Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education, 0305-7925
March 1995, Vol. 25, Issue 1, pp. 5-16

Comparative education in North America: The search for other through the escape from self?

Irving Epstein

Introduction

Few would argue with the contention that comparative education is at a crossroads. Not unlike the traditional social science fields, the social foundations sub-disciplines generally and comparative education in particular, have suffered as a result of general trends that have affected North American academic discourse and practice: increased disciplinary specialisation within the context of growing university corporatism, and in the 1990s, downsizing. For inherently generalist fields such as comparative education, these pressures have heightened prospects for their programmatic reduction or even elimination [1]. At the same time, they have encouraged a healthy introspection regarding current purpose and future goals [2]. The aim of this paper is to make a modest contribution to that process, through applying Pierre Bourdieu's notions of habitus, field and cultural capital to comparative education inquiry. A principle assumption of the paper is that critique void of reflectivity is incomplete, and formal critique must lead to an examination of who we are and how we project our sense of self onto our academic fields. The ways in which topics such as class, ethnicity, gender and disability are conceived within comparative education give insight into the more general issues that define that field holistically. The paper is divided into three parts. First, the social context in which comparative education is practised in North America will be analysed. Second, the field as a representation of that context will be defined. Finally, an effort will be made to assess some of the cultural capital produced by the field.

Habitus and the Practice of Comparative Education

Pierre Bourdieu's delineation of the concept of habitus lies at the heart of his concept of social practice. It serves as a bridge between notions of structure and agency, individual free choice and social determinism. Briefly summarised, one's habitus is that set of predispositions, internalised from the social structure and external environment where

one is situated, that influences without strictly predetermining one's practices, habits, beliefs, and behaviours. In his own somewhat convoluted language he states,

> The habitus, the durably installed generative principle of regulated improvisations, produces practices which tend to reproduce the regularities immanent in the objective conditions of the production of their generative principle, while adjusting to the demands inscribed as objective potentialities in the situation, as defined by the cognitive and motivating structures making up the habitus [3].

For Bourdieu, it is absolutely necessary to analyse the social context in which habitus operates if one is to obtain a clearer understanding of field.

In their practice, comparative educators claim to pursue research that reflects the search for other, defined in terms of educational policies, behaviours, and thoughts that exist in social, cultural and geopolitical environments different from their own, but they do so within a multiplicity of social contexts expressing specific habituses. In North America, for example, comparative educators act as policy makers, consultants, academicians, and practitioners, the heterogeneity of their background reflecting an historical tension that has characterised views of professionalism and the social sciences over the past two centuries. A brief description of the historical record can thus shed light as to the current state of comparative education.

Professionalism, the Social Sciences and the Growth of Comparative Education in North America

The gulf between professional and social science disciplines occurred in the late nineteenth century in the United States, as members of entrenched professions unsuccessfully attempted to use newly emerging social science disciplines as vehicles for preserving their class authority. The growing importance of domestic and foreign markets, along with improved transportation and communication mechanisms, led to an appreciation of the interdependent and complex nature of social problems. As a result, simplistic explanations that offered unilateral causal explanations for the existence of social phenomena were no longer acceptable. At the same time, the nineteenth century professional sought to define social inquiry in terms of the common sense acquired from one's own professional practice and presumed expertise [4], a proposition that became increasingly untenable.

In spite of some success in lobbying for civil service reform, the quest to secure a knowledge base that would legitimise the authority of the traditional professions proved unsuccessful, as the research university, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, took over as a most important determinant of professional prestige and authority. The record of the twentieth century indicates that the university has not only

succeeded in defining parameters for acceptable academic discourse, but that it has also encouraged narrow conceptions of professionalism reflecting its own institutional interests; interests that in the last 30 years have become increasingly corporalist. Knowledge production has increased in volume and has become more specialised, disciplinary boundaries have become more entrenched, and the gap between theory and practice has widened considerably. This has resulted in a marginalisation of the independent voice, both within the academy and between the academy and surrounding community. The academic professional, under these circumstances, has few allies in either setting [5].

The response of North American schools and colleges of education, professional units with low prestige within the academy, has been one of internally mimicking specialisation tendencies, while attempting to reinvent a commitment to social service that also reflects the values of the academy [6]. Comparative education seeks to apply the theory and methods of the social sciences to educational concerns, but in pursuing that goal, has received marginal institutional support from either professional education or social science constituencies. To be sure, the growth of comparative education centres at a few major research universities through the 1960s and 1970s provided enhanced international visibility to those education schools that housed them. Their presence addressed Cold War concerns about American educational mediocrity in light of 'Sputnik' and other international events. Comparative programmes also gave a place to international students who wished to use the resources of the western university in order to investigate educational issues in their own countries. These programmes allowed all students who were generally interested in area studies to pursue interdisciplinary work systematically, with the expectation of acquiring a doctorate, an alternative not always readily available in traditional interdisciplinary programmes. Nonetheless, in recent years, the field has faced the prospect of growing de-institutionalisation and fragmentation due to its generalist orientation and the inherent ambiguity of its character: professional yet theoretical [7].

