-school venues and teaching models with adult women made it evident that women needed – and could – develop their own knowledge to tackle what they had been missing all along. In the United States, women's groups were creating such knowledge. Deserving special recognition is the work of a Boston women's group that produced a slim book entitled *Our Bodies, Ourselves* (1970) providing information on the reproductive organs, sexuality, and reproductive health. This book has been translated into 29 languages, with over 4 million copies sold – a figure that dwarfs many formal research publications.

Since a transformation in the social relations of gender necessarily implies cultural change, this process has to touch women and men at all levels and walks of life, from childhood to adulthood, from schooling to adult literacy, from urban to rural location. I saw literacy as a basic tool to understand the world and to participate in it in fair ways. Paulo Freire (1970) was a source of substantial influence for his notion of political "consciousness raising," in which dialogue played an essential part. Upon learning he was coordinating a major literacy program in Sao Paulo, Brazil, I decided to study it, focusing on its process, outcomes, and proximate impact on the participating women (Stromquist 1997). This study showed that, while adult literacy had enormous potential (what else can rival exposure to the stable, abstract, and beyond-one's-borders knowledge made possible through print?), reading and writing needed constant support as well as access to feminist reading materials for it to become a practice and even more so a *gender transformative* practice.

But transformative knowledge *was* taking place in small, less visible women's groups, outside the public and state gaze. This phenomenon took me to explore the work of three women-led NGOs in Latin America (one in the Dominican Republic and two in Peru). I selected these NGOs because they operated nationally, had been at work for several years, and amassed evidence about their work. I found that the leadership style of these groups and their range of activities differed greatly from one another. They all had in common, however, the creation of knowledge both to understand the condition of women in their own society and to propose ways to modify their gendered social order. They were extremely aware of the gender-related policies and practices in their countries and tried to influence them through multiple strategies (Stromquist 2007). Though women-led NGOs are crucial collective change agents, partnership with them is almost absent among nation states and international agencies.

The State and the Gendered Social Order

Inequalities in the treatment of women through law (or its absence) and institutions such as the workplace, organized religion, and schools have been maintained through decades by the nation states of the modern era. Patriarchal states are not static; they seek to become democratic by recognizing demands from subordinate groups. Their response, however, tends to be more symbolic (via public policy declarations) than real (Stromquist 1993, 1995, 2006). A fundamental task of the state is the protection of human rights; without the state as enforcer, citizens cannot enjoy such rights. A profusion of national and global agreements now announce commitment to the greater inclusion of girls and women in educational organizations. Much less frequent are specific interventions and innovations to secure that this promised inclusion are undertaken at the necessary *national scale*. Further, the proposed measures habitually deal with manifestations of inequality, not with the causes that generate it. In other words, there are significant challenges to relying on the state as the prime defender of women's rights. It must be remembered that it was women in the feminist movement in the late 1960s who coined the most concise phrase linking feminism to the state: "the personal is political," a slogan that captured the need for the state to recognize that the home was not a man's "castle," but an area where violence against women was often perpetuated and hence not merely a private matter but a criminal offense.

Nation states and the international organizations they fund – from UNESCO to the World Bank – now identify gender as a social and cultural construction, and even recognize that power relations between men and women are involved. They also highlight the importance of human rights in addressing gender inequality. Yet, these institutions do not engage in a solid application of theory as they refrain from addressing contradictions and conflicts in the increasing number of normative conventions and declarations (Klees et al. 2012; Stromquist 2012). Nor do they discuss efforts by countries and a wide range of actors to suppress gender transformative action. States and international organizations, therefore, prefer to engage in aspirational statements rather than confronting reality. In behaving in this manner, institutions reinforce patriarchal ideologies. The current situation is reminiscent of an observation made by historian Rutger Bregman at the 2019 World Economic Forum, a global venue whose ostensible objective was to examine justice and equality but which avoided any discussion of global taxation. He said, "It feels like I'm at a firefighters conference and no one is allowed to speak about water" (TIME 2019).

The UN-sponsored Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that are to be attained by 2030 identify both education and gender as critical goals (UN 2015). SDG 4 refers to efforts "to ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education." It focuses primarily on parity and approximates only modestly the issue of knowledge content through an indicator of "the extent to which global citizenship education," including human rights and gender equality are mainstreamed in primary and secondary schooling.[1] SDG 5 aims "to ensure gender equality and the empowerment of women." Nothing in this goal *challenges* the sexual division of labor at home nor recognizes the power of pervasive and enduring ideologies such as patriarchy. These goals for social change, consequently, are weak, undetermined, and partial.[2]

Women's Empowerment

With nation states and international agencies evincing partial deafness when it comes to working with women's groups, it is clear that women's

[1] This numeral indicator has two flaws: (1) what is an acceptable "extent" is not defined, so it depends on whatever a country might so consider, and (2) how issues of human rights and gender equality are treated in the school curriculum is beyond the scope of the monitoring of SDG 4. It can be suspected that what is learned in schools will continue to avoid "controversial" topics.

[2] As in the case of SDG 4, these indicators offer no criteria on what acceptable "proportions" should be, leaving that entirely to the discretion of the UN member-states and comprise no mechanisms by which civil society and women's organizations may participate in defining what represents desirable progress.

sense of agency must be promoted first and foremost. The concept of "empowerment," whose origins can be traced to the US civil rights movement and to Indian feminists, emerged in my mind as a precious resource. I saw it as comprising four mutually supportive dimensions: a sense of one's worth (the psychological dimension, which enables one to think as having the right to agency), the capability to have some degree of financial self-sufficiency (the economic dimension, which reduces one's economic dependency on others), the development of social and political awareness (learning to recognize one's world and how it functions), and using empirical evidence and theoretical understanding (the knowledge dimension, which in making one informed, enables her to act and make claims). I would add to the knowledge dimension a new human right: the right to know.[3] Also, I would like to reiterate that it is primarily on the basis of empowering oneself individually that the ability to act collectively to make demands upon the state (the political dimension) follows (Stromquist 2002, 2015, 2017). Empowerment goes beyond resilience; while the latter is the ability to cope with major challenges in a given situation, the former seeks to steel ourselves to alter negative situations. In the context of international and comparative education, poverty (the oppressive facet of socioeconomic class) emerges as a significant compounding factor in gender inequality across nations. A proper approach to poverty is not coping with it but seeking ways to eliminate it. Regrettably, the concept of empowerment has been appropriated by international agencies primarily to mean women's participation in the labor force, irrespective of job conditions, under the assumption that income alone can enable women to become more assertive and develop a critical consciousness.

Epistemological and Ontological Developments

Intersectionality has been mentioned as a key contribution of feminist research. No question, this methodological approach has inspired many studies focused on populations additionally marginalized on account of socioeconomic conditions (including, Stromquist 2001), race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and several other social markers. It would be a mistake,

[3] This right has been recognized to protect workers by providing them with information about their work risks and security. It has also been applied to environmental law. Extended to education, it would mean that the curriculum would have to include information and knowledge about how gender is manifested in society.

however, to assert that previous sociological research failed to consider how variation in these conditions affected a given outcome. Sociology since its early beginnings has taken into account variability in factors suspected to influence collective phenomena. Social science approaches, in fact, can best be characterized as the study of variation among groups (including countries), and the identification of patterns within and among them. On the notion of gender itself, it must be reiterated that gender is a social marker that is a force on its own, independent of multiple potential intersectionalities.

Collini (1998, p. lvi) remarks that "We inhabit overlapping identities – social, racial, sexual, religious, intellectual, political – and no one of them is always dominant." As a solid movement for social justice, feminism has sought greater equality for women. In recent years, the consideration of "women" and "men" has been seen by some scholars as too narrow and dismissive of other gender manifestations that include sexual orientation and identity. Their broadening of the conceptualization of gender is to be welcomed.[4] However, there is a growing assertion by some gender scholars that speaking about women and men refers to a "binary" that prevents conceptual and political progress. I firmly believe that avoiding reference to "women" for being part of this "binary," is not useful as it erases a key political subject seeking social and economic justice. I also believe that much remains to be done to eliminate the myriad disadvantages that "women" face across the world, still quite severe in most world regions. Fraser (1995) has problematized the shift from material redistribution to recognition of sexual minorities, a trend that she sees in the academy under the rubric of "feminist cultural theory" and which she considers to have "eclipse[d] feminist social theory" (Fraser 2009, p. 108).

Action Within CIES

An important concern emerged for many of the women in the Society in the late 1980s, when it could be observed that at the annual national conferences of CIES there was a limited number of women participating

[4] Alternative and emerging categories include: gay, lesbian, bisexual, queer, transgender, and + (to refer to other sexual expressions). Sexual minorities face social discrimination and lack of recognition. Yet, their plight should not be construed as necessitating that the categories of women and men no longer be deployed.

in paper sessions and panels, and even fewer serving as panel chairs and keynote speakers. Casual conversations with others, particularly with colleague Karen Biraimah, led us into gathering comprehensive data of the low representation of women at CIES conferences, in the various committees of the Society, and in the journal of CIES, the *Comparative Education Review* (CER). This low representation was also evident in the small number of women presidents.

In 1989, Vandra Masemann was elected president of CIES. One of her first decisions was to create the Gender and Education Committee (GEC) as a standing CIES committee and to appoint me as its first chair. Early work by GEC centered on the sharing of syllabi for courses on gender and development education, the production of a directory of CIES scholars working on gender and education, and the provision of several gender-focused training sessions. In 1991 GEC proposed the creation of the Gail P. Kelly Award (after a pioneer gender scholar) for the best dissertation on gender equity; it was accepted and later expanded to cover social justice and equity in an international context. Reports over initial years provided details such as the location given to women for the presentation of paper sessions and panels intensified our levels of concern, as they showed that the best conference times and the nicest rooms and facilities were seldom assigned to women/gender sessions. GEC annual reports indicate that there have been significant advances: Conference organizers have developed greater gender consciousness, giving women and men equal access to conference space, and providing childcare facilities.

Over time, GEC has attracted highly capable and innovative researchers to serve as chairs, while its work has widened to include one-day pre-conference workshops comprising a variety of actions, from advising doctoral students working on dissertations, to research methodology workshops, to sessions on the most current gender and education issues, to inspirational presentations by leaders of women-centered organizations on exemplary efforts to improve institutions.

Today, GEC is one of the most active committees of CIES and carries out its work with a considerable degree of autonomy, electing its own chair rather than having it appointed. Since GEC was created, the proportion of women as CIES president has increased (being now 12 out of 31 or 39%) and several of the women who went on to become CIES presidents served first as GEC chairs (7 out of 12 or 58%). CIES has also registered shifts in its membership, as women comprised over 60% in

2019; the same year, a similar percentage of *CER* authors listed a woman as first author.

A more recent aspect of my work with GEC involved the drafting of a Gender and Education Manifesto, a 10-point document available in five languages (English, Spanish, French, Portuguese, and Chinese) and widely distributed at the World Council of Comparative Education Societies meeting in Buenos Aires in 2013.

Concluding Thoughts

My ideas, like those of many others, have expanded as I have engaged in greater reflection on gender and society. They have been nourished by the writings of gender scholars and those who are not focusing on gender. I see theory as indispensable to create a coherent understanding of gender and to propose effective ways to alter existing social relations. Schooling has acquired great salience today; regrettably, the states' emphasis has centered on making education more accessible to all, irrespective of what is learned at school for the purposes of changing the social relations of gender. While quality is invoked today, it appears limited to reading and math performance, and seldom includes the knowledge new generations need to question cultural norms and behaviors so coherently and pervasively manifested in patriarchal ideologies. International agencies are similar to the states that support them, avoiding the issue of curriculum in schools and failing to recognize the importance of non-formal education. The SDGs, which are supposed to guide governmental efforts in education and other critical sectors until 2030, do not reflect a gender-theory based approach. The concept of empowerment is a vital resource to envisage individual and collective agency by the women themselves, who must be fundamental actors in the process of their own emancipation and the creation of a new and just social order. Within CIES, the Gender and Education Committee represents a long-lasting and mature effort to increase research focused on gender as well as to ensure gender equality within the specialization of comparative and international education.

Men, our indispensable partners in the new social order, benefit from the status quo, yet masculinity comes at a high cost to their lives, from shorter existences to experiences marked by violence and distant from healthy emotions. Men's greater reflection on these empirical facts should provide an incentive for them to become different.

References

Acker, Joan. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, *4*(2), 139–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124390004002002.

Acker, Sandra. (1994). *Gendered education: Sociological reflections on women, teaching, and feminism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Boston Women's Health Collective. (1970). *Our bodies, ourselves: A book by and for women. Women and their bodies*. Boston: Boston Women's Health Collective.

Collini, Stefan. (1998). Introduction. In Charles Percy Snow (Ed.), *The two cultures* (pp. vii–lxxi). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Connell, Raewyn W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Foucault, Michel. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977*. (Colin Gordon, Ed., and Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, & Kate Soper, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Fraser, Nancy. (1995). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a 'post-socialist' age. *New Left Review*, *212*, 68–93.

Fraser, Nancy. (2000). Rethinking recognition. *New Left Review*, *3*, 107–120.

Fraser, Nancy. (2009). Feminism, capitalism and the cunning of history. *New Left Review*, *56*, 97–117.

Freire, Paulo. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder & Herder.

Gramsci, Antonio. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.

Klees, Steven J., Samoff, Joel, & Stromquist, Nelly P. (Eds.). (2012). *The World Bank and education: Critiques and alternatives*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Rosenau, James N. (1990). *Turbulence in world politics: A theory of change and continuity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stromquist, Nelly P. (1993). Sex-equity legislation in education: The state as promoter of women's rights. *Review of Educational Research*, *63*(4), 379–407.

Stromquist, Nelly P. (1995). Romancing the state: Gender and power in education. Presidential address. *Comparative Education Review*, *39*(4), 423–454. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543063004379.

Stromquist, Nelly P. (1997). *Literacy for citizenship: Gender and grassroots dynamics in Brazil*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Stromquist, Nelly P. (2001). What poverty does to girls' education: The intersection of class, gender and policy in Latin America. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *31*(1), 39–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920020030153.

Stromquist, Nelly P. (2002). Education as a means for empowering women. In Jane L. Parpart, Shirin M. Rai, and Kathleen A. Staudt (Eds.), *Rethinking*

empowerment: Gender and development in a global/local world (pp. 22–38). London: Routledge.
Stromquist, Nelly P. (2006). Consideraciones teóricas y programáticas sobre las políticas públicas en América Latina: Una introducción al tema. In Nelly P. Stromquist (Ed.), *La construcción del género en las políticas públicas. Perspectivas comparadas desde América Latina* (pp. 1–62). Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
Stromquist, Nelly P. (2007). *Feminist organizations and social transformation in Latin America*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
Stromquist, Nelly P. (2012). Theory and ideology in the gender proposals of the World Bank's *Education Strategy 2020*. In Christopher S. Collins & Alexander W. Wiseman (Eds.), *Education strategy in the developing world: Revising the World Bank's education policy* (pp. 133–149). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
Stromquist, Nelly P. (2015). Women's empowerment and education: Linking knowledge to transformative action. *European Journal of Education, 50*(3), 307–324. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12137.
Stromquist, Nelly P. (2017). Gender structure and women's agency: Toward greater theoretical understanding of education for transformation. In Robert Aman & Timothy Ireland (Eds.), *Education and other modes of thinking in Latin America* (pp. 59–75). Oxfordshire: Routledge.
TIME. (2019, January 25). *Davos panel on inequality becomes discussion about the very rich 'paying their fair share'* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oG0w2rTKE2w&t=1s. Accessed 22 August 2020.
United Nations (UN). (2015). Sustainable development goals. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/?menu=1300. Accessed on 28 October 2015.
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Global Education Monitoring Report Team. (2017). *Global education monitoring report 2017/8. Accountability in education: Meeting our commitments.* Paris: UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000259338. Accessed on 24 August 2020.
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Global Education Monitoring Report Team. (2019). *Global education monitoring report 2019. Gender report 2019: Building bridges for gender equality.* Paris: UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000368753. Accessed on 24 August 2020.
Weiss, Carol H. (1995). Nothing as practical as good theory: Exploring theory-based evaluation for comprehensive community initiatives for children and families. In James P. Connell, Anne C. Kubisch, Lisbeth B. Schorr, & Carol H. Weiss (Eds.), *New approaches to evaluating community initiatives: Concepts, methods, and contexts* (pp. 65–92). Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.

World Economic Forum. (2019). *Global Gender Gap Report 2020*. http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2020.pdf. Accessed on 17 April 2020.

Further References

Heward, Christine., & Bunwaree, Sheila. (Eds.). (1998). *Gender, education and development: Beyond access to empowerment*. London: Zed Books.

Kelly, Gail P., & Elliott, Carolyn M. (Eds.). (1982). *Women's education in the third world: Comparative perspectives*. Albany: SUNY Press.

King, Elizabeth M., & Hill, M. Anne. (Eds.). (1993). *Women's education in developing countries: Barriers, benefits, and policies*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press (Published for the World Bank).

Unterhalter, Elaine., North, Amy., Arnot, Madeleine., Lloyd, Cynthia., Moletsane, Lebo., Murphy-Graham, Erin., Parkes, Jenny., & Saito, Mioko. (2014). *Girls' education and gender equality*. Education Rigorous Literature Review. Technical Report. Department for International Development [UK]. https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.2509.8562. Accessed on 28 January 2017.

PART III

Policies, Practices, and Paradigms Emerging from Applied Research

CHAPTER 9

Eliminating Dysfunctional Boundaries and Mapping Educational Practice: Toward Integration, Infusion, and Inclusiveness in Comparative Education

John Schwille

Over past decades, the literature on comparative and international education has revealed an area of study that is fragmented and incoherent in the effort to accommodate schools of thought that have little to do with one another. A concern with making sense of boundaries in and around the domain of comparative education is long-standing, with scholars both challenging and defending existing or proposed boundaries (e.g., Crossley 2000; Foster et al. 2012). Tikly and Crossley (2001) almost twenty years ago offered a summary analysis of three models of comparative education: specialization, integration, and what they call "transformation."

J. Schwille (✉)
International Studies in Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA
e-mail: jschwill@msu.edu

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_9

Comparative Education in Light of Bourdieu

My analysis of this state of affairs follows much of what the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu wrote about intellectual work in general and academic fields in particular. His writings are of special relevance in explaining the lack of rationality in the organization of academic life (Grenfell 2012; Jenkins 2002; Swartz 1997). In his view, successful scholars acquire intellectual capital in the form of highly valued knowledge, giving them power (part earned and part arbitrary) over their fields of work and other scholars less endowed with this sort of capital. In formulating this argument, Bourdieu's analytical apparatus works with three central concepts: field, habitus, and capital. The interplay of these concepts acts, in part, to reproduce the social worlds in which they are embedded and, in part, to change those worlds.

Field is the social space in which this interaction takes place. It is analogous to a playing field on which a competitive sport is played. But Bourdieu's fields are not level. They favor certain players and teams over others due to the rules of the game, its history, and what plays are judged legitimate. This concept of field is readily applicable to university disciplines as organized in schools and faculties inasmuch as within and between these fields and subfields, scholars, and academic units struggle for status, recognition, and power.

These scholars bring to their fields a *habitus*, Bourdieu's concept for the set of dispositions with which an individual enters a field and which subsequently changes as a result of interaction with the field. Within universities, the habitus of practitioners in a field embodies a strong tendency to develop and transmit the status culture of a particular specialty. In each field, the habitus of the players leads them to erect strong barriers against outsiders. Nevertheless, such boundaries can remain fuzzy and contested. As a result, players can expect not clarity in their understanding of the field, but instead at best "a feel" for the game.

> The difficulty of initiation into any scientific practice (whether quantum physics or sociology) lies in the fact that a double effort is required in order to master the knowledge theoretically, but in such a way that this knowledge really passes into practice, in the form of a 'craft,' 'knacks,' an

> 'eye,' etc., and does not remain in the state of a meta-discourse about practices. (Bourdieu 2004, p. 40)[1]

Capital in its intellectual form, according to Bourdieu, consists of knowledge that has value to others within that field. The capital that successful scholars acquire determines their place in the system, their access to status and resources. Capital accrues to institutional units as well. Distribution of this capital shapes power relations within the field.

Bourdieu, in the eyes of many, has been regarded as overly deterministic. But in my view, this is not the case. According to Pérez (2008), writing about Bourdieu,

> agency in social life is seen as a 'menu' from which you can choose on the basis of your social background and available capital rather than as a free-will game, thus taking into account, although to different degrees, both the enabling and constraining sides of structure and agency. (p. 8)

Habitus is the key to both reproduction and change. The structures of habitus are not immutably fixed, nor are they in constant flux (Grenfell 2012). The fields with which the habitus interacts, likewise, are subject to change. Although a habitus is not completely shaped by the field in which it operates, the field does in large part determine whether a scholar's habitus can find a position within the field.

With this framework, one can examine how this process has played out in US schools of education where dominant orthodoxies have traditionally taken the form of a lack of interest and rewards for the study of education in other countries, a state of affairs well documented in other chapters of this volume. Degree programs in comparative and international education have enjoyed little success in challenging these dominant orthodoxies. Instead, these programs have generally occupied a marginal ghetto-like space. Thus, while their academic and intellectual capital has been recognized and valued internally within the relatively small network of university academics identifying themselves with comparative education, outside this space, comparative education capital has had little value. There are some exceptions, to be sure, as in the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) projects described

[1] To review the argument, see pp. 33–63.

below in which large grants of external funding give the primary investigators higher status. Such is the case with the unprecedented amounts of funding that Bill Schmidt and his team have raised for their work at MSU in comparative education over the years (Schwille 2017).

