Expanding the Notion of “World-Class” Higher Education Institutions

Sylvia S. Bagley, Mount St. Mary’s College
Laura M. Portnoi, California State University, Long Beach

Given the ascendancy of international ranking systems—most notably the Times Higher Education World University Rankings (THE) and Shanghai Jiao Tong University’s Academic Ranking of World Universities—various actors within the worldwide higher education sector are increasingly striving to achieve the “world-class” status currently ascribed to elite research universities. Central characteristics of world-class higher education institutions (HEIs) include high-quality and prolific research production; elite faculty and students; an abundance of increasingly privatized resources; favorable governance; rich learning cultures; global missions; and networks with other elite HEIs (Altbach, 2004; Altbach & Salmi, 2011; Khoon et al., 2005; Mohrman, Ma, & Baker, 2008; Salmi, 2009). Such conceptualizations of world-class HEIs imply several key factors: that the institution in question is a university (rather than a college or other form of HEI); that it has an interest in (and capability to pursue) a rigorous research agenda; and that competing with other comparable research universities around the world—not only for a top rank, but also for top students, faculty, and resources—is one of its primary goals. Media coverage contributes to the “discourse on global competition” (Portnoi & Bagley, 2011) that pervades the world-class debate by hyping certain criteria—such as research productivity in top-ranked journals, peer judgment, and reputation—at the expense of others.

Such narrow definitions of world-class status, however, counter what we all know to be true about the rich and varied landscape of higher education across the globe. As Salmi (2009) puts it, there is a need to develop “excellent alternative institutions to meet the wide range of education and training needs that the tertiary education system is expected to satisfy” (p. 13). Despite the dominant discourse around world-class status, excellence in higher education has never been restricted to research universities; numerous HEIs around the globe strive toward a different form of excellence by meeting a broad variety of local, regional, and national needs. Such institutions, as Altbach (2011) points out, could also be considered “world-class,” simply based on “doing the best possible job in the context of mission or location” (p. 2).

Indeed, despite the growing influence of international ranking mechanisms and an increasingly pervasive discourse on global competition, not all countries or HEIs strive toward world-class status as narrowly defined within the dominant global rhetoric. Rather, the “trend” toward global competition is consistently mediated through “vernacular globalization,” or globalization from below (Appadurai, 1996; Lingard, 2000), with various stakeholders intervening innumerable ways, depending on the local context. Countless...
HEIs, for instance, are less concerned with increasing their research output—a critical component of climbing the academic rankings ladder—than with improving their relevance to local populations, addressing regional concerns, refining the quality of teaching, and increasing access to underserved populations (Wilson, 2011). Brazil’s leading university, the Universidade de São Paulo (USP), considers itself as a local institution and maintains almost exclusive instruction in its native Portuguese (Schwartzman, 2007). More specifically, it views itself as a “provincial” institution, with a strong connection to the state of São Paulo despite its national (and global) reputation. Meanwhile, amid great controversy, Syracuse University in New York is privileging a more diverse student body and stronger connections with the local community, at the expense of its ranking status. In California, community colleges such as Santa Monica College and Pasadena City College consider themselves to be “world-class,” given that they provide a high-quality education to students from around the globe, and possess numerous “world-class” faculty members—yet their stature as colleges rather than research universities prevents them from ever being ranked among the official “world-class” HEIs as defined by the dominant view.

Which countries and regions benefit from the dominant rhetoric on world-class research institutions, and which are left out? We contend that the current notion of “excellence” in higher education is neoliberal in nature, with an emphasis on competition, “one-upmanship,” and, as Marginson (2011) has noted, uniformity of purpose. Indeed, the drive toward world-class HEIs perpetuates the global inequities of the postcolonial world. We posit that striving toward world-class status should not necessarily (or only) imply a desire to rate highly or move up on the current international HEI rankings. Dominant notions of world-class and excellence must be expanded to include alternative, context-specific definitions for determining the value of any given institution. Rather than reporting and researching almost exclusively about research universities worldwide that are striving to “place” somewhere on one of the prestigious ranking systems, we can and should argue for alternative conceptualizations of world-class excellence, based on local contexts. Only then will the rich variety of excellence in the global higher education landscape truly be seen, acknowledged, and valued.
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From the Editor...

This issue of CIES Perspectives includes readers’ commentary on two recently published articles: one originally appearing in the Society’s journal, Comparative Education Review, and a second one that was published in this publication. We also received responses by the articles’ authors to the critiques.

Any scholarly society is fundamentally about communicating knowledge. Our publications and forums provide ample opportunity for that. But as much as we devote time and resources to communicating what we know and have discovered to others, it is important to remember that communication is supposed to be part of a conversation. We should be willing as authors to engage in conversations with our readers in public after publication, just as we engage with our reviewers in private before publication.

This conversation is a key element, of course, in the public presentations that are featured through the Society’s annual conference (a Call for Proposals is also announced in this issue). Face-to-face dialogue and debate over preliminary findings and theoretical insights are the way science progresses. And it is equally important to try out new ideas and arguments in the up close and personal space of a conference hall. Publishing ongoing conversations about research and theory in the newsletter, however, allows the dialogue to be documented and referenced for the future edification of the field.

I would like to acknowledge CER editor David Post for his suggestion that this sort of dialogue be picked up and promoted in the pages of CIES Perspectives. It should, I think, be a regular feature here, and I welcome future contributions from those who wish to continue the conversation.

September 2012
Kevin Kinser
Email: KKinser@uamail.albany.edu

Reflecting on “Education as that which liberates” and “Worldwide Education Revolution”

Themes from the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) Conferences, 2011 & 2012
(Podcast version available: http://mozambicanscholar.podbean.com/category/comparative-and-international-education/page/3/)

By José Cossa

To reflect on or about something requires that we have a memory of some aspects about such a thing we are wishing to reflect about. In this essay, I wish to reflect on the CIES 2011 theme “Education is that which Liberates” as a gateway to preparing our minds for the CIES 2012 theme “The Worldwide Education Revolution”.

In my view, as expressed in the poem I read (with Yvonne Kamugisha’s vocal accompaniment in song) during the Africa SIG’s opening highlighted session (poem available online: http://youtu.be/hZCtg2JhvYM), there is a need to push the boundary of our discussions beyond the comfortable zone of educational rhetoric—what sounds like genuine problematizing of education framed within an appealing of (higher spirits and) forces that could jeopardize our professional careers, if offended. We educators, in this sense, tend to be very superstitious: aware of the realities of everyday injustices yet holding on to the constant appeasing of those who have the power to influence our economic security. We engage in the problematic to the extent that it is within the comfort zone of the dominant powers in our most influential institutions (e.g., government, funding agencies, universities, etc.).

This conflict between the awareness (and dislike) of social injustices and social evils amidst the need to preserve our socio-economic comfort turns the old Sanskrit motto “education is that which liberates” into a myth, adding to the many myths that have characterized formal education since its inception. This is not to say that all educations are myth-laden, but that the dominant form of education, upon which we have made many messianic claims, is myth-laden. These myths, perhaps only by virtue of our own narcissistic presentation of such education as the solution to the world’s problems, nevertheless dictate how we shape its appearance in regards to curricula, values, and ultimate goals. If we were true to our own struggles with global injustice and even more true to the fact that, despite our claims, we often contribute to the perpetuation of such injustice, perhaps we would be myth-ridden in our articulation of the ends of the education we promote.
Today, it is very fashionable in academia to claim militancy for social justice. Yet, we often miss the fact that claiming social justice does not imply living a social justice life-style. We are comfortable talking about social justice and liberation, to some extent within comfortable philosophical settings, yet we are not bold enough to confront ourselves about how our human core has been tempered with by misconceptions of the essence of justice and, therefore, of liberation. Does education really liberate? If my answer is ‘yes’, I will be succumbing to the status quo; if my answer is ‘depends’ or ‘maybe’, I will be succumbing to the realm of mere intellectual argumentation; if my answer is ‘no’, I will be entering a rebellion against all that I have been taught that is founded on dogmatic, agentic strains of critical social theory. The effect of such methodological trends is to bolster artificially the claim for convergence and consensus in cross-national educational models. Finally, the authors document a shift in the analytic language used over the 30-odd years of the world culture approach’s existence, from a more dynamic, contingent account of “rationalized myths” exercising global influence, to a more celebratory and prescriptive account of “world models” and “world culture” enacted and embraced globally. The effect of such a shift is to introduce a paralyzing sense of inevitability into global flows and appropriations of educational ideas; the juggernaut of liberal values becomes one more “just so” story in the Western imaginary.