Comparative Education as a Field

How then, has the entire field of comparative education reflected these realities? Before addressing the question directly, it may be useful to briefly review Bourdieu's notion of field. Field, for his (and our purposes) can be considered to be analogous to the playing field or the military field. It is the arena where one's habitus is transformed into a coherent set of conscious beliefs, where one uses various strategies to dominate and resist domination, through acquiring cultural capital. Fields can include the economic, the academic, the legal [8]. Three points are important in understanding his conception of field. First, although the general rules of the field are known ahead of time by its participants, those rules do not predict specific outcomes, in the same way that the rules of a sports

contest don't produce a victor before the contest begins. Second, the nature of field participation is one of contestation for power, a struggle that is never ending. Finally, in attempting to acquire cultural capital as a means of enhancing one's power, one participates (usually as a member of a class) in symbolically violent acts. With respect to the academic field, symbolic violence refers to the arbitrary exclusion or elimination of some forms of cultural capital from possible reproduction, so as to appease the interests of the dominating classes [9]. In peasant societies, symbolic violence refers to the obligation to return a favour implicit in gift exchange, regardless of whether one seeks entry into the relationship [10]. The term 'violence' is, thus, in both cases, used as an emotive metaphor for the irrational exercise of power over a subject, the irrationality of the act defining its illegitimacy.

Returning specifically to comparative education, the field began to come of age in the late 1950s and early 1960s, embracing the dominant social science paradigm of the time, structural functionalism, along with a positivist view of the possibility for conducting useful empirical comparative research on educational questions. This was not accidental. Early twentieth century pioneers, such as Hans and Kandel, set the example of using derivative conceptual frameworks (in their case, they borrowed from the humanities) in an effort to legitimise comparative inquiry. But the conclusions they deduced, that national systems of education embodied the historical roots and/or the philosophical wisdom of the society under examination, were simplistic, subjectivist and totalistic [11]. Structural functionalism and its variants, modernisation theory and human capital theory, gave promise to the possibility of putting the field on an objective footing. The politically conservative assumptions of this paradigm, which dismissed the existence of conflict as unnatural or dysfunctional, and argued that social systems naturally gravitated toward stasis and equilibrium, further served to promote a consensus status quo worldly perspective, in concert with the popular aspirations of the time.

It is not surprising that a field which sought to align itself with the social sciences would be subject to the same paradigm wars that erupted in the latter disciplines. The discovery of conflict theory and dependency theory as alternative paradigms, and the promotion of ethnographic methods and other forms of qualitative research as alternatives to the positivism and scientism that characterised mainstream comparative work, defined the terms for much of the paradigmatic conflicts that occurred within the field in the 1970s and early 1980s [12]. Yet disagreement was not limited to ideology regarding the nature of social conflict, the political imperative to modernise, or the utility of conceiving of education as investment in human capital. Comparativists alternatively stressed the nomothetic and the idiographic in their research, without reconciling the two, although pure comparative research, it had been argued, should do both simultaneously [13].

Another area of disagreement concerned the importance of framing comparative issues in problem-solving terms. Brian Holmes, in particular, used the theoretical perspectives of Popper and Dewey to justify this orientation, further aligning comparative theory with the practice of policy-making [14]. Others, such as Edmund King, objected to the inevitable narrowness of scope that such a perspective would present.

By the early 1980s, it was clear that the field had become sharply fragmented. Whether this fragmentation made it impossible for comparative educators to talk with one another, given the different premises they embraced as initial starting points for further dialogue [15], or whether this fragmentation indicated a commitment to diversity of perspective that was fundamentally healthy [16], it was reasonable to question the field's coherence and future prospects. Those who argued that diversity could ultimately become a unifying force called for an examination of cultural difference critically, yet with sensitivity [17], while the intrinsically decentred nature of the field became especially evident with the emergence of post-modernist and feminist perspectives as a part of theoretical discourse [18]. Roland Paulston views these approaches as progressive, in the sense that they not only give evidence for an increased tolerance of diversity within the field, but also demonstrate the possibility of building new theoretical constructions [19]. I am less optimistic though, and will attempt to make the argument for measured scepticism in evaluating the field's future possibilities.