Again, the perspective based on Bourdieu provides a good explanation of why in general, comparative education has not enjoyed such a high status in education schools dominated by other disciplines. From this point of view, dominant scholars are able to impose, without making any special effort, "the representation of science most favorable to their interests." They are the ones who set the rules of the game, the correct "legitimate way to play." Since their interests are aligned with the established state of the field, they are the "natural defenders of the normal science of the day." For these reasons, they enjoy decisive advantages in academic competition and they become an obligatory point of reference for other scholars, forcing the latter to explain their work as related to that of the dominant scientists, and restricting possibilities for innovation and new knowledge (Bourdieu 2004, p. 35).

From this perspective, although much has been written in recent decades about the need to internationalize education in the United States, including schools of education, it stands to reason that, for the most part, ethnocentricity has remained entrenched not only in academic systems of power and prestige, but also in what is taken for granted about the policies and practices of education. Bourdieu, taken seriously, shows that internationalizing is not a straightforward process of professional development in which faculty members and their students acquire new knowledge. It is also an assault on accepted norms of what constitutes legitimate knowledge in education, on the vested interests of scholars who have invested in and benefited from the capital they acquire in the status quo, and on the boundaries that have sealed off international studies in education. If successful, this assault could undermine the accumulation of more "legitimate" intellectual capital (as in educational psychology or school administration applied solely to the United States) (Schwille 2017).

Curiously, one reason that comparative education as it developed in its ghetto did not challenge the dominant orthodoxies was that it was not so much concerned with the empirical study of educational practice as it was with various grand theories at a more macro-level. Martin Carnoy's (2019) book on the history of comparative education at Stanford shows how the field mainly consisted of a succession and coexistence of theoretical preoccupations which were pursued without much attention to the details of educational practice on the ground. It was analogous to thinking that an advanced science of geology was possible without a detailed and precise map of the Earth's geological terrain. Progress in developing such an international map of educational practice has been made, but most of it has taken place outside CIES, which has played but a peripheral role. Mapping educational practice and outcomes systematically and, shall I say, scientifically was initiated in the international assessment studies some sixty years ago by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

I discuss two examples of what has gradually enabled comparative education to emerge from its ghetto. One is from the history of the IEA organization with which I have been associated since its early years in the 1960s and 1970s (Schwille 2011). Initially, IEA was confronted with hostility from within CIES as well as from many other American educators committed to showing that comparing educational outcomes across countries was an illegitimate enterprise. Fortunately, the history of what IEA was able to do in mapping mathematics and science achievement has recently been systematically documented and explained in the Schmidt et al. (2019) book on sixty years of international assessments in these two subject-matter areas. As a synthesis of what has been learned, this book in my view is one of the most important to the history of comparative education. It should be required reading for anyone who aspires to understand what it means to map learning and related variables across and within countries, including not only what has been contributed in terms of essential knowledge in comparative education, but also the dilemmas and pitfalls which can trap the unwary. It is a welcome response to some of the shortcomings and criticisms of international testing which Carnoy has elucidated in his chapter of the present volume.

My second example draws on our experience at Michigan State University (MSU) in replacing a separate degree program in comparative education with an attempt to develop an international dimension to all of the School of Education's research, teaching, and service, eliminating the dysfunctional boundaries protecting ethnocentricity. Like the IEA studies, this work brought other domains of educational practice that before had not been considered comparative education under the umbrella of comparative study. This effort of integration and infusion got off the ground at MSU in the early 1980s and continues to this day.

Initial Efforts by IEA to Map Educational Practice and Outcomes as the Foundation of Comparative Education

I first learned of IEA in Fall 1963 when I took my first doctoral course in comparative education at the University of Chicago from C. Arnold Anderson. Anderson, who first called for an international assessment in 1958, is listed in Schmidt et al. (2019) and in other publications as one of the founders of the IEA organization. As I remember, Anderson told us in his course: "The trouble with comparative education is that we don't have the dependent variables we need for comparative research across countries, but soon we will."[2] He was referring to the IEA First International Mathematics Study for which data were to be collected in 1964 with results published in Husen (1967). This was the beginning of IEA, the real beginning of international assessment research as we know it. IEA demonstrated that it was technically feasible to measure student achievement in mathematics across countries. It was the first such attempt to map educational practice with empirical research on the distribution of learning across students, schools, and countries. Theoretically, IEA was a pioneer in the conceptualization and operationalization of "opportunity to learn" and curriculum coverage as key sets of variables needed in any comprehensive mapping of educational practice (Schmidt et al. 2019).

This work continued with the landmark study of six different subjects in the 1970s. It was the first time such data was systematically organized and made available to other researchers for secondary analysis (I was the leader for this data-banking effort when it started in 1973). Although the period following the six-subject survey was very difficult for IEA and the organization nearly did not survive, two important studies kept the mapping effort alive with the second international studies of mathematics and science. But it was not until the 1980s that interest and support for such studies began to grow, based in part on the US national report *A Nation at Risk* that argued that existing studies had shown that the United States was lagging behind and therefore poorly placed to compete in terms of an educated labor force. As a result of the changing climate, subsequent events in the United States proved conducive to a much more ambitious study of mathematics and science, whose origins can be

[2] C. Arnold Anderson, personal communication, Fall 1963.

traced to an Education Summit in Charlottesville, Virginia, for the US President and 50 state governors in September 1989. National goals for education were formulated, including one calling on the United States to be first in mathematics and science by the year 2000 – a preposterous idea, but nonetheless taken seriously enough to justify an international study of the two subjects together and at two points in time. After a 1990 IEA meeting in Beijing endorsed this idea, the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) was born.

The importance of this study in its 1995 and 1999 repeat versions would be hard to overestimate. Of the numerous books and other publications on TIMSS-1995, the one titled *Why Schools Matter: A Cross-National Comparison of Curriculum and Learning* stands as one of the major landmarks in the international mapping of educational practice (Schmidt et al. 2001). In 2007, an issue of *Education Next* ranked TIMSS as the second most influential education study of the previous decade. IEA, with leadership from the School of Education at Boston College, built on this momentum with another major step in the comparative mapping of educational practice, the establishment of a regular cycle of repeat studies in the core subject-matters of mathematics, science, reading literacy, and civic education.

By the first decade of the twenty-first century, the systematic cross-national mapping of educational practice and outcomes at the elementary and secondary levels was well established (as reported in Schmidt et al. 2019), though improvement in methods and filling in gaps was still much needed. In contrast, the world of higher education remained relatively unexplored, with very little that could be seen as the systematic comparative mapping of practice and outcomes. Even within countries, comparison of what is learned in university and college courses, programs, and institutions has not proved possible on any systematic and technically valid basis. However, IEA has been a pioneer, undertaking the first IEA study of higher education in the domain of learning to teach mathematics at the lower secondary level. Many said this study could not be done within the IEA paradigm which required national probability samples of students and institutions as well as an agreed upon assessment framework to guide the development of tests. And yet it was. The study TEDS-M (2002–2013) was the first international assessment of learning outcomes in higher education, based on national probability samples (although since then further progress has been made especially by a consortium led by

Prashant Loyalka at Stanford as mentioned by Carnoy in this volume) (Schwille et al. 2013; Tatto et al. 2012).

Although the league tables which rank countries in such studies are much criticized for misleading professional educators and public alike (see e.g. Carnoy and Lindsay chapters in this volume), my view of them is different. Regardless of the admitted shortcomings and deficiencies, league tables in my mind are an improvement over what came before, that is, when there was no way to rank countries based on empirical evidence, leaving an arena open to wildly subjective and biased comparisons. While the rankings are misleading, they have the advantage of encouraging criticism, debate, revisionist hypotheses, and further research. The understanding of Japanese education based on publication in English has gone from almost nil in 1960 to a host of studies and analyses which have given us a much more precise view of Japan's place in the global map of education currently. This would not have happened had not Japan ranked so high in the first IEA mathematics study of the 1960s and from then onward. The fact that we currently cannot explain declines in Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) scores at the country level should likewise result in much new knowledge for the field.

IEA has been a pioneer in making its mapping data readily available to interested researchers, teachers, administrators, and policymakers. Its policy is to require all studies to make their data and documentation available on the web. Instruments and other documents necessary to use a study are now available in readily accessible and understood form. The databases for the studies are likewise prepared in a form to be as accessible as possible. User guides provide instructions that do not require a high level of data analysis expertise even though the samples in question are complex and do not give accurate estimates when analyzed directly with commonly available software such as SPSS. In addition, IEA has developed a free software tool, the International Database Analyzer, which can be used to combine and analyze data from all IEA studies, as well as PISA, and National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). There is also a data visualizer for constructing graphs and maps from the data. Prospective users have only to go to the website (www.iea.nl) to get the data and associated tools. All of this has brought comparative education much closer to the day when comprehensive maps of educational practice throughout the world are readily available for use and analysis.

Reducing Boundaries at MSU, Bringing More of Education Inquiry Under the Purview of Comparative Education

I used to think separate comparative education degree programs were the way to go. I accepted the prevailing notion that separate degree programs were what the field of comparative education was all about. It took me years to realize that this was not necessarily true. I had done my own Ph.D. in the field at the University of Chicago where comparative education was understood purely and simply, as Carnoy (2019) acknowledges, as the application of the social sciences to the study of education across countries. Nevertheless, I was convinced even as a student that comparative education had much more to say that would be of value to researchers and practitioners who have not studied in our field. I was very fortunate in that MSU gave me the opportunity to try to figure out in terms of scholarship and practice what that meant.

In 1984 the College of Education at MSU, having abolished its comparative education degree programs, adopted a policy of trying to add an international dimension throughout the College's research, teaching, and outreach. In the implementation of that policy, the University gradually broke out of the ghetto in which comparative education has too often found itself, attempting thereby to increase the significance and impact of its international capabilities and commitments. Given the lack of consensus about comparative and international education in general and the obstacles posed by the existing structures of educational studies, there was no clear-cut path to follow. But the aim was to bring the study of education into a broader international domain and to open up that space to be more inclusive, thereby blurring the boundaries that might interfere with this inclusiveness and emerging insights. It was an approach meant to give scholars in all the specialties of educational research the chance to earn capital with value in comparative education and to rework the fields of all education specialties to accommodate comparative and international education.

From this perspective, the field was to be defined more on the basis of what is done in practice than on theory. Instead of imposing a definition of comparative education that would shut out much that is actually or potentially international in schools of education, MSU has gone in the opposite direction. Comparative and international education is defined primarily by what is or could be done by faculty and students that is international in nature. Therefore at MSU, if anyone or its constituents and stakeholders believe the School should be concerned with something international, then the knowledge acquired in this endeavor should count as valued comparative education knowledge. In Bourdieu's terms, this approach changes the nature of the field, what faculty members and students do to acquire capital, and opens the field to individuals with a habitus that differs from what otherwise would be required.

One response to this state of affairs would be to say why not do it all, why not have a separate degree program while becoming more inclusive in other respects. But in my view degree programs run necessarily counter to this inclusiveness. Such programs are an attempt to establish a Bourdieuian field with clearer boundaries, criteria for what knowledge is most valued and what sorts of habitus are most welcome and rewarded. In other words, such a program typically amounts to taking a stand on what counts as knowledge in recruiting and retaining faculty, on what research will receive the most credit, and on what curriculum is most appropriate for students in the program. What counts as knowledge is also embodied in course and program requirements, and especially in the examinations that students are required to take. Enshrining valued knowledge in course and program requirements embodies a rigid view of comparative education, far less rich and flexible than the diversity that internationalizing could bring in the absence of such requirements.

In separate comparative education programs, faculty members earn the highest status and acquire the most influence on the program by staying as much as possible within the program. Thus, the separate programs create a disincentive for their faculty members to support or undertake other forms of less valued international education, such as working closely with international students in other graduate programs. Faculty participation in study abroad and efforts to internationalize K-12 and teacher education would also be unlikely to appeal strongly to program faculty or to produce the most valued knowledge. As the boundaries between inside and outside the program become clearer, barriers may be raised to prevent students outside the program from taking program courses. Likewise, there would be disincentives for faculty to design and teach courses with international content outside the program, in order to increase the concentration of faculty efforts on production of knowledge valued by the program. In short, any effort to share international knowledge and increase international involvement on the part of those not in the program could be seen as less valuable and therefore discouraged. Bourdieu's field in such a case would be far more restricted than it would be without a program, and the habitus of those recruited as faculty and students would likewise tend to be narrower in order to obtain a better fit with the reduced domain.

Efforts to move in the opposite direction, to open up a college's international domain to more inclusiveness, would most likely meet with resistance, since inclusiveness would mean less clarity on boundaries, status, and criteria for admission to the field. Inclusiveness could reduce the autonomy of comparative and international education within a school of education. An inclusive agenda opens up the possibility of valuing comparative education capital across a wide range of educational specialties, making it possible for comparative education to more easily influence the study and practice of education in general.

In its integration-infusion approach (Schwille 2017), MSU has taken advantage of various strategies made possible, in part, by not concentrating on a degree program. These strategies include:

- Building the strengths of faculty members that would enable them as individuals to break through barriers by engaging in both international and domestic research and practice;
- Undertaking international multi-country team research that will attract the interest of scholars outside the comparative education community as currently understood (as IEA studies and other teacher education studies at MSU have done);
- Continuing to do international development work so that faculty members and students who otherwise know little about education in developing countries will learn more about emerging parts of the world in which most of the children who need to be educated reside;
- Forming institutional partnerships to connect with educational research and practice in other countries;
- Breaking down ethnocentric barriers to international content and world languages in K-12 schools and teacher education (as in the MSU Confucius Institute's capability to teach Chinese language at this level online and face-to-face, and to prepare teachers of Chinese for US schools);
- Engaging internationally oriented students as major assets to bring their knowledge and experience to enhance the education of American students and faculty; and

- Using the capabilities gained from the integration-infusion approach to inform and strengthen the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) as the main body of scholars in comparative education and related fields.

All this is explained at great length in Schwille (2017).

Ideally, students – international students and US students with strong international interests – are viewed as one of the main resources for internationalizing schools of education. But once again this view of internationalization has not been one that developed easily or naturally or is shared universally among the faculty at MSU even today. Many of our international students have felt they were not listened to or respected enough. Faculty commonly have not involved them as much as domestic students in class discussions. And a certain number of faculty have tended to see international students more as problems than as assets, for example, their level of fluency in written and spoken English.

These experiences and attitudes are readily understood when examined from a Bourdieu perspective. Seen in this light, international students are generally lacking in the capital needed to give them the status and legitimacy that would command attention throughout a US school of education. Even US students have little such capital compared to faculty, and international students lack the knowledge and experience of American education that is generally the currency of schools of education. The artificial borders between US education and education in other countries and the ethnocentricity of US studies in education have kept US professors from trying to learn as much as they might from international students about the vast array of experiences and educational arrangements outside the United States. When international students do dissertations on their home countries, rarely are the findings of these theses regarded as important as those done on American education. The thesis of Liping Ma on teachers in China compared to the United States is a monumental exception. It gave her a lot of capital in the Bourdieu sense. Started at MSU and finished at Stanford, it has been used widely for professional development in the US. Ma's dissertation and subsequent book (2010) were major accomplishments in the integration-infusion approach and served in an exemplary way to show how an international student can make a contribution that is valued far beyond the traditional boundaries of comparative education.

The annual international reports of the College have documented many examples of how the integration-infusion approach worked. For example, the report for 1994–1995 (MSU OISE 1995) encapsulates the striking breadth and inclusiveness in the College's work for that year in a single paragraph calling attention to the following activities and achievements, among others:

- Teachers in China and the United States discussing videotapes of teaching in the two countries;
- American researchers at national meetings analyzing other MSU videotape clips of interactions between mentors and novice teachers in China, England, and the United States;
- MSU researchers comparing the curricula in science and mathematics in over 40 countries, based on detailed analysis of textbooks and curriculum guides;
- A Ph.D. student from Zimbabwe presenting results of Rockefeller-funded dissertation research to a special interest group of African students;
- Thai rural school children briefing officials from Bangkok on local case studies the children had produced on environmental issues;
- Guinean school officials in West Africa learning new ways to work with teachers in a small grants program for teacher-initiated school improvement projects;
- An MSU teacher education professor using original texts from Socrates, Gandhi, Mencius, and Dewey to teach a newly internationalized philosophy of education course to American International School teachers at the College's professional development center in Bangkok;
- Faculty and graduate assistants back on the MSU campus teaching a cross-college general education course on childhood and adolescence in China, Japan, and the United States; and
- A joint faculty-student-practitioner committee interviewing international students for a year-long program in 1995–1996 of international discussion and study with teachers from Haslett and Lansing school districts.

CIES Moves Toward Integration, Infusion, and Inclusiveness with SIGs

In contrast to these two examples which date back many years, CIES began to play a major role in breaking out of the comparative education ghetto only when it first began to provide for special interest groups in 2004. SIGs provide a forum for individuals drawn together by common interests, such as a particular field of study or a geographic region. By taking an active role in shaping the Society and its annual meetings, the SIGs can move CIES out beyond its traditional boundaries.

The CIES SIGs have assumed such importance today that it may be hard to remember that beforehand this was a controversial move. Many of the most loyal and dedicated CIES members wanted to keep the Society as a small tightly knit community of scholars that would allow them to pursue their individual interests freely and thereby accommodate a certain amount of academic capital within the field as then defined. There was little recognition that comparative education had already greatly changed due in large part to the work of IEA and the emergence of a second set of international assessment studies at the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

Examination of the SIGs today makes it possible to assess the extent to which CIES has opened up. Currently, there are 31 SIGs. Six are regional SIGs which provide assurance that the special characteristics of all parts of the world are taken into account in the Society's work. Other SIGs focus on specific areas of work. The importance of international assessment research is now more adequately recognized by the SIG on large-scale cross-national studies in education. There are also subject-matter SIGs (mathematics, science, literacy, civics) which acknowledge that, throughout the world, the specifics of subject-matter must be taken into account in any thorough mapping of educational practice. Other SIGs which illustrate the opening of CIES to other areas of educational research include: teacher education and the teaching profession, early childhood development, environmental and sustainability education, inclusive education, sexual orientation and gender identity and expression, religion and education. This inclusiveness is still incomplete, but the existence of SIGs allows it to continue unabated as needed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I have to admit that, after three decades of development, the integration-infusion approach at MSU was not an unqualified or complete success and never will be. It did not remove all borders and barriers. Administrators continue to protect their fiefs in ways that obstruct the integration-infusion approach although not as easily as they did before. But is it better than a more conventional approach to international and comparative education? The answer, in my view, at least in the case of MSU, is "yes." This approach has allowed MSU to do things and bring an international influence to bear in ways and areas that would not have been possible otherwise. Since 1984 when this approach was first adopted, in my view, MSU has contributed substantially to the field of comparative education as traditionally conceived while influencing the course of US education more generally as well.

There will always be faculty who are not willing or in a position to undertake international assignments or generate international projects. Nevertheless, in spite of these reservations, which range from agnostic to pessimistic, as long as we have an all-encompassing vision to encourage and give legitimacy to international work, creating expectations about what could or should be done in a school of education, the directions that have been set at MSU are not easy to ignore and will, I believe, continue to influence the entire College. What has been done for the last three decades will continue to evolve, and some previous accomplishments will no doubt fall by the wayside, but the expectations and momentum generated can give us grounds for optimism about the future of the integration-infusion approach. While degree programs remain vulnerable and can be abolished entirely, the integration-infusion approach is flexible enough to avoid any such instant death.

Overall, and perhaps most importantly, faculty and students throughout the College have been able to learn a great deal not only from what international and comparative education has to offer but also about the integration-infusion approach itself. We now know this approach is feasible; it works, as documented at length in my book on internationalizing a school of education (Schwille 2017). We have learned what it takes. We can discuss the various borders to be crossed or removed. We can show how a larger academic space (*field* in Bourdieu's terms) can be developed in which comparative education is no longer a marginalized academic endeavor competing against fields with more readily convertible intellectual capital. We have become conscious of the importance of all forms of comparative education that contribute to the mapping and interpretation of educational practice and policy, whether or not they are closely connected to CIES, its theories and traditional comparative education degree programs or not. The integration-infusion approach opens the way to new understandings of education, new processes of inquiry, new and productive cross-disciplinary interactions – all of which can be beneficial to educational policy, practice, and research in general.

References

Bourdieu, Pierre. (2004). *Science of science and reflexivity* (Richard Nice, Trans.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Carnoy, Martin. (2019). *Transforming comparative education: Fifty years of theory building at Stanford*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Crossley, Michael. (2000). Bridging cultures and traditions in the reconceptualisation of comparative and international education. *Comparative Education, 36*(3), 319–332. https://doi.org/10.1080/713656615.

Foster, Jesse., Addy, Nii Antiyae., & Samoff, Joel. (2012). Crossing borders: Research in comparative and international education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *32*(6), 711–732. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2011.12.003.

Grenfell, Michael. (Ed.). (2012). *Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Husen, Torsten. (1967). *International study of achievement in mathematics: A comparison of twelve countries*. New York: Wiley.

Jenkins, Richard. (2002). *Pierre Bourdieu* (Rev. ed.). London: Routledge.

Ma, Liping. (2010). *Knowing and teaching elementary mathematics: Teachers' understanding of fundamental mathematics in China and the United States.* New York: Routledge.

