

CHAPTER 2

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF COMPARATIVE EDUCATION

Peter Mugo ✓

mqathara@yahoo.com

CC Wolhuter

Charl.Wolhuter@nwu.ac.za

By the end of this chapter the students should be able to:

- Highlight the main phases through which comparative education has gone through in its development.
- Describe the main characteristic activities of each of the identified phases.
- Apply the knowledge obtained in each phase to the current day set up in their country.

INTRODUCTION

The present shape of comparative education, which has emerged out and is distinct from philosophy, sociology, and history and economic of education as a part of the field theory of education, has crystallised only in the twentieth century. It may not be possible to associate it with a specific discipline. It derives its knowledge from different disciplines. Those include history, sociology, anthropology, geography, political science and philosophy.

The search for the origin of comparative education has made many scholars who searched back far in time. Friedrich Schneider and Franz Hilker in Germany, for example were active in searching for the European precedent. In the United State of America, William Brickman

led the quest for the original comparative educator. He published several articles on the subject in which he reached as far back as Herodotus (C484-425 B.C.) as a competent cultural comparativist in the ancient world. Various scholars have used different stages in classifying the development of this discipline. For example S.P. Chaube and A. Chaube (2006) have come up with three main stages while Sodhi (2006) has divided the period into two major periods. The current book will use seven phases in the description of the development of comparative education. The seven phases are not distinct as portrayed in this chapter. Some of them have been overlapping as previous development run over two consecutive phases without a distinct boundary and the authors have used the following phases for clarity of ideas and for the students to grasp the required content.

PHASES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPARATIVE EDUCATION

The development of comparative education can be studied in seven major phases or stages that are based on the major characteristic activities. These phases are:

- i. The phase of traveller tales (from antiquity to 1817)
- ii. The phase of pioneers (From 1817-1900) (Selective borrowing)
- iii. The phase of philosophers (Concern for cultural context) from 1900 to end of world war two in 1945.
- iv. The phase of social science perspective (From end of world war two to present)
- v. Phase of heterodoxy: paradigm wars
- vi. Phase of heterogeneity
- vii. Contemporary trends

It is important to note that the phases used here to signify changes in the historical development of the discipline are retrospective and imposed ones. They should not be seen as precise or sudden turning points. The changes were gradual. Significantly, each phase is only for the purpose of organizing information because in reality there are no

such distinct phases. This is because towards the end of each phase, for example, the next phase has already evident in the work of prospective observer. At the same time, entry into a new phase does not mean a complete break with the earlier one.

THE PHASE OF TRAVELLERS' TALE (FROM ANTIQUITY TO 1817)

This period covers the time from antiquity to around 1817 A.D. when Marc Antoine Jullien De Paris published his famous work "Plan and preliminary views for work in Comparative Education". Before this time writings on foreign education systems were mere descriptions of accounts of foreign education systems by individuals who had opportunities for foreign travels. Visitations to other countries - whether for purpose of commerce, conversations, curiosity or conflict - goes back to ancient history of humankind. From one point of view, every one who had interest in the upbringing of children or in education, tended to enquire into what went on in those communities they visited. The writings by the early writers on comparative education drew examples from the societies other than their own. The motives for accounts of travellers' tales were partly curiosity and the need for comparison. As they were visiting the new lands they wrote about the education systems of the countries they visited. These travellers included:

Xenophon (c430-355B.C.)

He was a Greek, described the training of Persian youths for citizenship and leadership. He compared the aims and structure of Persian and Greek education systems, especially Sparta, which he admired and wished Athens would copy. He commented on the relationship between education and social occupation status in the two countries. He also gave a detailed account of the education of the Persians in his bibliography of King Cyrus.

Plato

In his two books, *The Republic* and *The Law*-he compared systems of education in Sparta and Athens. He urged that the Athenians education system should borrow from the Spartan education system aspects of discipline.

ROMANS

Cicero (106-43B.C)

He made comparisons between Greek and Roman education in his book *De Republica* (57B.C) coming in favour of the state controlled system as opposed to a family centered system. He admired the training in oratory of the Greeks and suggested that Romans should organize a better education system controlled by the state like Sparta. In his book *De Oratore* he claimed that the Greeks were far better than every other nation in the practice of eloquence.

Tacitus (55-116A.D.)

He described education practices of Jews, customs of early Britons and characteristics of Germans. He compared oratorical practices in several countries. He also contrasted the education in his own day with that of the earlier period.

Julius Caesar (102-42B.C.)

In his *De Bello Gallico* book IV he commented on education of Druids- a Celtic religious order of priests, soothsayers, judges and poets in ancient Britain, Ireland and France. In his writings on the Gallic wars, he commented on education of the Belgian Acquitanians and Celts.

Marco Polo

He travelled to the court of Kublai Khan and reported about the Chinese system in the 13th century as follows:

“The natives of the city of Kinsey are men of peaceful character. They know nothing of handling arms and keep none in their houses. You hear of no feuds or noisy quarrels or dissension of any kind among them. Both their commercial dealings and in their manufactures, they are thoroughly honest and truthful and there is such a degree of good will and neighbourly attachment among both men and women that you would take the people who live in the same streets to be all one family- much of this is attributed to their education in the classics.”

S. Well Williams

An American missionary writing in mid nineteenth century, he had this to say about the Chinese:

“Their conversations are full of filthy extraneous expressions and their lives of impure acts. Their disregard of the truth has perhaps done more to lower their character than any other fault- the alarming extent of the use of opium- the universal practice of lying and dishonest dealings, the rowdiness of the old and the young; harsh cruelty towards prisoners- all form a full unchecked torrent of human depravity.”