It would be reductivist and simplistic to conclude that it is the lack of institutionally firm academic commitment that has led to the field's decentredness, or that the role-ambiguity inherent in comparative education practice (scholar versus policymaker, practitioner versus social scientist), is responsible for the field's conceptual fuzziness. Yet the ramifications of the social practice do resonate within the field.

Probably the most important choice comparative educators make is the decision to pursue the 'other', to investigate phenomena grounded in contexts demonstrably different from those with which we are most familiar, and in so doing, play the role of outsider. Given the inherently personal nature of educational endeavours, the courage required to extend oneself and expose oneself to cultural difference, or simply to conceive of educational issues and policies in cross-cultural terms, is not insignificant. But because the pursuit of 'other' is inextricably linked with questions of identity and sense of self that fail to be fully resolved, it is my contention that the limited understanding of self restricts scope and possibility within the comparative field.

The remaining portion of this paper will pursue this argument by examining four areas of research within comparative education: social class, ethnicity, gender, and disability. The first two areas represent dominant research thrusts, the latter two areas have been less

thoroughly researched. Yet together the four examples demonstrate the narrowness with which we conceive of time, space and body, fundamental characteristics of self.

Class, Time and Transformation

Educational scholars writing about issues of class have typically embraced explanations that stress the importance of either structure or agency in producing class identity and class conflict. In recent years, the critique of social practice has included analyses of cultural expression, influenced by the growing popularity of post-modernism. The use of time in each of these perspectives is quite interesting, but it is my contention that the usage is also limiting.

Structuralist applications of neo-Marxist principles to schooling have emphasised the ways in which schools function so as to promote class conflict by preparing students to enter a hierarchically differentiated labour force, on the basis of their class standing. While Bowles & Gintis argued that schooling practices reflected the surrounding economic inequalities that characterized modern capitalism [20], when applied to a comparative context the frame of reference is expanded to include an international stage, where educational dependency in the developing world mirrors global economic dependency. Core countries use their considerable educational resources, manifested in their control over international donor agencies, powerful universities and research centres, textbook publishing companies, computer technology, etc. to shape the terms and conditions under which educational practice and policy in the developing world is conducted. Countries that attempt to resist foreign domination are doomed to failure.

In the most comprehensive and penetrating work of this genre, Carnoy & Samoff analyse the nature of pre-conditioned capitalist states in their efforts to transform themselves through revolutionary action, into transition socialist states. The authors argue that unlike capitalist systems, where economic forces are more fully developed and allow the state to play less of an overt role in defining social relations, in countries pursuing socialist transformation, the state is held to be primarily responsible for influencing social interaction, social movements, and by extension, class consciousness [21]. When the transition to socialism is attempted, the growth of state bureaucracy, the pre-existing characteristics of the pre-conditioned capitalist state, the possibility of external military conflict, and continued disparities within the capitalist-oriented world economy all serve to hinder a successful completion of the transformation [22].

Two points should be made regarding neo-Marxist structuralist arguments concerning education. First, all of these theories conceive of time as linear, adhering to classical Marxist formulations. Pre-conditioned capitalism precedes advanced capitalism, conditioned socialism precedes a more fully developed ideal socialist state, at least in terms of economic

and political development. This assumption shares Marx's bias in defining progress in western terms. In Carnoy & Samoff's writings specifically, it is the less mature, unevenly developed societies of the developing world that, while undergoing transformation, encourage the state and state-sponsored institutions like schools, to direct the formation of social relationships and class consciousness. Second, the organisation of state institutions is considered to be bureaucratic, and while those institutions that operate in less developed countries may be more coercive and patrimonial, exercising their authority with less popular legitimacy than their counterparts in advanced capitalist economies, institutional bureaucratic structure as well as the organisation of the school is assumed to be genetically applicable to both the developed and developing word [23].

Bureaucracies, of course, operate according to their own specific sense of time: time is divisible and measurable, time is related to work, production and efficiency, Yet these views of time are themselves products of the historically specific epoch, early modern capitalism [24], and the degree of their applicability to other cultural contexts or the inevitability that they must be universally shared are debatable contentions.

The radical functionalism implicit in neo-Marxist structuralism thus reiterates the western biases so heavily criticised in modernisation theory. More importantly, the notion of class is deprived of a strong sense of agency, collective struggle, aspiration, or sense of becoming. Ultimately, class identity becomes a derivative of economic and political exigency, dependent upon the degree to which these external conditions have matured through time.