Michigan State University (MSU), College of Education, Office of International Studies in Education (OISE). (1995). *Annual report, 1994–95.*

Pérez, Francisco Perales. (2008). Voluntarism and determinism in Giddens's and Bourdieu's theories of human agency. *Essex Graduate Journal of Sociology*, *8,* 55–64.

Schmidt, William H., Houang, Richard T., Cogan, Leland S., & Solorio, Michelle L. (2019). *Schooling across the globe: What we have learned from 60 years of mathematics and science international assessments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, William H., McKnight, Curtis C., Houang, Richard T., Wang, HsingChi., Wiley, David E., Cogan, Leland S., & Wolfe, Richard G. (2001). *Why schools matter: A cross-national comparison of curriculum and learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schwille, John. (2011). Experiencing innovation and capacity building in IEA research, 1963–2008. In Constantinos Papanastasiou, Tjeerd Plomp, & Elena C. Papanastasiou (Eds.), *IEA 1958–2008: 50 years of experiences and memories* (Vol 2, pp. 627–707). Nicosia: Cultural Center of the Kykkos Monastery.

Schwille, John. (2017). *Internationalizing a school of education: Integration and infusion in practice*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Schwille, John., Ingvarson, Lawrence., & Holgreve-Resendez, Richard. (Eds.). (2013). *TEDS-M encyclopedia: A guide to teacher education context, structure, and quality assurance in 17 countries*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED545243.pdf. Accessed 27 July 2020.

Swartz, David. (1997). *Culture and power: The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tatto, Maria Teresa., Schwille, John., Senk, Sharon L., Ingvarson, Lawrence., Rowley, Glenn., Peck, Ray., Bankov, Kiril., Rodriguez, Michael., & Reckase, Mark. (2012). *Policy, practice, and readiness to teach primary and secondary mathematics in 17 Countries: Findings from the IEA teacher education and development study in mathematics (TEDS-M)*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED542380.pdf. Accessed 27 July 2020.

Tikly, Leon., & Crossley, Michael. (2001). Teaching comparative and international education: A framework for analysis. *Comparative Education Review, 45*(4), 561–580.

United States. The National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: The National Commission on Excellence in Education.

CHAPTER 10

Training 'Deep Practitioners': 50 Years of the Center for International Education at the University of Massachusetts Amherst

David R. Evans

This chapter presents a brief analytic history of the Center for International Education (CIE) at the University of Massachusetts Amherst with the goal of understanding what made it possible and what can be learned from it for the future of CE/IE[1] programs. The chapter begins with the unusual context in which CIE was created and its commitment to a synergistic linkage between academics and managing funded development education programs. The discussion then presents CIE's defining characteristics, the challenges faced, and the insights that can be gleaned

[1]This chapter will use CIE to refer to the Center for International Education at UMass Amherst. Comparative Education and International Education programs will be referred to as CE/IE, not CIE programs as is often found in the literature.

D. R. Evans (✉)
Center for International Education, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, MA, USA
e-mail: dre@educ.umass.edu

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_10

from its history. This chapter concludes with comments on the implications for the future shape of CE/IE graduate programs and centers at universities.

The External Context-Comparative Versus International Education Debate

In April 1956 the Comparative Education Society (CES) was founded and in its early years focused on organizing study tours to provide United States educators with first-hand observations of foreign education systems. In the following decade, the membership expanded beyond faculty teaching comparative education as a foundational course in teacher training. Increasingly, members brought two additional perspectives: the value of applying analytic tools and frameworks from the social sciences, and the knowledge based on applied education reform projects in developing countries. Debates over the focus of the society ultimately led to renaming the society as the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) in the fall of 1968.

The renaming of the Society created a larger umbrella to include research and activities undertaken by university programs as well as development agencies. Debates about the meaning of and relative importance of comparative versus international education flourished over the next decades (Wilson 1994). Different graduate degree programs chose to emphasize one or the other, often seeking a balance. Terms like "academic-practitioner" (Wilson 1994, p. 450) or "scholar-doer" used at the beginning of the program at Stanford (Carnoy 2019, p. 31), or the term "deep practitioner" coined by the program at UMass Amherst, reflect various ways in which the tension between basic and applied research was conceptualized.

The Institutional Context – the School of Education at UMass Amherst

In the late 1960s, the School of Education at UMass Amherst was a quiet place set in a state university sometimes known for its party atmosphere rather than its academic quality.[2] The School had trouble recruiting quality faculty and students. A recently appointed Provost charged with improving the quality of the University wanted to revitalize the School. He said at the time "The School [of Education] was … recognized as pedestrian, non-progressive, dull. We couldn't even claim it was second rate" (Brainerd 1973, p. 121). To that end, in 1968 he recruited Dwight Allen from Stanford to become the new dean. Dwight was known as a charismatic, iconoclastic educator. The Provost got much more than he bargained for.

The new Dean had a vision of a school of education that was flexible, dynamic, student-centered, and revolutionary – reflecting the heady optimism of innovation in education of the late 1960s. His goal was no less than the creation of a completely new organizational structure in the School. He wanted to replace departments and programs with centers which would be formed around areas of interest and led by teams of faculty and graduate students. One of his first actions was to throw out the entire existing curriculum of courses and begin a process to create a new School of Education.

The Dean organized a School-wide retreat in Colorado, where working groups of graduate students and faculty were formed with the charge of creating centers, one of which was the Center for International Education. The retreat began a planning process which lasted a full academic year and led to a planning document that established the goals, structures, and program for a new Center for International Education (Evans and Kinsley 1970).

The challenge faced by the School was to recruit high quality faculty and students to an institution that had little to offer at the time.[3] The Dean set about creating an exciting, innovative, and dynamic vision for the School within a state university that was seeking to become more diverse and to respond more effectively to the changing social realities in society. CIE benefited from being part of that larger organizational

[2] Over the following fifty years, UMass Amherst steadily improved to the point of being ranked in the top 25 public universities in 2019 (University of Massachusetts Amherst 2019).

[3] The author was one of about a dozen doctoral students that the new Dean brought to UMass from Stanford as newly appointed faculty members. We were all attracted by his vision of a new kind of College of Education and the opportunity to make a difference. The author joined two other faculty members in September of 1968 to start the Center for International Education.

revitalization and from the determination of the Dean from the beginning to create a Center for International Education.

The Birth of the Center for International Education

The Center for International Education was created in the national and institutional contexts briefly discussed above. The combination of the unbounded optimism for change of the 1960s and the highly unusual time at the School of Education at UMass Amherst produced a unique graduate program.

In the first several years, students and faculty were attracted to the School and CIE primarily by the charisma of the Dean and the excitement of a radically different school of education that offered student-developed degree programs, no letter grades, credit for past experience, and above all an exciting environment.[4]

CIE faced the same challenges as the School of Education at its inception. How could it compete against elite CE/IE programs including those in two prestigious regional institutions: Harvard University and Teachers College, Columbia? CIE could not compete on the basis of academic reputation or institutional status; it had to offer something different and attractive.

From its inception, CIE was designed as a program for practitioners, students who were training for leadership roles in improving educational systems in the developing world. The first cohorts of students and the faculty all had extended experience working in education systems in developing countries. Initially, almost all the students were returned Peace Corps volunteers (RPCVs). Faculty members all had two or more years of experience of living and working in developing countries. Reflecting the values and goals of its founding members, the program from the beginning was known as the Center for International Education without any debate about comparative vs. international education.

[4] A doctoral dissertation by a graduate of CIE provides a fascinating and well-documented history of the first 25 years of CIE (Pfeiffer 1995).

Eras of Implementation in the History of CIE

Over its 50 year history, there have been a succession of development education focuses at CIE: nonformal/adult education, expanding access for under-served populations, teachers and teacher education, higher education development, alternative education, and education in conflict and crisis. Each can be characterized as an era, although they overlap and persist even as new eras emerge.

Nonformal[5]/Adult Education

In the early 1970s, inspired by the then ground-breaking writings of Paulo Freire and Ivan Illich, CIE began exploring ways in which their ideas could be translated into practice. Both Freire and Illich visited CIE, with Freire making a series of annual visits during that time. CIE was also influenced by the work of Philip Coombs, especially his book *World Crisis in Education* which laid out the limitations of the schooling systems in developing countries. He argued that world universities have a responsibility to get directly involved through "the productive search for truth and knowledge" to facilitate "human development and progress toward peace" (Coombs 1968, p. 161).

CIE's first nonformal education (NFE) project provided a chance to translate the ideas of Freire and Illich into a program with indigenous peoples in rural Ecuador (Andrade et al. 1975). The project pioneered the use of games and simulations in pursuit of practical and experiential ways of learning for rural populations in non-school contexts. The project ultimately produced a series of publications and dissertations based on that experience, thus providing an early example of how CIE would combine academic work with practical application.

The work at CIE was in contrast to the more academic approach to nonformal education undertaken by other universities at the time. In an early paper, the Non-Formal Education Information Center chronicled the work of Michigan State University in assessing various approaches to non-school education and presented a conceptual framework that delineated the key differences between formal and nonformal education (Brembeck 1978). Other universities pursued similar analytic approaches.

[5] This chapter will use the term nonformal without a hyphen. Sources vary on the preferred usage.

The experience in Ecuador laid the foundation for CIE's approach to NFE in other contexts. Subsequently, CIE was awarded a USAID 211(d) contract to develop a NFE Center, and then an additional award to pursue pilot NFE projects in Guatemala and Thailand (USAID 1975). Next, CIE undertook a large NFE project with the Ministry of Education and Culture in Indonesia, financed by a World Bank loan, followed by a subsequent project with the Peoples Education Association in Ghana.[6]

Expanding Access for Under-Served Populations

The NFE projects involved working with adults on literacy and numeracy, especially in non-school settings. That led to work in literacy, basic education, girls' access to education, and developing the distance education components of universities. CIE offered an annual summer literacy institute at UMass for a number of years, which attracted literacy workers from multiple countries.

The 1980s brought contracts in Lesotho and Swaziland working with their adult education programs in departments of extramural studies. USAID's emphasis on basic education led to a project in Botswana. USAID's priority focus on girls' access to education resulted in a contract to work with teacher training and schools to improve girls learning opportunities in Uttar Pradesh, India. Later CIE worked on a project in Afghanistan to develop a curriculum to help girls qualify for mid-wife training. More recently CIE undertook an evaluation of a girls' education project in the Democratic Republic of Congo. In addition, CIE's involvement in a large education project in southern Sudan focused on providing non-school education for rural girls in a conflict environment.

Teachers and Teacher Education

Almost all education projects have a component of teacher training, which led CIE to work on a variety of approaches to improve the effectiveness of teacher training, particularly in low-resource contexts.

Illustrative of this focus was a national-level project to develop a new system of training and supporting primary school teachers in Uganda.

[6] Documents and research produced by many of the projects discussed are available on the UMass Scholarworks site: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cie/. Master's capstone projects and doctoral dissertations based on the projects are also available there.

The new approach, known as the Teacher Development and Management System, sought to merge preservice and inservice training with ongoing support for teachers in schools. It created an intermediate staffing level of Coordinating Center Tutors to build much stronger linkages with the schools and the teachers in them. The focus shifted from training to having an impact on what happened in the classrooms. This model was ultimately implemented on a national basis in Uganda (Ministry of Education and Sports 2000).

Multiple other projects focused on teachers and improving their effectiveness, including a series of Teacher, Text, Technology projects in Somalia, Tanzania, and Cote d'Ivoire, and a project to help teachers teach multi-grade classes in Senegal and The Gambia.

Higher Education Development

Over the decades, priorities of development agencies gradually shifted from basic education to a recognition of the role played by institutions of higher education. CIE's projects reflected that shift. In the first project with a significant focus on higher education, CIE worked with the University of Malawi to create a new Master's Degree in Education – developing curriculum, training faculty, and offering advanced degrees to faculty members in the Faculty of Education. Subsequently, CIE became involved in strengthening teacher training degree programs at several universities in Palestine.

In 2006, CIE embarked on what would become a sequence of three large projects over a period of 14 years to strengthen the national Higher Education system in Afghanistan. CIE introduced the first modern master's degrees, helped strengthen capacity of faculty and administrators in public universities, worked to develop the capacity of the Ministry of Higher Education, and introduced associate degrees in five universities (Boardman et al. 2012; Shumaker et al. 2017).

Alternative Education & Education in Crisis and Conflict

Throughout CIE's history there has been a focus on non-school alternatives, first under the rubric of NFE, then variations of adult education, community-based education, accelerated education models, and most recently provision of education for refugees and immigrants in war and natural disaster contexts. Many of these activities were part of the recent

Education in Crisis and Conflict Network project at CIE in collaboration with the Education Development Center (EDC) (Center for International Development, n.d.).

Defining Characteristics of CIE

What then are the defining characteristics which made possible the unique nature of CIE at UMass? The paragraphs below outline the key components and how the synergy between them shaped the 50 year history of CIE.

Financing of CIE

The financial basis for CIE has two major components. First, CIE was fortunate from the beginning and throughout its history to have multiple full-time, state-funded faculty positions – something that over the years became a challenge for many CE/IE programs at US universities. The other major source of financing has been funded projects and grants. These funds support a full-time financial manager, an administrative staff member, as well as student assistantships.

CIE has always been committed to combining practical project management with academic degree programs. While other CE/IE university programs also sometimes manage funded projects, CIE is unique in the extent to which they were integrated into its degree programs. The size and scope of the activities are also noteworthy. In its 50 year history, CIE has managed more than 75 funded projects, contracts, and grants with a total value of about $97 million. The projects took place in more than 30 countries, including some in the U.S. working with Teacher Corps, Peace Corps, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Additional financing for CIE came from three other sources. First, UMass returns 10% of the indirect revenue generated by projects to the PIs managing the projects. These funds are used to support CIE activities. A second source is income from CIE's Endowment Fund, started in the early 2000s, which is now sufficient to partially support two graduate assistantships a year and is still growing in size. A third source is local fundraising efforts that generate small amounts used to support the professional and social activities of CIE, such as its annual overnight retreat.

Taken together, these strategies have provided CIE with sufficient financial support to flourish for 50 years. It is noteworthy that the School of Education has not provided any funding for CIE over its history, other than the key input of faculty salaries. In fact, CIE has been a substantial revenue center for the School since it receives 20% of the indirect revenue earned by the university on external contracts.

Faculty

From its inception, CIE was in a favorable position in that it had state-funded faculty positions in international education. Initially, there were three faculty members in CIE, and over the years, the number increased to four and sometimes even five state-funded faculty members. CIE also works with faculty from other programs as is needed in implementing projects. In contrast, many CE/IE programs have only a few core faculty members and must rely upon shared faculty from other programs or on adjunct and non-tenure track faculty funded by external projects.

Because of CIE's active role in managing funded projects, the faculty had to have personal experience working in development contexts and be willing to take on the responsibilities as principal investigators for projects. Recruiting faculty members willing to undertake such expanded responsibilities has proved challenging in recent years. Younger faculty members that joined CIE were less willing to carry the dual responsibilities of pursuing the academic work needed for promotion while simultaneously seeking and managing funded projects. For some, there was the additional desire for a better balance between work and family life, something that was understandably more critical for female faculty members with young children or other family obligations.[7]

Students

From the very beginning, students have been a central driving force of CIE, starting with what were known as planning doctoral candidates who spent the first year of their studies working with faculty to design CIE and its academic programs. Since then, students have played a central role in both project and academic activities of CIE. From the outset, admissions

[7] By the early 2000s, half of the CIE faculty members were women.

criteria required that new students, in addition to meeting academic qualifications, needed to have at least two years of experience working in a developing country setting. Many had much more experience. The belief was that such experience provided evidence of an informed commitment to careers in development education.

The goal was to create an on-campus learning community where students learned from each other, faculty learned from students and together they combined working on projects with academic work. Discussions in classes were always grounded in real-world experience. Theory and concepts were regularly confronted with the lived experience of the learners. CIE attracted students who did not want to pursue degrees with primarily academic programs in CE/IE, but wanted a combination of real-world practice and academic learning.

Initially, the student community at CIE was predominantly US males, mostly RPCVs. In the 1980s and 1990s that began to shift as more women joined the program, until by the early 2000s women were in the majority. Gradually over the decades, the student population became more international so that by 2010 international students made up at least half of the student body. Many of the international students returned home to significant leadership positions in education. Over the 50 years, the on-campus CIE community has ranged in size from 20 to 30 graduate students, about two-thirds of whom were doctoral students.

Curriculum & Pedagogy

From the start, the curriculum at CIE was designed and driven by a dialogue among students and faculty. Pedagogy in the classroom was participatory and experiential, with almost every class session involving some sort of applied or participatory exercise. Experience from field settings was integral to the learning process with both faculty and students regularly citing examples and issues from their experience. If a reading discussed a particular context, there was usually someone in class who had first-hand knowledge of that setting or a similar one, leading to an informed and sometimes critical discussion of the issue.

The curriculum for the degree programs began in the 1970s with almost total flexibility for students to create their own degree program based on identified learning goals and outcomes. Over time, structure was added with certain core courses strongly recommended and after several decades some became required. On multiple occasions, a few students would work with a faculty member to design and offer a new course. Several such courses ultimately became part of the core curriculum.[8]

The flexibility of the program was attractive to students who had a wide range of professional interests within the umbrella of international development education. But the extraordinary breadth of possible content in the field posed difficult challenges for faculty trying to decide what the content of CE/IE degrees should be (see, e.g., Klees 2008).

The openness was also reflected in the relative lack of difference in the guidelines and content of master's and doctoral degree programs. Master's students took many of the same classes as doctoral students. They were treated equally in terms of access to financial support. CIE has never viewed master's students as a revenue source to provide financing for doctoral students, although in recent years there has been pressure from the University to do so. Until the 1990s, there were no courses restricted to only master's or doctoral students. In the early 1980s, CIE introduced a capstone project as a requirement for the master's degree and began offering a supporting seminar.

Funded projects and related activities formed part of the curriculum. Interestingly, smaller projects often provided better learning opportunities for students than larger projects which had much higher proportions of administrative tasks. By working on projects students learn how to respond to donor requests, write proposals, recruit and manage field staff, and, equally important, to experience the challenges of translating academic theories into effective educational interventions.

Organizational Structure of CIE

At the beginning, CIE functioned as a committee of the whole, which led ultimately to the long-standing tradition of Tuesday morning community meetings attended by all students and faculty. These meetings became a defining characteristic of CIE and lasted for 50 years with CIE celebrating the 1,000th meeting in October of 2006. Typical meetings were combinations of CIE internal business, a speaker or presentation by a student, reports from CIE committees, etc. The meetings had less obvious benefits

[8] Examples of student-initiated courses included: Theory and Practice of NFE; Development Theories; Gender and Development; and Theater of the Oppressed.

as well: students could count on finding faculty members to talk to informally about their programs, and CIE graduates knew that if they returned to visit on a Tuesday, they would find faculty and colleagues.

In the 1990s CIE developed a more formalized governance structure and set of procedures. The structure featured an executive committee, with faculty and student members; standing committees for admissions, academic affairs, and program development; and ad hoc committees as needed. CIE's annual calendar included a welcoming fall reception, an overnight retreat for the whole community in a regional venue, a fall tag sale to raise funds, a holiday party, and a spring picnic. The activities of the CIE community played an important social and academic support role for all students, particularly for international students who often lack a local network of family and friends to support them during their studies.

Worldwide Network of Graduates

Over the 50 year period, CIE has created an international network of nearly 700 members (almost 300 doctoral and more than 300 master's degree graduates) as well as those who were all but dissertation. Because of the strong on-campus community that they experienced as students, graduates have a strong affinity for CIE and maintain contact both with CIE and with each other for years afterward.[9]

The network helps CIE in many ways. Graduates help identify and recruit promising applicants to degree programs. They also provide leads on possible project funding, help with recruitment of staff for projects and generally act as representatives of CIE in wherever they are working – there are graduates living and working in over 30 countries in the world.

The careers of graduates follow several patterns. A large proportion work as educational leaders in development settings. Many achieve national political positions as ambassadors or high commissioners, ministers of education, permanent secretaries, and even as the Speaker of the National Parliament in one case. Others are more directly involved in development activities as CEO or vice presidents of large international NGOs. More than half-dozen have served as chiefs of party for large USAID education projects, while others have become USAID Mission

[9] See Members section of CIE Web site (http://umass.edu/cie) for profiles of over 300 CIE graduates.

Directors, country directors, or senior staff members with UNESCO, UNICEF, Peace Corps, and the LEGO Foundation.

More than a dozen have founded or held leadership positions with smaller NGOs, some domestic and others international. Another large group have become university faculty members in the United States and abroad, where they often rise to become department chairs - with several becoming presidents, vice presidents, deans, and elected fellows of major domestic and international scholarly and policy organizations. Several dozen are members and active participants in CIES and one became president of CIES.

The career trajectories of graduates reflect CIE’s commitment to training “deep practitioners” who combine academic knowledge, policy, and research skills with the commitment and ability to become leaders in education. It is notable that many of those who rose to the most influential positions were master’s degree graduates, validating CIE’s commitment to valuing those students on a par with doctoral students. Master’s graduates were less likely to pursue academic careers and thus sought careers in organizations committed to work in development education.