Escalante

In 1544 A.D. he commented about the Japanese educational system and said:

“They read and write in the same manner as do the Chinese; their language is similar to Germans. Instruction of the young is entrusted to learned tutors among the nobles, while the commoners send their children to Buddhist temples.”

Matteo Ricci

In 1610 A.D. he praised the Chinese as follows:

“Of the entire pagan sects known to Europe, I know of no other people who fell fewer errors in the early ages of their antiquity than did the Chinese. The books of rare wisdom of their ancient philosophers are still in existence and are filled with most salutary advice on training men to be virtuous. In this particular respect, they seem to be quite the equals of our own most distinguished philosophers.”

Alexis De Tocqueville (France)

He discussed educational systems of other states including the United States of America.

Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406A.D.)

He was a Tunisian born Scholar, and made comparisons between the eastern Moslem culture and that of the west. He emphasized the need to establish similarities and difference between the present and past (or distantly located) conditions. He stressed the need to know the causes of the similarities in certain cases and of the differences in others.

Jacob Middendorp

He was sent from Germany to collect information about universities in France, Italy, Denmark, Poland and Bohemia in the sixteenth century.

William Petty

He was a professor of anatomy at Oxford and the founder of the Royal Society. He presented a more scholarly approach to the observation of foreign countries in his book, "The Methods of Inquiring into the state of any country".

La Chatouous

In 1763 he reported on the progress of education in Russian science education in an essay entitled, "Essay on National Education."

Diderot

In 1776 he presented Catherine II with a plan for raising the standard of the Russian education system, which was based on the superior quality of the French education.

Condorcet

After the French revolution he presented to the National Assembly on behalf of the Committee of Public Instruction, recommendations for the development of French education based on comparison with education found in England, Italy and Germany.

I-tsing

An Asian, he wrote about the University of Nalanda in India, which was a centre of learning. He gave details about teachers and students, buildings, its library and curriculum.

Suleiman the merchant

He wrote about the Chinese and said that whether poor or rich, young or old, all the Chinese learnt to trace the characters and to write and when the cost of living increased, the government issued food from its reserves and sold it at less than the market price so effectively that the cost of living did not rise and that in each town there was a school master for the institutions of the poor and their children. The schoolmasters were supported at the expense of the treasury.

Some contributions were made to the development of comparative education by learning institutions especially, university type institutions of higher education during the period and after the Renaissance and Reformation in Europe.

Characteristics of this phase

Interesting as those stories may have been to the reading public of their times, they were not scientific accounts and had many shortcomings. Among them were that they were mostly descriptive. They were giving descriptive accounts of their journeys and experiences in foreign lands. They gave descriptive accounts of features in foreign systems of education as they saw them. Therefore, they were influenced by writer biases and prejudice. In addition, they were not systematic. Their attention to education was fragmented and generally unsystematic. Most of them had gone to foreign lands for purposes other than education. In this regard their statements included obvious exaggerations, understatements and at times deliberate falsehood since the purpose of the author was usually to entertain. However, although they were stimulating, they were superficial and piecemeal. Cultural biases were prevalent. The observer was always gauging the one group as inferior to other. This at times went hand in hand with racism.

Lastly, most of this information had little comparative value since it was influenced by the curiosity of the author.

Relevance to present day theory and practice of education

Features of travellers' tales still remain with us in the work of journalism and education trips. Indeed their reports are informal, getting to know the experiences of other societies. They form the first step to understanding education in other countries. Stories given on return

from visits to other countries add flavour to our teaching in schools. Eyewitness accounts are still deemed as valuable in research work. Reading of novels and stories about other countries are all-commendable in our present day educational practices.

PHASE OF SELECTIVE EDUCATION BORROWING (PIONEERS)

The aftermath of the French revolution, industrial revolution, agrarian revolution and the process of colonization characterized the 19th century Europe. Most education reformers of the time were disturbed by the social and the political conditions of revolution and reactions of the early 19th century Europe. In education, they saw the means of moral improvement and social amelioration. Reformers were concerned that the ability of individual school systems to improve themselves seemed limited-even where there was a good intentions. What was needed was some way of sharing the best ideas and practices available in many countries. This presented a significant change of approach suggesting a more systematic and comprehensive collection of data and selective borrowing in education.

This period was geared towards the development of methodology or systematic rules to be followed in studying of comparative education. It was a drive to learn lessons from foreign education systems for the purpose of borrowing ideas. This period is considered as the starting point of comparative education, which is associated with Marie Antoinne Jullien De Paris' work *Plan and Preliminary Views for Work of Comparative Education*.

He seems to have had the foresight and concern for systematic approach to comparative examination of educational institutions and practices. Selective education borrowing was motivated by the desire to develop a methodology or system of rules, to be followed in studying foreign systems of education. There was a drive to learn lessons from foreign systems for purpose of borrowing ideas. Consequently the 19th century period saw journeys to foreign countries by travellers with specialized interest in educational matters. There were serious attempts at observation and study of other systems of education. The travellers no longer travelled for general curiosity and enlightenment. They wanted to discover what was going on in education in other

countries in order to borrow aspects for improvement of their own systems of education.

