

CERC Studies in Comparative Education 20

Changing Education

Leadership Innovation and Development
in a Globalising Asia Pacific

Edited by Peter D. Hershock
Mark Mason & John N. Hawkins



Springer

Comparative Education Research Centre
The University of Hong Kong



Changing Education

CERC Studies in Comparative Education 20

Changing Education
Leadership, Innovation and Development
in a Globalizing Asia Pacific

Edited by

Peter D. Hershock

Mark Mason

and

John N. Hawkins



Comparative Education Research Centre
The University of Hong Kong

 Springer

SERIES EDITOR

Mark Mason, *Director, Comparative Education Research Centre
The University of Hong Kong, China*

FOUNDING EDITOR (AND CURRENTLY ASSOCIATE EDITOR)

Mark Bray, *Director, International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)
UNESCO, France*

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Anthony Sweeting, *Comparative Education Research Centre
The University of Hong Kong, China*

INTERNATIONAL EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Robert Arno, *Indiana University, USA*

Beatrice Avalos, *Santiago, Chile*

Nina Borevskaya, *Institute of the Far East, Moscow, Russia*

Michael Crossley, *University of Bristol, United Kingdom*

Gui Qin, *Capital Normal University, China*

Gita Steiner-Khamsi, *Teachers College, Columbia University, USA*

Comparative Education Research Centre

Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China

© Comparative Education Research Centre

First published 2007

ISBN 978-1-4020-6582-8

e-ISBN 978-1-4020-6583-5

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the written permission of the publisher.

COVER

The Chinese character for *change* is highlighted against a background of fractal imagery. A fractal is an “infinitely complex” recursively constructed shape that is often associated with chaos and complexity theories.

Cover by John Siu.

Index by Kokila Katyal.

Type-setting and layout by Emily Mang.

*As editors of this volume,
we would like to dedicate the book to
Victor Ordonez,
an educational leader of
global stature and rare passion,
to whom we owe special thanks for inspiring
– as well as contributing to –
this project.*

East-West Center Studies

East-West Center Studies books present significant new research and policy analysis on issues of contemporary concern in the Asia Pacific region.

Contents

List of Figures	ix
Abbreviations	ix
Foreword	xi
Victor ORDONEZ	
Introduction: Challenges in the Leadership of Innovation and Development in Education in a Globalizing Asia Pacific	1
Peter D. HERSHOCK, Mark MASON & John N. HAWKINS	
I: THE CONTEXT AND IMPERATIVES FOR PARADIGMATIC CHANGE IN EDUCATION	27
1. Globalization and Education: Characteristics, Dynamics, Implications	29
Deane NEUBAUER	
2. Rethinking Educational Aims in an Era of Globalization	63
Fazal RIZVI	
3. Multiculturalism, Shared Values, and an Ethical Response to Globalization	93
Mark MASON	
4. Education and Alleviating Poverty: Educating for Equity and Diversity	115
Peter D. HERSHOCK	
II: OUTCOMES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHANGE: EDUCATION IN A RENEWING ASIA	135
5. The Intractable Dominant Educational Paradigm	137
John N. HAWKINS	
6. Globalization and Paradigm Change in Higher Education: The Experience of China	163
MA Wan-hua	

7. Pulling Together amid Globalization: National Education in Singapore Schools Jason TAN	183
8. Education in the Years to Come: What We Can Learn from Alternative Education Joseph P. FARRELL	199
III: LEADERSHIP IN CHANGING THE WAY EDUCATION CHANGES	225
9. Leadership in the Context of Complex Global Interdependence: Emerging Realities for Educational Innovation Peter D. HERSHOCK	227
10. The Changing Role of Leadership (or A Changing Leadership for a Changing World) Victor ORDONEZ	249
11. Interconnections Within and Without: The Double Duty of Creative Educational Leadership WANG Hongyu	273
12. Unraveling Leadership: 'Relational Humility' and the Search for Ignorance Vrinda DALMIYA	297
Conclusion: Changing Education Peter D. HERSHOCK, Mark MASON & John N. HAWKINS	323
Notes on the Authors	335
Index	341

List of Figures

Figure 8.1	The Forms of Formal Schooling	201
Figure 8.2	The Emerging Alternative Model.....	206
Figure 8.3	Comparison of Alternative School Pedagogies	215