Lessons Learned from 50 Years of CIE

The characteristics which seem to have been most essential to its growth and success include:

- Committing to a synergistic linkage between academic study, research, and direct involvement in substantial funded projects in primarily developing contexts.
- Recruiting a cadre of faculty and mid-career students with extensive development experience and a desire to apply their learning to the challenges of education and development.
- Creating and maintaining an active, participatory learning community on campus that seamlessly merged learning and practice – in courses and in the field.
- Encouraging and facilitating graduate students to take a significant role in developing both academic courses and projects.
- Having a clear vision and consistent long-term leadership committed to that vision.

- Maintaining linkages between the campus community and the worldwide network of CIE graduates working in international development.
- Producing substantial income for the University and the School which encouraged the administration to support or in some periods to at least tolerate the existence of CIE.

Challenges to the Success of CIE

The defining characteristics of CIE discussed in the previous section are the primary factors that have enabled CIE to achieve much of its success. However, CIE has faced a number of challenges that other CE/IE programs may be facing:

- Many universities are unwilling to take the risk of having faculty or employees work in conflict and crisis settings. CIE was fortunate that UMass Amherst was supportive and willing to allow employees to work in challenging and sometimes insecure contexts.
- However, at the same time the environmental press of a university that was pursuing greater academic status based on traditional criteria of research and publication led to pressure to separate the academic program from implementation projects at CIE.
- Critiques that being reliant on external funding would limit the topics of research and compromise academic freedom and integrity (Carnoy 2019).
- Difficulty in recruiting faculty who were willing to make the personal sacrifices involved in managing fieldwork while also meeting the demands of teaching, research, and publishing that are required for academic promotion. Faculty members with young children were particularly reluctant to accept such challenges.
- The discomfort of some Deans with the degree of autonomy of CIE and its substantial resources in contrast to other programs led to periodic attempts to restrict or even break up CIE.
- The problem of transition of CIE leadership after the founding Director had served for more than 45 years and was PI for most of the major funded projects during that time – the difficulty of finding and keeping a qualified successor.

Current Status

After 50 years, CIE has entered a period of transition. The founding director retired, and his immediate successor moved to another university to assume a leadership position after only one year, leading to the recruitment of a second new director. In the last several years, the academic program in international education has been separated from the Center, weakening many of the components that were at the core of CIE's strength. The IE program remains part of a department, while CIE is now a College-wide unit that reports directly to the dean, not to the department chair. The new director is working to build a center that is more broadly based with linkages to other programs in the College of Education[10] and throughout the UMass Amherst campus.

What Is the Future Prognosis for CE/IE Programs and Centers?

There are many models in universities with CE/IE programs. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to analyze their variations in structure and purpose. Wilson (1994) provides an exhaustive and detailed genealogy of CE/IE programs, tracing multiple generations of students and the rise and fall of programs[11] at various universities but doesn't address their internal organization. A more recent review of CE/IE programs argues for more emphasis on recruiting students from, and preparing students for, non-academic positions in development education, but doesn't discuss how programs need to change to achieve that goal (Blosser 2016).

Programs vary widely in their structure as well as their content, but almost all CE/IE programs are separate from units that engage in implementation of funded field projects. However, to varying degrees they all share a number of challenges:

- International education is not central to the mission of colleges of education, especially at state universities, despite the fact that many

[10] The School of Education at UMass Amherst was renamed the College of Education in 2013.

[11] Wilson (1994, p. 470) mentions CIE in a paragraph that names the faculty members who helped start CIE and where they earned their degrees.

universities have committed to internationalizing their programs. Universities seem to give priority to promoting internationalization across all activities rather than by supporting individual international programs.

- Most colleges of education do not finance faculty positions that are full-time in CE/IE, so such programs have to seek part-time commitments from faculty employed in other education programs or disciplines.
- Graduate education has become very expensive, so strong financial support is necessary to recruit students to CE/IE. Simultaneously, the employment market for new faculty in the US is tight. While opportunities for work with development agencies are still plentiful, increasingly such agencies are hiring staff from developing countries which provides career opportunities for international students.
- CE/IE programs often need to seek external funding, but in most universities funded projects are housed in separate centers that are not directly linked to degree programs.
- A few universities have created new models (Arizona State and Virginia Tech are recent examples) in the form of institution-wide centers which engage actively in implementing development projects, drawing upon relevant faculty members as needed. However, linkages to academic content and degree programs are mostly opportunistic and rely almost exclusively on the initiative of individual faculty members.
- Schwille's chapter in this book describes the approach used at Michigan State University when it abolished the CE/IE program in favor of adding an international component to all programs in education.
- Another model is emerging where a center or institute like CIE becomes a campus-wide hub for multi-disciplinary approaches to research on developing educational systems because of the linkages to other sectors like health, agriculture, and economic development (Harvard is an example).

CIE is quite unique and does not offer a model that is likely to be emulated elsewhere, although there are lessons to be learned from the CIE model about the benefits of embedding funded projects in an academic program. The current challenges are such that many existing programs face ongoing struggles for survival under financial pressures and changing market demand for graduates. Some will likely be merged into other programs, while others may persist in a weakened state. Those in prestigious universities will likely survive with support from grants for scholarships and research funding. New programs are unlikely, except in rare, unusual contexts.

The late 1960s were a period of societal upheaval and innovation, perhaps not unlike what is occurring in our present era. In the future, centers may be less about replicating or adapting existing models of CE/IE programs, and more about generating innovative new structures that did not previously exist. This will require visionary leadership that resists the environmental press in higher education to conform to existing institutionalized norms, particularly for universities seeking to improve their academic ranking.

References

Andrade, Diego., Alcocer, Beatriz., Barriga, Patricio., Bourbeau, June., Borja, Amparo., Bing, John., Evans, David., Hoxeng, James., Moreno, Carlos., Ochoa, Alberto., Pulupa, Pedro., Smith, William., Tasiguano, Enrique., Toaquiza, Enrique., & Villacis, Rodrigo. (1975). *Nonformal education in Ecuador 1971–1975*. Amherst: Center for International Education. https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cie_nonformaleducation/3. Accessed 18 April 2020.

Blosser, Allison H. (2016). Program development. In Erwin H. Epstein (Ed.), *Crafting a global field: Six decades of the Comparative and International Education Society* (pp. 71–81). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong, and Dordrecht: Springer.

Boardman, Gerald R., Sylvester, Roxanne M., Khalid, Mohammad Fahim., & Shaheed, Mohammad Rateb. (2012). *Final evaluation: Afghanistan higher education project (HEP)*. USAID Mission to Afghanistan. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACT899.pdf. Accessed 16 April 2020.

Brainerd, Lyman B. (1973). *Radical change in a school of education, September 1967–November 1969: A study of leader-dominated change in a university subcomponent* (No. 2788) (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst). Doctoral Dissertations 1896–February 2014. https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/2788. Accessed 14 April 2020.

Brembeck, Cole S. (1978). *Formal education, non-formal education, and expanded conceptions of development*. East Lansing: Non-Formal Education Information Center.

Carnoy, Martin. (2019). *Transforming comparative education: Fifty years of theory building at Stanford*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Center for International Development. (n.d.). *Education in conflict & crisis network—CIE with EDC (2014–2019)*. https://www.umass.edu/cie/our-work/education-conflict-crisis-network-cie-edc-2014-2019. Accessed 14 April 2020.

Coombs, Philip H. (1968). *The world educational crisis: A systems analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Evans, David R., & Kinsley, Dale. (1970). *Draft of proposed process for structuring, monitoring, and recording the doctoral program in international education* (Unpublished Document). Center for International Education, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, MA, USA.

Klees, Steven J. (2008). Reflections on theory, method, and practice in comparative and international education. *Comparative Education Review*, *52*(3): 301–328. https://doi.org/10.1086/589978.

Ministry of Education and Sports. (2000). *Final report on the evaluation of the teacher development and management systems (TDMS) programme*. Development Consultants International and Incafex Consultants Ltd.

Pfeiffer, Katherine G. (1995). *Using historical narrative as a tool for organizational analysis: A twenty-five year history of the Center for International Education* (No. 2269) (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst). *Doctoral Dissertations 1896–February 2014*. https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/2269. Accessed 1 April 2020.

Shumaker, John W., Davenport, Michele M., Wafeq, Manizha., Rezaie, Ammar., & Haroon, Rohina. (2017). *Mid-term performance evaluation of the university support and workforce development program*. USAID Mission to Afghanistan. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00MJZ4.pdf. Accessed 16 April 2020.

University of Massachusetts Amherst. (2019). *UMass Amherst moves up to no. 24 among public universities in latest U.S. news rankings*. https://www.umass.edu/newsoffice/article/umass-amherst-moves-no-24-among-public. Accessed 8 April 2020.

USAID, Office of Program and Methodology. (1975). *A directory of institutional resources supported by section 211 d grants: U. S. Centers of Competence for International Development*. The Office, 145–146.

Wilson, David N. (1994). Comparative and international education: Fraternal or siamese twins? A preliminary genealogy of our twin fields. *Comparative Education Review, 38*(4), 449–486. https://doi.org/10.1086/447271.

CHAPTER 11

Two Tales, Contending Perspectives, and Contested Terrain

Joel Samoff

What, the student wondered, is comparative education? A catch-all category for people who study education somewhere else? Or, as some colleagues insist, a unique discipline with its own content, approaches, and methodologies?

Later, I asked the question again, prompted by a request from England's Department for International Development (DFID) to review major Comparative and International Education themes (Samoff and Schweisfurth 2009). My colleagues and I sought to understand CIE by exploring what CIE researchers publish (Foster et al. 2012). Efforts to survey a body of research are of course always limited and flawed. Using major journals as a filter surely underweights innovative and insightful inquiries and observations. Still, we were confident we could learn a good deal about CIE as a field with our approach. Focusing on the full text of four major CIE journals over a five year period, we asked what concerns

J. Samoff (✉)
Center for African Studies, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA
e-mail: joel.samoff@stanford.edu

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_11

CIE researchers? What do they see as worth studying? What are the major puzzles?

Three observations stood out. First, we found that while CIE scholars explored what goes on in schools and other learning settings, they were even more interested in education in society, in education finance, policy, and politics. The priority attention was more to education's context than to education's content. Second, while some researchers addressed the general and education issues of the day (our examples were HIV and computers and education technology), their broad reach did not suggest that current events were a pressing driver. Third, notwithstanding efforts to specify the domain, methods, and boundaries of a field, CIE researchers proved to be an itinerant lot, regularly crossing disciplinary and methodological borders. They regarded disciplinary core ideas and rules as guides, not limiting boundaries. Reading their work made clear that they regarded the knowledge they generated as sufficient evidence of its value.

At the same time, critics insist that CIE research has become deeply enmeshed in the structured inequality of the contemporary global political economy. Indeed, in this view, the energetically affirmed critical and progressive intent of many researchers obscures, even worse, provides an acceptable cover for, CIE's deeply problematic role. Genuine commitment to democratic ideals, to an egalitarian ethos, to providing voice for the poor and disadvantaged contributes to the facade that disguises and shields the institutions and relationships that entrench and perpetuate underdevelopment and dependence.

To make sense of these contrasting perspectives, it is useful to explore two stories of Comparative and International Education, tales that intersect and overlap and that sharply diverge. My focus is Africa.

The Development Tale

Context matters, even for academic disciplines. While studies of other societies have a very long and rich history, the important starting point for this tale is decolonization. Thirty-five years after the 1884–1885 Berlin conference declaration of European authority over Africa, the Versailles Treaty ended German colonial rule. That Treaty institutionalized a notion of development, or rather, lack of development. Colonies were deemed not ready for independence. After all, if the German colonies could become independent, why not those of England, France, Portugal, and

Spain? The important point for our story is that decolonization was tightly linked to a notion of development, a largely linear scale of progress on which countries could be located. That linkage was elaborated over the years between the wars and further institutionalized when the League of Nations Mandates became United Nations Trusteeships.

Development has had many definitions, but all include a core notion of progress from less developed to more developed. Here, we find an important role for scholars, both to provide terminology and scientific legitimacy for the conditions termed less and more developed and to assist in their popularization. Africa is to be understood somewhere in the tension between *traditional* and *modern*.

Over many years, research on Africa was deeply enmeshed in and framed by the colonial process.[1] The British Royal Geographic Society funded David Livingstone, the missionary and explorer who became an icon for Europe's scramble for Africa, and facilitated his contacts with the British government, which provided additional funding and appointed him its roving consul in southern Africa. Research, trade, and proselytizing, he argued, were integrally linked.

This framing of events in Africa had a compelling purpose: creating moral legitimacy for immoral practices. Beginning with the slave trade and then continuing as colonial rule developed, a major ideological challenge for the Europeans was explaining and defending their treatment of the African communities they encountered. Scholars' sanitized racism made colonial rule's crude and brutal racism more comfortable.

Critical to that was the asserted distinction between barbarian and civilized, which scholars refined into traditional and modern. That core idea and its associated stereotypes motivated and informed a good deal of the research on what were termed primitive societies. Among the most influential academic work was Parson's analysis of pattern variables: traditional/modern, affectivity/affective neutrality, diffuseness/specificity, ascription/achievement, collectivity orientation/self-orientation (1960). Modern and traditional, less offensive and more friendly than "primitive," became scientific terms, ostensibly detached from colonial motives, exploitation, and abuses. By clothing the traditional vs. modern distinction in scientific language and credibility, social science provided a foundation for the notions that backward is a property of Africa – that is, a cause,

[1] I draw here on Samoff 2019.

not an effect, a condition not a process – and that the humane task of colonialism was to overcome that backwardness. Those ideas persist. Both inside and outside Africa, a good deal of the effort to study Africa, from the older themes (chiefship and succession; the African family) to more recent concerns (electoral outcomes; the gendered nature of power and authority), assumes a necessary tension between traditional and modern. With that assumption, explanations for backwardness – in contemporary terms, poverty, ignorance, disease – must lie in Africa, not in the interactions between Africa and the rest of the world and certainly not in the actions of countries and companies in the external environment.

Framing

Here, we have an instructive example of framing: the consequences of the ways ideas, issues, and relationships are described and understood. The assumption of the traditional/modern tension became the foundation for a very wide range of analytic efforts. Yet, the assumption itself is regularly obscured as researchers' focus and readers' attention shift to, say, the uses of big data or the interpretation of regression lines. That starting point assumed a political, economic, and intellectual context, regarded it as natural and inevitable, and then sought to explain what was observed in terms independent of that context. Yet, not only does that context need explanation, but even more important, the context may itself offer the most powerful explanation for what is observed. The framing controls what we do and do not see.

Certainly, this perspective has been contested. As Mudimbe explains, research during the colonial era helped to institutionalize the understanding of Africa as the Other (1988). Mudimbe explores how those who saw themselves as modern required an Other to define themselves – we are the civilized, the Other are the barbarians – inventing it as necessary. Certainly critical and insightful analysis. Yet traditional vs. modern marches on. The 2020 South African National Arts Festival described a jazz musician as "Urban, erudite, international and skilled, but rooted in his culture." Not "and" – "but," assuming a tension between urban, erudite, and international (modern) and culture (traditional).

Important for our purposes here is that a core idea with roots in the colonial enterprise continues to inform and shape contemporary research, often with little or no critical assessment. It has simply become an unexceptional and unnoticed part of the standard research frame.

In the rationalism and empiricism of twentieth century social science, development was, and continues to be, addressed as a knowable set of stages and a knowable set of steps to progress through the stages. *Knowable* assigned a special role to knowledge generation and thus to research. Knowledge makes development understandable and manageable. That creates essential roles for knowledge specialists with expertise on the formerly colonized world: description, comparison, analysis, and prescription.

The second half of the twentieth century brought several important changes to the political context. The United Nations system brought new institutions onto the development terrain. The international financial institutions refocused their attention from reconstructing Europe to developing the former colonies, increasingly cast as reducing poverty. Most important, two global powers with no African colonial history competed to pursue their African interests and displace the colonizers. In that competition, the development gap became a prime rationale for foreign aid.

Financial-Intellectual Complex

Here, the threads of our development tale come together. The decolonization of Africa is accompanied by notions of development and a development gap. Researchers provide the scientific authority and legitimacy for framing Africa as primitive, traditional, and underdeveloped. Discomforting as it is to the CIE community, those terms are effectively synonyms. The Cold War competition for access to Africa made foreign aid central in development activities. Since allocations require justification and reporting, the development discourse focuses on studies, plans, projects, and evaluations. Asking what works. Whether initiated within Africa or proposed by the funders, programs worthy of funding required credible research support. The essential opening became: "Research shows that …" (Samoff 2012). That frames new waves of research, and even for researchers with no direct connection to foreign aid, influences research funding decisions and journal editors' expectations. That combination – poverty, development, development gap, foreign aid – spawned an entanglement of research and aid, a financial-intellectual complex.

Beneath the claims about science, falsifiable hypotheses, and reproducible results lie several foundational faiths. Faith in development as a rational process with knowable laws. Faith in a positivist process of knowledge generation. Faith in a depoliticized, evidence-driven process for formulating and implementing public policy.

Recall that this story is concerned with research on education in Africa. Since research funding is so limited, foreign aid has become, directly and indirectly, the major source of individual and institutional funding for education research in post-colonial Africa. At the same time, notions of evidence-based policy and practice and a flawed understanding of the links between research and public policy make claimed research findings essential and influential in development discussions. In that setting, the foreign aid funding frames research method and content. In this way, research on education in Africa has become inextricably intertwined with the needs, interests, and preferences of external funding and technical assistance agencies. Currently, directly and indirectly those organizations employ more researchers and commission more studies than any African research institution and perhaps more than nearly all of them combined. (Beverly Lindsay's chapter addresses links between foreign aid funding and research.)

Informed and well-grounded policy is, of course, desirable. So indeed is dialogue between policymakers and researchers. Yet, just as their funds seat foreign aid organizations at the African education policy table, so too do those funds secure powerful influence over research and the research process. Though clearly consequential, this conjunction of external funding and education research has itself had limited research attention.

The understanding implicit in the assistance relationship begins with two related assumptions: education is essential for development, and education in Africa is currently in such disarray that it cannot fulfill its developmental role. From that starting point comes a third widely accepted proposition: foreign assistance is required to support new education initiatives, to rehabilitate African education systems that have deteriorated, and even to meet recurrent expenditures. Another set of propositions informs the determination of what sort of support is to be provided. Although foreign assistance is of course negotiated and thus subject to the exigencies and vagaries of politics, priorities and targets for foreign aid to education should be determined (it is generally assumed) on the basis of careful research on education and development. That is, reliable knowledge about education, both in general and in its role in African development, ought to be the primary standard for assessing specific proposals and projects. Finally, it is taken for granted that the most reliable knowledge is the product of research undertaken according to the canons of Western social science by individuals educated and socialized in the universities of the North Atlantic.

The research community is proud and protective of its autonomy. Several layers of institutions and arrangements are intended to insulate recipients of research funding from the preferences and prejudices of the fund providers. My concern here is not with the ideas and orientations of individual researchers but with the ways in which the dominant framing orients and constrains their research.

How is that framing specified? Consider the notion of evidence-based public policy, a dominating idea that envisions a depoliticized policy process that favors research over democratic participation. Yet, even where researchers differ little, their analyses are only one component of the policy process, which must address and manage conflicting interests. Effective public policies must be both desirable and feasible, which in democratic settings requires negotiation and compromise, and which in practice means more muddling through and satisficing than optimizing. Making education policy is not and cannot be a linear path from problem specification to research to policy. In practice, the emphasis on evidence-based policy is regularly used to disempower critics and community activists.

In another framing role, the research funders become arbiters of research quality. Here we find the assumption that the most reliable research approach is an effort to reproduce in the field a laboratory experiment in which independent and dependent variables are clear and distinct and in which claims of reproducibility and falsification require quantification. The embedded assumptions of this social science perspective have several powerful consequences. They favor quantification over deep and detailed observation. They seek broadly applicable law-like patterns and in the process devalue roots, context, and the insights derived from unique circumstances. They insist on reproducible linear causality, dismissing explanatory frameworks that focus on intersections and interactions and that recognize that an institution, relationship, or mindset can be simultaneously both cause and consequence – for one example, racism. Best rewarded are approaches that dissect events and relationships from their settings. Regularly devalued and dismissed as uninformative or non-scientific are approaches that emphasize context and complexity and that insist that it is isolation from setting that provides a weak foundation for observations and findings. The primary actors, students and teachers, are regarded as the objects of observation, not subjects whose agency is critical and who can be effective research collaborators.

Within that methodological frame, large-scale sample surveys are preferred over detailed observation, ethnographic investigation, and panel or cohort tracing. Other research strategies are rarely supported and regularly dismissed as not research at all, for example action research intended to support a social transformation objective (say, reducing discrimination against students from a racial, ethnic, or religious minority) and legal action to compel disclosure of critical information (say, details of school or district education spending).

Here, too, our story has to do with framing and method rather than content. Once the method has been validated by conformance to disciplinary standards, the research findings are deemed reliable. That framing dismisses alternative interpretations and counterarguments based on historical experience, independent expertise, participants' observations, text and discourse analysis, even, sometimes, common sense.

If science were itself independent of context, relying on methodology to validate findings might not be problematic. But since the specification of science and rigor are shaped by context (think Galileo), the central role of aid agencies in specifying credible and acceptable methodology has an enormous influence on education research in Africa.