Apart from the increase in the incidence of trips to other countries in search of improvement for home systems of education, the 19th century was noteworthy for the establishment of national agencies for the collection and dissemination of information about systems of education. For example the United States Office of Education (1867) the Musée Pédagogique in Paris (1879) and the Office of Special Inquiries and Report in London (1895). There were various contributors who are accredited to this phase. They involved Marc Antoine Jullien De Paris, Victor Cousin, Horace Mann, Henry Bernard, Matthew Arnold, K.D. Ushinsky and Peter the Great.

Victor Cousin

He lived in France at a time when Europe was in chaos after the Napoleonic wars. There was need to bring reforms in France. He was a professor of philosophy and head of France's national schools. He investigated the education of Prussia with the aim of finding out how the French government could set about instituting a national system of primary education through borrowing. His work was to stimulate the French education system using foreign examples. Therefore it heralded the beginning of borrowing as a motivation for conducting comparative education. In his reports in 1813, Cousin recommended selective education borrowing from the Prussian experience. According to him, rivalries and antipathies would be out of place. People of stature should not be afraid to borrow from whatever and whenever it is appropriate.

Peter the Great

When Peter the Great embarked on his programme of modernizing Russia in the 17th century, he set a precedent that has been assiduously followed by later reformers. He sought abroad for models of what his country could become. His answers to the questions, "What has made Britain and Holland great?", was the existence of systems of training that gave them superiority in industry, commerce, travel and communication. As a result, Peter inspired by the English example of the naval academy and the Dutch example of schools of Navigation, imported British teachers to staff similar schools in Russia. This precedent was continued in the efforts of those 19th century travellers

who sought to draw useful examples from foreign lessons. For example, all through the century, American educators were visiting the major European countries; English commissioners were inspecting European and American schools; Russian educators went to France, Switzerland and Germany. Towards the close of the century, Japanese emissaries were sent to Germany, France and England to bring back useful information for developing the Japanese schools system. Officials from the United States visited the Soviet Union in order to examine the contribution of the soviet education to Russian development.

In the 19th century, as reformers manoeuvred to establish state responsibility for the provision of schooling, the precursors of modern comparative education were drawn to study particularly Prussia and then France, as models of well developed national systems. In Prussia laws requiring each locality to establish and maintain a school had been operating for nearly a century. In France the revolution and the Napoleonic regime had produced a system of secondary education to serve state purpose.

Marc Antoine Jullien De Paris (1775-1848)

The prime example of work in comparative education motivated by the desire to gain useful lessons from abroad is seen in the work of Jullien De Paris, "Plan and preliminary Views for the work of comparative Education." This marked the beginning of modern comparative education. Jullien was not only a cosmopolitan at the time of intense nationalism, but also an exponent of French Enlightenment views. A rationalist, and heir to the philosophy of Condorcet and the encyclopedic, he subscribed to the view that one should look at facts in a structured way and that on this basis alone, proposals might be made to improve the conditions of the society. Jullien lived during the Napoleonic Wars and was disturbed by the social and political conditions of revolution in the early 19th century Europe. He saw education as a positive science, which could be utilized to improve the French society through a systematic and rigorous approach of comparative analysis. Frustrated by politics in France, he turned part of his energies to educational improvement. He was essentially a practical man, preferring to base all programmes to improve education and society on systematic knowledge of what actually existed. He saw that the first

task was to develop an instrument of collecting information on schools in some of the France neighbouring countries. Jullien drafted an elaborate questionnaire for this purpose and he hoped that the resulting comparison would spur backward countries to develop their educational systems. Thus he sought to do more than merely collect objective data. He was ultimately concerned with the problem of diffusing knowledge of educational innovation, influenced as he was by the ideas of Rousseau and Pestalozzi. He wished to encourage a practical, child-centered educational methodology that emphasized among other things, education of senses and preparation for life in society, all with a strong humanitarian emphasis.

John Griscom (1774-1852)

In America educators, too, were aware of the potential value of the schools for what is now termed nation building, and for improving social conditions. They also hoped to find better teaching techniques and looked to Prussia, Switzerland and Holland for models systems of teacher training and supervision. John Griscom from New Jersey was one of the first to report on "a year in Europe". In his preface he cited three reasons for studying European education and society. First, the United States was expanding her cultural and trade contacts with European countries and consequently ought to know more about Europe. Second, after a period of bitter hostility between the United States and England, greater intimacy might lead to mutual understanding and a desirable pacification of relationships. Finally, he submitted, there were lessons for American to learn from enterprising developments in European education.

Horace Mann (1796-1856)

He reported on his grand tour of selected European countries in the "seventh Annual report to the Board of Education of the State of Massachusetts. He argued that, "if we are wise enough to learn from the experience of others, rather than wait the infliction consequent upon our own errors, we may yet escape the magnitude and formidableness of those calamities under which some other communities are now suffering. On the other hand, I do not hesitate to say, that there are many things abroad which we, at home, should do well to imitate; things, some of which are here, as yet, mere matters of speculation and

theory, but which, they have long been in operation, and are now producing harvest of rich and abundant blessings." Thus Mann sees the value of borrowing as a way of mitigating the problems that are being faced with by a particular system of education. He visited Prussia, Scotland, France, Germany, Holland and England. Experiences in these countries led him to conclude that history provided an explanation for the conditions that he saw. He saw the role of history in comparative education studies as that of illuminating present problems. He argued that many features of Prussian education could be useful in America despite the gulf he saw between political and social ideas of the two societies.