There is much close reading and brilliant argumentation in the article, yet despite my admiration for it I can’t help but wonder why the authors choose not to situate themselves within the well-known traditions of critical social theory. At the end of the article, the authors do point us to some of these traditions—Marxist, post-structural, postcolonial—for alternative understandings of the same phenomena examined by world culture theorists. Yet drawing more explicitly on today’s non-dogmatic, agentic strains of critical social

Commentary on CER Articles

Commentary to “Between Faith and Science: World Culture Theory and Comparative Education,” by Stephen Carney, Jeremy Rappleye and Iveta Silova

By Bradley A. Levinson (brlevins@indiana.edu)

In their recent article, “Between Faith and Science: World Culture Theory and Comparative Education,” Stephen Carney, Jeremy Rappleye and Iveta Silova illuminate and deconstruct one of the most powerful currents of scholarship in contemporary comparative education scholarship—the so-called “world culture” school. This is a valuable and timely intervention, not least because the world culture approach has by now attained the status of orthodoxy in some quarters of our field, and because its normative ambitions betray a conservative agenda despite(or because

of?) its pretensions to scientific objectivity and its celebration of Western “progress.” In this commentary, I shall indicate some ways that the authors’ critique could be deepened and extended, even as I suggest that the critique must also be turned back on itself to constantly interrogate the conditions of its own production.

The Carney, et al. article presents three main areas of world culture theory for critique. First, the authors highlight world culture theory’s tendentious interpretation of Max Weber’s approach to theorizing the spread of bureaucracy and rationalization. In a powerfully insightful move, the authors identify how world culture theorists interpret Weber through the prism of Talcott Parsons’ prior reading, which elides Weber’s emphasis on interests and domination, and places instead a positive functionalist spin on Weber’s otherwise cautionary account. Second, the authors identify empirical and methodological shortcomings in the world culture approach, showing how its practitioners opt for quantitative “breadth” over depth, “take liberties” in the samples they claim to be representative, and often substitute reference to like-minded arguments for empirical substantiation. The effect of
Some of the key principles of critical social theory that could help further illuminate the kind of ideological work accomplished by world culture theory are reflexivity, interestedness, contingency, and knowledgeable agency. Taking the first two together, I note that one of the fundamental injunctions of all critical theories is that social knowledge must be turned back upon itself (reflexivity) and analyzed in relation to the social conditions and interests that constitute it. Put differently, there is no such thing as disembodied objectivity or disinterested knowledge. Carney and his co-authors certainly call attention to the lack of reflexivity (and humility) in the pronouncements of world culture theorists, and they emphasize that world culture theory’s confident claims tend more to produce than to explain the existence of a “world culture” (368). They also note the pretensions to universalism and scientific objectivity in world culture theory, the recourse to large data sets and a triumphalist discourse about “facts” (certainly there is little concern expressed about the notorious unreliability of self-reported survey data). Yet a critical theoretical approach would pose more questions about the social conditions and embodied interests, the matrices of power, which spawn and energize world culture theory. What institutions, for instance, support such research, and hire and promote such theorists (e.g., major American research universities, major multi-lateral lending agencies)? Are the race, gender, and class interests embodied by such theorists overwhelmingly white, male, and middle-class? What substantive values and commitments—such as individual rights, equality of opportunity, indeed the full liberal substrate of American imperial culture—do such theorists hold most dear, and how do such values issue from their interests and inform their research?

From these questions it is not a far leap to consider the many ways that world culture theory itself ignores the play of power, interest, and contestation in the adoption of educational forms and ideas. As Carney and his co-authors note, because of their particular reading of Weber world culture theorists celebrate a kind of globalizing “rationality” rather than critique it, and they show little awareness of capitalist political economy and the conditionalities placed on educational development in the global South (Arnove, 1980) and democratizing East. In their cheerleading for the “worldwide success” of mass schooling, moreover, there is little reckoning of the problems and losses that such schooling arguably tends to bring along with its so-called “cognitive achievements”—e.g., a divorce from situated ecological knowledge (see Rival, 1996), a rupture of salutary kin-based socialization, a Cartesian compartmentalization of the utilitarian self. At a time when the world faces environmental, economic, and moral crises of unprecedented scale, critical social theorists ask us to question the dominant narratives of Western liberal progress and wonder where we also went wrong.

Another leitmotif of recent critical social theories has been the emphasis on the knowledgeable actor amidst powerful structuring forces, and the historical contingency of all social action. What world culture theory offers us instead—and it surprises me that Carney et al. do not identify this feature as such—is a reinvigorated form of structural analysis. The world culture approach stops just short of mechanistic determinism, but like all structuralisms this one, too, must privilege a singular impetus to action; here we have a “culture” with the overwhelming force to “enact” itself upon most populations and governments around the world. And like all structuralisms, this one, too, erases knowledgeable agency and the many traces of past and ongoing struggle by subaltern groups to utilize and define education according to their own needs, values, and interests. To be fair, in world culture theory there is a dynamic historical account of the origins of mass schooling, and there is also a nod to the phenomenological literature on the social construction of institutions, a la Peter Berger. Yet such nuances ultimately get subsumed by the structural logic of their argument; in their account, institutions do more than “socially construct” attitudes and perceptions, they all but determine them. It is especially ironic that an outdated anthropological conception of culture gets drafted into this enterprise. For instance, Baker and LeTendre (2005, p. 11) pull their definition of culture as “shared meaning” from the pen of Louise Spindler (1977); one gets a sense of culture as a materially unmoored but nevertheless all-powerful script that compels consensual action. For more than twenty years now, most anthropologists have abandoned this simplistic view of culture for a more grounded one that fully admits the play of power, contradiction, and contingency (Gupta and Ferguson, 1997; Levinson, 2000).

It’s important to acknowledge that, as hegemonies go, world culture theory is relatively benign, since it purports to herald gender equity, human rights, individual freedoms, and so forth. Many of the substantive goals would seem to be shared by critical theorists and world culture theorists alike. That being said, what makes the structuralist mode of argumentation insidious is precisely its implicit denial of the struggles that required liberalism reluctantly to fulfill its promises. More importantly still, the policy recommendations that world culture theory enunciates assumes the continued prevalence of elite, technical policy formation processes in limited representative democracies and multilateral agencies. Critical social theories, on the other hand, endorse a more dialogic, broadly participatory approach to democratic policy formation (e.g. Levinson et al., 2000). Such an approach holds out the promise of engaging a greater diversity of educational actors and stakeholders, so that notions of “rights” and “freedoms” actualized in practice carry the imprint of active cultural negotiation rather than imposition.

Finally, critical theorists must be prepared to engage in the same reflexive critique of our own work. Like Carney et al., I, too, have often played the role of academic critic, of deconstructive sniper. Yet we have to ask the hard questions about what institutional and subject-positions, what value commitments and social imaginaries, make our own knowledge both possible and desirable. It is much easier to dismiss the complications of scholars whose work dovetails nicely with dominant policy trends than to
wade into the messy and complicated business of policy formation ourselves. Rather than simply deriding the facile “policy relevance” constructed in our colleagues’ work, we should work to build and exemplify a different way of becoming “relevant” to policy through various modes of engaged critical social science. From Flyvbjerg’s (1998, 2001) “phronetic” study of urban planning policy to André-Bechely’s (2005) feminist institutional ethnography of school choice, from Oakes and Rogers’ (2006) account of research for social movement activism to Sousa Santos and Avritzer’s (2004) case studies of “democratized democracy,” in the English-language literature alone we have many such examples (Not surprisingly, some of the best examples come from activist scholars in the Global South whose work has not been translated into English). Characterized by collaborative dialogue and the reflexive negotiation of values, they challenge the hierarchies by which expert knowledge is typically proffered to policy on high. We would do well to listen and learn.
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Comments on “Between Faith and Science”

Kathryn Anderson-Levitt (kandersonlevitt@ucla.edu)

Stephen Carney, Jeremy Rappleye and Iveta Silova raise important questions about research by world culture theory in their essay in the August 12 issue of CER. Their location of this version of neo-institutionalism within the broader neo-institutionalist framework is tremendously helpful. I would like to comment on a few other points in their essay.