These examples highlight this thread in our story. The conjunction of funding and research is consequential not primarily because of direct influence on individual research projects, though that occurs, but, more important, because of the ways in which it frames the research process. Shaping how we see things can be as simple as the choice of words. Consider the many references to apartheid, institutionalized racial discrimination, as a strategy for securing *cheap* labor. That understanding seems so clear that we need not think about it further. But for whom is the labor cheap? Clearly, for the miners recruited to work underground in dangerous circumstances that will shorten their lives, the labor is high cost, not cheap. Understanding several generations of coerced and exploited workers as cheap labor makes the employer's perspective the general view. What seems to be a simple description locates the researcher in a vantage point that would be discomfiting if discerned.

What works? Research shows that …. It is along this path that CIE became a major, though not the sole, bridge between research and finance. Review, refine, and ultimately legitimize the research agenda effectively set by the funding agencies. Specify and validate appropriate research methods, and thereby determine what is and what is not scientific, with funding agencies setting limits by their funding decisions. Validate results, by attention to research methods rather than to program outcomes.

A brief essay does not permit detailing the many pathways of influence in the financial-intellectual complex. Across Africa, CIE research becomes aid agency consulting, with problematic consequences for research, aid, and public policy.

Our story must not decay into caricatures. Certainly, some CIE researchers see no direct role for development issues in their scholarship and have no direct contact with funding and technical assistance agencies. Certainly, many CIE researchers – in my experience, the majority – are deeply committed to ending poverty, collaborative and sensitive to the situations of their partners, supportive of African voices and initiatives. Certainly, there are critics. This story is not about heroes and villains. This story does not ignore or doubt the goodwill and humanism of the CIE research community. Still, at the larger scale, this story recounts a process in which a good deal of CIE research functions to support, directly and indirectly, ideas, ways of knowing, approaches and methods, reporting, and intellectual accountability that result in reinforcing and entrenching dependence and thus inequality and poverty. As well, this process defangs the critics.

Fixing Foreign Aid

This attention to framing helps us make the transition to another tale of Comparative and International Education. I have been exploring the consequences of the conjunction of foreign aid and research funding. In the common view, foreign aid is a transfer of resources, human as well as physical, intellectual as well as material, intended to reduce poverty and promote development. For many years, foreign aid has been criticized and challenged. Within the development story, since foreign aid is essential to expand education access and improve its quality, a high priority task is to fix foreign aid. Suggested fixes have been many, often proposed by those deeply involved in the foreign aid system. Even those who insist that foreign aid is so problematic and so broken that it cannot be fixed work within this broad framing of foreign aid and its role.

Accordingly, the fix-it efforts go down several paths. Examples must suffice. Some focus on the institutions and organization of the foreign aid system. For example, aid is often too late and too little and at odds with the priorities of the recipient country. Aid operations staff are accountable and rewarded for the volume of funding they initiate, but not for achieving the objectives for which the funding was allocated. The fix: improve aid delivery.

Some fix-it efforts start with the perspective of the recipients and the disabilities of dependence. For example, aid conditions constrain local initiatives and control. The rhetoric of partnership remains empty. The fix: create rules to govern the aid relationship.

Still other fix-it efforts focus on recipients' leadership and implementation. Funding is redirected to activities other than those for which it was allocated. Aid's availability enables authoritarian leaders to ignore alternative voices and suppress critics. The fix: explicit constraining conditions attached to aid.

These are selected examples. While some fixes seem effective, at the larger scale what is most striking is that while the major problems of foreign aid have been clear for decades, they persist.

Our second story starts there, insisting on an alternate framing for foreign aid.

The Critical Deconstruction Tale

Efforts to fix foreign aid are misdirected, some CIE scholars insist. Foreign aid is not broken. Foreign aid is working as intended.

As its legislative charters and periodic justifications make clear, foreign aid is first and foremost intended to promote the provider's national interests. For example, that a substantial portion of foreign aid is spent on the products, services, and personnel of the providing countries and that foreign aid regularly requires the use of providing countries' sources and services are neither accidental nor unintended. Foreign aid is also used to organize and manage the global political economy. Though it sounds odd now, US aid to Africa in the 1960s rewarded new United Nations members who supported US efforts to exclude China. Foreign aid provides incentives, rewards, and sanctions to influence countries' behavior. Foreign aid entrenches dependence and reinforces power and authority relations.

The point here is not foreign aid but the framing. For many in the CIE community, foreign aid needs fixing, and our scholarship can contribute to that. For others in the CIE community, that approach reflects a fundamental misunderstanding – foreign aid is working as intended. Critical scholarship must pierce the facade, expose the underpinnings, and contribute not to remediation but to transformation.

This second story, then, is about CIE research as demystification and deconstruction, and therefore necessarily about liberation and transformation.

Several analyses have been especially influential. I note a few to suggest directions, regretful that I have had to omit others and that this essay does not permit a fuller review of the development, elaboration, and refinement of critical scholarship.

Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) and his subsequent work insisted that education need not be simply training for adulthood and that it could and should be liberating and transforming. Learners must be the subjects, not the objects, of the learning process, he showed, with primary responsibility for their learning. Carnoy's *Education as Cultural Imperialism* (1974) challenged the assumption that education is a universal good, independent of the economic, political, and social context in which its content and practices are specified. His analysis challenged as well the still widespread assertion that education in the Global North should be understood as universal. Bowles and Gintis (1976, 1981) centered education-society links, noting education's circumscribed autonomy and emphasizing that schooling both reproduces and shapes the social order. (Martin Carnoy's and Beverly Lindsay's chapters address these issues.)

I use the term influence cautiously. I have been struck by the frequency of the references to Freire and the paucity of applications of his thinking and pedagogy. Exceptions stand out. At a recent South African conference, two teacher educators reported that Freire's pedagogy led them to take their students on a community walkabout and to have sitdowns with community residents to talk about how they saw school problems and solutions.[2] Describing their pedagogy, the educators explored the challenges and demands of learner-centered learning, differentiating it clearly from learner-attentive teacher-centered teaching.

Especially since my concern here is with research on education in Africa, I must note that only infrequently has this critical scholarship been focused in that direction. Far too often the common medical metaphor (expert external diagnosticians tell Africa what is wrong and what to do) and the common improvement approach (effectively, unending remediation, with little clarity on causes and less innovation) remain unchallenged.

Demystifying, Deconstructing, and Challenging

Critical analysis is of course a continuing story.

This second CIE tale, then, is not a straight path through research opportunities and results, but more a series of efforts to examine, expose, and challenge the modernizing and missionizing CIE mainstream. A few examples must suffice.

The Education for All campaign spawned a strikingly independent and critical periodic review. Its first Global Monitoring Report was starkly clear: Though the world had committed to universal basic education, its current practices could not achieve that (UNESCO 2002). That message – at its core an insightful challenge to the EFA process – recurred in successive reports. Still, both education funding and re-thinking organizing mass education remain unresolved.

Lewin's systematic studies of the pressures to privatize and their consequences have shown forcefully that charging school fees to the poor, even low fees, impoverishes them further and weakens both the public provision of education and the notion of education as a public good (2017). Klees has perceptively highlighted the distorted uses of human

[2] Here too, the terminology is instructive. "Walkabout" and "sitdowns" – not investigations and interventions – are from the original presentation. "Neighborhood" is the proper American term, but it does not capture the notion of a community with distinctive characteristics and interactions clearer in the French "quartier." The South African usage, "township," is an apartheid era legacy, suggesting that a community and its residents are peripheral and marginal to a white city, even when the area is well integrated into the city. Only when scholars are attentive to how communities see and describe themselves – to the context for whatever they are studying – can they work on distinguishing analytically between poor and impoverished.

capital theory and the economics of education more generally (2016a, b). Regression analysis, presented as scientific and objective, he has shown, often obscures how particular ideas are integrated into approach and method and produces outcomes that are neither scientific nor objective.

CIE critics have regularly challenged the common assumption that the Global North is the primary generator and owner of knowledge: “developing countries will remain importers rather than principal producers of technical knowledge for some time” (World Bank 1999, p. 24). Ignoring knowledge generated in the Global South, and even worse, undermining and constraining its knowledge generation capacity entrenches dependence (Samoff 2019). Far from making broadly-sourced information accessible, knowledge management strategies reinforce power inequalities and discourage research innovation (Samoff and Stromquist 2001).

CIE critics have forcefully challenged another common assumption: that the model for social science research should be an experiment. Rarely is it possible to impose on social humans the controls that a reproducible laboratory experiment requires. Researchers who address that by randomizing and using statistical tools to permit systematic comparison most often obscure rather than resolve selection bias – specifying which variables warrant attention. For evaluation research, the claimed gold standard, randomized controlled trials (RCTs), is equally problematic. Randomization is difficult to implement without disrupting core education activities and without impeding learning interactions, adaptations, and changes of direction. Political and ethical issues are rarely addressed. Decontextualization makes findings difficult to interpret. RCTs are expensive (Pritchett 2013; Samoff et al. 2016, pp. 47–58). (Steven Klees’ chapter addresses these issues.)

These selected examples reflect several shared understandings. Learning is a participatory, interactive, and dynamic process, deeply intertwined with the political, economic, and historical contexts within which formal and non-formal education take place. To explain interactions, researchers must study them. Explanatory frameworks must explore reciprocal influences where causes are simultaneously effects. Capturing complexity and context cannot be accomplished by setting either aside. Focusing on education as process is more likely to yield grounded understandings than a dissection strategy directed toward education as outcome.

The challenge is to the paradigm, and its framing. Ordinary science cannot be unparadigmatic, or ordinary.

So, a very different tale, but still the second story, not the first.

Contested Terrain

As the two stories suggest, under the collegiality of Comparative and International Education lies sharply contested terrain. We should expect no less. Several concluding thoughts.

Real-world outcomes are both consequential and instructive. After decades of pronounced commitment to Education for All, the current projection is that poor rural African girls will take nearly a century to get there (UNESCO 2014). Poverty and limited national funding for education cannot explain that, since EFA strategies must take those into account. What must we infer? Perhaps the world's educators have been horribly incompetent. Or, more likely, Education for All is a rhetorical objective, not a global goal, and education differentiation, not universal access, remains the working priority. Similarly, if after years of efforts to close the development gap, inequality has increased, then maintaining inequality must be very important to powerful global forces. That is, we must understand that what is decried as a lack of progress is often evidence of very different, perhaps opposite, objectives.

Put sharply, we must recognize that global inequality is not accidental or inadvertent or simply slow progress, but rather the result of conscious actions by individuals and institutions. CIE researchers concerned about EFA and about the liberating and developmental potential of education more generally, must explore that process. And challenge it.

A sense of humility and a notion of role remain high priorities. We live in an unequal and unjust world. CIE research will not change that world. Political action must do that, especially initiated and led by those disadvantaged and their allies. CIE researchers can be those allies, or they can stand in the way.

Small gains do matter. It is important to understand better the critical role of teachers, the ideas and practices that disadvantage girls, instructional strategies that strengthen learning, and pedagogies developed for settings of large classes and limited resources. Those findings can contribute to expanded access, improved quality, and more effective learning. To make the small gains enduring gains, we need to use that research to explore how they are achieved. Who decides? Who manages? Who is accountable? Who owns the process? Who owns the results? Who is empowered not only to make progress within the frame but to change the frame?

Mountains of research have sought to explain poverty, understood as a condition or characteristic of a set of people, or a country, or a region. Far far less attention is focused on the process, on how people and countries became poor, and on the process that keeps them poor.

CIE research must distinguish between poor and impoverished. And it must understand why that matters.

References

Bowles, Samuel., & Gintis, Herbert. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books.

Bowles, Samuel., & Gintis, Herbert. (1981). Education as a site of contradictions in the reproduction of the capital-labor relationship: Second thoughts on the 'correspondence principle.' *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, *2*(2), 223–242. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0143831X8122005.

Carnoy, Martin. (1974). *Education as cultural imperialism*. New York: David McKay Company.

Foster, Jesse., Addy, Nii Antiaye., & Samoff, Joel. (2012). Crossing borders: Research in comparative and international education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *32*(6), 711–732. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2011.12.003.

Freire, Paulo. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Klees, Steven J. (2016a). Human capital and rates of return: Brilliant ideas or ideological dead ends? *Comparative Education Review*, *60*(4), 644–672. https://doi.org/10.1086/688063.

Klees, Steven J. (2016b). Inferences from regression analysis: Are they valid? *Real-World Economics Review* (74), 85–97. http://www.paecon.net/PAERev iew/issue74/Klees74.pdf.

Lewin, Keith M. (2017). Making rights realities: Does privatizing educational services for the poor make sense? In Bekisizwe S. Ndimande & Christopher Lubienski (Eds.), *Privatization and the education of marginalized children: Policies, impacts, and global lessons* (pp. 81–102). New York: Routledge.

Mudimbe, Valentin Y. (1988). *The invention of Africa: Gnosis, philosophy, and the order of knowledge*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Parsons, Talcott. (1960). *Structure and process in modern societies*. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Pritchett, Lant. (2013, November 14). *RCTs in development, lessons from the hype cycle*. Center for Global Development. http://www.cgdev.org/blog/rcts-development-lessons-hype-cycle. Accessed 20 August 2020.

Samoff, Joel. (2012). Research shows that ...: Creating the knowledge environment for learning for all. In Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, & Nelly P.

Stromquist (Eds.), *The World Bank and education: Critiques and alternatives* (pp. 143–157). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Samoff, Joel. (2019). *Higher education for self-reliance: Tanzania and Africa*. Dar es Salaam: HakiElimu. http://hakielimu.org/files/publications/HigherEducationforSelfrelianceforweb.pdf.
Samoff, Joel., & Schweisfurth, Michele. (2009). *Tensions and opportunities: Supporting research on education and development*. Department for International Development.
Samoff, Joel., & Stromquist, Nelly P. (2001). Managing knowledge and storing wisdom? New forms of foreign aid? *Development and Change*, *32*(4), 631–656. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7660.00220.
Samoff, Joel., Leer, Jane., & Reddy, Michelle. (2016). *Capturing complexity and context: Evaluating aid to education*. Stockholm: Expert Group for Aid Studies (Expertgruppen för biståndsanalys [EBA]). https://www.oecd.org/derec/sweden/Rapport-Capturing-complexity-and-context.pdf. Accessed 30 August 2020.
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Global Education Monitoring Report Team. (2002). *Education for all: Is the world on track? EFA global monitoring report, 2002*. Paris: UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000129777?posInSet=1&queryId=eda4bd4d-67a0-42bb-9c31-59f1cd16c17c. Accessed 16 August 2020.
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Global Education Monitoring Report Team. (2014). *Teaching and learning: Achieving quality for all; EFA global monitoring report, 2013–2014*. Paris: UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000225654. Accessed 16 August 2020.
World Bank. (1999). *World development report 1998/99: Knowledge for development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/5981/WDR%201998_99%20-%20English.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y. Accessed 21 August 2020.

CHAPTER 12

Evolving Nexus Between Diplomacy and Comparative and International Education

Beverly Lindsay

Over a half century ago, Coombs (1964) identified education and cultural affairs as the fourth dimension of foreign policy, while Frankel's publications (1965, 1969) discussed education and cultural policy as neglected aspects of foreign affairs. In recent times, the geopolitical landscapes of the world have changed as the top industrialized G-7 and develop and emerging G-20 nations,[1] grapple with how they can address cross-border opportunities and problems such as fostering adequate current and future professionals, demographic and racial challenges, public health matters, natural resources, and terrorism (Schindler 2018; U.S. Department of State 2019). Such matters highlight the

[1]The G-7 (Group of 7): Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom, and United States of America. The G-20 (Group of 20): Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, European Union, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Turkey, United Kingdom, and United States of America.

B. Lindsay (✉)
University of California, California, USA

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_12

need for analyzing relationships between comprehensive doctoral universities within the G-7 American and British government programs via the Department of State, United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and British Department for International Development (DFID).[2] These departments provide fellowships, grants, and contracts largely to university professionals and domestic and international consortiums that undertake cooperative arrangements to address transnational challenges.

While some academicians have resisted the direct acknowledgment of the underlying purposes of funding types, scholars and policymakers need to be cognizant of challenges and move forward in their analyses and research in comparative and international disciplines (Knight 2008; Lindsay 2004; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 2019). Closely aligned to these actualities are the increasing aspects of diplomacy (integral to foreign affairs) as portrayed by the United States and other Western nations. Cull (2019), Cooper et al. (2015), and Haass and Indyk (2008) assert that diplomacy necessitates immediate and long-range creative alternative modes of diplomatic renewal through communications, leadership, negotiations, and multiple actors. Hence combining traditional forms of governmental diplomacy with multiple domestic and international organizations is imperative. That is, expansive forms of multi-track diplomacy can occur by both government agencies and other entities.

Such assertions raise queries about the linkages of universities to diplomacy, and international affairs *vis*-à-*vis* the major functions of universities – teaching, scholarship and research, and public engagement (Korgen and White 2015). Are they quite distinct? Should they be related? This chapter explores such questions by: (1) articulating various concepts and dimensions of diplomacy and soft power; (2) examining select American and British university rankings and league tables; (3) portraying domestic and geopolitical matters via the explication of how various American and British government agencies and philanthropic foundations are affected by diplomacy and foreign policy via their missions and funding priorities for education; and (4) fusing diplomacy and international educational studies. In this exploration, it is posited how comparative and international education and "parent disciplines" are discussed in terms of the

[2] DFID became part of Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office after this chapter was written.

aforementioned four items. In essence, there are evolving nexuses among phenomena that influence the field.

Concepts of Diplomacy and Soft Power

At the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the term diplomacy began to appear signifying the formal relations between governments. It was envisioned as communication by governments through envoys (Leira 2016; Roth and Arndt 1986). Nevertheless, due to a combination of factors, major wars occurred with the most noticeable ones being World Wars I and II. Endeavors for a League of Nations, with diplomatic representatives from multiple nations never fully materialized. Moving further into the twentieth century, World War II raged and technological shifts became evident. Hence diplomacy became more urgent and various manifestations of relations among nations needed to be developed. Technical and military assistance, information dissemination, and cultural exchanges became expanded aspects of diplomacy to help ensure vital benefits among countries – although progress did not always occur.

As cited previously, Coombs (1964) and Frankel (1965, 1969) articulated the importance of educational and cultural affairs as components of foreign policy. That is, these programs are aspects of public diplomacy "to explain and understand each other's values, purposes, and policies…'an effective *intellectual connection between one's own and foreign countries*'" (Lindsay 1989, p. 427 citing Garner 1983, p. 44). During the late twentieth century, policies of diplomacy proliferated to emphasize non-governmental forms of diplomacy, although the American federal government was already funding some non-government or state entities. Somewhat notable was the term multi-track diplomacy, coined by Diamond and McDonald (1991). Multi-track diplomacy encompassed the corporate world, religious institutions, private citizens (people to people direct interactions), peace activism, communication via various modes, and additional financial entities. Under the funding rubric, philanthropic foundations would be included, particularly both decades long and new ones that have distributed billions of dollars and pounds to developing nations for educational and cultural programs – that include traditional university functions of teaching, research and scholarship, and public engagement. Further illustrations from major American and British departments and ministries are discussed below.

In the aftermath of World War II, United States Senator J. William Fulbright proposed that surplus war funds be reallocated to the Department of State. When Congress passed the legislation, it was named for its chief architecture and sponsor. Within the Department, the funds were to promote mutual understanding and cooperation and to move beyond the atrocities of World War II. Hence the Fulbright Program became the international flagship entity for academic personnel within universities and for professionals in other learned societies, artists, and scientific fields. Research, study, and teaching were the main foci. Each year, approximately 1200 American scholars receive Fulbrights and 900 international visiting professionals are affiliated with American institutions (Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs 2020; Loss 2014).

Within Fulbrights, some fellowships are more prestigious than others such as the Bicentennial Chairs, Distinguished Chairs, and New Century Fulbrights. The two chairs were often awarded to very senior scholars or policymakers. Some included Duke University endowed Professor John Hope Franklin and Nobel Chemistry and Peace Laureate Linus Pauling. Yet, others such as the New Century Scholars Program in Higher Education included professionals active in the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES), who used material from Fulbright group endeavors in classes and research publications. However, some New Century Scholars Programs circumvented the purposes of enhancing mutual understanding via the non-inclusion of particular demographic groups such as African Americans.[3]

Near the beginning of World War II in 1940, the British government established the British Council as a charitable body to promote: cultural relationships, wider knowledge of the United Kingdom, English language, advancement of education (e.g., administering tests) and educational cooperation (such as placement of students, teachers, and a range of professionals in multiple nations). In reality, considerable programs would be located in British colonies that would become independent after the War ended. Other offices would be situated in North American and other

[3] A former member of the Fulbright Scholarship Board and this author shared concerns about the absence of African Americans on several prestigious Fulbrights. Concerns were expressed to the then Chair of the Board and the then Director of the Council for the International Exchange of Scholars, that administers the Fulbright Scholar Program. In Spring 2020, there were no African Americans or Latino/Latina on the Fulbright Scholarship Board.

Western nations with particular focus on cultural and educational information about the United Kingdom (British Council 1993). Unlike the Fulbright programs funded by the United States Department of State, the British Council is funded, in part by the British government, but substantially from various charities. Hence, it continues as a designated charity; however, it works closely with the government in terms of long-term governmental priorities as the Council implements its purposes and goals (British Council 2020).

Fulbright and similar programs within the Department of State are essential parts of American diplomacy (Arndt 2007; Arndt and Rubin 1993; Lindsay 2008) and can be termed aspects of "soft power" (Nye 2004, 2007). Given the British Council's alignment with the government, it also portrays features of "soft power." The concept of soft power, developed by Nye (2015) concentrates on achieving outcomes via attractions, rather than coercions through military actions or economic sanctions. Cultural exhibitions, educational funds, and artistic portraits, are emblematic of soft power that encompasses legitimacy and credibility by involved parties. Soft power and public diplomacy can be intertwined.