A second view of class consciousness is expressed in the writings of Hans Weiler, who has applied Habermas' concept of legitimation crisis to educational reform in Western European contexts. He argues that educational reform policies represent a compromise of conflicting interests that legitimise the role of the state as a vehicle for ameliorating, without fundamentally addressing the antecedent causes of social conflict. It is assumed that through the exercise of critical discourse, state policies can be de-legitimised on the basis of their inconsistencies, and the struggle to attain a communicative rationality that addresses the interests of all of the state's citizens can be pursued [25]. Two assumptions are prevalent here. First, it is assumed that the context for class struggle can be shifted from the world of social practice to the world of the ideological. Praxis becomes a struggle over ideas rather than actions. Second, in Habermas' world view, the modern state acts in such a way so as to allow individuals and groups to articulate their interests within a public sphere. And, it is arguable whether the public sphere has ever existed or can exist in the non-welfare state. Thus, the association of rationality with modernity, defined within a western context, again expresses a view of time that is culture bound.

A third view of class consciousness is inspired through the writings of Paolo Freire, whose pedagogical techniques inspiring consciousness raising, lead to a recognition of the oppressive conditions to which peasants in the developing world are subjected. Consciousness raising can only occur when the banking notion of education (education consists only of inert facts to be stored in a bank) is rejected, when the power relations between teacher and pupil are redrawn so as to allow generative learning, emanating from the pupils themselves, to occur. One cannot raise consciousness while marginalising one's students. In failing to consider the learner as a potentially engaged and active political actor, capable of transforming an awareness of oppression into a commitment for social action, traditional educators are remiss in their responsibilities [26].

Unlike the previous social theories, Freirian consciousness raising is timeless rather than linear. The desire to recognise and then confront unequal relationships is universal, and the popularity of Freirian methodology, which is now used in social contexts completely removed from the original conditions under which it was conceived, attests to its significance. However, the universality of the message also raises questions concerning its practical application, for when power relationships are both timeless and universal, perceptions of marginalisation, empowerment, and disempowerment, may be too generic to be adequately contextualised or understood in diverse settings. Conceptually, power defined in ethereal terms loses its force.

A final critical perspective examines cultural expression in a post-modern world. In rejecting the conventions of modernism, time is perceived as being neither linear nor universal: time is flux, time is immediate, time is constant change. This perspective, in sits embrace of relativism, implies an approval of diversity and a recognition of the authenticity of the subjective voice [27]. A key question for comparative educators though, is whether a post-modern world really exists outside of MTV, cyberspace, and the other affectations that have come to characterise western affluence. Have in fact those affectations created an artificial sense of radical individuality and subjectivity and of time as consumable? And is this sense at all transferable to other social contexts? Although the post-modern perspective may convincingly remind us of the ambiguity of daily life, constructing responses to those ambiguities that include shared meaning is a much more difficult task.

It is clear that within some of our most trenchant critical theories of social practice, time has been perceived as linear, timeless, or in a constant state of flux. (To parody Bergson, time is infinite non-duration). Yet each of these perspectives is problematic when viewed according to the mandate of the comparative educator: to search and seek out the other. A linear world places others within the framework of who we have been, and where we wish to go. A timeless world fails to make any distinction between past and present, between self and other. And a world requiring the individual to respond to the immediacy of flux and

temporality does not adequately explain how diverse voices can communicate with one another authentically. Similar issues are apparent in the ways in which we conceive of space.

Ethnicity and Social Space

Two major conceptual frameworks have been used by comparative educators to describe comparative ethnic relations. A typology of dominant and subordinate group relations that discusses responses of subordinate groups to policy, formulated and inflicted upon them by dominant groups, was conceptualised by R. A. Schermerhorn and applied to comparative education situations by Fredrick Wirt and Thomas J. Labelle & Peter White [28]. In this instance, the subordinate group's access to institutions and resources controlled by the dominant group, combined with its willingness to accept the values of the dominant group, lead to conditions of assimilation, socialised isolation, cultural pluralism, or colonialism.

John Ogbu's work has alternatively emphasised the importance of caste in analysing dominant-subordinate group relations, particularly when the subordinate group is colonised or has not emigrated to its current location on its own accord. Other caste-like conditions include the existence of persistent barriers to occupational and social mobility, status closure (such as prohibition against intermarriage), and as a consequence of these factors, a lack of faith in schooling as a means of achieving greater equality of opportunity [29]. Ogbu's provocative depiction of racial conditions in the United States as resembling those of other caste-like societies has drawn a responsive chord.