Representing the World

On the question of mis-representing partial data as global data, these authors are right to argue that Baker and LeTendre over-reach when they claim that the TIMSS database of 53 countries can stand in for the whole world. TIMSS is a lopsided collection of countries weighted toward Europe and North America. However, the best world culture analyses aim more systematically for world coverage. For example, when Benavot and Riddle (1988) constructed the database on which Meyer, Ramirez, et al. (1992) drew for an important article, they reported primary enrollment information for 120 countries for the 1935-40 period. Along the same lines, Meyer, Kamens et al. (1992) assembled official primary curriculum information for 75 countries for the post-World War II, and “the West” (North America, Australia and western Europe) makes up just 12% of their sample for that era. Some of the recent studies likewise seem to aim for coverage across all regions of the world, such as Frank et al.’s analysis of the university history curricula of 83 countries (2000) and Schofer and Meyer’s study of the expansion of university enrollments in about 124 countries (2005).
There are, of course, problems with the sampling—notably, later data sets are three or four times larger than earlier data sets, and many of the additions are former colonies whose school systems were established by Western metropoles. This biases the evidence in favor of convergence. Benavot and Riddle (1988) and Meyer et al. (1992) addressed the issue by constructing smaller subsamples or “panels” of countries for which they had complete data sets across all time periods—but this forced them back to over-representation “the West.” Since all samples are problematic, I would like to see all of these studies include an appendix actually listing the data country by country, as found in Benavot and Riddle (1988) but in none of the other publications, so that readers can make better informed judgments about the trustworthiness of the analyses.

Myths and Models

Carney, Rappleye and Silova are also right to point out the cheery optimism that tints some of the later work in world culture theory. However, I would not use the shift from the word “myth” to the word “model” as evidence that necessarily signals a shift from description to prescription. Whereas in common parlance “myth” may signify a fictional story and “model” an ideal to attain, as an anthropologist I read “myth” to mean any story, however true to reality, of epic implications, and “model” to mean simply a physical or mental representation. Contrary to phrasing one sometimes finds in world culture theory and elsewhere in comparative education, cultures do not act, and neither do models. People act, and in doing so they may use myths or models or recipes or any manner of tools as guides, but generally improvise or modify as they do so (Anderson-Levitt in press).

Meaning Need Not Be Shared by Very Many People

Carney, Rappleye and Silova point out that world culture theory fails to demonstrate consensual local meaning. In fact, many studies have demonstrated that “global ‘sameness’” dissipates when we “move beyond the policy texts,” as they put it. However, I am not so sure that world culture theory requires consensus among masses of people across the globe. For at least some world culture theorists, what counts as world culture is not necessarily widely shared; rather, it is whatever is successfully claimed as world culture by those relatively few people who manage to make decisions about policy. That is how I read the “as if” in the following claim: “To say that a cultural element is universalistic . . . is to say that the element is presented to the world ‘as if’ it were universally meaningful, applicable, useful, or proper” (Lechner & Boli 2005: 21).

Where We Agree and Where We Don’t

What most strikes me most about Carney, Rappleye and Silova’s critique is how they bring into focus where they agree with world culture theory and where they disagree. First, they agree that there are similarities—isomorphisms—in official forms of schooling across more and more countries and a larger and larger percentage of the world’s population. Second, they agree that there can be huge discrepancies—identified as “loose coupling” by world culture theorists—between official forms of schooling and what actually happens on the ground. My take on these two points is that, while it is crucial to understand how actors re-interpret or even subvert global models, the worldwide spread of schooling nonetheless matters for local practice. Placing almost all of the world’s children in schools, however those schools operate locally, must have an effect on skills and ideas and even values learned around the world (Rogoff et al. 2005).

So the big point of contention remains, as it has for decades, the issue of power (Ginsburg, et al. 1990). World culture theorists fail to acknowledge that sometimes economic pressure from other countries forces a ministry of education to adopt a policy. They also don’t recognize that the science and cachet that can make “global” ideas so attractive depend on global inequities—the wealth behind universities, research institutes, and academic publishing from the dominant countries. It is good to see Carney, Rappleye and Silova put the focus back on powerful people who manage to make changes that are not always good for other people and certainly not inevitable.
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Response from Stephen Carney, Jeremy Rappleye, and Iveta Silova

In our recent essay “Between Faith and Science,” we sought to interrogate some of the foundations on which current world culture research is grounded and to use this as a basis for questioning the methodology of the approach, as well as critiquing its increasingly normative political stance. A multi-dimensional statement of this type offers unique possibilities for working theoretically, historically, and across a wide range of examples of the genre but, inevitably, it opens one to the charge of superficiality. That is a challenge for any writer(s) seeking to problematize a well-established academic debate and we are fully aware of (and looking forward to) the consequences and opportunities it holds.

As a team of writers, all three of us approached the world culture debate with certain individual concerns. While these concerns are more fully elaborated in an upcoming special issue of Globalization, Societies, and Education (2013), we felt that it was important to make a collective statement that brought together – however briefly and incompletely – the key elements of our critique. Undoubtedly, other issues might have been highlighted to reinforce or deepen our argument. For example, in addition to exploring the reception of Max Weber’s writing in North American social science, we might have illustrated the extent to which Talcott Parson’s interpretation of Emil Durkheim was also compromised by Parson’s own research agenda (Pope, 1973). More recently, world culture writing tries to attach singular meaning to the writing of Erving Goffman, especially the notion that the self is shaped primarily by acts of ritual, devotion, and ceremony when in actuality Goffman also emphasized that the individual attaches singular meaning to the writing of education in the so-called “developing” world. We could have also provided more evidence of the normative inclination in the most recent world culture scholarship through the analysis of the discursive shift from “myths” to “models,” as well as elaborated on the implications for comparative education research. While unable to pursue these lines of critique more fully in Comparative Education Review, we will further elaborate on these ideas in the special issue of Globalization, Societies, and Education.

One particularly provocative element in the CER essay is our implication that it is not only the latter generations of world culture writers who embody a more normative agenda in their scholarship, but that this normativity is built into the foundational and programmatic writing of John Meyer himself. We make that charge, to a point, but also acknowledge that this is one area in particular that requires further exploration, not least because the “myth” surrounding this early work is that it is impartial, if not ambivalent, towards the assumed ascendency of the European Enlightenment model of society.

Even though all research is partial (which we acknowledge explicitly in the essay), we have attempted to address the most pressing issues surrounding the world culture debate in recent years. Even though we received many supportive comments from colleagues in the CIES community and beyond, there has been no response from scholars associated with the world culture genre. As such, we can only respond to the commentaries of those presented here.

Anderson-Levitt’s commentary on our nice article captures “where we agree and where we don’t.” She makes an important point that much of the discussion within the world culture debate concerns issues of “culture,” locality, and context that are ignored or avoided in both the world culture genre as well as our critique. Anderson-Levitt’s (2012) recent and important contribution to this discussion highlights just how contested and problematic the concept of “local” has become in social science, how the spatialization of place(s) persist in anthropological and ethnographic work, and how we need to think afresh and with more sophistication about the concept of “power.” This work awaits others!

Levinson’s commentary is spot on by pointing out that our critique could have been a jumping-off spot for a thorough elaboration of tangible ways forward. The Marxist-inspired route would have been persuasive as indeed would any number of “critical” analytical strategies. Strategically, we chose not to shape our critique through an alternative theoretical or conceptual lens, not least because this would have complicated our message (that the world culture genre is overly normative) and offered writers within that genre the opportunity to respond to the limitations of what they view as competing social theories rather than address the arguments laid out in the essay itself. More importantly, however, we felt that the world culture debate should be reframed to enable an exploration of a variety of ways forward, not necessarily limiting itself to a singular (and partial) theoretical perspective. This broader orientation became necessary during our own writing as we had difficulty agreeing (among the three co-authors) on one way forward.

We hope that our CER essay has opened up space for some tangible alternatives to be elaborated by the broader CIES community, including colleagues who have found it difficult to be heard in the “world culture debate” so far. The upcoming issue of GSE attempts to address this problem by highlighting Marxist, feminist, and post-colonial voices, among others. Our hope is that this will lead to a richer and more inspiring conversation!

**CALL FOR PROPOSALS**

Early bird submission deadline: October 1st, 2012
Final submission deadline: October 26th, 2012

The Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) is pleased to announce its 57th Annual Conference, which will be held at the Hilton Riverside Hotel in New Orleans on March 10-15, 2013. We invite you to submit proposals for individual, group panel and poster presentations that contribute to the advancement of theory, practice, methodology or field work in comparative and international education.

The purpose of the CIES Conference is to encourage dialogue and discussion, promote and disseminate high quality research in the comparative education field and provide an opportunity to share and analyze “best” practices and models in applied educational settings. To achieve this goal, we encourage proposals that are theoretically oriented, based on evidence, and discuss old or new inquiries and initiatives in comparative and international education.