Abbreviations

APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
BRAC	Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee
FDI	foreign direct investment
EU	European Union
GATS	General Agreement on Trade in Services
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GNP	Gross National Product
ICT	information and communications technology
IFE 2020	International Forum on Education 2020
IGO	intergovernmental organization
LNR	local-national-regional
NE	National Education
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PAP	People's Action Party
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
SAF	Singapore Armed Forces
TIMMS	Third [also Trends in] International Mathematics and Science Study
TNC	transnational corporation
TSLN	Thinking Schools, Learning Nation
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WTO	World Trade Organization

Foreword

This book responds to the growing unease of educators and non-educators alike about the inadequacy of most current educational systems and programs to sufficiently meet the demands of fast changing societies. These systems and programs evolved and were developed in and for societies that have long been transformed, and yet no parallel transformation has taken place in the education systems they spawned. In the last twenty years or so, other sectors of society – transportation, communication, banking, health services – have radically changed the way they operate, but education has continued essentially the same. There is no doubt: education must change.

To those ready to accept this challenge, this book represents a welcome guide. To be sure, it is not a ‘how-to’ instruction manual, since the shape of change must be particular to the needs and situations of each setting, and societies are as varied as they are fast changing. Rather than provide specific directions, it provides a useful road map for the navigators of change, within which each can plot out their specific itineraries towards their goal. It illuminates the basic goal of education – the total and balanced development of individuals and, through them, societies – and depicts the main features, the imperatives, the demands, and the pitfalls of an ever more interdependent, globalized world in which this goal must be pursued.

My work has exposed me to dozens of international conferences on various education themes, and several colleges of education worldwide. There is no lack of effort, or literature, on how to improve educational systems or various sub-sectors within them. But the focus is usually on fine tuning or making more efficient existing systems and paradigms – how to train teachers better, how to manage data and financial systems, how to improve textbook production and distribution, how to incorporate specific themes into programs of study, and so on. This book departs from that approach, and provides ideas and insights, not into how to improve existing systems, but into how to change systems altogether, not into doing things better, but into doing better things. The

focus of this book is not on doing things right, but on doing the right things.

This book represents a major output of the education initiative of the East-West Center in Honolulu. This initiative also includes networking of institutions similarly concerned with paradigm change; annual senior seminars, some of whose participants are authors in this volume; and a leadership institute for teams of participants from the USA and a number of Asian countries who are committed to finding new solutions to old or perennial problems. I am proud and happy to have been part of the East-West Center team behind this initiative.

Victor Ordonez

*Senior Education Fellow, East-West Center
and formerly*

Director of Basic Education (Education For All), UNESCO;

Director, Principal Office for Asia and the Pacific, UNESCO;

*Deputy Minister/Undersecretary, Department of Education, Culture &
Sports, Philippines;*

*Visiting Professor, University of California (Los Angeles) and the
University of Hawaii.*

Introduction

Challenges in the Leadership of Innovation and Development in Education in a Globalizing Asia Pacific

Peter D. HERSHOCK, Mark MASON & John N. HAWKINS

Education is widely regarded as a singularly important public good. Globally, it has come to assume a central position in the making of local, national, and regional public policy, and is considered to have direct bearing, not only on the development of individual character and capabilities but also on national prospects for advancing and sustaining development. Indeed, while directly budgeted support for education varies considerably among both developed and developing countries, total governmental expenditures on education typically run between 10% and 20% of total GDP. Yet, in spite of this considerable esteem and investment, it is almost uniformly the opinion of parents, educators and policy makers that the public good being served by existing educational systems is, simply stated, not good enough.

The uniformity of this assessment undoubtedly conceals widely varying confluences of forces and conditions. Nevertheless, many of the globally perceived shortcomings of education systems as a means for delivering and serving the public good can be traced to disruptions – and, at times, outright ruptures – taking place in the shape and meaning of the public sphere itself. It has become something of a cliché to invoke in this regard the increasingly wide and deep effects of contemporary patterns and scales of globalization and their phenomenal acceleration of change dynamics – dynamics that at once penetrate and span the private and public spheres, affecting both our most intimate and our most international acts and aspirations. But as with most clichés, there is a significant factual basis underlying explanatory appeals to globalization processes as

a cyclone of what are, at times, a veritable deluge of challenges to long-standing institutions and traditional norms. As the domain of the public itself changes, so does the meaning of the public good and, *pari passu*, of a good education.