But for both Schermerhorn and Ogbu, the dynamics of intergroup conflict are largely frozen in space, and even after reading their work, one does not acquire a clear understanding of the nature of the relationship between the various groups that are discussed. Both authors assume that ethnic conflict is fuelled by the desire to acquire and exercise power, and power is always exercised in top-down fashion, from the dominant to the subordinate group. As a result, there is no explanation as to how the dominant group itself can be influenced by those it seeks to control. As intergroup relations are usually subject to rather constant change, it is unfortunate that neither approach adequately explains how and why change occurs once dominant/subordinate positions are initially achieved. Certainly, it is often true that more than two ethnic groups interact with one another, and in these instances, dominant/subordinate roles are often ambiguously ascribed. This situation, too, is not discussed at length. Finally, in mapping out the space between the dominant and subordinate ethnic group, intragroup conflict and difference is not addressed, or if it is addressed, it is minimalised. The willingness to view space as a fixed, stagnant entity, is not helpful in the pursuit of the other.

Gender, Disability and the Body

Issues of class and ethnicity are extremely important areas of research in the social sciences, and it is not surprising that they figure prominently in the field of comparative education as well. Issues of gender and disability when examined within the field, have not fared so favourably. Indeed, as Table I, surveying citations from the journal-furnished bibliographic sections in the Comparative Education Review and citations taken from the Review's own articles over the past 6 years, indicates, about 4% of all Comparative Education Review citations dealt with gender issues, and almost 0.6% dealt with disability issues. It must be admitted that the table has severe limitations. The Comparative Education Review bibliographies do not include books or book chapters, or non-English sources. However, even when these limitations are kept in mind, the statistics are indicative of the modest amount of cultural capital gender and disability issues possess within the field. Before speculating as to the reasons for this phenomenon, it may be useful to analyse a few of the dominant themes within the literature.

The Rejection of the Radical Feminist Critique

Because few conceptual frameworks have had as important an impact upon the social sciences over the past two decades as has feminist theory, it is both disturbing and revealing that so little theoretical work of this type has entered into comparative education discourse. Feminist theory can be divided into at least three distinct perspectives [31]. First, liberal feminist theory emphasises the existence of gender inequality and the social, economic, and political practices that reinforce such inequality. The state is characterised as a somewhat neutral player that has the capacity to be reformed so as to address existing inequalities. A second perspective places feminism within a traditional socialist approach. Gender inequality is largely a function of economic production, with the state reinforcing domesticity and patriarchy when the family is a viable unit of capitalist production, and later reinforcing the sexual division of labour in the work place as economic forces mature under advanced capitalism. Again, in this case, the state is viewed as a wilful contributor to gender subjugation, but is not viewed as having any independent agenda apart from complying with the dominant class interests that perpetuate economic inequality. Finally, a most provocative perspective within feminist theory argues that the state is fundamentally male, that its purpose includes the intentional subjugation of women, and that its practices are neither historically nor economically determined, but instead reflect the reality of permanent domination [32]. The de-personalisation and objectification of women, induced through social and legal tolerance for pornography, rape, the explicit effort of the state to control women's reproductive freedom, deny them personhood. In the developing world, this may also involve the sanction of genital mutilation, the state's tolerance of arranged marriage and its unwillingness to give equal access to divorce. These and other of the practices that are indicative of the state's direct role in subjugating women to subordinate and life threatening status, ultimately also deny them personhood. Given this picture, the

practices that occur within schools--negative socialisation messages concerning appropriate career aspirations and biased teacher expectancy concerning ability, behaviour, school performance, etc.--must be viewed as intentional efforts to suppress gender identity rather than unconscious functional contributions to a larger economic and social structure that seeks to reproduce economic inequality. Although Nellie Stromquist has argued that both a socialist and modified radical feminist perspective, together offer a convincing explanation for the practice of gender inequality within schools, the radical perspective has not received noticeable support on its own terms [33]. Whether or not one agrees with its assumptions, the invocation of a radical perspective would call attention to the need for a more penetrating understanding of school practice in all of its dimensions: the abuse of body through use of physical punishment, restrictions upon classroom movement and the negotiation of physical space, the effort to restrict personal expressions of taste or dress through use of the school uniform, and the explicit effort to deny the existence of sexuality and expressions of sexual preference. As these practices affect both genders, they are representative of the school's (state's) interest in control over the body, an interest that will dramatically affect women in later social settings. But insofar as the radical feminist perspective faithfully calls attention to issues of body in the general sense, the questions it raises have serious implications for everyone. These are questions that can only be answered through gathering empirical evidence that is contextualised; they are formulated and responded to through use of embodied rather than abstracted knowledge. To the extent that abstraction too conveniently places women in the developed and developing worlds under the same umbrella, and serves the purpose of denying the possibility of expressing a multiplicity of identities [34], the emphasis upon embodied knowledge emanating directly from specific social and cultural contexts, is a welcomed feature of the radical feminist perspective.