The early bird deadline is October 1st, 2012. The final deadline for all submitted proposals is October 26, 2012. Proposals should be electronically submitted through the CIES on-line submission system, and comply with the requirements detailed in the guidelines below. Proposals that do not comply with these requirements will not be considered for inclusion in the program.

CIES membership is required to present at the Conference. If you are not currently a member of CIES, please take a few minutes and become a member by registering on the CIES webpage: [http://www.cies.us/membership.htm](http://www.cies.us/membership.htm)

For proposal submission or more information, Please visit [http://www.cies.us/2013/index.html](http://www.cies.us/2013/index.html).
How and where to publish so your ideas will not perish (in the long run):

a response to Helen Abadzi Submitted to the CIES newsletter (April, 2012)

Alec Ian Gershberg

The New School & Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

I read Helen Abadzi’s essay about the problems with peer-review journal publication processes in the last CIES newsletter and feel that it deserves a response. While I agree with much she has to say, ultimately I object strongly to her core arguments on four primary grounds: 1) her essay is needlessly disparaging of the world of academic journals and academics; 2) the realm of publications by the donor agencies and international organizations themselves (unmentioned in the Abadzi piece) already serves many of the same functions Abadzi advocates for peer-review academic journals; 3) it is important to understand the “peer review” process in most of these development institutions and the impact it has on the work produced; and 4) I am less sanguine about her implicit assumption that the analytic work of staff in most donor agencies and international organizations is trustworthy with respect to its causal chains and, thus, policy prescriptions.

Let’s start with a major point of agreement: the publication process in academic journals takes too long. Reviewers take too long to review, editors take too long to reach decisions, and it takes too long for final print versions to see the light of day. While it may never be done at a pace to please Abadzi, it could certainly be streamlined a great deal (I have ideas on this matter). Yet, speed will never be the main objective of academic publishing. Rather, the focus of peer-review journal articles is to publish knowledge that is meant to last, to be as relevant in a few years, or decades, as upon publication—even for work related to public policy which relies on timely analytic inputs to a policy-making process, with a time frame usually measured in months, a year, or at most till the end of the term of a key elected official.

But there are ways around this timing problem. Reports, working paper series and other higher-level publications by international organizations and many others already serve to get the key ideas and conclusions of most analytic work into the public domain (and most importantly into the hands of policy-makers and analysts in governments and international organizations). Thanks to the internet and the expressed goals of the World Bank and others to be more open, knowledge-sharing organizations the so called “grey literature” is increasingly accessible. It’s not clear why the practitioners Abadzi discusses need to get their ideas out quickly into the world of academic literature.

Nevertheless, I agree with her that more of these reports should be able to wind their way successfully through the academic journal peer-review process. I believe this precisely because it should force practitioners to think about the more timeless aspects of their work, those that deserve to stand the test of time, that make contributions to knowledge beyond their specific case and time-frame, and especially those that improve upon the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of the work in ways that may not be possible within the timeframes practitioners face in their “day jobs”. The management of international organizations would need to show that it values such work by giving even non-research staff at least some time and credit for the conversion process.

Abadzi’s assertion that staff in donor agencies and international organizations (not to mention government policymakers) need to work on topics that “matter” and “make real-time decisions based on the available causal chains” touches on many key analytic tensions in fields like the applied social sciences and comparative education. The ethos in academia is most typically if you can’t answer a question well, then ask another question. Certainly I have given this advice many times to graduate students and junior faculty. Policy analysts on the other hand need to provide the best possible answer to a given question in a timely manner. Resolving this tension requires hard intellectual work and often a little luck (and a blind peer-review journal process helps). Of course, it’s not always critical to resolve the tension, but it certainly is necessary if practitioners want to take reports they have written for their organizations and convert them into publications in what Abadzi calls “actual journals.”

But there is also a danger in the more common policy analytic strategy. It’s true policy gets made in “real time”; however, you can make policy in any time you want, but if you are not right about the causal chains, don’t expect the policies to have the impacts you intend. I won’t take pot shots by naming a litany of, say, World Bank education projects that have not quite worked out as planned, or had the effects that the Bank’s analytic work predicted. That is the messy nature of policy analysis, and I myself am guilty of having produced quite a bit of it. I also believe that some of the very best policy analytic work on the planet is produced by World Bank staff.

Yet, it’s worth considering the typical review process for analytic work at the World Bank. For starters, it’s not blind. Often one knows who the peer-reviewers will be before a project is even past the proposal stage. Certainly this has some impact on the shape and nature of the way the work is done. Furthermore, peer-reviews are often quite public, being presented at meetings and/or circulated widely among staff. This dynamic creates several incentives: 1) reviewers tend to take their jobs seriously since their work is public; unlike blind peer-reviewers who can hide in anonymity; 2) reviewers tend to find something to criticize strongly so as to prove that they have taken their job seriously and to show their “chops”; 3) reviewers know that their own work in future is likely to be peer-reviewed by the staff whose work they are reviewing, creating an incentive to be tough but reach the institutional equivalent of a “revise and resubmit” rather than a “reject.” Throw in institutional and bureaucratic politics and it’s not hard to see how the studies often reach rather predictable policy prescriptions that may or may not be supported by the analytic work.

I have great respect for Abadzi’s work and have relied on it often myself. I am sure that the quality of her work is well above average among practitioners or academics alike. However, I think the tension between practitioner-produced, policy analytic research and academic journals is on the whole about what it should be. I also applaud the increase in the number of policy-relevant journals that seek to live in that tension (though CER does not appear to me to be one of them, for better or worse). But in the spirit of Abadzi’s angst driven critique, I would note the pain I have myself experienced as a reviewer
of many journal submissions that are clearly slap-dash adaptations of reports for development organizations which are often not analytically strong nor reliable for policy-making, or even if they are strong and reliable fail to make any attempt to converge to the norms of the journal’s style and audience. I have also seen superb journal publications come from work originally done for development organizations.

I would encourage practitioners to continue to seek publication for some of their work in academic journals. They should consider carefully what is more timeless and less timely about the work, plug it into a theoretical or a methodological cannon, and accept the more diffuse long-term nature of the impact. It’s true, despite the massive increase in the availability of the “grey literature,” publishing in academic journals provides permanence to a work that other outlets generally do not. This is what makes going through the pain of the conversion process worthwhile – for the authors, the field, and perhaps even the subjects of the work itself.

Helen Abadzi’s Response to Alec Ian Gershberg

Thank you very much, Alan, for taking the time to read and actually respond to my thoughts. I think we both agree on the issues that really matter.

As I write this message, students somewhere in the world are dropping out illiterate. To minimize these unfortunate events practitioners must locate, communicate, and help apply knowledge that is scientifically valid and usable. And to prevent wastage, they must do so very quickly.

Published articles are a prime source for such information. But governments and donors cannot possibly access the articles that are stuck in the publication queue. And the usable articles are mainly the ones that adequately explore causal chains. How to help publish documents of the necessary quality? Below are some thoughts of clarification.

As you mentioned, reviewer delays are inexplicable. Personally I review manuscripts within a week, and I find it hard to understand why others do not. In one journal where I am a reviewer, I proposed a two-week turnaround time to other reviewers, and everyone said they need at least a month. However, in two experiences with electronic journals, reviewers came through within two weeks with quality, considered reviews. Are they perhaps paid an honorarium? If money will fix things, journal editors need to find out what the minimum acceptable amount would be and pay it.

Also as you mentioned, practitioners badly need peer reviews. Many field workers lack good qualifications for what they do, and they learn on the way. Also many reports produced by international organizations or NGOs get limited prior review. (The World Bank is meticulous on that, by the way, but publications are commissioned, and weak topics may proceed anyway.) The anonymity of peer reviewers is probably a good thing, but sometimes it hides a sloppy review job. An author ought to be able to ask a reviewer for clarifications or to offer some. But we really don’t have a good system in our journals for that.

Ultimately what criteria do or should the peer reviewers use to judge practitioners’ manuscripts? Our greatest concern ought to be internal validity, because results depend on a valid causal chain. But the knowledge base for education often lies in psychological fields, such as cognitive neuroscience. However international educators are rarely taught this discipline, so the reviews are often strong on statistical complexity but weak on causality. Thus they may give the wrong signals to those who take the time to write articles. Manuscripts with sophisticated statistics and fuzzy causal chains are not likely to bring results. They may actually mislead governments and donors into investments that are peripheral to the real problems.