A signal effect of contemporary globalization processes has been the increasingly wide and steady circulation of individual goods and services, and also of people(s) and their cultural norms and values. Many early commentators stressed the potentially homogenizing effect of globalization and deepening social, economic and political interdependence. In fact, deepening global interdependence has also had an ironically fragmenting effect on societies world-wide. Even in those societies in which pluralism is not embraced as an explicit social or political value, the presence of plural perspectives and interests in any given situation can no longer be ignored. In effect, the public sphere increasingly resists any reading as a homogeneous or uniform space, or as one that supports but a single ordering of relational dynamics and authority structures. Under such circumstances, it is no longer viable to assume a society-wide, shared sense of the good. Globalization has come to involve an accentuation of difference – whether as something to be ignored (we are all equal, the appeal to universalism) or celebrated (we are all distinct or unique, the appeal to particularity).

This increased emphasis on both the universal and the unique has, among other things, served to bring into the educational foreground issues of diversity, multiculturalism, and language. In the same way that it is no longer possible to assume comfortably a single sense of what is meant by ‘the public good,’ it is no longer possible to assume deeply shared consensus on the meaning of a ‘good education.’ An early 21st century reality would seem to be the necessity of acknowledging the simultaneous presence, in any given society, of multiple educations, both formal and informal. Inevitably, questions have begun emerging about how to stimulate and sustain the provision of manifold educational goods and services. One response involves the privatization of educational goods and services and the granting of mounting autonomy to institutions within the education sector – a response, however, that invites serious concern about the erosion of core educational commitments to furthering the public (and not merely private) good. All of this then recursively occasions – just as do the dynamics of market driven economic activity serving as a primary driver and result of globalization processes – deepening educational confrontation with issues of access and equity.

A second characteristic of contemporary globalization processes that has profound effects on education policies and practices is the manner in which these processes accelerate the pace of technological, scientific, social, economic, political and cultural change. Most evidently in the sciences, social sciences and engineering (but also in the arts and humanities), the half-lives of useful knowledge and best practices are shortening dramatically. At the same time, market-driven production processes have become acutely responsive to changes in both local and global conditions, resulting in their unprecedented mobility and in highly volatile geographies of development. In combination, these emerging dynamics are bringing about circumstances in which it is increasingly difficult to provide current generations of students with the knowledge and skills that will be demanded by tomorrow's employers and markets (hence the oft-heard mantra, 'life-long education'); they also occasion circumstances in which many graduates with appropriate knowledge and skills find themselves residing in locales which are either not yet or no longer able to afford them with suitable employment opportunities. The complex dynamics of post-industrial production regimes resist anticipation, placing a high premium on capacities for innovation, if not improvisation. Yet, this runs counter to the well established association of formal educational regimes with the building of specific, market-demanded skills and expertise. Increasing innovative capacity is not now just a desirable outcome of education, it is an educational necessity.

These are clearly 'interesting times' for education practitioners and policy makers who – as never before – are faced with the task of taking into account both the play of global forces and trends, and the particular needs of individual students and their ever more pluralist societies. We intend that this volume should engage critically with the contemporary factors associated with the realization of significantly new means-of and meanings-for education. It is in large part a consequence of the activities of the International Forum on Education 2020 (IFE 2020) – an initiative of the East-West Center and partners in the Asia Pacific region that recognizes that education systems world-wide are being challenged by expanding global interdependence, accelerating social change, increasing economic inequity, and political and cultural conflicts within and among societies; that seeks to engage policy makers, academics and practitioners in collaborative efforts to understand and address in innovative ways these challenges to education in the Asia Pacific region; and, that furthers this mission through a leadership institute, senior seminars, regional work-

shops, and publications that aim to foster diverse strategies for meeting emergent educational needs.

In brief, the first section of the book aims to provide readers with coherent grounds for seeing in global interdependence the need to question basic assumptions about the means and meaning of education, and opportunities for transforming education so that it might contribute more substantially and more effectively to global equity. The second section provides an overview of how the globally dominant education paradigm is currently manifested, with attention given to how two individual national systems of education in the Asia Pacific region are responding to the realities of increasing globalization and accelerating social change. The final section aims at drawing out synthetic insights regarding the form and function of educational leadership in a world of complex – and not merely complicated – interdependence, where cultural diversity itself emerges as a key resource for engaging and effecting changes in the direction of global interdependence.