Joseph Kay (1821-1878)

Though the British during this period were much less prone to look abroad for models to emulate, there were some noteworthy exceptions. Joseph Kay travelled extensively in Europe to examine the social conditions and education of the people. Kay's motive was to collect foreign examples of improvement in the conditions of the poor. He observed that Europe had much to teach England. He noted that the remarkable improvement which had been witnessed in the conditions of a great part of Germany and Swiss since 1800 A.D., having been the results of admirable and long continued education given to all the children and the division of land among the poor/peasants.

Matthew Arnold

He was a school administrator, poet, literary critic and political and social observer. He was active in establishing a national system of education, particularly secondary schools. His practical studies of the French and German systems, which included detailed historical and statistical materials, were designed to make a particular case for reforms of education in England. He advocated for the expansion of state activities in education because of what he had seen himself, on tours that took him several times to the continent of Europe. He called on the people of England to look at what the French and the other countries in the continent were doing. If this were done in England, or something on the same principle, then the English system of education would be better. He stressed borrowing of positive points of continental

systems of education. He cautioned on the dangers of making comparisons based on analysis of inadequate statistical data.

Leo N. Tolstoy (1828-1910)

He is one of those observers travelling abroad to inspect educational institutions but simply rejected the foreign models outright. He was a writer, educator and a social critic. He was among those in the 19th century who interested them with comparative education but was disenchanted with what they saw. He returned from Western Europe convinced that what he had observed in foreign education was completely unsuited to the further development of schools in Russia. Tolstoy was looking for an education that would set humans free; he asserted on his return to Russia in 1862 that he had found abroad only what would make people slaves. Consequently, he rejected outright the desirability of Russia's borrowing from the West. Especially noteworthy is Tolstoy's vehement rejection of Prussian system as a model for his own country at a time when admiration for Prussian schools was widespread among comparative observers, whether from representative or autocratic political systems.

Francis Wayland (1795-1865)

He was one of the few Americans observers prepared to dismiss outright the possibility of improving education in the United states by imitating foreign examples. He was the president of Brown University, who undertook a tour of England at the mid-century. He condemned slavish imitation of the Oxford-Cambridge university tradition without considering how utterly unsuited to American conditions must be institutions found for the education of the medieval clergy and modified by the pressure of an all powerful aristocracy.

Henry Barnard

Though he was impressed by the superiority of the European teacher training system and schooling, he voiced similar doubts like those of Wayland and Tolstoy. He asserted that Europe still did not manage to turn out such practical and efficient men as the American common schools acting in concert with their religious, social and political institutions. If the aim in bringing up the young people is not merely instruction, he argued, but the building of national character, the school

is not everything. The quality of its output would be determined by a combination of influences derived from school, home and society. Thus though foreign institutions may be admired; they are not to be borrowed without careful thought.

K.D. Ushinsky

In Russia, he read the works of European educational reformers and attempted to introduce many views into schools with which he was associated. He visited foreign countries in order to observe educational institutions and to conduct educational studies. He acknowledged national differences in systems of education. Consequently, he emphasized the non-transferability of national traditions as they affect education. However, he suggested the possible transfer of general schemes across national borders.

Characteristics of this phase

This phase comprised of cataloguing of descriptive educational data and then the comparison of data with the hope of yielding the best educational practices as lessons for borrowing. The main motive of comparative education was utilitarian. The studies were descriptive in nature but hardly analytical. Moreover, most writers in this stage of comparative education ignored not only the rather obvious pitfalls of cultural biases, but also the technological problems arising from international differences in terminology and statistical procedures.

Relevance of the selective borrowing phase to present day education theory and practice

Despite the above shortcomings this phase is relevant to present day theory and practice of education. First, they were mainly descriptive and utilitarian in purpose. Descriptive studies are features that are still relevant in education today. We also endeavour to make education more utilitarian. Second, we still have visits to other countries or institutions, for the purpose of observing what may be of value to be brought back and used at home. Lastly, there is the importance of learning from experience of others in order to improve institutions in our own systems of education.

THE PHASE OF CONCERN FOR CULTURAL CONTEXT: FROM 1900 TO THE END OF SECOND WORLD WAR-1945

The publication in 1900 of short essays by Michael Sandler (1861-1943) ushered in new phase of comparative studies in education. Although intimations of this approach may be discerned in the work of some earlier writer notably Matthew Arnold in England, Wilhelm Dilthey in Germany, William T.Harris in USA and P.E.Levasseur in France, from this point on, new prospects for comparative education were revealed that were more comprehensive, more analytical and that had greater explanatory potential.

The approach was more comprehensive because specific educational systems were regarded as the contemporary outcomes of an identifiable set of historical and social forces and factors. The schools of a particular country, it was argued, could be studied only as integral part of the society in which they had developed. Parts of the school system could not be wrenched out of their educational contexts, nor could entire school system be examined in isolation from their total cultural environment. The first works done within this phase characteristically gave as much attention to historical and political developments outside the school as to the narration of events within the school system itself. Later this heavy historical emphasis was gradually replaced by the growing data drawn from economics and sociology.

Many writers in comparative education had been content to offer descriptive materials on foreign education school systems, implying that such facts in themselves had something valuable to say. The rapidly growing social science and new works in historical methods tended to deny that the facts outside a context of explanation could convey much. This critique was reflected increasingly in the twentieth century work in comparative education, which now began to emphasize dynamic analysis and explanations instead of static institutional descriptions. The concept of causation that began to grow and eventually to dominate the field was combined with optimism about the predictive value of causal analysis.