Clearly, feminist discourse has raised the treatment of the body in practical and symbolic terms, as an important area of investigation for humanistic and social scientific inquiry. But an evaluation of the relationship between body and personhood is even more clearly expressed when one examines issues of disability and, as has been noted, this is an area that has received extremely scant attention from comparative educators.

It should be stated that the sociology of special education is a vibrant area of increasing importance that has traced the growth of special education programmes to the state's efforts to create conditions of medical dependency and/or impose social and political control upon the disabled. At the same time, special education has been influenced by the assertion of political fights on the part of the disabled themselves, who have sought to either create their own independent power base or achieve recognition as a culturally unique group in a pluralistic society, with the expectation that a recognition of their legitimate status will contribute to social diversity [35]. None of these perspectives appears

to be particularly threatening or radically different from those traditionally discussed in either sociology or sociology of education research. Yet with the exceptions of Len Barton, Sally Tomlinson, and Susan Peters, there are few, if any, scholars who have consistently attempted to frame these issues in comparative terms. What separates issues of disability from other sociological concerns though, is that they directly evoke questions of personal identity. To be labelled disabled is to implicate a person's competency in every area of social interaction, including the intellectual, emotional, and sexual. Indeed, it is often the inability of the health professional or classroom teacher to accept the personhood of the patient (or student) being treated or taught, that proves to be an impenetrable barrier to successful intervention [36]. In any event, as is true of the radical feminist critique, a significant area of research that touches upon issues of body and identity has been ignored by the comparative educator.

Conclusion

What are the implications of a search for the other without coming to terms with self? In the field of comparative education, one result has been the production of cultural capital that is so formalised and abstracted from daily social practice that its usefulness can be seriously questioned. This is true of both research that seeks to discover the nomothetic and that which relies upon the case study to make its argument. Something is wrong when we are only able to view other cultures holistically, when our perceptions of time must be either diachronic, synchronic, or timeless, without allowing for the possibility that two or all of these modes simultaneously may exist independently or relationally, in different settings. An inability to conceive of social space as being relational and dynamic hinders our range of perception regarding group conflict and group interaction. And an unwillingness to consider the way in which the body is treated on an everyday basis limits our ability to examine issues of identity, personhood, their social construction, and their potential transformation.

The de-institutionalised nature of the conditions under which we practice comparative education has been noted, and it is certainly understandable that there is a strong desire to speak to a loyal audience, given the heterogeneity of our own habituses, and the de-centredness of the field. It is not surprising that the type of research western-educated comparative educators have produced is safe, predictable, and easily digestible for a compliant audience in search of shared ground. But if the field is to grow, it will have to do a better job of exploring the many habituses that constitute social practice in its complexity and ambiguity. Such a process can start with the realisation that as the search for self and discovery of other are inextricably linked, comparative research cannot continue to emanate from a few major western institutions, to be conducted by like-minded scholars. When the power imbalances implicit in conducting comparative research begin to be

redressed, researchers from the 'other' will be asked to recommend educational policy changes that will be enthusiastically applied to the institutions, issues, and social contexts with which the self assumes intimate familiarity. Perhaps then, the idealism that has defined the field's sense of purpose since its inception, will be susceptible to realisation.

TABLE 1. Comparative education articles dealing with gender and disability (19881993) [30]

	Number	Percentage
Gender	125	4.06
Disability	18	0.585
Total Citations	3079	100.00

Correspondence: Dr Irving Epstein, Associate Professor, Department of Education, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, MI 49006, USA.

NOTES

[1] The decision in 1993 to eliminate Stanford University's SIDEC (Stanford International Development Education Committee) programme is thus particularly unfortunate, given this context.

[2] See, for example, HEYNEMAN, STEPHEN P. (1993) Quantity, Quality, and Source, Comparative Education Review, 37, pp. 372-388.

[3] BOURDIEU, PIERRE (1977) Outline of a Theory of Practice, p. 78 (New York, Cambridge University Press).

[4] See HASKELL, THOMAS L. (1977) The Emergence of Professional Social Science, pp. 24-47 (Urbana, University of Illinois). It is revealing that the American Social Science Association rounded in 1865, modelled itself after the British National Association for Social Science, and included four departments: education, public health, jurisprudence, and economy, trade, and finance. These departments of course, represented the prominent professions of the time, positioned in such a way as to define the scope and acceptable boundaries of social inquiry. See HASKELL, THOMAS L. (1977) op. cit., pp. 91-121.