These case studies are drawn from the Asia Pacific region in part because of the regional partnerships constituting IFE 2020, but also because this region has emerged over the past quarter century as a site of remarkably rapid and accelerating change. The region recommends itself, then, as both a barometer of existing conditions driving educational change and a likely site for innovative approaches to initiating and coordinating such change. To the extent that the book successfully links global imperatives for change, local realities, and normative (though not prescriptive) insights into the meaning of sustained and innovative leadership, it serves well as an appropriate inaugural offering of IFE 2020 (with its implications of perfect eyesight) and its vision of paradigmatic educational change as key to achieving a sustainable and equitable global public good.

We turn now to an introduction of each of the book's three sections and twelve chapters. The questions that guide each section in turn are:

- Section I: What are the consequences of globalization for education?
- Section II: How are some states and alternative providers of education challenging (or not challenging) the prevailing educational paradigm in their responses to the processes of globalization?
- Section III: Given a world of complex global interdependence, what are the challenges for the leadership of change in education?

Part I: The Context and Imperatives for Paradigmatic Change in Education

The 21st century may well become known as the ‘century of interdependence.’ The fact of accelerating global interconnectedness has been widely recognized as a consequence of historical processes associated with democratic governance and free markets. Yet, increasing global interdependence does not necessarily mean greater equity and sustainability. Indeed, there is considerable evidence that prevailing patterns of global interdependence are bringing about greater economic and social inequity and have served to sharpen differences in interpretations and perceptions of the good life. At the same time, the complexity of emerging global realities makes equally evident that the direction of global change is neither random nor predetermined. Rather, the complexity of global interdependence points to the growing importance of values and norms in shaping and orienting global dynamics. The realities that are emerging with contemporary patterns of interdependence bring into focus emerging responsibilities for negotiating robustly shared commitments with respect to the meaning and direction of change. Importantly, at the same time that aspects of globalization constitute a forceful driver for educational change, other aspects of education are able to serve as touchstones for revising the meaning and direction of global interdependence.

This first section of the book addresses the context and the imperatives for imagining and undertaking genuinely paradigmatic educational change, rather than the familiar piecemeal reforms that leave untransformed the fundamental means and meaning of education. The several chapters of this section aim at: establishing a common vision of the factual realities of contemporary patterns of global interdependence; exploring how and to what extent these realities are related to crises in equity and the felt need for reprising values and ethics as pivotal content in education; examining how complex global realities command an increasingly important role for improvising shared values and norms in the equitable enhancement of global diversity; and drawing out the implications of complex interdependence for educational change.

In Chapter One, “Globalization and Education: Characteristics, Dynamics, Implications,” Deane Neubauer argues that contemporary globalization has brought into play a set of forces arguably as far-reaching as those that marked the history of the industrial revolution and the political and economic shifts that followed. He shows how globalization has wrought transformations of similar scale: in how people live, work, com-

municate, and engage with each other and the world, and in how they are educated. He shows how changes are taking place in the nature of the state itself, and in the roles of supra- and non-state actors in organizing and affecting human behavior. At the core of contemporary globalization he identifies transformations in how capital flows throughout the globe and is linked to production and consumption, how information and knowledge are created, transmitted and conserved, how labor is employed and deployed, and how value is created, distributed, conserved and destroyed.

As a social enterprise, from early childhood to post-graduate, public and private, secular and religious, education, suggests Neubauer, is located in the very midst of these complex processes of change. In situations in which the pace and reach of social change are great, tensions surrounding education are heightened because as a social activity it is framed by its essential conservatisms of knowledge transmission and conservation, which are challenged by novelty, invention, and innovation. Educational institutions frequently find themselves pressed to respond rapidly to changing social environments, with insufficient resources and uncertain maps of emerging social needs. At such moments, the certitudes of what we seek to impart to younger generations are threatened. Under these conditions social and political conflicts erupt over the disputed propriety of various forms of knowledge, belief and value. Challenged by the rapidly changing social contexts of contemporary globalization, education becomes contested terrain.

Neubauer provides in this chapter some suggestions for navigating this terrain: a set of observations, questions, propositions and insights into possible courses of action directed at aligning emergent education with parallel social, economic and political needs. The task is complicated if only because the processes of education are long and drawn out, whereas the pace of change associated with globalization has quickened and its consequences are far-reaching and substantial. Among these challenges he identifies primarily the requirement, for basic as well as higher education, to shift from passive modes of knowledge transmission – knower to learner – to active modes of knowledge engagement – learner to learner. Education about how the world works has proceeded, he suggests, from the former notion of learning how people in power operate the world, to seeking to gain some possible understanding of how these complex and unpredictable processes work, or might work. Education at all levels needs to become in novel ways a theorizing activity, a pervasive inquiry about the nature of things, the order of things, and the way of things.