By the close of the 19th century, most governments were encouraging and even sponsoring studies of foreign systems of education. Those involved in the studies became more concerned with problems of comparison. It was not enough to accumulate masses of information

about educational practices in other countries or simply to borrow practices indiscriminately. Questions of interpreting observed practices in context, and of judging or predicting whether a particular arrangement of practice could be transplanted successfully in the home environment had to be faced.

This phase was motivated by the need to move from the encyclopaedic, descriptive and sometimes uncritical approach of the earlier phases to a more analytical approach. The trend towards analytical studies of the interrelationship between education and society became more generally recognized. There grew a concern to understand factors, which helped to shape systems of education. The problem for comparativists was no longer one of selective borrowing, but of predicting the likely success of educational transplant through knowledge of cultural context in both the donor and recipient countries. Most comparativists have to account for the features existing in systems of education in terms of the forces and factors that shaped them.

The individuals who made substantive contributions to the development of comparative education during this phase were mainly philosophers, historians and sociologists. Some of the individuals to be considered are:

William T. Harris (1859-1909)

He recognized the necessity of discussing and examining the educational system of a country as an entity, and accepted the thesis that education and society are intimately associated. To him comparative education can reveal the general or the universal principles about the relationship of society and education. To him, education breaks down caste systems and brings about a state of democracy. However, he was more cautious on the use of statistics in education, particularly statistics of foreign systems of education. He argued that each individual nation puts its own stamp on its system of education. Therefore, it is not possible to borrow from another system as freely as one might like to, because what is suitable for one social situation may not be suitable for another. This is because each nation's education system is strongly affected by its culture and embodies ideas reflecting that culture.

Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911)

He was a professor of philosophy and pedagogy at the University of Berlin. He stressed the total and dynamic interactions of education and society. He believed that education should serve the larger interests of the society, by putting into consideration that the lessons derived from comparative study might serve as possible guides to bringing education and contemporary society closely together.

Isaac Kandel (1881-1965)

He contributed a lot to the understanding of the relationship between education and the political and social problem confronting a nation. In all his works, both as editor of the *Educational Yearbook* and as the author of an impressive series of studies in comparative education, he advocated the use of historical, social and political data to explain the variety of educational outcomes. He was a political liberal thinker who saw the progress of humanity as measured by the movement towards more enlightened, individualistic and democratic school practices. In his classic textbook, *Comparative Education*, that appeared in 1933 at a time when economic depression, rising nationalism, emergence of modern authoritarian ideologies and problems of democracy preempted the attention of educators all over the world, Kandel viewed comparative education as a comparison of variant philosophies of education based not on theories but on the actual practices that prevailed. Broad social movements, political development and intellectual currents swept across national boundaries and each country reacted differently to these disturbances. Kandel contributed to the theory of school and society and to the theory of causation. The forces and factors that he identified are nationalism, political ideology and historical antecedents. He emphasized the need to collect accurate data and his emphasis was on cultural-historical context in which an education system develops. He argued that the importance of studying the national character is that it would help one to understand the character of the school by first understanding the country's national character, which is as a result of the philosophy and history of that society.

Nicholas Hans

He brought to comparative study the theory of causation and a search for explanation. Hans did more than merely synthesize the separate

themes found in the works of Levasseur, Sandler and Kandel. By concentrating on relatively few factors and by addressing them historically he clarified the impact of environmental forces on educational outcomes. He distinguished between natural factors such as race, language, geographical location, climate and natural resources and ideological factors such as major European religious traditions and the secular forces of humanism, socialism, nationalism and democracy.

Michael Sadler (1886-1943)

The work of Michael Sadler brought together the major separate strands of comparative education exemplified in the individual efforts of Arnold, Harris, Dilthey and Levasseur. From 1894-1895 Sadler was a member of the Bryce Commission on secondary education. For the next eight years he was the director of the Office of Special Enquiries and Report at the Board of Education. The special reports issued under his guidance were strongly historical, empirical and comparative. Sadler's major theoretical contribution to comparative education is the axiom that the schools of the society must be studied in the context of that society. He argued that all the good and true education is an expression of national life and character. It is rooted in the history of the nation and fitted to its need. In his view, the critical value of studying foreign systems of education is that it would in turn be fitted to study and understand our own. He called for attention to an awareness of the importance of the schools' cultural context and the dangers of piecemeal education borrowing. He used sociological and historical data to explain trends in education. His famous essay of 1900, "How far can we learn anything of practical value from the study of foreign systems of education?" summarized his views on the dynamic relationship of school and society and on the value of comparative education.

Contribution by institutions of learning

In the 1930s and 1940s courses in comparative education became part of teacher training programmes in many colleges and universities of the world. Where they become established they tended to use books written by Kandel and Hans. The endeavour of these individuals led to founding of national and international agencies, like the International Bureau of Education in Geneva in 1925. Among the main functions of

these agencies was to study educational problems of international nature and to disseminate educational data worldwide. This phase is relevant to the modern day theory and practice in education has helped in understanding of the forces and factors that shape the systems of education worldwide.

The following are the main motivation for comparative education during this phase:

1. Studying of educational problems of international nature.
2. Promotion of humanitarian and international sentiments.
3. Contribution to the solutions of the world's gravest social and political problems especially those arising from nationalism and using education for social advancement.
4. Outpouring of educational data by identifying worldwide movement in education such as basic education and lifelong education. This was accompanied by exchange of scholars and students as a way of helping developing countries to improve their education system. Moreover the promotion of understanding and elimination of racial, ethnic and gender biasness from books also motivated this stage.