[5] See JACOBY, RUSSELL (1987) The Last Intellectuals: American culture in the age of academe (New York, Basic Books).

[6] The efforts of the Holmes group, to upgrade teacher preparation to graduate status is one example of the effort. More recent calls for greater university/school district collaboration, for the purposes of enhancing action research, or awarding teachers advanced degrees, is another. On the latter, see, GOODLAD, JOHN 1. (1993) School-university partnerships and partner schools, Educational Policy 7, pp. 23-24; CASE, CHARLES W., NORLANDER, KAY A. & REAGAN, TIMOTHY G. (1993) Cultural transformation in an urban professional development center: policy implications for school-university collaboration, Educational Policy, 7, pp. 40-60.

[7] See Ross, HEIDI, TO, CHO-YEE, CAVE, WILLIAM. & BAIR, DAVID E. (1992) On shifting ground: the post-paradigmatic identity of US comparative education, 1979-1988, Compare, 22, pp. 113-131.

[8] BOURDIEU, PIERRE (1977) Op. Cit., pp. 184-190.

[9] The issue is discussed fully in BOURDIEU, PIERRE & PASSERON, JEAN-CLAUDE (1977) Reproduction (Beverly Hills, Sage Publishing).

[10] BOURDIEU, PIERRE (1977) op. cit, pp. 191-197.

[11] See KANDEL, I.L. (1959) The methodology of comparative education, International Review of Education, 5, pp. 270-280; HANS, NICHOLAS (1959) The historical approach to comparative education, International Review of Education. 5, pp. 299-309.

[12] An overall account is offered in PAULSTON, ROLAND G. (1993) Mapping discourse in comparative education texts, Compare, 23, pp. 101-114. See, specifically, Comparative Education Review, 28 (November 1984) where the entire issue is devoted to a discussion of contrasting theoretical approaches, and Comparative Education Review (1990), 34, pp. 369-404, where a colloquy on comparative theory revisits similar issues. Also, see KELLY, GAlL P. (1992) Debates and trends in comparative education, in: ROBERT F. ARNOVE, PHILIP G. ALTBACH & GAll. P. KELLY (Eds) Emergent Issues in Education: comparative perspectives (New York, SUNY Press).

[13] PRZEWORSKI, ADAM & TEUNE, HENRY (1970) The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry (New York, John Wiley).

[14] HOLMES, BRIAN (1981) Comparative Education: some considerations of method pp. 76-110 (London, Allen & Unwin).

[15] See EPSTEIN, ERWIN (1983) Currents left and right: ideology in comparative education, Comparative Education Review, 27, pp.3-29.

[16] KELLY, GAlL P. & ALTBACH, PHILIP G. (1986) Comparative education; challenge and response, Comparative Education Review, 30, pp. 89-107.

[17] See for example, MASEMANN, VANDRA (1990) Ways of knowing: implications for comparative education, Comparative Education Review, 34, pp. 465-473; and HAYHOE, RUTH E.S. (1989) A Chinese puzzle, Comparative Education Review, 33, pp. 155-175.

[18] See for example, RUST, VAL (]991) Post-modernisation and its comparative education implications, Comparative Education Review, 35, pp. 610-626; and HEIDI Ross's review of PATTI LATHER'S Getting Smart: feminist research and pedagogy within the post-modern, titled, The tunnel at the end of the light: research and teaching on gender and education, Comparative Education Review (May 1992), pp. 343-354.

[19] PAULSTON, ROLAND G. (1993) op. cit., 110; this is also the view of Ross, ET AL. (1992) op. cit.

[20] BOWLES, SAMUEL. & GINTIS, HERBERT (1976) Schooling in Capitalist America (New York, Basic Books).

[21] CARNOY, MARTIN & SAMOFF, JOEL (1990) Education and Social Transition in the Third World, p. 12 (Princeton, Princeton University Press).

[22] CARNOY, MARTIN & SAMOFF, JOEL (1990) op. cit., p. 23.

[23] See CARNOY, MARTIN (1992) Education and the state: from Adam Smith to perestroika, in: ARNOVE, ROBERT, F. ET AL. (Eds), op. cit., pp. 143-159.

[24] THOMPSON, E.P. (1967) Time, work-discipline and industrial capitalism, Past and Present, 38, pp. 56-97.