Ironically, the difficulties of reputable journals in publishing timely and useful articles for practitioners are being superseded by private online journals. The space of online journals in in theory infinite. To earn the $500 or so that they charge, they have flexible criteria. They miraculously get peer reviews fast, so they often publish within 4 months from submission. But should not have to go down the paying road. Hopefully international education professors will become more knowledgeable learning research, use the causal chains, and thus focus on the variables that matter rather than peripheral issues.
**Vice President - Karen Mundy**

Karen Mundy is Professor and Canada Research Chair at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, where she co-directs the Comparative, International and Development Education Centre. Her research has focused on the politics of educational assistance in the developing world, educational reform in Africa, the role of civil society in the reform of educational systems, and on the issue of global education in North American schools. Her recent publications include Public Private Partnerships in Education: New Actors and Modes of Governance (edited with Robertson, Verger and Menashy) and a series of articles and book chapters on the World Bank. She is presently part of a large scale evaluation of the results based aid in education in Ethiopia. Dr. Mundy has been a consultant for such organizations as UNICEF, UNESCO, CIDA, OSI and the Hewlett Foundation. She is also the founder and co-chair of the Canadian Global Campaign for Education, a coalition of NGOs, teachers unions and universities committed to advancing education for all.

**Board Representatives - Noah Sobe and Karen Monkman**

Noah Sobe

I am greatly honored to be elected to the CIES Board of Directors. The Society has provided an intellectually enriching professional home for me from the time that I was a master’s student at Teachers College, Columbia University and attended the 1999 conference in Toronto. While a doctoral student at the University of Wisconsin-Madison I had the good fortune to participate in the New Scholars Workshop. The work that CIES does to develop new scholars has been extremely beneficial to me and it is something I want to continue emphasizing as a Board member. In recent years I have chaired a number of Society committees – Nominations Committee (2008, 2009), the Bereday prize committee (2010, 2011), and the Investment Committee (2012) – and increasing opportunities for CIES members to become involved in this work is also something that is important to me.

I am a comparativist also trained as a historian of education and I research the trans-national circulation of education policies and practices. My scholarship has appeared in journals such as the Harvard Education Review, Current Issues in Comparative Education (CICE), History of Education, European Education, Educational Theory, Revista Brasileira de História da Educação (Brazil), and Perfiles Educativos (Mexico). CIES annual conferences and my CIES colleagues have been a constant source of inspiration and encouragement and in fact an edited volume that I put together, American Post-Conflict Education Reform: From the Spanish-American War to Iraq (which was a finalist for the Jackie Kirk award) originated from CIES conferences and panels. I am also presently serving a term (2012-2015) on the Board of Directors of the International Standing Conference on the History of Education (ISCHE) and I hope to be able to help foster increased collaboration and exchange between historians and scholars and practitioners in comparative and international education.

Karen Monkman (PhD, University of Southern California) is a professor at DePaul University in Chicago. Her research focuses education (informal, nonformal, and formal) as it relates to gender, migration, transnationalism and globalization, with a primary focus in Africa and Latin America. She teaches comparative education, sociology and anthropology of education, education policy, and qualitative research methods. She has been a member of CIES since 1987 and has previously served on the CIES board (2000-2003), as a co-chair of the Gender and Education Committee (2008-2010), and has been both a New Scholars Faculty Mentor (four times) and a Mentee.

CIES has experienced growth and changes in recent years, necessitating attention to a range of governance and structural concerns. The institution of SIGs a few years ago, which has created a space for members with common interests to deepen their work together, has made our structural organization more complex. The three standing committees, New Scholars, Gender, and UREAG, are undergoing a reexamination of their missions and activities. The conference planning has moved toward a process supported by technology (the on-line submission process) and, to some degree, decentralized program planning (through SIGs and their reviewers). These changes (and others) give rise to the need for improved practices and they also raise some challenges. Her work on the board will include a focus on supporting our collective attention to these the structural challenges. Other (but not less important) concerns are about equitable participation, keeping costs affordable, and active encouragement of new and underrepresented scholars/practitioners. She values the interactions among the academy, agencies and organizations, and consultants, and students and professionals, as this strengthens the work that all of us do and is important to promote.
CIES New Board Members & CIES 2011 Awards Recipients

Student Representative to the Board- Mariusz Galczynski

Since CIES 2012 in San Juan, it has been a great privilege for me to begin my term as the Student Representative on the Board of Directors. I am likewise grateful for having had the opportunity to interact with so many Society members through my experiences as Co-chair of the New Scholars Committee this past year and as the Conference Coordinator for CIES 2011 in Montréal.

Originally from Poland, I grew up in the Chicago area and later relocated to Texas for my university studies, earning my B.A. in Literary Studies and M.A. in Humanities from the University of Texas at Dallas. After working for several years as a secondary English teacher in a public school outside of Dallas, I returned to school to pursue a Ph.D. in Educational Studies at McGill University. Informed by my teaching background, my doctoral research interests center on teacher education, recruitment, and professionalization; multicultural and inclusive education; and the politics of assessment. In addition to my studies, I have served as a course lecturer, Book Reviews Co-editor for the McGill Journal of Education, and administrator of the Québec Ministry of Education’s English Exam for Teacher Certification. As the Student Representative on the CIES Board, my goal is to advocate for the needs of students, who make up a significant portion of the Society. In doing so, I strongly support the efforts of the New Scholars Committee in organizing events for graduate students and junior faculty. I also believe that the leadership of CIES should communicate with members as openly as possible, so I invite all of you to share your perspectives, debate issues, and brainstorm new ideas (and find out how the Board reacts to them) .......Follow me on Twitter @CIESStudentRep—or send me an email at ciesstudentrep@gmail.com.

CIES 2011 Awards Recipients

Each year the Comparative and International Education Society distinguishes the work of scholars in comparative and international education. The recipients of the CIES awards are selected by the awards sub-committees, appointed by the President of the Society. The sub-committees’ members reflect the membership of the CIES, its commitment to affirmative action, its diversity and breadth of methodological skills, theoretical views, their intellectual rigor and approaches to scholarship.

Gail Kelly Award

Created to honor the distinguished comparative educator Gail P. Kelly and her many contributions to the CIES, the Gail P. Kelly Award recognizes an outstanding doctoral dissertation. The Award honors a doctoral dissertation that addresses social justice and equity issues in an international context and that manifests academic excellence, originality, methodological, theoretical, and empirical rigor. These issues may include -- but are not limited to -- gender, race, class, ethnicity, and nationality.

This year the Gail Kelly Award sub-committee selected two outstanding dissertations:


“Titled Human Rights, Diversity, and National Identity: Changes in Civic Education Textbooks Cross-nationally (1970-2008) and in British Columbia (1871-2008), Dr. Bromley’s project empirically examined the extent to which the original, nationalizing purpose of schooling is challenged through the rise of emphases on universal human rights and diversity in civic education. Her dissertation committee was comprised of Professors Francisco Ramirez (Chair), John W. Meyer, and Woody Powell. Using hierarchical linear models to analyze a unique primary data source of over 500 social science textbooks from 70 countries and a neo-institutional theoretical perspective, her main findings suggest a worldwide increase in emphases on human rights and increasing emphases on diversity in Western Europe and North America. The quantitative analyses were complemented with a case study of social science curricula in British Columbia, Canada to examine the form of nation-building in a context of high emphases on diversity and human rights. A key implication of this study is that mass school systems shift from their original goal of constructing a unitary national citizenry and towards one that emphasizes human diversity and equality in a globally-interconnected world.”


“...no education system can be better than the quality of its teachers, nor can a country be better than the quality of its education.” –1992 Government White Paper on Education, Uganda

In the east African country of Uganda, the push for free Universal Secondary Education (USE) has become a driving force for educational change at both the national and local levels. While the policy is touted as “pro-poor,” teachers, students, and parents are embroiled in constant debates surrounding the purpose of USE, its commitment to educational access and quality, and the controversial facets of this multi-tiered policy. This study, which is focused on the impact of USE on one peri-urban community, will investigate the unintended consequences of this new “pro-poor policy” on a middle-class school and its impact on the lived experiences of teachers and students adjusting to life in a drastically changing school environment.
George Bereday Award

The George Bereday Award sub-committee selects the most outstanding article published in the Comparative Education Review.

This year the sub-committee selected “Effects of Cram Schooling on Mathematics Performance: Evidence from Junior High Students in Taiwan” published in Volume 55 (August, 2011). The article was written by Pin-Yin Kuan, a professor at the Department of Sociology in the National Chengchi University in Taiwan.