From this, Neubauer concludes that the new educational paradigms that we seek will radically challenge our notions of how knowledge is created, transmitted and conserved. The historical conventions that have produced our subject matter categories will increasingly be replaced by imperatives to understand the world in terms of the processes and relations extant within it: ecology, information, political economy, and globalization itself. We will come to educate in terms of problems and dilemmas, both of which require solutions of very different orders, because increasingly this is what the world we have created will present to us.

In Chapter Two, "Rethinking Educational Aims in an Era of Globalization," Fazal Rizvi discusses some of the ways in which educational aims are being redrafted in contemporary curricular discourse in relation to dominant interpretations of globalization. He suggests that these new approaches are seriously flawed, in that they indicate a trend towards uniformity and convergence in thinking, proposing similar solutions and programs of educational reform in response to problems confronting educational systems with widely differing social, political and economic traditions. They display a major shift to neo-liberal policy thinking, manifested most clearly in privatization policies, and in policies that assume the validity of market mechanisms to solve most of the various challenges facing nation-states and civil society. They do this, he suggests, by working with a particular social imaginary that is largely inimical to the values of democracy and justice. As a result, they fail to develop broader visions of education aimed at preparing students to be critically informed and engaged with globalization's new challenges, threats and opportunities.

In showing how educational aims are always embedded within a broader context of social relations and practices, Rizvi draws substantially on what Taylor (2004) refers to as a 'social imaginary,' a framework that is at once descriptive and prescriptive of conceptions of how educational practice is best directed towards certain outcomes and is organized around a set of norms. In this sense, educational aims are located within a social imaginary, which for Taylor involves a complex, unstructured and contingent mix of the empirical and the affective. In this sense, his idea of a social imaginary is akin to Bourdieu's notion of 'habitus,' Raymond Williams's idea of 'structures of feeling,' or what Wittgenstein called the 'background.' The social imaginary is a way of thinking shared in a society by ordinary people; it involves common understandings that make everyday practices possible, giving them sense and legitimacy.

It is, of course, remarks Rizvi, possible to imagine the dynamics of

globalization in a variety of ways. Globalization is, after all, a highly contested term. However, the dominant social imaginary of globalization is a neo-liberal one, and its policy applications clearly benefit some communities more than others. Such is its logic that it assumes that if nation-states, for example, deregulate their economy, privatize their major institutions and pursue 'free trade' then their development is all but assured. Rizvi argues that the neo-liberal imaginary of globalization thus represents a range of ideas concerning new forms of politico-economic governance based on a pervasive naturalization of market logics and the extension of market relationships. It replaces an earlier imaginary that regarded the state provision of goods and services as a way of ensuring the social well-being of a national population. Education is thought to play a major role in national development because the emerging global economy is thought to be a knowledge economy that requires people with the capacity to operate in an ill-defined and ever-changing labor market. John Hawkins picks this idea up again in Chapter Five, where he considers why the prevailing educational paradigm is as intractably dominant as it is.

Rizvi concludes, however, that there is nothing inevitable or necessary about locating globalization within this imaginary. It is indeed possible to understand the facts of global interconnectivity and interdependence in radically different ways, with implications for rethinking educational aims by engaging with the processes and consequences of globalization in ways that do not prioritize the economic over all other human concerns. It is possible, he suggests, to imagine and work with an alternative form of globalization, a form rooted much more in democratic traditions, which does not rely entirely on the logic of the market, and is able to tame its excesses. Such a view of globalization demands not ready-made technocratic solutions to problems of education, but focuses instead on open dialogue across cultures and nations. It requires thinking and acting both locally and globally. It implies an education that teaches students to see our problems as inextricably linked to the problems of others. It requires that they develop both critical skills and an attitude that enables them to imagine our collective futures, for humanity as a whole. It involves viewing education as a public good in which all can share. In a globally interconnected world, education, more than ever before, needs to be viewed as expanding the general welfare of communities. In the end, what Rizvi's argument suggests is that it is possible to conceive of education as contributing to both public and private goods, to both social and economic ends, and to both national and global concerns.