Soft power (Nye 2007) can be a form of diplomacy, as a way to cooperatively build nations and contribute to national and global economic good. For example, science diplomacy has become an important bargaining chip in international affairs that employs STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) to promote multinational collaborations and consortiums. Many of these collaborations are driven by globalization and seek to address worldwide challenges through economic and scientific investments (Nye 2007), with improved diplomatic relations as the desired outcome. This use of soft power is designed to benefit both donor and host nations. For example, science diplomacy is at the forefront in a rapidly changing world due to porous borders and technology. Statements by a National Science Foundation grant interviewee (to this author) at an American university exemplified science diplomacy and soft power: "I migrated to the USA [from Asia] where I was exposed to American culture and science after visiting an American embassy cultural center and watching videos of the 1969 moon landing" (Lindsay 2015). As a teenager, he learned that mathematics and science placed men on the moon, not utilized primarily for military purposes. Thus, he continued to attend embassy programs, exposing him to computer science wherein he eventually earned his Ph.D. and became a professor in the United States. His appointment was at a comprehensive urban doctoral research university that is well known, along with others as we will note in the following discussion of university rankings.

University Rankings and League Tables

Given that domestic and international university rankings proliferated during the last quarter century, thus government officials and university administrators have devoted increasing attention to league and ranking tables. The relative positions of universities on national and international ranking tables contribute to favorable or unfavorable assessments when awarding fellowships, grants, and contracts, including those for international research (Lamont 2009; Lindsay 2012). Achieving and sustaining national and international reputations are important to university executives and faculty. Similar valuations are akin to observations through the 1970s when American diplomatic corps were over-represented by European American men graduates from Ivy League and east coast universities (Arndt 2007), representing *de facto* views of excellence. Yet, post-war era diplomatic practices necessitated revisions to prepare broader cohorts for diplomacy and expanding indices of excellence. This expansion occurred via graduate universities curriculum, emphasizing fellowships and grants, that could incorporate geopolitical shifts covering international studies in social science and education.

Although dated, the last 2010 National Research Council (NRC), university rankings still carries notable attention since it is widely viewed in domestic and international venues. The NRC ratings focus on doctoral programs largely in the established social sciences, humanities, mathematics, and engineering. In fall 2010 a comprehensive NRC report (the first since 1995) was issued and quickly met criticism, e.g., methodological discrepancies. By the spring of 2011, the NRC corrected some errors and mistakes regarding American graduate programs. Consequently, the rankings were simultaneously praised by those ranked highly and still questioned by favorably ranked institutions such as Harvard University where errors still appeared (Lederman 2011). New NRC rankings are scheduled to appear in 2020, since rankings are normally conducted in 10 year intervals.

For North American educators, parents, students, and the general public, the *U.S. News & World Report* rankings of universities are the most extensively reviewed (Pham 2019) compared to the NRCs. The vast majority of American college and university websites display rankings if they are in the top 20–30 nationally or highly rated within a geographical region. The overall top 20 are heavily dominated by 19 elite private universities, where schools of education are viewed in a peripheral manner, compared to disciplines in colleges of arts and sciences (Pham 2019). Only four of the top 20 offer doctorates in comparative and international education. If attention is then devoted to the top 50 private and public universities, their university websites indicate that only five offer doctorates in comparative and international education (Pham 2019). Only 16 of 50 are public universities.

The top North American institutions included in the London *Times Higher Education* World University Rankings (2020) are similar to the top 10 *U.S. News and World Report* designations. The top 50 are considerably different between these two rankings, since *U.S. News and World Report* include private elite colleges that do not offer doctorates such as Amherst, Swarthmore, Pomona, and Williams. Not surprising, Oxford University is ranked number one, followed by California Institute of Technology, University of Cambridge, Stanford University, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Oxford, Cambridge, and Stanford offer doctorates in comparative and international education, as evinced by searches of their 2020 web pages.

National and international rankings of comparative and international education *per se* are not the norm. Rather, they appear in proxy modes since various senior professors and researchers are known via their publications, fellowships and grants, and leadership in professional societies. Often they are positioned at American Tier One research universities and hold offices in the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) or the British Comparative and International Education Society (BCIES), now the British Association for International and Comparative Education (BAICE) (BAICE 2020; CIES 2018). Various officers are also known via their joint or adjunct appointments in social science departments, that is, the disciplines where the majority of CIES and BAICE earned their initial degrees and continue to conduct research.

In the United States, international education specialists are often located in the Association of American Universities (AAU) sites. AAU, composed of the top 65 research universities in North America, are at the forefront of teaching, research, and innovations with comprehensive doctoral programs (AAU 2020b). They receive the majority of Federal grants, faculty fellowships, and contracts. In 2017, AAU sites were awarded approximately $24.3 billion or 60% of Federal research funds with $20.1 billion primarily from the Department of Health and Human Services, National Science Foundation, and Department of Defense. Plus, AAU institutions award 42% of research doctorates, with the majority of students funded and not graduating with significant loans (AAU 2020a). For example, AAU members Stanford, Columbia, and McGill Universities and the Universities of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Toronto, and Southern California represent locations of CIES presidents, officers, or journal editors who have comprehensive experiences with domestic and international matters that we now discuss.

Convergence of Domestic and Geopolitical Matters

International and Domestic Government Agencies

From the late 1940s through the 1970s, former British and French colonies in Africa and Asia obtained political independence. In the aftermath of World War II and the advent of new nations, national government agencies and philanthropic organizations turned their attention to addressing the challenges of independence. India obtained independence in 1947 from the British, while Indonesia demanded independence in 1945 that was recognized by the Netherlands and the United Nations (UN) in 1949.

Quite poignant were the declarations of a British Minister of Colonies who exclaimed that 1960 would be the year of Africa because independence was rapidly approaching. United Nations Undersecretary, Ralph Bunce, voiced: "the explosive rapidity which the peoples of Africa in all sectors are emerging from colonialism" (Hoffman 1960). Further, *The New York Times* and other outlets devoted attention to new nations (Chambers 2020). In 1960, 17 nations became independent of British and French rule – ranging from Nigeria, Cameroon, and Senegal in West Africa to the Democratic Republic of Congo in Central Africa, to Somalia in East Africa. Tanzania and Kenya became independent in 1961 and 1963 respectively. As critical policies and programs were designed and implemented, the roles of key professionals steeped in the social sciences are now expounded below.

For example, Ralph Bunche, the first African American awarded the Nobel Peace prize in 1950 negotiated the 1949 peace accord between

Israel and Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria. With a Ph.D. in government from Harvard University, Bunche wrote his dissertation on the politics of Dahomey (now Benin) and Togo. During his doctorate and post-doctoral studies, he spent time at the London School of Economics and School of Oriental and African Studies interacting with future African leaders such as Kwame Nkrumah (Ghana) and Jomo Kenyatta (Kenya). As one of the founding members of the *Journal of Negro Education*, he edited issues on educational conditions of Negros in the southern United States and Africans in the colonies (Lindsay 2008; Robinson 2008). In short, Bunche contributed to comparative and international education, although this is widely unknown.

Bunche's extensive domestic and international expertise prepared him for work in the establishment of the United Nations in October 1945. Integrally related are the United Nations agencies such as United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). UNESCO is designed to facilitate international cooperation in education, science, and culture enterprises. Promoting mutual understanding in the wake of racism and anti-Semitism after World War II and tackling adverse conditions in colonies were original aims (UNESCO 2019). While international professionals were involved in the establishment of UNESCO, Bunche played informal substantive roles since he had observed directly educational and scientific needs of colonial territories and educational apartheid in the American South. Moreover, in the 1940s, Bunche worked at the American Office of Strategic Services, that later became the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) (CIA 2020), where he was exposed to information that was background material for the establishment of the UN and UNESCO (T. Hesburgh personal communication 2006).

According to Hesburgh, Bunche asserted that education and the understanding and development of science were indispensable for new nations and southern Negroes (T. Hesburgh personal communication 2006). Hence, it was unsurprising that Bunche and colleagues recognized the necessity of professionals with substantive disciplinary expertise in education, social sciences, and natural and physical sciences to be utilized in multiple venues. In the contemporary era, the involvement of specialists in comparative and international affairs and education is still observed, with CIES members who have served as administrators, consultants, and researchers with UNESCO. Such cross-fertilization from within and external to UNESCO influences academic and policy studies of international education in university programs.

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) mission statement declares: "support of America's foreign policy" (U.S. Department of State & U.S. Agency for International Development 2018, p. 19). Moreover, the Department of State and USAID joint strategic objectives articulate that USAID spearheads the government's international development by "working with partner countries to strengthen the formation of human capital, USAID education programming contributes directly to the U.S. Government's foreign policy objectives" (USAID 2018b, p. 6). Established in 1961 (McMaster et al. 2019) USAID has continually relied upon comprehensive doctoral universities – often the 112 land-grant ones – to enact its missions and objectives. Congressional legislation, under the 1862 Morrill Act, provided grants of land to states to establish (or refine) colleges designed to teach and conduct research in agricultural and mechanical arts (now includes engineering and technology) primarily in rural communities. Advancements occurred over decades; thus land-grants were suited to transfer their skills to developing rural nations in the post-World War II era as part of university public engagement and scholarship. Hence this fit USAID's involvement in foreign diplomacy. In 1890, the Black land-grants were established by Congress during harsh racial segregation. Decades later, some partnerships were formed between Predominately White Institutions (PWIs) and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) land-grants to address domestic and international challenges. Land-grant universities such as University of California, Berkeley and Davis, Michigan State University, Texas A&M University, Prairie View A&M University, University of Massachusetts Amherst, University of Florida, and Florida A&M University formed graduate programs with faculty focused on international agriculture, engineering, and education. These universities are some of the largest recipients of USAID funding for projects in African, Asian, Caribbean, Eurasia, European, Middle Eastern, and South American countries (USAID 2018a). Such federal funding is highly valued by university executives, and local congressional and state legislators. Yet USAID accounts for only 0.01% of the total federal government. Both the U.S. Department of State's and USAID's budgets were approximately $40 billion in 2018 (USAID 2018a).

The Department for International Development (DFID), loosely analogous to USAID, assumed its current name in 1997. Its principles include "investing in peace, the planet, prosperity, people and partnerships – all underpinned by a focus on quality and having … staff and expertise on the ground" (DFID 2019a). DFID emerged from the Overseas Development Administration, formerly the Ministry of Overseas Development. It was formed during a British Labor Government administration from 1964 to 1970, in the aftermath of African and Asian independence. The British Labor government likely believed it had some obligations to the independent countries. Establishing and maintaining development programs – ranging from education to health and poverty to mass migration to security – are contemporary foci (DFID 2020). Toward these endeavors, University College London and other British universities engage in DFID projects with emerging nations in research development and leadership via cooperation with British and other nations' development agencies and foundations. One notable project was Strengthening Research Institutions in Africa (DFID 2019b).[4]

Philanthropic Organizations

When founded in 1936, the Ford Foundation mission encompassed, "reducing poverty and injustice, strengthen democratic values, promote international cooperation, and advance human achievement" (Ford Foundation 2020b). Founded upon the principle of human dignity throughout the world, Henry Ford II, in the post-World War II era, realized that global matters needed addressing. Ford Foundation, then the largest philanthropic organization in the world, selected an immediate former administrator of the Marshall Plan for Europe to expand domestic and international projects (Ford Foundation 2020a). In recent years, Ford committed between $500 million to $600 million a year in grants with education as a priority area (Ford Foundation 2017). American universities began involvement (in the early years of the Foundation) in international endeavors since top-level expertise was needed. Notably, dissertation and post-doctoral fellowships were initiated for minority students in the 1960s and thereafter to increase diversified pools of professionals in the social sciences, humanities, and some sciences. Since the Foundation is still one of the largest, it plans to continue in perpetuity. Its effect can last into the next century.

A recent philanthropic body, MacArthur Foundation, began forty years ago and has distributed approximately $7.1 billion dollars in nearly 120

[4] After completing research for this chapter, DFID closed and becamse part of Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office.

countries, including the United States. Central to their grants distribution are "effective institutions, and influential networks building a more just, verdant, and peaceful world" (MacArthur Foundation 2020). Thus, approximately $6.4 million was granted to Nigerian universities as part of the Partnership in Higher Education in Africa in conjunction with Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations during the 2000s. Modest non-partnership endeavors continued. Funding objectives included *inter alia*: completing doctoral degrees at domestic and international universities; enhancing academic exchanges among global venues; and collaborating with private sectors to mesh research (MacArthur Foundation 2005). Demographic data project that Nigeria may be the third most populated nation in 2050, following China and India (U.S. Department of State 2018). MacArthur is helping the United States build future economic and security relations with Nigeria through university programs, as it asserts, "democracies and development cannot flourish without strong intellectual, scientific, and cultural communities. Universities are critical to the sustenance of these communities" (MacArthur Foundation 2005).

Original aspects of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation began in 1994 emphasizing education, world health and population, and community endeavors in the Pacific Northwest. Over 25 years later, approximately $50.1 billion dollars have been allocated to the aforementioned aspects, technology, and programs to enhance the lives of women and girls (Gates Foundation 2019). Approximately $31 billion is being transferred to the Gates Foundation, over several years by Warren Buffet (Smith 2006). As the largest American foundation, considerable significance is accorded to global development in emerging regions and to building relationships with governments, other private philanthropists, and public policy experts (Gates Foundation 2019). In essence, features of multi-track diplomacy are evident, although not specifically labeled in that fashion. The Gates and their senior administrators engage in contacts with national ministries in African and Asian nations regarding priority areas. Specialists in comparative and international disciplines are essential to the Foundation's work.

One of the newest foundations, Bloomberg Philanthropies, began in 2006 and has disbursed approximately $6.7 billion to education (Bloomberg Philanthropies 2020). The Foundation concentrates on public health, education, environment, government innovation, and arts and culture. At the 2019 annual conference of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Bloomberg declared, "Education holds the key to so many of the major challenges we face. Want to reduce poverty? Education… [My father's] principles remain the same ones I've always carried with me: equal rights, equal justice, and equal opportunity for all" (Oliver 2019). Moreover, the Bloomberg Global Scholars Program represents 76 cities throughout the world seeking to reflect: "There is no magic bullet for the divisions and misunderstandings that drive conflict around the world, but overcoming them starts with dialogue and communication" (Bloomberg Philanthropies 2019). Such foci have been central to research analyses by international education professionals and echo features of the Department of State Fulbright programs in public diplomacy.

The United Kingdom has historical differences from the United States regarding charitable foundations. A prominent independent foundation is the Wellcome Trust, that emerged from an American, Henry Wellcome, knighted for his contributions in pharmacy and health. Founded in the late 1930s, pursuant to his will, the global Trust's constitution states: "To protect, preserve and advance all or any aspects of the health and welfare of humankind and to advance and promote knowledge and education" (Wellcome Trust 2019, p. 8), particularly in biosciences. Substantial current grants have been awarded to University College London (£344 million) and Imperial College London (£180 million) that are lead members of the Russell Group universities. These 24 members, analogous to the AAU in North America, provide policy information to domestic and international governments (Russell Group 2020) i.e., public diplomacy as addressed in the next section.

Fusing Diplomacy and International Educational Studies

The preceding exposition highlighted interlocking relations between national and international government principles and policies of foreign affairs – especially as diplomacy affects academic enterprises in comparative and international studies. Government programs evinced evolving roles within universities in view of geopolitical conditions. These realizations are evident from portraits from UNESCO, USAID, and DFID. To encapsulate, the Association of Public & Land-grant Universities (APLU), that includes the majority of public doctoral universities, stressed their collective commitment to global engagement to include cross-border research and sustainable development goals (APLU 2020). Similarly, the American Council on Education (ACE) strives to ensure that universities continue attunement to international matters (Huron et al. 2019) in view of shifting funding options. These are illustrations of multi-track diplomacy (APLU 2020).

Simultaneously, philanthropy continues to evolve with mega-billionaires altering the financial extents of their funding. Buffett, Gates, and Bloomberg – among the 10 wealthiest men in the world – donated significant percentages of their yearly income to philanthropy: 71%, 22%, and 10%, respectively (Di Minto 2017). Their foundations intend to disburse the majority of their finances during the founder's lifetimes. Hence, these are financial surges so their priorities may be unavailable years later that have been aligned with diplomatic priorities of governments and international organizations. Consequently, trajectories of academic fields and subsequent policies might be altered that could ameliorate geopolitical circumstances. Meantime, in February 2020 the world's wealthiest man, Amazon founder Jeff Bezos pledged $10 billion to fight climate change (Wade 2020) that will affect international studies.

While general missions and principles might remain relatively stable, funding priorities can shift with leadership transformations combined with fluctuating sociopolitical, economic, and technological variables. In autumn 2019, the Chief Executive Officers/Presidents of major American foundations, e.g., Bloomberg, Ford, and Gates, were people of color or women who sought to promote new knowledge and applied policies so that the cannons of international studies evolve and incorporate diversity and inclusivity. Hence, foci can be altered due to varied demographic and professional backgrounds.

It is crucial to recognize that G-7 nations do not desire to diminish their economic and geopolitical power (Colby and Mitchell 2020). To what extent the geopolitical dominance of the United States and Britain remains evident through diplomacy and soft power via academic and financial troughs of universities is debatable. How university disciplines, such as international education, will thrive (or decline) in eras of shifting political policies and league table rankings may be scrutinized as part of larger equations. Consortiums and organizations such as AAU, APLU, ACE, and Russell Group will exert pressure, for funding to continue especially to ensure prominent university and global statures. Enhanced disciplinary research and scholarly engagements, contributing to common domestic and global good, are interwoven with funding and diplomacy. Nevertheless, a fundamental issue is maintaining the integrity of disciplines while endowed chairs and fellowships are central to university finances and academic prestige. These accolades are awarded based upon adherence to missions and principles of the funding agencies – where diplomatic endeavors are paramount although unacknowledged by academicians.

Assertions by former University of Pennsylvania President Judith Rodin provide insight: "It is important that universities really understand what it means to be a global institution…so they know what American democracy looked like, why and how it was different, and what role they can and should be playing in it today" (Winthrop and Dusst 2020). Rodin's perspectives echoed fundamental premises of diplomacy. Her viewpoints mesh with Coombs' and Frankel's pronouncements regarding university roles in foreign policy and diplomacy, while integrating neoteric knowledge and innovative applied policy research to address contemporary and emergent challenges.

References

Arndt, Richard T. (2007). *The first resort of kings: American cultural diplomacy in the twentieth century*. Dulles: Potomac Books.

Arndt, Richard T., & Rubin, David L. (Eds.). (1993). *The Fulbright difference: 1948–1992*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Association of American Universities (AAU). (2020a). AAU by the numbers. https://www.aau.edu/aau-numbers. Accessed 19 February 2020.

Association of American Universities (AAU). (2020b). Who we are. https://www.aau.edu/who-we-are. Accessed 11 March 2020.

Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU). (2020). Declaration on university global engagement. http://globallyengageduniversities.org/. Accessed 10 February 2020.

Bloomberg Philanthropies. (2019, January 31). Education leaders convene to promote and improve global learning. www.bloomberg.org/press/releases/education-leaders-convene-promote-improve-global-learning/. Accessed 6 February 2020.

Bloomberg Philanthropies. (2020). Mike Bloomberg. www.bloomberg.org/about/mike-bloomberg/. Accessed 6 February 2020.

British Association for International & Comparative Education (BAICE). (2020). Archive. https://baice.ac.uk/archive/. Accessed 8 March 2020.

British Council. (1993). Royal charter and bye-laws. https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/royalcharter.pdf. Accessed 8 June 2020.
British Council. (2020). How we work. https://www.britishcouncil.org/about-us/how-we-work. Accessed 8 June 2020.
Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. (2020). Frequently asked questions. https://eca.state.gov/fulbright/frequently-asked-questions. Accessed 7 February 2020.
Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). (2020). History of the CIA. https://www.cia.gov/about-cia/history-of-the-cia. Accessed 28 January 2020.
Chambers, Veronica (Ed.). (2020, February 6). A continent remade. Reflections on 1960, the year of Africa. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/02/06/world/africa/africa-independence-year.html?te=1&nl=morning-briefing&emc=edit_NN_p_20200207&section=whatElse&campaign_id=9&instance_id=15812&segment_id=21057&user_id=9519f0. Accessed 10 March 2020.
Colby, Elbridge A., & Mitchell, A. Wess. (2020). The age of great-power competition. *Foreign Affairs, 99*(1), 118–130.
Comparative & International Education Society (CIES). (2018). Our society. https://www.cies.us/page/About. Accessed 8 February 2020.
Coombs, Philip H. (1964). *The fourth dimension of foreign policy: Educational and cultural affairs*. New York: Harper & Row.
Cooper, Andrew F., Heine, Jorge., & Thakur, Ramesh. (Eds.). (2015). *The Oxford handbook of modern diplomacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Cull, Nicholas J. (2019). *Public diplomacy: Foundations for global engagement in the digital age*. Medford: Polity Press.
Department for International Development (DFID). (2019a, June 27). Corporate report: [Withdrawn] Department for International Development single departmental plan—December 2017. www.gov.uk/government/publications/department-for-international-development-single-departmental-plan/department-for-international-development-single-departmental-plan. Accessed 2 February 2020.
Department for International Development (DFID). (2019b, December 19). Strengthening research institutions in Africa. https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/projects/GB-GOV-1-300781. Accessed 17 March 2020.
Department for International Development (DFID). (2020). About us. https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-international-development/about#responsibilities. Accessed 2 February 2020.
Di Mento, Maria. (2017, September 19). Buffett, Gates, and Bloomberg give largest share of wealth to charity. The Chronicle of Philanthropy. https://www.philanthropy.com/article/Buffett-GatesBloomberg/241235. Accessed 9 February 2020.