SOCIAL SCIENCE PERSPECTIVE: FROM THE END OF WORLD WAR TWO IN 1945 TO PRESENT

Since the end of world war two in 1945 interest and activity in comparative education have developed dramatically and especially in two main respects.

1. The work of new and influential national and international agencies involved in educational inquiry, planning and programme implementation. In these associations there were those comparativists who saw the field's most productive future in terms of more active involvement in international projects of an inquiring or potentially reformative kind.
2. Increased activity in the study and teaching of comparative education as discipline in colleges, universities and comparative education centres for research. This also points to a further shift in emphasis on social science.

Getao (1996) has enumerated that the following forces characterize the contemporary era: Explosion of knowledge especially in science and technology.

- i. Drive for more knowledge and globalization.
- ii. Drive for liberty with the proclamation of human rights by UNESCO in 1948.
- iii. Urbanization as a result of industrialization.
- iv. Population explosion due to development of medical science where fifty percent of the population is under twenty years.
- v. Drive for the reconstruction of peace to facilitate material, moral and spiritual reconstruction. This is to help in removing suspicion and distrust among nations and promote good will and cooperation among them.

The outcome of the above forces can be noticed in:

- i. Greater efforts to democratize education to make it available to all as a way of ensuring a reasonable good life.
- ii. Diversification of education to serve and suit diversified societies and communities.
- iii. Greater concern and effort to provide quality education for the purpose of progress.
- iv. Creation of international organizations like UNESCO, UNICEF, WHO, UNEP in order to promote human welfare, reconstruction of peace, democratization, diversification and improvement of education and management of knowledge.

Motivation and characteristic activities

Since the end of Second World War in 1945, there has been less concern for analysis of antecedent and more for analysis of contemporary relationships. The mode for analysis have been less historical and more quantitative and empirical drawing on the techniques and conceptual frameworks of sociology, economics and political science in particular. It has become important to collect facts. It

has become necessary to organize and interpret the collected facts. The comparativists have to change the collected facts into systems, and must offer explanation and theories regarding the collected data. Consequently, the comparativist have been pre-occupied with debate in an effort to identify the best method of conducting comparative education studies so as to yield the most valid data, information and advice.

Some of the individuals who have contributed to the development of comparative education during this phase involved: Vernon Mallinson, Joseph A. Lauwerys, George Z.E. Bereday, Brian Holmes and Edmund J. King.

Institutions of learning, various agencies and comparative education societies have contributed to the development of this phase. After World War Two University centres developed comparative education studies. Today they have developed comparative education as a discipline in various countries of the world in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and North America. The scope of work in comparative education has broadened through the development of international, regional and national agencies. For example the International Bureau of education, UNESCO, UNICEF and many others. Their functions include: collecting, analyzing and disseminating educational documentation and information. They are involved in undertaking surveys and projects studies in the field of comparative education.

Lastly, individuals interested in the field of comparative education have formed a number of societies to promote comparative studies in education. Their aims are: to initiate and co-ordinate research; and to cooperate with other persons and organization in international and comparative studies. In 1956 the comparative education society was established in New York. British and German sections of the society were also established. Similar comparative education societies have been organized in Canada, Korea, Japan, and in Africa. Most of these societies are affiliated to the world council of comparative education societies.

A phase of heterodoxy

A paradigm refers to the way in which a scientific community views their field of study, identifies appropriate problems for study, and

specifies legitimate concepts and methods. Whereas, until the end of the 1960s, there existed among comparativists broad consensus as to these issues, the 1970s saw the appearance of rival paradigms - in opposition to the ideas of the social science phase - as Comparative Education entered an era of paradigm clashes or paradigm wars. Paulston (1997) this phase of comparative education a phase of heterodoxy.

The reasons for the emergence of rival paradigms are not hard to find. By the early 1970s, educationists were disillusioned with the societal effects of education, and the massive educational expansion project, which had taken place world wide since the early 1960s. For example, rather than promoting economic growth, the 1970s saw the spectre of stagflation. Instead of eradicating unemployment, the educational expansion brought the new phenomenon of schooled unemployment (cf. Blaug, 1973). Jencks demonstrated on the basis of extensive empirical analysis in his book, *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*, that education was no major determinant of social mobility.

The first line of opposition to the ideas of the 1960s, was the conflict paradigm. Conflict theories saw societies as consisting of a number of groups of unequal status and power, existing in a conflicting relationship with each other. Education is an instrument in the hands of the dominant group whereby they (the dominant group) enshrines their position and keep the powerless subdued. The following are conflict paradigms: the theories of socio-economic reproduction and cultural reproduction and dependency theory.

Sam Bowles and Harry Gintis' *Schooling in Capitalist America: Education and reform contradictions in economic life* (1976) is widely viewed as the pace-setter for theories of economic reproduction. Bowles and Gintis (1976) contend that schools which are attended by elite and middle class children, respectively prepare them for or predetermine their roles as subordinates and rulers in a capitalist economy.

Cultural reproduction theories shift the focus from correspondence between labour processes and education systems to the mediating role of culture in the production of a stratified social system. In *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (1977), Bourdieu and Passeron

(1977) deny the view that schools as independent institutions transmit neutral, independent knowledge. The accepted body of knowledge at a particular time in history is determined by the ruling class, and reflects their culture and interests.