In his piece, Kuan explores the effects of cram schooling in Mathematics in Taiwan and offers two important findings. First, the impact on student learning outcomes of time spent in extra-schooling is relatively small. Second, those more likely to attend cram schools, students with parents possessing higher educational attainment and those with better prior math attainment do less well than would otherwise be expected. Whilst it is suggested that those not attending cram schools might actually benefit more from it – and this has public policy implications – the overall effect of cram schools is low. This mirrors other research findings but is especially important here for the thorough research design and methodological procedures underpinning the research. According to the sub-committee members, “the study is a potential corrective to policy makers who encourage or allow this phenomenon to ‘drift’ and an inspiration to other researchers to replicate and extend the methodology in other subjects, years and country contexts.”

Joyce Cain Award

In honor of the memory of Joyce Lynn Cain, the Joyce Cain Award recognizes each year an outstanding scholarly publication that explores themes related to people of African descent.

This year the Joyce Cain award sub-committee selected the article written by José A. Cossa “System Transfer, Education, and Development in Mozambique”. Jose A. Cossa is an educator, independent researcher and consultant of comparative and international education.

In this study the author used conceptual historical method to assess the phenomenon of system transfer and the association between education and development in Mozambique. The assessment was administered through critical analysis of documents pertaining to the Salazar (1924-1966), Machel (1975-1986), and Chissano (1986-2005) administrations. The findings were that (a) the colonial government created economic and educational systems for colonizing Mozambique, whereas the Machel and Chissano administrations adapted foreign systems of government and education (i.e., Socialism, Soviet, Democracy, Portuguese, etc.), to their particular context without altering the inherent theoretical basis of the systems transferred; (b) the Machel and Chissano administrations, implicitly or explicitly, perceived the relationship between education and development as circular causality rather than a unidirectional linear causality, while the Salazar administration perceived it as unidirectional linear causality; and (c) while the Machel and Chissano administrations focused on primary education, literacy campaigns, and education of women and girls, they differed in the reasons for such focus.

http://journals.sfu.ca/ijepl/index.php/ijepl/article/view/93
Jackie Kirk Award

The Jackie Kirk Award, created to memorialize the legacy of Jackie Kirk, recognizes an outstanding book that is reflective of one or some of the varied areas of expertise represented in Jackie Kirk’s areas of commitment, primarily gender and education and/or education in conflict (fragile states, post-conflict, peace education).

The committee selected the following book as the award winner: Bajaj, Monisha. 2011. Schooling For Social Change: The Rise and Impact of Human Rights Education in India published by Continuum.

In Schooling for Social Change: The Rise and Impact of Human Rights Education in India, Monisha Bajaj traces the rise of human rights education both globally and in Indian educational policy discussions over the past three decades, juxtaposing the experiences of students and teachers in six Indian states to offer multiple levels of analysis. Bajaj argues that the emergence of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and educational initiatives that utilize rights-based language corresponds with the country’s greater integration into the global economy since 1991. She charts the strategic usage of ‘rights talk’ for securing international support and donor aid and argues that power and social location mediate understandings of human rights by diverse individuals. The book utilizes data gathered over 13 months to support its primary arguments that (1) there are many different manifestations and understandings of human rights education in India today as well as globally; (2) strategy is as important as pedagogy and content in securing support human rights education; and (3) the social context and material conditions of students’ and teachers’ lives greatly influence how human rights concepts are learnt and enacted.

An Honorable Mention was given to Mundy, Karen & Sarah Dryden-Petersen (eds.) 2011 for Educating Children in Conflict Zones: Research, Policy, and Practice for Systemic Change – A Tribute to Jackie Kirk published by Teachers College Press.

Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) Announcement

Council for International Higher Education

The CIHE Award for Significant/Exemplary Research on Comparative and International Higher Education

The ASHE Council for International Higher Education (CIHE) invites nominations for the inaugural CIHE Research Award for Significant/Exemplary Research on Comparative and International Higher Education.

The purpose of the CIHE Research Award is to recognize a recent, highly significant research outcome in the field of comparative and/or international higher education. Unlike a lifetime achievement award, or an award that focuses on a particular form of research, for example, a dissertation award, the CIHE Research Award is focused on recent, state-of-the-art knowledge and scholarship. In recognition of the diversity within and across our specialty - as well as the wide variety of scholarly traditions around the globe - all scholars conducting comparative and/or international higher education research are eligible for the CIHE Research Award. The CIHE Research Award will be conferred at the CIHE Membership Meeting at the 2012 Annual ASHE Conference in Las Vegas, NV, with a special mention at the ASHE Awards Presentation Ceremony.

For nominations, please email a letter of nomination to the CIHE awards committee chair, David Hoffman (david.hoffman@jyu.fi), by September 30, 2012, articulating the contribution of the nominated individual, group, effort or organization involved, as well as the significance and implications of their research, in terms of a comparative and/or international perspective. Nominations should also refer to specific publications, or other outcomes, in the elaboration of the contribution(s) of the nominee’s work to research, practice, policy, and/or theory in the field of comparative and/or international higher education.
N'Dri Assié-Lumumba with the contributions of other ASIG's Executive Committee members

As a young graduate student, Joan Osi Oviawe singlehandedly initiated the Africa Special Interest Group (ASIG), receiving approval by the CIES Board in 2005 and leading its inaugural year during the 50th Anniversary conference of the Society in Honolulu, Hawaii in 2006. ASIG's main goal is to foster scholarly exchanges, networking, and deliberation among African scholars, Africanists, the general membership of CIES and other interested parties. ASIG provides a valuable space for critical and constructive dialogue on the challenges and prospects of contemporary African education, as well as on the educational issues faced by people of African descent around the world.

Our inaugural activities in Honolulu included a special panel, a business meeting and a reception, all aimed at bridging scholarly works and policy implication. The reception was sponsored by the Association for Development of Education in Africa (ADEA), which has continued to be involved through intellectual and social networking activities since then. The special panel was headlined by the Nigerian Ambassador to UNESCO, Professor Michael Omolewa and the Honorable Dr. Kilemi Mwiria, the Assistant Minister of Education of Kenya. An offshoot of that panel was a special issue of the International Review of Education, co-edited by ASIG leaders Dembé and Oviawe (2007), entitled Quality education in Africa: Challenges and prospects. This special issue was the basis for ASIG's three highlighted panels during the 2007 conference. Presenters included, among others, Hamidou Boukary, Birgit Brock-Utne, Ward Heneveld, Jonathan Jansen, Albert Motivans, Joel Samoff, and Cream Wright. The same year, ASIG began a collaborative relationship with UNICEF, centered on education in post-conflict countries in Africa.

ASIG's participation in the 2008 conference featured the highlighted panel, African Renaissance and Education for Social Progress: Aspirations, Expectations, and Development Paradigms for Africa in the 21st Century. With the renowned Professor Ali Mazrui as a panelist and other great scholars, we drew a standing-room-only crowd. Selected papers from this panel, which was reconstituted by Assié-Lumumba from her earlier panel at the 2004 World Congress of Comparative Education Societies in Havana (Cuba) will be included in her forthcoming edited book on African Renaissance and Education, to be published by the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa.

The 2008-2010 Executive Committee, led by Dr. Dembé, embraced the challenge of raising the bar of the already high standards set by Joan Oviawe and Dr. Nancy Kendall. Judging by the growth in paid membership and the quantity and quality of panels, they successfully delivered on this challenge. ASIG presented three highlighted panels at the 2009 and 2010 conferences. In addition, we organized respectively three and nine non-highlighted panels during these two conferences. The term was also marked by (i) a peak in paid membership in 2010; (ii) the creation of three new positions (Secretay-Treasurer, Program Chair-Elect and Communications Officers); (iii) making all past Chairs ex-officio members of the Committee; and (iv) updating the SIG’s website. ASIG has also been involved in ADEA's new initiative titled the Education Research in Africa Award (ERAA). Several ASIG members participated in two working meetings organized by ADEA in Tunis in 2010 to get this initiative off the ground. The ERAA is "set to promote excellence in the conduct of relevant and quality research within African universities, research institutes and networks and also among members of the African Diaspora who work and study in universities in other parts of the world. It seeks to identify, reward and nurture (through professional development opportunities) outstanding accomplishments in educational research in Africa." It is expected that some ASIG members will be involved in the management of this high profile initiative or as jury members. ADEA plans to announce the first awards by the end of 2012.