We have in this Introduction described the concerns of the chapters in the first section in terms of the following aims: to establish some empirical realities of contemporary patterns of global interdependence; to explore how and to what extent these realities are related to crises in equity and the need to re-emphasise values and ethics as pivotal in education; to examine how complex global realities point to the importance of developing shared values and norms in the equitable enhancement of global diversity; and to consider the implications of complex interdependence for educational change. With respect to the first aim, and by way of justification of the second, Mark Mason considers in his Chapter Three, "Multiculturalism, Shared Values, and an Ethical Response to Globalization," five critically important features of our contemporary world that are closely associated with the process of accelerated globalization, each of which raises difficult moral questions, principally to do with equity, sustainability and social justice. The five phenomena that he considers are: the exponentially increasing gap between rich and poor; the destruction of the planet's natural environment; the phenomenon of urbanization; the proliferation of HIV/AIDS; and, the intercultural tensions associated with increasingly multicultural societies. The third aim of the chapters in this first section of the book has to do with how we might respond to the moral questions that each of these features raises by the development at least of some shared values and norms across cultures. Mason's response to this question is to identify some core moral principles that do indeed have transcultural normative reach, that all (who accept at least the moral principle of multiculturalism) are obliged to honor, whatever their cultural background. He concludes that we need not and in fact should not accept all culturally-specific ideals and practices as legitimate, but only those which honor the values and ethics that are consistent with the principle of multiculturalism itself. He proposes these ethics as constitutive of at least some values and norms that can be shared across cultures and that might, then, contribute to the equitable enhancement of global diversity. And in response to the fourth aim, which is concerned with the implications of complex interdependence for educational change, Mason defends, in conclusion, an education in these values and norms – an education for a global rather than a national citizenship, and an education informed by and committed to the principles and processes of democracy – as an important practical consequence of this moral position.

In Chapter Four, "Education and Alleviating Poverty: Educating for

Equity and Diversity,” Peter Hershock examines a set of connections among the structures and direction of 21st century global interdependence, deepening poverty and inequity both within and among societies, and the now almost ubiquitous experience of educational shortfalls emerging at rates and intensities that far outstrip capacities for educational reform. His conviction is that the same conditions that are globally sharpening inequity and driving education into locally distinct and yet virtually uniform crises are also opening spaces for education to serve as a driver for reorienting global interdependence and alleviating poverty, but only if the globally dominant model of curriculum-based and competence-biased education is fundamentally abandoned.

The association of education and poverty alleviation is a mainstay of government, non-governmental and inter-governmental approaches to poverty reduction. Hershock notes, however, that as appealing as are approaches like that of Amartya Sen (2000), which link poverty alleviation and education, they shed insufficient explanatory or strategic light on the fact that patterns of global interdependence that have fostered remarkable economic growth, greatly increased capacities for choice, and rapidly expanded educational opportunities, have also heightened global inequity and locally intensified the conditions for educational crisis. To gain critical purchase on this ironic set of linkages, Hershock forwards an explicitly relational conception of poverty and a complex understanding of change dynamics.

As the distinctive nature of 21st century realities have become increasingly manifest, many have called for a turn toward a relational ontology, recognizing that traditional, individuality-biased concepts of self and state are rapidly eroding, and that contemporary realities seem much better addressed through such relational concepts as interdependence, shared meaning construction, mutual interaction, and systematic process (e.g., Gergen 2000, Harvey 1996). From the perspective of a relational ontology, Hershock claims, poverty is best seen as marking the persistence of a constraining and qualitatively stagnant or degrading relational dynamic. Poverty does not represent a lack *in* a given situation, afflicting only some specific persons or peoples. It signals a distinctive meaning or heading *of* a situation – a heading that is not spatial, but qualitative – in which all involved are in some degree complicit. Poverty, Hershock summarizes, can be seen as a function of compromised or collapsed *diversity*, where diversity consists of self-sustaining and difference-enriching patterns of mutual contribution to meaningfully shared welfare. Strategies

for poverty alleviation that are not ecological in the sense of addressing the meaning or direction of an impoverishing situation as a whole are doomed to failure. Yet, this is precisely the type of poverty alleviation afforded by the globally dominant educational paradigm.