Diamond, Louise., & McDonald, John. (1991). *Multi-track diplomacy. A systems guide and analysis*. Iowa Peace Institute.

Ford Foundation. (2017, April 5). Ford Foundation commits $1 billion from endowment to mission-related investments. https://www.fordfoundation.org/the-latest/news/ford-foundation-commits-1-billion-from-endowment-to-mission-related-investments/. Accessed 4 February 2020.

Ford Foundation. (2020a). A legacy of social justice. https://www.fordfoundation.org/about/about-ford/a-legacy-of-social-justice/. Accessed 4 February 2020.

Ford Foundation. (2020b). Mission. https://www.fordfoundation.org/about/about-ford/mission/. Accessed 2 February 2020.

Frankel, Charles. (1965). *The neglected aspect of foreign affairs: American educational and cultural policy abroad*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Frankel, Charles. (1969). "Culture," "information," "foreign policy". *Public Administration Review*, *29*(6), 593–600. https://www.jstor.org/stable/974100.

Garner, Richard N. (1983, March 20). Selling America in the marketplace of ideas. *New York Times*, Section 6, p. 44. Retrieved from Proquest Newspaper database.

Gates Foundation. (2019). *Who we are. Global policy and advocacy*. https://www.gatesfoundation.org/Who-We-Are/General-Information/Leadership/Global-Policy-and-Advocacy. Accessed 9 February 2020.

Haass, Richard N., & Indyk, Martin S. (2008, December 2). A time for diplomatic renewal: Toward a new U.S. strategy in the Middle East. *Brookings.edu*. https://www.brookings.edu/research/a-time-for-diplomatic-renewal-toward-a-new-u-s-strategy-in-the-middle-east/. Accessed 29 January 2020.

Hoffman, Paul. (1960, June 16). Bunche says '60 is year of Africa. *New York Times*, p. 15. Retrieved from Proquest Newspaper database.

Huron., American Council on Education., & Georgia Institute of Technology. (2019). *The transformation-ready higher education institution: How leaders can prepare for and promote change*. https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/The-Transformation-Ready-Higher-Education-Institution-Huron-ACE-Ebook.pdf. Accessed 17 March 2020.

Knight, Jane. (2008). *Higher education in turmoil*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Korgen, Kathleen O., & White, Jonathan M. (2015). *The engaged sociologist: Connecting the classroom to the community*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lamont, Michele. (2009). *How professors think: Inside the curious world of academic judgement*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lederman, Doug. (2011, May 2). More errors in NRC's doctoral rankings. *Inside Higher Ed*. https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2011/05/02/more-errors-nrcs-doctoral-rankings. Accessed 8 March 2020.
Leira, Halvard. (2016). A conceptual history of diplomacy. In Costas M. Constantinou, Pauline Kerr, & Paul Sharp (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of diplomacy* (pp. 28–38). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
Lindsay, Beverly. (1989). Integrating international education and public diplomacy: Creative partnerships or ingenious propaganda? *Comparative Education Review*, *33*(4), 423–436.
Lindsay, Beverly. (2004). *The Fulbright experience*. http://www.cies.org/specialists/ss_blindsay.htm. Accessed 2 October 2004.
Lindsay, Beverly. (Ed.). (2008). *Ralph Johnson Bunche: Public intellectual & nobel peace laureate*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Lindsay, Beverly. (2012). Articulating domestic and global university descriptors and indices of excellence. *Comparative Education*, *48*(3), 385–399. http://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2011.613279.
Lindsay, Beverly. (2015, August 20–22). American presidential and British prime ministerial perspectives and policies on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics: Public portrays on American and English graduate STEM programs [Conference session]. *Race and inequality in the Obama era and beyond*. The 45th Annual Conference of the Association of Black Sociologists, Chicago, IL.
Loss, Christopher P. (2014). *Between citizens and the state: The politics of American higher education in the 20th century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
MacArthur Foundation. (2005). Human rights, higher education, and young peoples reproductive health in Nigeria. https://www.macfound.org/press/press-releases/macarthur-foundation-awards-more-than-9-million-in-grants-for-human-rights-higher-education-and-young-peoples-reproductive-health-and-rights-in-nigeria/. Accessed 3 February 2020.
MacArthur Foundation. (2020). About us. https://www.macfound.org/about/. Accessed 4 February 2020.
McMaster, Morgan., Guevara, Alejandra., Roberts, Lacey., & Alvis, Samantha. (2019, November). USAID higher education: A retrospective 1960–2020. *Edu-links.org*. https://www.edu-links.org/resources/higher-education-retrospective-1960-2020. Accessed 18 February 2020.
Nye Jr., Joseph S. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. New York: PublicAffairs.
Nye, Joseph. (2007, November 29). Smart power. *Washington Post*. www.huffingtonpost.com/joseph-nye/smart-power_b_74725.html. Accessed 17 March 2020.
Nye Jr., Joseph S. (2015). *Is the American century over?* Malden: Polity Press.

Oliver, Katherine. (Host). (2019, July 25). Mike Bloomberg 2019 NAACP convention remarks [Audio podcast episode]. In *Follow the data*. Bloomberg Philanthropies. www.bloomberg.org/blog/follow-data-podcast-mike-bloomberg-110th-naacp-annual-convention-remarks/. Accessed 6 February 2020.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2019). *Private philanthropy for development*. http://www.oecd.org/development/private-philanthropy-for-development-9789264085190-en.htm. Accessed 20 February 2020.

Pham, Nancy. (2019, September 8). Explore the 2020 best national universities. *USNews.com*. https://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/articles/slideshows/us-news-best-national-universities. Accessed 19 March 2020.

Robinson, Pearl T. (2008). Ralph Bunche and African Studies: Reflections on the politics of knowledge. *African Studies Review, 51*(1), 1–16.

Roth, Lois., & Arndt, Richard. (1986). Information, culture, and public diplomacy: Searching for an American style of propaganda. In Walter M. Brasch & Dana Royal Ulloth (Eds.), *The press and the state: Sociohistorical and contemporary interpretations* (pp. 724–744). Lanham: University Press of America.

Russell Group. (2020). Policy. https://russellgroup.ac.uk/policy/. Accessed 21 February 2020.

Schindler, Caitlin E. (2018). *The origins of public diplomacy in US statecraft*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Smith, Robert. (2006, June 26). *Buffett gift sends $31 billion to Gates Foundation*. https://www.google.com/search?q=Buffett+donates+%2431+billion+to+Gates+Foundation&rlz=1C1CHWA_enUS605US605&oq=Buffett+donates+%2431+billion+to+Gates+Foundation. Accessed 9 February 2020.

Times Higher Education (THE). (2020). *World university rankings 2020*. www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/2020/world-ranking#!/page/0/length/25/sort_by/rank/sort_order/asc/cols/stats. Accessed 15 February 2020.

U.S. Agency for International Development. (USAID). (2018a). Agency financial report fiscal year 2018. https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/USAIDFY2018AFR_508R.pdf. Accessed 3 February 2020.

U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). (2018b). USAID education policy. https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1865/2018_Education_Policy_FINAL_WEB.pdf. Accessed 3 February 2020.

U.S. Department of State. (2018). US relations with Nigeria. https://www.state.gov/u-s-relations-with-nigeria/. Accessed 1 February 2020.

U.S. Department of State. (2019). Diplomacy in action. /findit.state.gov/search?query=Percentage+of+Muslims+in+Indonesia&affiliate. Accessed 21 March 2019.

U.S. Department of State, & U.S. Agency for International Development. (2018, February). *Joint Strategic Plan FY 2018–2022*. https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/JSP_FY_2018_-_2022_FINAL.pdf. Accessed 3 February 2020.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2019). UNESCO in brief—Mission and mandate. https://en.unesco.org/about-us/introducing-unesco. Accessed 28 January 2020.

Wade, Reggie. (2020, February 17). Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos pledges $10 billion to fight climate change. *Yahoo Finance*. https://www.yahoo.com/finance/news/jeff-bezos-10-billion-climate-change-200822069.html. Accessed 17 February 2020.

Wellcome Trust. (2019). Annual report and financial statements 2019. https://wellcome.ac.uk/sites/default/files/wellcome-trust-annual-report-financial-statements-2019.pdf. Accessed 3 February 2020.

Winthrop, Rebecca., & Dusst, Emal. (2020, February 10). *Can leading universities be engines of sustainable development? A conversation with Judith Rodin*. The Brookings Institution. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/education-plus-development/2020/02/10/can-leading-universities-be-engines-of-sustainable-development-a-conversation-with-judith-rodin/. Accessed 10 February 2020.

PART IV

Moving Forward in the New Decade

CHAPTER 13

Traversing Beyond the Contemporary to the Future

Beverly Lindsay

"Look to the past to help create the future.
Look to science and to poetry.
Combine innovation and interpretation.
We need the best of both.
And it is universities that best provide them."[1]

In the early 2020s, it had been virtually impossible to read print media or view online sources without constant news about the novel coronavirus,

[1] Faust (2010).

Material for this chapter is derived, in part, from a Ford Foundation grant, Fulbright fellowships, National Science Foundation grants, and United States Agency for International Development contracts. Any findings, conclusions, opinions, and recommendations are those of the author and do not represent those of funding bodies.

B. Lindsay (✉)
University of California, California, USA

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_13

COVID-19, and its devastating effects throughout the world. Since the Fellows, who contributed to this volume, all focus on comparative and international education, we are compelled to view our field – both its positive and challenging paradigms and policies – in terms of this overwhelming pandemic. While several chapters elucidated major aspects of the last half century through to the first decades of the twenty-first century of necessity, we must think critically of features for the next years of this decade.

Certainly, our work must be grounded in sound conceptual and theoretical frameworks and their translations into applied policy research and transfers into actual agendas to address concrete and emerging problems. Hence this chapter will reiterate fundamental components of the major sections of this volume and move into innovative territories – indeed as aspects of major missions and purposes of schools and universities. That is, teaching and learning, research and scholarship, and public engagement are beyond the walls of the academy. In undertaking these aims, this chapter will: (1) reiterate social and public challenges affecting education and impacts on various demographic populations; (2) explicate the importance of conceptual and theoretical frameworks and their groundings in social sciences and humanities; (3) posit the centrality of education and public policies; (4) elaborate the roles of external funding agencies on comparative and international education; and (5) envision contemporary and emerging motifs and paradigms.

Social and Public Challenges Affecting Education

Porous borders are the reality, as clearly evinced by the global COVID-19 pandemic. There are and cannot be distinct boundaries on how adverse realities affect millions of people. Hence continuous intellectual migration should become even more evident via various technological modes, including those we would not have envisioned before the current pandemic as epidemiologists share emergent research results in real-time. Such realities began to appear, particularly in the late 1990s and early 2000s. The following direct quote from Lindsay and Blanchett's (2011) volume is an example.

> A patient was rushed to a hospital emergency room with life-threatening conditions when no experienced senior physicians were available or on call. 'What should I do to save the patient's life?' the young physician queried

himself. His dilemma was abated by YouTube where he quickly located an illustrated medical procedure that he then utilized to save the patient. (p. xv)

Teaching, instruction, and learning are central missions of universities throughout the world. When schools and universities began closing in March and April 2020 to the time this manuscript proof was read in early February 2021, forms of virtual or online learning became constant realities. These were limited realities previously, as only select faculty had the ability to use them to full capacity, while other faculty opted not to use these technologies. So now, educators must develop and ascertain the best ways to deliver courses, seminars, meetings, and forums – via these technological modalities. Therefore, comparative and international educators must be particularly attuned to different learning styles, technological facilities, cultural alterations, and analyze them in different geographical areas. Some of these matters have been cited in chapters by Carnoy, Arnove, Klees, Schwille, Ghosh, and Ginsburg via their examinations of international testing, preservice and inservice teachers, and demographic student profiles. It is critical to explore the profound effects in multiple settings when totally unanticipated pandemics occur or when natural disasters completely obliterate sites killing thousands of people in its wake.

Coinciding with social challenges, a colleague and I discussed how to address critical aspects for this chapter. We pondered the implications of the massive protests and perhaps continuing movements around the globe, that appeared after the death of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and others who were killed brutally by police and other law enforcement officers (Philbrick and Yar 2020). The colleague voiced the issue of how does the field deal with "more visible forms of unequal impact?" The operative words were "more visible forms," since unequal effects have existed for centuries affecting multiple demographic groups. What types of altered or new pedagogies and conceptual frameworks should emerge from these very new visible actualities, covered extensively by the media and online platforms?

This exchange prompted me to consider how we, as specialists in comparative and international education and affairs can foster modes to further enhance the field. Often there may be immediate visible events such as the current global pandemic, massive natural disasters, and the killings of unarmed people. Nevertheless, there are continuous invisible circumstances that stifle various demographic groups from advancing in both formal and informal educational realms. There may be visible factors that are treated as invisible factors in comparative and international research – differences in teacher qualifications or timeframe and length of public school years that are not part of the formal equations when comparing test scores among pupils who, on the surface appear, to be a similar age and/or year in school.

Invisible factors are not always taken into account in cross-cultural or cross-national analyses, as Carnoy, Ghosh, Klees, and Samoff elucidate in their chapters. On the one hand, school testing and university league tables often do not reflect invisible factors such as *de facto* exclusive policies. For example, Lindsay's chapter discussed the American Association of Universities. AAU desires to limit its membership to 60 plus members, although there are dozens of other American and Canadian universities that are as impressive in terms of quality of research, graduation rates of demographic groups, and international collaborations (Lindsay and Simeon 2014). This author, as Principal Investigator (PI) of a National Science Foundation (NSF) grant, asked a senior associate chancellor why her university was not part of AAU, considering all the impressive research outcomes. She stated, "our students take longer to graduate with BA/BS degrees, than other AAU sites in our state. Higher graduation rates, within four years, are AAU criteria, even if unstated." That university is one of the most demographically diverse in terms of student and faculty profiles. First-generation students, students of color, and those with special needs often take longer to graduate.

On the other hand, at the university level invisible factors are often tacitly acknowledged, and still overlooked when preparing domestic and international league tables for university rankings. As some researchers and policymakers emphasize, the apparent visible criteria of ranking university fellowship and grant proposals from faculty overlook or discount invisible conditions. Lamont (2010) and Lindsay (2012) discuss how fellowship and grant proposals are ranked on established criteria. Further, proposals from organizations, situated in or near Washington, D.C. continually rank higher than those from smaller metropolitan areas or in the Midwest or Southern parts of the United States. Similarly, various countries have devoted resources to select universities to enhance their status to obtain higher rankings on international league tables.

China, Indonesia, and South Korea have established ministerial (equivalent to a cabinet entity in the United States) level criteria to allocate funds and promote research publications to foster higher recognitions via international league tables (Lindsay and Simeon 2014). Hayhoe's chapter explicates how the term "normal university" is not perceived in the same manner as universities without the term "normal" as part of the organization's brand and identity. A perusal of the *THE* World University Ranking (2020) indicates that no normal universities are ranked in the top 200, and barely cited in the next hundreds.

Conceptual and Theoretical Frameworks

As this discussion continues, the seminal conceptual framework of sociologist Goffman (1959) appears and identifies frontstage and backstage behaviors, decisions, and decision-makings. More recently, it was updated by sociologists Picca and Feagin (2007). These concepts originally derived from theater performances – where actors have one persona on stage and another backstage – are developed in relation to interpersonal presentations of the self and can be extended to larger milieu. The context, time, and place influence what is presented on the stage. Frontstage is presented in a public milieu while backstage is in a non-public or private environment. Frontstage behavior is transferable to a variety of public settings, even when they may appear dissimilar. For instance, American graduate students who interact informally in laboratories may automatically engage in similar behavior in another country where this is not the usual norm. Backstage behavior is non-public or perceived to be in non-public environments. General human behavior entails actions quite differently when she/he is not on stage or in public (Goffman 1959). Some backstage behavior may become frontstage, such as when a wireless microphone emits non-complimentary critique of another actor who is still on stage. Perhaps the "classic" examples emerge when politicians, in frontstage settings, publicly advocate positions and then work backstage to thwart policies associated with the public statements (Goffman 1959; Lindsay 2018; Picca and Feagin 2007).

During my Fulbright in Indonesia, I conversed with Ministry of Education – Division of Higher Education officials, university presidents, and deans regarding the transfer of the Division to the Ministry of Research and Technology. The public or frontstage position was to: (1) foster more research and technological innovations in Indonesian universities;

and (2) help public universities become more internationally recognized by collaborative research with Australian, Western European, and North American universities. Public or frontstage support for the impending move was voiced and written. However, private backstage reluctances were expressed. After only a few years, the Division of Higher Education was returned to the Ministry of Education where faculty criteria still stressed extended research and international publications (Baswedan 2019). Ultimately, promotions to the rank of professor occur only after peer-reviewed publications appear in Western journals from the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and Australia. I asked Indonesian faculty and administrators why journals in Japan or South Korea were not considered. Publicly these Asian countries are lauded, but not in comparison with Western nations.

A thought-provoking aspect of the conceptual framework of frontstage and backstage is that there can be reversals or disjointed views. For instance, it is intriguing that many Western senior academic faculty engage in frontstage scholarship and publications that are critical of missions and purposes of funding bodies whether from the Federal or National government departments or ministries. Sometimes, these professionals were consulted and had input into revised mission and goals as Samoff's and Lindsay's chapters discuss. Yet faculty strive to obtain fellowships and grants from the same bodies where they ostensibly do not agree with many of the program goals or research studies in developing nations. In short, frontstage positions and backstage acquisitions are in opposition. Early in my sociology career at the University of the District of Columbia, one of my colleagues refused his salary for a period because he did not agree with established goals linked to the external funding. It is rare for most faculty to decline salary or accolades.

Today, most Western faculty accept endowed or named chairs from wealthy university patrons or philanthropic organizations, even when concern is levied against the funding organization. Sometimes, particular Federal or National president or prime minister espouses policies for diversity yet excludes the demographic and disciplinary foci of candidates. A particular Fulbright New Century program was designed to include specialists in higher education from several nations. Conspicuously absent were African American specialists. A woman (a former college provost and member of the presidential appointed Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board) raised the matter of exclusion of African Americans, despite many professors and associate professors who met the criteria. A response was that Africans were included. Yet European Americans were selected, including several from the same American Association of Universities. Europeans did not "replace" American Europeans. But Africans replaced African Americans. Frontstage and backstage actions were witnessed.

A select few conceptual or theoretical frameworks cannot address the multiple dimensions of comparative and international education and affairs. Conceptual frameworks stemming from analysis of race and other demographic characteristics are important at the micro-, meso-, and macro-levels. Intersectionality of factors has received notable attention in the last quarter century by educators, although such multiple features have been examined for decades by political scientists, social psychologists, sociologists, and public affairs professionals. The challenge is what combinations of conceptual and/or theoretical frameworks are apropos for dynamic conditions. Chapters by Arnove, Stromquist, and Samoff elucidate frameworks of world-systems, gender, and colonialism and decolonization that encompass overlapping variables. Carnoy's and Evans' chapters discuss what sociologists classify as insider and outsider constructs (Merton 1972), while Schwille's uses Bourdieu's theoretical frameworks regarding the perceived status of particular disciplines over others. Carnoy (2019) describes how comparative education at Stanford was, at one time, relegated to an off-campus location, i.e., subjugation of the field. It could be contended that dynamics involving the transfer (in Indonesia) of the Division of Higher Education to the Ministry of Research and Technology and back to the Ministry of Education may also be examined in terms of sociopolitical realities of power and status relations coupled with the legitimacy of roles and views of senior executives within the two Ministries. What are the empirical results that can be captured adequately by combinations of frameworks as the field of comparative and international education expands during the 2020s?

Attention must be devoted to public and educational policies and organizational and structural frameworks. Thus, concepts from multiple disciplines are at play, since individual actions are manifested in the immediate societal or organizational conditions, linked with external policies. The original placement and movement of the Indonesian Division of Higher Education elucidate multiple conceptual frameworks, although initially explicating the transfer in terms of frontstage and backstage.

Education and Public Policies

The challenges are to comprehend which matters can be addressed in the immediate, intermediate, and long-range timeframes (Eryaman and Schneider 2017). For example, COVID-19 has severely affected public and private school and university education, throughout the world – with especially harsh impacts in developing countries as Winthrop (2020) writes regarding Ghanaian public school education. Lindsay and Moses (2020) discuss harsh consequences in Indonesia, Myanmar, and South Africa. Both of these articles emphasize the criticality of nations with majority youth populations that are vital to national and social development, thus expanding beyond the immediate and intermediate timeframes.