Led by Professor Assié-Lumumba, José Cossa and Peter Moyi, the 2010-2012 Executive Committee has also worked very hard to maintain ASIG's ascending trajectory. For example, at the 2011 annual conference in Montreal, our SIG claimed five highlighted panels, and helped organize ten non-highlighted ones. Three of the highlighted panels were devoted to taking stock of half a century of education for development in Africa and looking forward. We found this reflection timely (and in line with the theme of the 2011 conference, "Education is that which liberates") as a large number of African countries celebrated fifty years of their respective political independence.

An offshoot of these panels is a forthcoming double special issue (in 2013 and 2014) of African and Asian Studies, a prestigious journal whose Editor-in-Chief, Professor Tukumbi Lumumba-Kasongo, contributed to the Montreal panel. During the conference in San Juan, we will continue our assessment of the post-colonial national education projects as more African countries are celebrating their 50th year of independence and warrant critical perspectives on their respective journeys.
The global engagement of ASIG includes the regular participation on its panels of the faculty at the Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education at Hiroshima University in Japan and their African teammates on the Africa-Asia University Dialogue for Basic Education Development project for sub-Saharan Africa.

The ASIG membership and all members of the executive committee are productive scholars who remain deeply engaged in diverse SIG and CIES activities, such as serving as reviewers of paper and panel submissions, participating in various networking activities, and ensuring the SIG’s intellectual vitality. Three of ASIG’s executive committee members are serving on the CIES Board of Directors, two are past and current recipients of the Joyce Cain Award, and one is past recipient of the George Bereday Award. Since Joan’s initiative in setting the first stage of ASIG’s relationship with ADEA, they have provided unfailing support to ASIG. Thus, we want to express our recognition of the critical role that ADEA has been playing in supporting our receptions and making consistent contributions in organizing panels on timely topics. We will continue the collaboration through the implementation of ERAA and other forward-looking projects on African education to be discussed in San Juan.

We are confident that the incoming Executive Committee, led by Professors Mabokela and Moyi, will continue the ASIG tradition of quality work. In particular, over the upcoming year, we hope to continue to increase the SIG membership, specifically targeting our emerging scholars. We would like to pursue programmatic initiatives that focus on mentoring new scholars and graduate students, to ensure a strong intellectual foundation in our next generation of scholars with interests in African education.

Following are the Chairs and Program Chairs of ASIG’s Executive Committee:

**Chairs:** Joan Ovaawe (2006-2008), Professor Martial Dembélé (2008-2010), Professor N’Dri Assié-Lumumba (2010-2012), Professor Reitumetse Mabokela (Chair-elect).

**Program Chairs:** Professor Nancy Kendall (2006-2008), Professor Kimberly King-Jupiter (2008), Professor N’Dri Assié-Lumumba (December 2008-March 2010), Dr. José Cossa (2010), Professor Peter Moyi (interim 2011 and elect).

---

**Higher Education Special Interest**

**Building Bridges Worldwide through Higher Education Networking and Outreach Efforts**

W. James Jacob
University of Pittsburgh

---

The Higher Education Special Interest Group had an active year supporting various conferences and HESIG-sponsored projects. Membership in the HESIG continues to be vibrant and we welcome participation from anyone interested in promoting scholarship opportunities, critical dialogue, and linking professionals and academics to the international aspects of higher education. HESIG serves as a professional forum supporting development, analysis, and dissemination of theory-, policy-, and practice-related issues that influence higher education.

HESIG began co-sponsoring the annual International Workshops on Higher Education Reform in 2010. Last year’s event was organized on 5-7 October 2011 by Andrà Wolter and his colleagues of Humboldt University in Berlin, Germany. The Workshop theme—"Reforming Higher Education with a Lifelong Learning Perspective"—drew a large number of participants from across the globe. Keynote addresses included higher education experts Ada Pellert, Tom Schuller, Ulrich Teichler, and Shirley Walters. Figure 1 shows many of the participants of the 8th HER Workshop inside the lobby of Humboldt University’s historic main building.

The next International Workshop on Higher Education Reform will be held for the first time in the United States at the University of Pittsburgh from 10-12 October 2012. The theme of this year’s Workshop is on “Reforming the Policy and Practice of Community Engagement of Higher Education.” For more information about the general announcement and call for papers of this upcoming event, visit the conference website at www.iise.pitt.edu/her9.
In partnership with publisher Palgrave Macmillan’s International and Development Education Book Series, HESIG co-sponsors outstanding scholarship on higher education in comparative, international, and development education. Several books were recently added to this ongoing HESIG-sponsored project, including Rajika Bhandari and Peggy Blumen-thal’s International Students and Global Mobility in Higher Education, which was published in December 2010. This book examines current trends in global student mobility in key destination and sending countries, including large hosts like the Australia, Germany, United Kingdom, and United States and newer players such as China, India, and the educational hubs of the Middle East. Experts from these countries, and others, contributed to this volume by offering timely analysis for higher education policymakers, practitioners, and researchers, of how national-level investments and developments affect academic migration trends.

A third co-sponsored volume, The Internationalization of East Asian Higher Education: Globalizations’ Impact (2011), was edited by John D. Palmer, Amy Roberts, Young Ha Cho and Gregory S. Ching. This book develops new and intriguing insights into globalization theory and internationalization practice, expanding the investigation of East Asian values and contexts in comparison and separate from Western-dominant thoughts of globalization and internationalization in higher education. The authors reveal how the Western model of higher education is not always applicable or appropriate in an ever-evolving globalized world. Several contributors address how higher education institutions in East Asia are moving towards globalization theory and internationalization practice that is compatible for themselves and their respective nation’s global engagement.

Recipients of this year’s HESIG Awards include Val D. Rust, Lifetime Contribution Award; Saloshna Vandeyar, Best Article Award; William K. Cummings, Donald Fisher, and William Locke’s edited volume Changing Governance and Management in Higher Education: The Perspectives of the Academy (Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer, 2011), Best Book Award; and Enkhjargal Adiya and Jian Liu both received honors for the Best Dissertation Award.

This year’s Lifetime Contribution Award will be given to Val Rust, who is Professor Emeritus of Education at the University of California, Los Angeles and recently served as the Faculty Chair of the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies. He received his PhD from the University of Michigan in Education Studies and served for a number of years as the Director of the International Education Office at UCLA, which houses the Education Abroad Program, the Travel Study Program, non-University of California study abroad providers and other student exchange programs. He is also Associate Director of the Center for International and Development Education in the Department of Education (CIDE), which deals extensively with higher educational mapping around the world, international educational leadership, and teacher training.


Coming in second place for the Best Book Award was Ruth Hayhoe, Jun Li, and Qiang Zha’s Portraits of 21st Century Chinese Universities: In the Move to Mass Higher Education (Hong Kong and Dordrecht: Comparative Education Research Centre, the University of Hong Kong and Springer, 2011).

Enkhjargal Adiya recently graduated from the University of Pittsburgh where she earned top honors for her dissertation titled Gender Equity in Access to Higher Education in Mongolia. Jian Liu of the University of Toronto also received this first-place honor for completing a dissertation titled Expansion and Equality in Access to Chinese Higher Education: A Cultural Perspective. We look forward to honoring both young and senior recipients of this year’s HESIG Awards as...
Special Interest Group (SIG) Contributions

part of the HESIG Annual Business Meeting on 25 April 2012 in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

On behalf of the entire HESIG, we want to recognize the founding role Rosalind Latiner Raby (California State University, Northridge) played in helping to establish the HESIG Awards Committee. She served as the Awards Committee Chair from 2009-2012, and will step down from this position at the HESIG Business Meeting in Puerto Rico. Joining her on the committee were Scarlett Anna Aeckerle, University of South Carolina; Gustavo Gregorutti, Universidad de Monterrey, Nuevo Leon, Mexico; Ruth Hayhoe, University of Toronto; Diane Oliver, California State University, Fresno; Laura Portnoi, California State University, Long Beach; Janet Thomas, Zayed University, Dubai; and Matthew Witenstein, Claremont University.

The Japan SIG, one of CIES’ youngest, was established in 2007 to create opportunities for ongoing collaboration on conference panels, future research projects, publications, and grant applications. In 2008, SIG members identified five areas of professional and research interests in Japanese education: international education exchange, politics and policy, higher education, philosophy and aims of education, and non-formal education. These are the core areas identified to date, but we are also open to other areas of interest of our members, including early childhood education.