Drawing on themes raised by Neubauer and Rizvi, and anticipating Hawkins' characterization of the globally dominant educational pattern, Hershock draws attention to the co-emergence of the curriculum model of formal education with the 16th and 17th century advent of modernity and the rise of global markets. From this time forward, formal education has been seen as a deliverable – a quantifiable product of logically ordered sequences of instruction transferring predetermined knowledge content. Shaped in fundamental accord with the modern values of control, universality, autonomy and equality – and matured in interdependence with other modern institutions, including those of the nation-state and global commodity, labor and consumer markets – education came to focus on the disciplined completion (or consumption) of methodically structured, standard curricula. According to Hershock, this model of education, whatever its past utility, is ill-suited to the needs of persons and communities enmeshed in complex patterns of global interdependence. Using key concepts from complexity theory and introducing a critical distinction between problem solution and predicament resolution, Hershock points to the crippling incompleteness today of any body of knowledge restricted to knowing-that and knowing-how, and to the need for education suited to skilfully and wisely improvising shared meaning and commitments across plural domains of fact and value, as well as across sectors and societies. Arguing that an educational bias toward market-defined competency limits the degree to which education can positively affect poverty, he envisions an explicitly pluralist educational ethos emerging as a shift is made away from delivering *curricular commodities* toward revitalizing commitments-to and capacities-for *educational craft*: educational practices and institutions that are not structured in accord with the values of control, competition and choice, but rather those of commitment, coordination and contributory virtuosity. Hershock avers in conclusion that education that does not take deep account of diversity is ultimately incompatible with increasing equity.

Part II: Outcomes and Opportunities for Change: Education in a Renewing Asia

Asia is the world's most rapidly developing continent. While rapid

change is taking place globally, affecting all societies with varying degrees of profundity, Asia is a particularly intense nexus of economic, political, and social development. It is also among the most culturally diverse regions of the world, with over 2,100 living languages, and substantial populations adhering to each of the major world religions. For these reasons alone, Asia would commend itself as a locus for empirical studies on how increasingly complex interdependence is associated with educational change. Yet Asian societies are also experiencing an uncommonly wide range of the problems and predicaments characterizing the global spectrum of educational crisis. Asia is home, for example, both to some of the world's most well educated and to some of the least literate societies. The Republic of Korea ranks in the top 2% of global educational achievement in the 2005 UNESCO Education for All index, while Pakistan, Bangladesh and India account for nearly half of the world total of adult illiterates, nearly 34% of whom live in India alone.

The chapters constituting this section aim to provide some empirically grounded perspectives on educational realities and needs in contemporary Asia, as well as insight into how the challenges of meeting these needs are opening spaces for potentially paradigmatic shifts in the meaning and practice of education. A unifying concern of these regionally diverse perspectives is to clarify how the complex conditions that are mandating substantive educational change are also opening opportunities for educational change to help direct or shape growing interdependence.

The section begins, in Chapter Five, "The Intractable Dominant Educational Paradigm," by John Hawkins, with a characterization of the globally dominant educational paradigm(s), with a particular emphasis on the Asia Pacific region. Hawkins finds this globally dominant "grammar of schooling" (Tyack & Cuban, 1995) ubiquitously in evidence in both the developed and developing world. If this grammar has a Western origin, Hawkins finds it pursued in the latter "so we can develop like them." In an age of skepticism about meta-narratives, references to a 'globally dominant educational paradigm' will of course be met with such skepticism. We accept that actual observations of educational systems and environments around the world arguably reveal the existence of multiple and often interleaving educational paradigms – highly variable patterns of educational practice that are tied in many and intimate ways to specific local-national-regional conditions. But, as Hawkins shows, these conditions do not arise autonomously: they reflect, to a greater or lesser extent, global forces, global historical dynamics and globally emerging patterns

of interdependence among societies. To the degree that this is so, the uniqueness of educational systems world-wide can be affirmed, but only in a qualified sense. Our view in this book is that there is value in stepping back far enough to discern significant, global trends and patterns in the history of formal education. Such a meta-perspective may yield insights into how most effectively to enhance educational access and quality and to translate educational successes from around the world into locally viable and vibrant institutional and pedagogical idioms. If educational institutions and practices reflect the shifting global dynamics of complex interdependence and emergence – a point made in several of this volume’s chapters – then changing education even at the most local level can be effective only if pursued on the basis of a clear understanding of the interwoven developmental trajectories of local, national, regional and global historical, social, political, economic, cultural, technological and educational processes. What Hawkins refers to as ‘the globally dominant educational paradigm’ is a surprisingly consistent pattern of interrelationships among these often quite distinct development trajectories.