[25] WEILER, HANS (1983) West Germany: educational policy as compensatory legitimation, in: R. MURRAY THOMAS (Ed.) Politics and Education, pp. 34-54 (New York, Pergamon Press); (1988) The politics of reform and non-reform in French education, Comparative Education Review, 32, pp. 251-265; HABERMAS, JURGEN (1984) The Theory of Communicative Action, Vol. l: reason and the rationalization of society (Boston, Beacon Press); (1979)Legitimation Crisis (Boston, Beacon Press).

[26] FREIRE, PAOLO (1970) Pedagogy of the Oppressed (New York, Seabury).

[27] In addition to LATHER and RUST, see GITLIN, TODD (1988) Hip-deep in post-modernism, The New York Times Book Review, (6 November), pp. 35-36.

[28] See SCHERMERHORN, R.A. (1970) Comparative Ethnic Relations: a framework for theory and research (New York, Random House); WIRT, FREDRICK M. (1982) The stranger within my gate: ethnic minorities and school policy in Europe, in: PHILIP G. ALTBACH, ROBERT F. ARNOVE & GAlL P. KELLY (Eds) Comparative Education, pp. 119-136 (New York, Macmillan); LABELLE, THOMAS J. & WHITE, PETER S. (1980) Education and multiethnic integration, Comparative Education Review 24, pp. 155-173.

[29] OGBU, JOHN U. (1982) Equalization of Educational Opportunity and Racial/Ethnic Inequality, in: ALT-BACH, PHILIP G. ET AL. (Eds), op. cit., pp. 269-289; see also, OGBU, JOHN U. (1983) Minority status and schooling in plural societies, Comparative Education Review, 27, pp. 168-190; GIBSON, MARGARET A. & OGBU, JOHN U. (Eds) (1991) Minority Status and Schooling: a comparative stud)' of immigrant and involuntary minorities (New York, Garland).

[30] For the purposes of this survey, the term gender was defined to include descriptors such as women's education, girl's education, single sex education, as well as gender; disability was defined to include descriptors such as special education, gifted, handicapped, exceptional as well as disability.

[31] These perspectives are summarized in STROMQUIST, NELLY P. (1990) Gender inequality in education: accounting for women's subordination, British Journal of Sociology of Education, 11 pp. 137-153.

[32] See MACKINNON, CATHERINE A. (1989) Toward a Feminist Theory of the State (Cambridge, Harvard University Press).

[33] In addition to STROMQUIST, for a socialist feminist explanation of gender inequality, see KELLY, GAlL P & NIHLEN, ANN S. (1982) Schooling and the reproduction of patriarchy: unequal workloads, unequal rewards, in: MICHAEL W. APPLE (Ed.) Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education pp. 163-180 (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul); KELLY, GAlL P. (1992) Women and higher education reforms: expansion without equality, in: PETER W. COOKSON, JR, ALAN R. SADOVNIK & SUSAN F. SEMEL (Eds) International Handbook of Educational Reform (New York, Greenwood); KELLY, GAIL P. Education, women and change, in: ARNOVE, PHILIP G. ET AL. (Eds) op. cit., pp. 267-281.

[34] See MOHANTY, CHANDRA TALPADE (1991) Cartographics of struggle: third world women and the politics of feminism, in: CHANDRA TALPADE MOHANTY, ANN RUSSO & LOURDES TORRES (Eds) Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism (Bloomington, Indiana University Press).

[35] For social control theories, see TOMLINSON, SALLY, (1982) A Sociology of Special Education (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul); BARTON, LEN (Ed.) (1988) The Politics of Special Education Needs (Falmer, East Sussex, Falmer Press); BARTON, LEN and TOMLINSON, SALLY (Eds) (1984) Special Education and Social Interests (London, Croom Helm); and in the United States, see LAZERSON, MARVIN (1983) The origins of special education, in: JAY G. CHAMBERS & WILLIAM T. HARTMAN (Eds) Special Education Policies (Philadelphia, Temple University Press); MILOFSKY, CARL, (1986) Special education and social control, in: JOHN G. RICHARDSON (Ed.) Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Special Education (Westport, Corm., Greenwood Press); for an excellent analysis of various cultural paradigms of the disabled including political and pluralistic strategies, see PETERS, SUSAN J. (Ed.) Education and Disability., in Cross-Cultural Perspective, pp. 19-38 (New York, Garland).

[36] See, for example, GOODE, DAVID A. Socially produced identities, intimacy, and the problem of competence among the retarded, in: BARTON, LEN & TOMLINSON, SALLY (Eds) op. cit, 228-247.

~~~~~~~~

By IRVING EPSTEIN, Kalamazoo College, MI, USA
~~~~~~~~