The book project Japanese Education in an Era of Globalization: Enduring Issues in New Contexts (Teachers College Press, forthcoming) is a good example of how our SIG contributes to the production of knowledge about education. This project emerged from a Japan SIG highlighted session at the 2009 annual CIES conference and took shape in follow up discussions in the Japan SIG business meeting and in email correspondence among Japan SIG members. In the words of the editors, Gary DeCoker and Chris Bjork:

The goal of this edited volume is to present a rigorous yet readable book of integrated chapters that place Japanese education in a global context, with particular attention given to how the Japanese education system is responding to changing expectations and pressures that emerge from rapid social change. In an era of global interaction and uncertainty, Japan’s experiences offer opportunities for understanding Japan itself and for insight into other countries as they, too, confront issues related to equality, academic achievement, privatization, population diversity, societal expectations, and the influence of the media, parents, and political movements. This research will make a valuable contribution to literature on educational change and opportunity, a literature that is currently dominated by studies of practices in schools in the United States, and will provide valuable lessons to policymakers and practitioners facing similar challenges. The studies included in the volume will generate empirical evidence to help educators and policymakers better understand the context and ramifications of their decisions as they attempt to modify school policy and practice toward producing educational and societal change.

Other topics that have been presented at CIES by Japan SIG members include how students become Japanese in varied educational settings; higher education reform in Japan; Japanese preschool teachers cultural pedagogies; and education policy for the indigenous Ainu in 19th Century Japan.

If you are interested in joining our SIG, please contact Akiko Hayashi (akikoh@uga.edu)

Sustainable Development Special Interest Group

Dr. Ligia Toutan

I welcome the CIES secretariat’s idea of allocating space to SIGs in the CIES Newsletter.

As the chair of the Education for Sustainable Development SIG, I see the need of expanding collaboration with members and chairs of other SIGs—more specifically, with the Indigenous Knowledge and the Academy (IKA) SIG, the Peace Education SIG, and CANDE SIG. Despite the fact that these SIGs have their own identity and goals, I see a common denominator, which is advocating for a sustainable future. Also, the quest for new knowledge creation and research aligns with the goal of social justice and some of UNESCO-ESD’s directives included in the following categories:
We Need is Collaboration.”
In paraphrase Beatles’ song “All You Need is Love,” I would say “All we need 30
is to establish new communities. To create a new community, one
needs 50 or more individuals to be eligible as members of
the IKA and ESD SIGs’ members, but also to all those
who have the curiosity and/or interest in this topic.

Another avenue for collaboration is to use a collaboration
service such as EVO.AU and to form a community that has
“sustainability” as the common denominator. Thanks to Dr.
David Zyngier from Australia who introduced me to EVO.AU
service, I became a member and I have tried to learn to navi-
gate through this platform. The 24-hour EVO@AU Support
(Jason) is willing to assist anyone who has questions or wants
to establish new communities. To create a new community, one
needs 50 or more individuals to be eligible as members of
EVO.AU and to request this from customer service. If subscrib-
ing to a community sounds complicated, we can use Skype for
 colaboration and content. The technology is here, and to par-
aphrase Beatles’ song “All You Need is Love,” I would say “All
We Need is Collaboration.”

The Information and Communication for Technology
(ICT4D) SIG is focused on the technologyside of international
development. Our members are actively researching and work-
ing on development projects whichcenter on various aspects of
technology in the less developed world. The ICT4D SIG cur-ently has over 50 member including professors, graduate stu-
dents, and professionals working in the field. The SIG was
started 2008.

The Co-Chairpersons of the ICT4 SIG are Jayson W. Rich-
ardson (jayson.richardson@uky.edu) from the University of
Kentucky and Jeffery Lee (jefferyleep@apu.edu) from Azusa
Pacific University. Tryggvi Thayer (thay0012@umn.edu) from
the University of Minnesota serves as the webmaster. Gréta
Björk Guðmundsdóttir (greta.gudmundsdottir@iktsenteret.no)
from the University of Oslo serves as the secretary.

Below are descriptions of just some of the ICT4D projects
with which members are engaged. Reconsidering Development
is an innovative, open-access electronic journal launched in
2010 by Interdisciplinary Perspectives on International Devel-
opment, an interdisciplinary group of graduate students, schol-
ars, and practitioners at the University of Minnesota. The tar-
get audience for Reconsidering Development includes scholars
who are affected by and affecting international development.
The journal particularly encourages submissions that reflect
the diverse perspectives of underrepresented voices, creative
 methodologies, and contemporary forms of expression in order
to reconsider the broader field of development. Reconsidering

Dr. Jeffrey Lee is leading an ICT4D initiative in Nepal that
allows rural villages in Nepal to engage with literacy content
through voice technology. Voicethread technology is uniquely
beneficial for developing countries where literacy rates are low.
It allows endusers to engage with content through looking at
pictures/video and participating in threaded discussions
through listening and speaking.

Drs. Jayson W. Richardson and John Nash are leading a
project in Cambodia focused on fostering research skills in local
NGOs and faculty at the Royal University of Phnom Penh. This
project funded by USAID, aims to build local research capacity
through conducting actual research. For example, at the Royal
University of Phnom Penh, Jayson and John are working close-
ly with faculty members to survey teachers and students in
three high schools about their use and perceptions of comput-
ers and the Internet. An output of this project is also to build
local scholarship. As such, the project has already led to a book
chapter being accepted and a few journal articles being submit-
ted.

The ICT4D hosts a website which highlights conferences,
calls for papers, and various updates about the SIG. http://cies-
ict4d.org/. Find us on Facebook at Technology 4 Development
- CIES Special Interest Group. If you are interested in becoming
a member of the ICT4D SIG or if you have ideas on new pro-
jects or new collaborations, please contact Jayson W. Richard-
son at jayson.richardson@uky.edu
CIES has approved the formation of a new SIG on Teaching Comparative Education. The Teaching Comparative Education SIG brings together scholars, instructors, and graduate students of comparative and international education from around the world. It is dedicated to understanding and enhancing the contours of course work in the field, sharing instructional resources, and promoting comparative and international education in higher education. If you are interested in joining the SIG, please register for it when you next renew your CIES membership. Those intending to join should contact Allison Blosser (ablosser@luc.edu) to have your name added to the SIG listserv.

SIG Officers
- Co-chairs: Patricia K. Kubow (Bowling Green State University) and Allison Blosser (Loyola University Chicago)
- Secretary and Treasurer: Yao Chen (Loyola University Chicago)
- Newsletter Editor: Osman Ozturgut (University of the Incarnate Word)

**Book Publications**

- **Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff and Nelly P. Stromquist (Eds.)**
  - *World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives*
  - Sense Publisher

- **Erin Murphy-Graham**
  - *Opening minds, improving lives: education and women’s empowerment in Honduras*
  - University of California, Berkeley

- **Nancy Pine**
  - *Educating Young Giants: What Kids Learn (And Don’t Learn) in China and America*
  - Palgrave Macmillan

- **Richard A. Shweder (Eds.)**
  - *The Child: An Encyclopedic Companion*
  - The University of Chicago Press

- **John G. Richardson & Justin J.W. Powell**
  - *Comparing Special Education: Origins to Contemporary Paradoxes*
  - Stanford University

- **Maria Teresa Tatro (Ed.)**
  - *Learning and Doing Policy Analysis in Education Examining Diverse Approaches to Increasing Educational Access*
  - Sense Publisher
Recent Dissertations

- Rebecca Paulson Stone. “A Professional Development Program for the Mother Tongue-based Teacher: Addressing Teacher Knowledge and Attitudes About MTBMLE.” University of Massachusetts Amherst
- Martha Nyongani. “Mitigating Negative Externalities Affecting Access and Equity of Education in Low-Resource Countries: A study exploring social marketing as an alternative strategy for planning school food programs in Malawi.” University of Massachusetts Amherst

We welcome recent dissertations. If you want to share your dissertations with CIES, please email the title, university name to secretariat@cies.us.

Call for CIES Newsletter Contributions

The CIES newsletter editorial staff seeks contributions from the membership. The following topics are especially welcome:

- Notes from the field
- Reports of Special Interest
- Group activities
- Highlights of new publications and blogs
- New dissertation abstracts
- Dialogues and debates on current topics
- Essays and opinion pieces
- Graphics and charts that present data relevant to the membership
- Photos (with captions) of members

Free-standing articles should be between 750 and 1500 words. Shorter contributions can direct the reader to a website or other publication for more information. All submissions will be edited for style and space considerations. Please send all contributions to the attention of the newsletter editor at secretariat@cies.us.