In these illustrations, the types of public schools and universities and their domestic or global contexts help determine which of the three foci will be the most prominent. Public and university policies as presented by legislative bodies (macro-levels), executive government branches (macro and sometimes meso-levels), and postsecondary institutions (macro and micro-levels) articulate and set the tone for what types of educational and socioeconomic and political matters are addressed – in the frontstage. Regardless of the settings, the vast majority of universities espouse sound academic endeavors and engagement in larger societal issues as those cited in chapters by Carnoy, Hayhoe, Schwille, Evans, and Lindsay. Such endeavors often advocate the inclusion of diverse students and professionals who should or will contribute to social progress via evolving policies. Overall purposes are to explicate the presence and modification of applied policies in multiple nations. That is, advanced industrialized nations and developing or emerging nations are intertwined with the latter being continually affected by policies and sociopolitical conditions of the former.

We postulate that cooperative interaction among geopolitical regions should be mutually beneficial to educational sites and successful outcomes. Indeed, salient comparative educational analyses should occur within and among geopolitical blocs and organizations such as SADEC (Southern African Development Community), ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations – that includes Australia), the G-7, and the G-20. The G-7 and G-20 nations represent the top 7 and 20 major counties, respectively, that address economic, financial, and some political conditions on a global level.[2]

Klees' chapter maintains that the underlying premises, or what I term philosophical perspectives, influence how issues are viewed and the subsequent questions raised thereof. In the fields of applied policy research, this important tenet is or should be part of the scaffolds. The outcomes or results, to considerable extent, are shaped by the premises. Is the basic premise to bolster standing or prestige, for example, through additional revenues? Indonesian and Chinese research entities and universities are cooperating on the development of COVID-19 vaccines and select other international endeavors (Soeriaatmadja 2020). The Chinese-based Glover Biopharmaceuticals is undertaking vaccine trials in Australia (Felter 2020). Some contend it is for prestige to boost their standing among nations, by being the first or among the top to develop vaccines, and for revenues. Or is it to create viable options to improve educational, health, and social conditions for students and educators as Arnove's, Ghosh's, and Schwille's chapters might question? It is likely both categories as suggested by Bera (2020).

Perhaps equally notable conceptual and theoretical frameworks are listed in Arnove's, Carnoy's, Ghosh's, and Samoff's chapters. Their theoretical frameworks are more akin to macro and meso-level policies, although data collection is at the micro educational sites for students' and teachers' performances. Schwille's discussion of Bourdieu's sociological thesis appears to be grounded, in some respects, to sociological and philosophical premises, as are aspects of Klees' and Ghosh's chapters. They include humanistic educational and social settings. Hence the works of Appiah (2003, 2017) provide multi-disciplinary nexuses for examining phenomena that may establish foundations contributing to public policy. Combined public and educational policy formation and implementation will, of necessity, be developed and/or expanded in technological realms as presented next.

In several emerging African and Asian countries, over 25 years ago, various technological modes skipped traditional technology such as landline telephones as means of communication during the HIV/AIDs

[2] The G-7 (Group of 7): Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom, and United States. The G-20 (Group of 20): Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, European Union, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Turkey, United Kingdom, and United States.

pandemic, especially since electricity and constant electrical power sources were absent (Lindsay and Moses 2020). Over a decade ago, I engaged in a Fulbright at Eduardo Mondale University. Upon my arrival at the airport in Maputo, Mozambique, an American embassy official gave me a cell phone. While in Mozambique, I often thought of the potential educational purposes of ubiquitous cell phones in offices and homes, which had never used landline telephones. One day at the University office, I picked up my office phone and prepared to dial a local number. My office mate immediately exclaimed, "Use your cell phone! It costs more to dial from your office phone!" (Lindsay 2008). Contemporary technology had bypassed the old modes as the nation leaps toward modern communication and technology. Eduardo Mondlane University graduate students prepared PowerPoints, used flash drives, and sent text messages as routine modes, comparable to counterparts in comprehensive American universities (Lindsay 2008).

While the immediate aforementioned technological features were becoming fairly common, the COVID-19 pandemic requires the immediate necessity of multiple online and virtual modes for pedagogical delivery, student development, and transmission of cooperative research projects. Schwille's and Evans' chapters stress the importance of collaboration both within schools/colleges of education and colleagues in the same university, along with those in domestic consortiums and international venues. Recently, select Federal and National departments and Ministries of Education and Research and Technology, along with philanthropic organizations, have issued new requests for proposals and/or reallocated budgetary funds for critical problems. Such alterations and proposals are to undertake novel modes of cooperative online and virtual communications and instruction. Notably, the massive displaced internal populace and migrations to escape civil conflicts and natural disasters in Syria, Iraq, Indonesia, South Africa, and Venezuela – of the last decades and the 2020s – also prompted online instruction involving international education specialists.

The evolving uses of technology were spurred additionally by COVID-19 and other massive challenges. This represented opportunities to disseminate in multiple modalities in preparing professionals for a range of educational portfolios that can contribute to social cohesion and lessen discriminations against demographic groups different from one's own. While these innovative forms are emerging, careful appropriate micro-, meso-, and macro- policies should help ensure that mutable forms of gender, racial, class, and other non-visible or backstage discriminatory *de facto* practices do not continue or emerge – as chapters by Stromquist, Ghosh, Samoff, and Lindsay offer. Basically, what is asserted is that comparative and international education professionals must be attuned to dynamic circumstances. It is mandatory that adverse social and educational mutations do not emerge – as somewhat analogous to those in the biological and chemical sciences with the mutated COVID-19.

External Funding by Government and Philanthropic Organizations

Regarding the last illustrations, Lindsay's and Evans' chapters articulated the importance of external funding, especially for comprehensive doctoral research universities. Seeking and being awarded external funding that demonstrates meritorious achievements sponsors individual faculty and contributes to university coffers. In the vast majority of social science and educational departments and schools, external funding has become a *de facto*, if not *de jure*, criteria for promotion and tenure to associate professor (in comprehensive doctoral universities) with tenure in the United States and England. It is *sine qua non* for becoming a professor. Yet for women and other particular gender groups, this can be challenging since evaluations and promotions regularly occur when there are children and/or other family members who need care. In the case of international education and affairs specialists, field research and scholarship typically occur away from the home site. Merit and prestige via fellowship and grant acquisitions are juxtaposed with multiple policy level edicts.

Perhaps the aforementioned realities could be tempered in view of vastly changing demographic characteristics in emerging and developed countries coupled with people of color and women in decision- and policy-making positions in government and philanthropic funding bodies. Witness Lindsay's chapter about people of color and women being the Chief Executive Officers of a number of major American philanthropic foundations. (Note, however, that the percentages of people of color are still quite underrepresented in executive positions.) During the Presidential administrations of Barack Obama and George W. Bush, there were various indices of additional diversity compared to previous administrations. Even with such increased diversity, the fields of comparative and international education and affairs, that prepare professionals to work in international settings, present a somewhat mixed portrait. Evans' chapter discussed how international education doctoral graduates, often from non-American countries, have become ambassadors, cabinet officers, and executives in international organizations. A notable domestic example at Evans' university was an African American woman doctoral graduate who was appointed to ambassadorial posts by three different American presidents. Another African American woman and other doctoral graduates developed and administered multi-million dollars in international education projects, via the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) with American universities and university partners in other nations.

The USAID and the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID)[3] have allocated grants and contracts to American and British universities for projects during the emergence of new nations, that broke the yokes of formal colonialism in the aftermath of contemporary civil conflicts in emerging nations, as Samoff's and Lindsay's chapters review. As developing nations continue to chart their own paths, yet simultaneously influenced by global geopolitical conditions, they will continue to exude larger voices and demand agency. Since these are still emerging nations, compared to the United States and other Western ones, there are huge gaps in economic viability, educational facilities, and other indicators of national socioeconomic conditions and individual livelihoods. What does this portend for professionals in comparative and international education and affairs as we envision new paradigms?

Contemporary and Emerging Motifs and Paradigms

Our chapters present arrays of topics that have been foci of scholarly and professional work during the past decades, and in some cases for over a half century. Central to our discussions are the critical importance of conceptual and theoretical frameworks as we examine empirical data and conditions in ranges of educational settings. Chapters have also elucidated topics that should be explored further in the field and within the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES), and similar professional bodies on the continents. Themes encompass *inter alia*: (1) paradigms from nations situated throughout the world; (2) educational

[3] After completing research for this chapter, DFID closed and became part of the Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office.

finance policies, including those for profit-making schools and universities; (3) interplay of gender with formal structures and policies; and (4) criticality of university and non-university settings of teacher education and subsequent conditions of teachers. Further creative modifications and additional topics and paradigms can and should be examined through the lenses of comparative and international education via the following illustrations.

Stromquist's and Samoff's chapters expound on the roles of the formal government of the state or nation. Lowther and Lindsay (2009) engaged in conversations with young adult prisoners, convicted of terrorism. In 2015, Lindsay was in a nation where a university student provided a guided tour of the campus grounds and the surrounding city. He casually explained how university students and those not enrolled were buried in a particular cemetery. Those buried there, had been willing to give up their lives for their causes that had not been sanctioned by the state or formal political parties, in the region. I pondered the current and likely future roles of such "independent" actors and if there are roles that secondary schools and universities can exert to thwart such violent actions – as Ghosh's chapter currently suggests the need for educational institutions to embed social cohesion in the curriculum.

In the United States and other countries, non-state actors engage in violent acts to achieve their aims that may be related to religious views, political principles and goals, or natural resources like land and water (Crimaldi 2020; Ray 2020; UN News 2020). For example, one Boston Marathon bomber was a student. These acts are distinguished from "criminal violence" such as robberies and random killings (Lowther and Lindsay 2009). What kinds of frameworks or paradigms may be modified or developed to curtail or, desirably, prevent such atrocities – from non-state actors – as we have seen in recent carnages? What multi-disciplinary perspectives – from several social sciences, international relations, public health, and comparative and international education – will be necessary?

One of the first areas requiring multi-disciplinary perspectives is climate change. A *New York Times* article stated approximately 1% of the Earth has current climatic conditions comparable to the Sahara desert. By 2070, this could increase to 20% of the Earth's landmass (Lustgarten 2020). While this may seem in the distant future, we bear in mind that today's 20 years of age university students will be completing their careers in 2070. Many of the new retirees' students will be mid-career and will be working into 2100.

Climate change has necessitated migration of populaces, from the Caribbean and Central America to seek livelihoods internally in the United States, and elsewhere (Baez et al. 2017; Semple 2019). The United Nations (UN News 2019) is analyzing climate migration from African nations to European ones. Both climate change and migration (Lustgarten 2020) raise issues of how educational sites will be physically constructed where limited natural resources are present even in new migratory sites (Lustgarten 2020). For example, water will be a scare commodity, and many environments will not be near freshwater rivers or oceans where desalination can be options. What does this entail for educational policies that establish criteria for school locations via school mapping? What does this mean for teaching and learning ambiences with limited natural resources, that curtail children's and youth's developments?

There is an extensive body of research on theoretical and policy frameworks that examine issues of race, ethnicity, gender, and social status, that were used during my NSF grants (Simeon and Lindsay 2017) and in critical works (Gates 2007; Kendi 2016; Lindsay 1980). With changing migratory patterns, the traditional paradigms of comparative analysis within and among countries may not align with recent research. For instance, during my NSF grants observations indicated that numerous "distant citizens" from former British colonies migrated to England and often resided in enclaves, as observed in Leicester, England, where *de facto* public schools and banks were primarily utilized and/or formed by Muslims. During the early 2000s, the designation "Black and Minority Ethnics" (BMEs) was used to combine the range of non-European origins of demographic groups. There was considerable diversity among the thousands of school and university students who were lumped into this category. From approximately 2015 onward, slightly more specificity occurred as witnessed in the group becoming "Black Asian and Minority Ethnics." Asians expressed the necessity for their clear BAME identification (Sandhu 2018). In the relatively same timeframe, Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) evolved into Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Queer Intersexual Asexual (LGBTQIA), the newer nomenclature. How might comparative and international education specialists tease out empirical data and subsequent micro school and university policies coupled with macro ones at the national levels, when demographic identifications are changing?

During an NSF grant, I was at a London National Health Service (NHS) hospital where there were over a dozen classifications of Black people whose origins were somewhere on the African continent or diaspora. People of Bahamian, Jamaican, Ghanaian, Kenyan, Nigerian, Somalian, and Zambian ancestry did not wish to be viewed as monolithic Blacks. According to interviewees, there are notable socioeconomic and status differences so that Nigerians and Jamaicans are perceived as having better educational and career options than other Blacks. Similarly, immigrants from Georgia, Greece, Poland, and Ukraine did not wish to be simply "whites migrants." So, public health and education services had to grapple with these distinctions in terms of health care and teaching – rather than simply viewing the various demographic groups as "disadvantaged" or recipients of unequal opportunities. They are and may be disadvantaged and at risk for unequal educational attainment and public health, since education and health are closely linked amid epidemics and chronic illnesses. However, cultural conditions and learning styles do not equate the same monolithic pedagogies and treatments. Might this be similar to Samoff's chapter of describing people as poor versus impoverished?

As previously cited, extensive use of alternative and/or new technologies are necessitated by global pandemics and regional epidemics. Multi-disciplinary teams and consortiums of specialists in instructional technology, curriculum, educational psychology, and comparative and international education will have to delve into the efficient modalities and outcomes from pre-kindergarten through doctoral and professional levels. Such associations can employ micro and macro-levels of analyses.

School districts, colleges and universities, and professional training programs compete for state and provincial *and* federal or government funds. Concurrently, other public organizations provide requests for financial allocations. In the meantime, philanthropic bodies elicit proposals to address their missions and goals. With multiple competitors, universities can articulate that their three major functions – teaching and learning, scholarship and research, and public engagement – benefit all sectors of education. In turn, benefits are accrued to other public bodies. Such rationales may not suffice when there are herculean public health and economic crises emanating from diseases or natural disasters causing the diversion of educational funds to immediate catastrophes. Gutman and Moreno (2019) elucidate the centrality of ethical premises with competing financial disbursements among patient care, public health, and education. Klees' and Lindsay's chapters link the roles of ethics in decision-making with important competing social and educational essentials.

As précises, we can heed sage advice from my PhD faculty advisor, in international administration at American University and Doyle and Ikenberry (2018). They were attuned to the vicissitudes of the overwhelming political ambience in Washington, D.C., the United Nations, and other international bodies. The advisor voiced that we should continue numerous types of empirical research and policy development and also be prepared for the unexpected by allowing time in our agendas and schedules to address immediate urgent realities. Doyle and Ikenberry (2018) surmised that theories change in light of: evolving issues; desired changes; and theories contributing to change. We can query ourselves and ask "how do we move beyond intersections of theories, policies, and programs to anticipate challenges and plan for contingencies?" The current global pandemic, unfortunately, will not be the last overwhelming emergency that confronts schools and universities. Traditional foci in comparative and international education and affairs should continue and simultaneously realize that expertise will be elicited to address unknown phenomena. We will have built upon the past to create future innovations and interpretations – to paraphrase former Harvard University President Drew Faust – as quoted at the beginning of this chapter.

References

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. (2003). *Thinking it through: An introduction to contemporary philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. (2017) *As if: Idealization and ideals*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Baez, Javier., Caruso, German., Mueller, Valerie., & Niu, Chiyu. (2017, May). Heat exposure and youth migration in Central America and the Caribbean. *American Economic Review*, *107*(5), 446–450. https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.p20171053. Accessed 28 July 2020.

Baswedan, Anies. (2019, July 15). *Jakarata Governor Address to the United States-Indonesia Society (USINDO)*[Forum]. Washington, DC: Cosmos Club.

Bera, Ami. (2020, August 11). *Virtual meeting: A conversation with Representative Ami Bera*. Council on Foreign Relations. https://www.cfr.org/event/virtual-meeting-conversation-representative-ami-bera. Accessed 15 September 2020.

Carnoy, Martin. (2019). *Transforming comparative education: Fifty years of theory building at Stanford*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Crimaldi, Laura. (2020, August 1). 'This was an attack on all of us': Tsarnaev decision sparks anger, sorrow. *Boston Globe*. https://www.bostonglobe.com/2020/08/01/metro/tsarnaev-decision-sparks-anger-sorrow/. Accessed 3 August 2020.

Doyle, Michael W., & Ikenberry, G. John. (Eds.). (2018). *New thinking in international relations theory*. New York: Routledge.

Eryaman, Mustafa Yunus., & Schneider, Barbara. (Eds.). (2017). *Evidence and public good in educational policy, research and practice*. Cham: Springer.

Faust, Drew. (2010, June 30). *The role of the university in a changing world*. Harvard University. https://www.harvard.edu/president/speech/2010/role-university-changing-world. Accessed 5 August 2020.

Felter, Claire. (2020, July 23). *What is the world doing to create a COVID-19 vaccine?* Council on Foreign Relations. https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/what-world-doing-create-covid-19-vaccine. Accessed 3 August 2020.

Gates Jr., Henry Louis. (Ed.). (2007). *The world and Africa: Color and democracy. The Oxford W. E. B. Du Bois*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goffman, Erving. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.

Gutmann, Amy., & Moreno, Jonathan D. (2019). *Everybody wants to go to heaven but nobody wants to die*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Kendi, Ibram X. (2016). *Stamped from the beginning: The definitive history of racist ideas in America*. New York: Bold Type Books.

Lamont, Michèle. (2010). *How professors think: Inside the curious world of academic judgment*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lindsay, Beverly. (Ed.). (1980). *Comparative perspectives of third world women: The impact of race, sex, and class*. Westport: Praeger.

Lindsay, Beverly. (2008). *Traversing urban milieus across continents: Reflections on Maputo*. Washington, DC: Council for International Exchange of Scholars. http://www.cies.org/specialists/stories. Accessed 10 June 2009.

Lindsay, Beverly. (2012). Articulating domestic and global university descriptors and indices of excellence. *Comparative Education*, *48*(3), 385–399. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2011.613279.

Lindsay, Beverly. (2018, October 26). *STEM illustrations from the Black Panther movie: The case of Princess Shuri* [Conference session]. African Heritage Studies Association 49th Annual Conference, Clark Atlanta University, Atlanta, GA, United States.

Lindsay, Beverly., & Blanchett, Wanda J. (2011). Preface to the new decade. In Beverly Lindsay & Wanda J. Blanchett (Eds.), *Universities and global diversity: Preparing educators for tomorrow* (pp. xv–xvii). New York: Routledge.

Lindsay, Beverly., & Moses, Yolanda. (2020, July 28). International diverse universities in the midst of a global pandemic. *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*. https://diverseeducation.com/article/185646/. Accessed 29 July 2020.

Lindsay, Beverly., & Simeon, Eric Jason. (2014). Relationships between global citizenship and university rankings. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, *9*(2), 243–257. https://doi.org/10.2304/rcie.2014.9.2.243.

Lowther, Adam B., & Lindsay, Beverly. (Eds.). (2009). *Terrorism's unanswered questions*. Westport: Praeger Publishers.

Lustgarten, Abrahm. (2020, July 23). The great climate migration has begun. *The New York Times Magazine*. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/07/23/magazine/climate-migration.html?referringSource=articleShare. Accessed 23 July 2020.

Merton, Robert K. (1972). Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge. *American Journal of Sociology*, *72*(1), 9–47. https://doi.org/10.1086/225294. Accessed 21 July 2020.

Philbrick, Ian Prasad., & Yar, Sanam. (2020, August 3). What has changed since George Floyd. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/03/briefing/coronavirus-vaccine-tropical-storm-isaias-tiktok-your-monday-briefing.html. Accessed August 3, 2020.

Picca, Leslie H., & Feagin, Joe R. (2007). *Two-faced racism: Whites in the backstage and frontstage*. New York: Routledge.

Ray, Michael. (2020). Boston Marathon bombing of 2013. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. https://www.britannica.com/event/Boston-Marathon-bombing-of-2013. Accessed 3 August 2020.

Sandhu, Rajdeep. (2018, May 17). Should BAME be ditched as a term for Black, Asian, and minority ethnic people? *BBC News Daily*. https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-43831279. Accessed August 10, 2020.

Semple, Kirk. (2019, April 13). Central American farmers head to the U.S., fleeing climate change. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/13/world/americas/coffee-climate-change-migration.html. Accessed 28 July 2020.

Simeon, Eric., & Lindsay, Beverly. (2017, August 12). *Higher education, STEM, and global citizenship: A nexus for social inclusion* [Conference session]. American Sociological Association 112th Annual Conference, Montreal, Canada.

Soeriaatmadja, Wahyudi. (2020, July 21). Indonesia's Bio Farma and China's Sinovac to begin final clinical trials for Covid-19 vaccine. *The Straits Times*. https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/se-asia/indonesias-bio-farma-and-chinas-sinovac-to-begin-final-clinical-trials-for-covid-19. Accessed 21 July 2020.

Times Higher Education (THE). (2020). *World university rankings 2020.* https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/2020/world-ranking#!/page/8/length/25/sort_by/rank/sort_order/asc/cols/stats. Accessed 20 July 2020.

UN News. (2020, July 9). Intercommunal violence, terrorist attacks inflame tensions in West Africa. *UN News*. https://news.un.org/en/story/2020/07/1068071. Accessed 3 August 2020.

UN News. (2019, July 31). Migration and the climate crisis: The UN's search for solutions. *UN News*. https://news.un.org/en/story/2019/07/1043551. Accessed 3 August 2020.

Winthrop, Rebecca. (2020). *Ghana's leapfrog experiment: Free senior secondary school for all youth*. Brookings Institution. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/education-plus-development/2020/07/14/ghanas-leapfrog-experiment-free-senior-secondary-school-for-all. Accessed 20 July 2020.

Index

A

B

B. Lindsay (ed.), *Comparative and International Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7

F