Dependency theory projects economic and cultural correspondence theories on a world scale. Dependency theorists such as Carnoy (1974), Arnove (1982) and Altbach (1982) contend that Western industrialised nations dominate the economic and educational systems of the developing countries. Such controls seek to maintain existing inequalities, and keep the third world independent.

The second line of attack against orthodoxy, which represents an attack against the conflict paradigm too, was that of the proponents of the micro-analysis theories of ethnomethodology and phenomenology. Heyman's "Comparative Education from an ethnomethodological perspective" (*Comparative Education* 15(3), 1979) held that comparative education has not provided any useful knowledge to educational planners, policy makers and reformers, because of its decontextualised commitment to social "facts" and its narrow interest in functional and structural relationships as well as its focus on social science indicators rather than on interaction among participation in actual social and educational environments. Ethnomethodologists call for the observation, description and interpretation of the reality of everyday existence in schools and classrooms (Paulston, 1994: 926).

A PHASE OF HETEROGENEITY

During the late 1980s comparative education entered a new phase, which Paulston (1994) calls a phase of heterogeneity. The "paradigm wars" of the preceding two decades, when comparativists had directed their heavy ordnance against each other, were replaced by a tolerance if diversity, even an appreciation of the value thereof (Rust, 1996: 32; Wilson, 1994: 450, 451; Arnove, 2001: 497; Psacharopoulos, 1990: 34; Masemann, 1990: 465). The *Zeitgeist* of postmodernism entered the field of comparative education too. Postmodernism rejected the idea of metanarratives (that is the idea that *one* perspective or paradigm contained the entire truth and exclusively so) and plead for the acknowledgement of different perspectives or views. While the conflict paradigms and the frameworks of the social science phase and of the

phase before the social science phase all remained very visible (cf. Wolhuter, 2008: 335-336), a plethora of new paradigms appeared, some of which will be described in subsequent paragraphs.

Cultural revitalisation offers an extension of conflict theories and focus on deliberate, organised attempts to create more satisfactory cultures at both the national and local levels (Paulston, 1977: 388). Examples are Joseph Elder's (1971) article: "The Decolonization of Educational Culture: The Case of India" and Rolland Paulston's (1972) article "Cultural Revitalisation and Educational Change in Cuba".

Pragmatic interactionists, such as Brian Holmes (1982) viewed educational change as neither the outcome of deterministic frameworks (as both conflict theorists and those in the social science tradition contend) nor as the outcome of pure chance. Human beings are free to take decisions. Subscribing to Karl Popper's philosophy of piecemeal reform, as explained in his book *The Open Society and its Enemies* (1945) Holmes emphasises the acceptance of specific policy decisions for their instrumental value to attain a particular goal, rather than policy formulation from a rigid, deterministic, ideological frame of reference.

Critical ethnography is defined by Maeseman (1986) as studies which use a qualitative, participant-observation method for data collection, but which, for the interpretation of the data, use a corpus of theory in the conflict paradigm. This method entails participant-observation at a small scale during the first phase of research, after which the data are placed in a larger theoretical framework to make statements which the research subjects would never make about themselves. An example of critical ethnography is Judith Marshall's (1993) publication on the relation between literacy, power and democracy in Mozambique.

At least two refinements or hybridizations of the theory of modernization theory (the theory which places an unqualified belief in the power of education to act as agent of modernization in a society). Paulston (1999) defines reflexive modernity as a position which, while still clinging to the notion of a unitary space (metanarrative), is prepared to open space for other perspectives/paradigms, in order to understand "what is going on". An example is Male's (1980) study of multicultural education in Britain. Critical modernization, in turn, is reflexive modernization theory's counterpart in the conflict paradigms stable. Critical modernists abide by the basic meaning of liberalization, but

wants to blow new life and credibility into the project by selectively involving ideas from other perspectives, in order to shore up their positions. An example is Anne Hickling-Hudson's (1999) study of mistakes made in the adult literacy campaigns during the socialist revolution in Granada (1979 - 1983).

CONTEMPORARY TRENDS

A recently published survey of the history and present state of the field of comparative education, Wolhuter (2008), came to the conclusion that the field is characterised by two equally strong trends, namely a remarkable resilience/constancy amidst a broadening. The nation-state remains the most common unit of analysis, amidst calls and moves to broaden the field to larger (global, regional) and smaller (state, district, individual, class, individual) levels of analysis. Similarly, amidst a proliferation of paradigms, the interwar "factors and factors" paradigm (outlined in phase three above), remains the dominant. That publication suggests that there is much scope for the expansion of comparative education, not only in terms of more levels (levels other than the nation-state) of analysis, but also in terms of methods and topics/themes of study.

The problem with the current fixation on paradigms is that, while a proliferation of paradigms makes for an interesting and dynamic field, there is the danger that sight could easily be lost of its actual subject of study, namely education; and that amidst the diversity of paradigms, comparative education tends to become irrelevant to addressing educational issues of the day. This concern has been expressed by several eminent comparativists (e.g. Welch, 2000; Psacharopoulos, 1990; Biraimah, 2003 and Weeks *et al.*, 2006). Many of the noble ideals of Jullien, which had inspired the field, may fade away.

Two emerging focal points emerge. The first was prompted by the events of 9/11, which gave rise to talk of a "post-9/11" comparative education. Perhaps the publication demonstrating this best, what looks like it was probably a very ephemeral rallying point for scholars in the field, is Wayne Nelles' (ed.) *Comparative Education, Terrorism and Human Security: From Critical Pedagogy to Peace Building* (New York: Palgrave). However, this collection of essays does not go beyond

giving a number of “perspectives of others” and though very interesting and good quality scholarship, do not live up to the promise of its title.

The second focal point is that of globalization; however, the way this theme gets treated in comparative education too raises a number of concerns. Standaert (2008) distinguished between three stances *viz-a-viz* globalization: anti-globalisation; pro-globalization and other-globalization (the last category means an acceptance of the principle of globalization, but a desire to have a different kind of globalization than the one currently manifesting itself). In comparative education literature the anti-globalization stance dominates (*cf.* Wolhuter, 2008: 334-335). The question could be asked as to whether such an almost reality-denying comparative education can be of any value? If it could be accepted that globalization contains threats as well as unprecedented opportunities, then a promising way to take the field forward would be to restore the philanthropic ideal of the father of the field, Jullien, and to approach globalization with that ideal.

ACTIVITIES

- i. Name the seven phases constituting the historical development of comparative education and outline the characteristics of each phase.
- ii. How can the activities of each phase assist with addressing some of the educational problems your country is facing?
- iii. Page through the newspapers of the past week,. Make of a list of the problems facing the world and your country. Then, on the basis of what you have studied in the first two chapters of this book, decide:
 - a. what role education can play to address those problems
 - b. what role comparative education can play in helping education addressing those problems
 - c. is comparative education in its present state well geared to play the role outline in b; if yes why; if not, what developments/improvements need to take place first in the field of comparative education?

REFERENCES

- Altbach, P.G. (1982). Servitude of the Mind? Education, Dependency and Neocolonialism. In: Altbach, P.G.; Arnove, R.F. and Kelly, G.P. (eds). *Comparative Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Arnove, R.F. (1982). Comparative Education and World-Systems Analysis. In: Altbach, P.G.; Arnove, R.F. and Kelly, G.P. (eds). *Comparative Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Arnove, R.F. (2001). Comparative and International Education Society (CIES): Facing the twenty-first century. *Comparative Education Review* 45: 477-503.
- Biraimah, K. (2003). Transforming Education, Transforming Ourselves: Countries and lessons. *Comparative Education Review* 47(4): 423-444.
- Blaug, M. (1973). *Education and the Employment Problem in Developing Countries*. Geneva: ILO.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J.G. (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H.A. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America: Education and reform contradictions in economic life*. New York: Basic.
- Carnoy, M. (1974). *Education as Cultural Imperialism*. New York: David McKay.
- Chaube A. and Chaube S.P. (2004) *Comparative education*, Vikas publishing house PVT ltd, Delhi.
- Getao F. N. (1996) *International Education Systems: Text book in Comparative Education*, Nairobi: Lectern publications.
- Hickling-Hudson, A. (1999). Beyond Schooling: Adult education in postcolonial societies. In: Arnove, R.F. and Torres, C.A. (eds). *Comparative Education: The dialectic of the Global and the Local*. Oxford: Littlefield and Rowman.
- Male, G.A. (1980). Multicultural education and education policy: the British experience. *Comparative Education Review* 24: 291-301.

Marshall, J. (1993). *Literacy, Power and Democracy in Mozambique: The governance of learning from colonization to present*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Masemann, V. (1986). Critical Ethnography and the Study of Comparative Education. In: Altbach, P.G. and Kelly, G.P. (eds). *New Approaches to Comparative Education*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Masemann, V. 1990. Ways of knowing: Implications for Comparative Education. *Comparative Education Review* 34: 465-475.

Paulston, R.G. (1972). Cultural revitalization and educational change in Cuba. *Comparative Education Review* 16(3): 474-485.

Paulston, R.G. (1977). Social and Educational Change: Conceptual frameworks. *Comparative Education Review* 21: 370-395.

Paulston, R.G. (1994). Four Principles in a Non-Innocent Social Cartography. In: Paulston, R.G. (ed.). *Social Cartography: Mapping ways of seeing social and educational change*. New York: Garland.

Paulston, R.G. (1997). Comparative and International Education: Paradigms and theories. In: Husen, T.N. and Postlethwaite, T.N. (eds). *The International Encyclopedia of Comparative Education* (second edition). Oxford: Pergamon.

Paulston, R.G. (1999). Mapping Comparative Education after Postmodernity. *Comparative Education Review* 43(3): 438-463.

Psacharopoulos, G. (1990). Comparative Education: From theory to practice: are you A:/neo* or B:/list? *Comparative Education Review* 34: 369-380.

Rust.V.D. (1996). From Modern to Postmodern Ways of Seeing Social and Educational Change. In: Paulston, R.G. (ed.). *Social Cartography and Educational Change*. New York: Garland.

Sodhi, T.S. (1998) *Text Book of Comparative Education* (6TH edition), Vika Publishing House, Delhi.

Weeks, S.; Herman, H.D.; Maarman, R. and Wolhuter, C.C. (2006). SACHES and Comparative, International and Developmental Education in Southern Africa: the challenges and future prospects. *Southern African Review of Education* 12(2): 5-20.

Welch, A. (2000). New Times, Hard Times: re-reading Comparative Education in an age of discontent. In: Schriewer, J. (ed.). *Discourse Formation in Comparative Education*. Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang: 189-222.

Wilson, D.N. (1994). Comparative and International Education: Fraternal or Siamese twins: a preliminary genealogy of our twin fields. *Comparative Education Review* 38: 449-486.

Wolhuter, C.C. (2008). Review of the Review: constructing the identity of Comparative Education. *Research in Comparative & International Education* 3(4): 323-344.