Hawkins’ intention in this chapter is to trace the broad historical outlines of this paradigm – one centered on development-enabling, curriculum-based formal education – and to consider why it remains as widely and deeply entrenched as it does. He does so, and in this book we do so, in full awareness that a paradigm of education is not an empirical entity, but rather a way of structuring educational relationships. There are no schools or educational systems to which one can point as instantiations of the dominant paradigm. Tyack and Cuban’s invocation of grammar as a metaphor is apt in that it focuses attention on discerning structural commonalities that indicate a history of convergences explaining why education has come to mean such similar things to so many different people in so many quite distinct settings. Hawkins is left in his conclusion with two issues: the ‘why’ of education, the theoretical rationale for why we conduct schooling the way we do; and the method of education, which has flowed from the ‘why.’ Having shown what has shaped this system and the method in which it has been implemented, a method or ‘grammar’ that has been almost impervious to change and reform in any significant degree, Hawkins concludes that we certainly have not witnessed a paradigm shift to match those found in other sectors. Despite the increasing complexity of an increasingly globalized world, formal education has trudged forward in a unilinear fashion, as has most of the thinking about how to think about education. The dominant paradigm reigns. Para-

doxically, however, increasing rates of globalization have created a consciousness of the paradigm's key features and some resistance to its dominance that might lead to reinterpretations of the means and meaning of education and set in motion a genuine shift of paradigm.

Ma Wan-hua, in Chapter Six, "Globalization and Paradigm Change in Higher Education: The Experience of China," discusses the most populous country in the region as an example of a large, rapidly growing transitional society in which higher education change is playing a central role in social transformation. She locates current patterns of educational innovation in the context of China's policy of opening up and integrating into global dynamics, showing that China's alignment with the dominant educational paradigm is explicitly driven by the need for national economic development. Ma stresses how globalization processes have spurred educational change in China, but also how Chinese educators and policy makers have engaged these processes in ways sensitive to Chinese concerns about both national global standing and equity of access to education within China's borders. While many of the changes she considers are specific to China, there are lessons in China's experience for other transitional societies seeking new educational forms and practices.

Of course globalization impacts differently on countries at different developmental stages. To developed countries, globalization might primarily mean the opportunity to open up more international markets and to gain access to more natural and human resources. In the case of China, globalization is about much more than economic reform. Although it can be argued that China first opened up to globalization processes through economic reform, the ramifications have been not only economic, but also political, social, cultural and educational. In many ways, the trajectory of change in higher education in China has been unique – a transition from a Soviet-modeled system aimed at engineering socialist industrialization, through the interregnum of the Cultural Revolution – but it has converged towards a gradual assimilation into Hawkins' globally dominant educational paradigm, albeit with "Chinese characteristics." Globalization and the associated economic reforms and educational paradigm changes in China constitute an ongoing process in which higher education is being used as a strategy to increase the country's economic growth and development – a fairly standard expression of the still globally dominant paradigm. The challenge that lies ahead for higher education, and one which has important implications for the emergence of new educational paradigms, is not only to improve the competency of stu-

dents, but also to address moral and social values and issues, educational, social and gender inequities, cultural diversity, and environmental protection. These are among the basic elements for the sustainable development of a society. They also constitute key concerns for higher education development, globally and in the still emerging China of the 21st century.

In Chapter Seven, "Pulling Together amid Globalization," Jason Tan challenges some common assumptions about diversity and education as he focuses on one of the more multicultural countries in the region, Singapore. A major challenge in Singapore has been to develop educational programs that address imperatives both to produce students capable of competing within and creatively engaging with global markets, and to foster cultural sensitivities and citizenship skills and dispositions that are expressive of local, Singaporean values. The chapter focuses on the National Education policy initiative that was introduced into all Singapore schools by the Ministry of Education in 1997. The initiative aims to develop in students a sense of national identity, an awareness of Singapore's recent history and of the country's developmental challenges and constraints, and a confidence in the country's future. Tan points out that the National Education initiative is by no means new in its desire to impart a sense of 'Singaporean National Identity.' It is simply another indication of a long-standing concern over the past four or five decades to foster social cohesion through schools through a top-down approach to education policy-making. What is new, remarks Tan, is the changed social context, that is, the greater income disparities in a materially wealthier society, amid the economic vagaries of globalization, as well as a more fragile socio-political world-wide environment, characterized by heightened fear and tension following the events of 11th September 2001. He suggests that the National Education initiative was drawn up in direct response to the growing pressures of globalization, as Singapore attempts to situate itself firmly within the global economy. Even as Singaporeans are being encouraged to foster greater regional and international economic and cultural links, Tan shows how they are, somewhat paradoxically, being urged to root themselves firmly within the local context. The chapter demonstrates the limits to a top-down approach to fostering social cohesion and national identity in a national education system, particularly in the face of the pressures wrought on the society by globalization.

Joseph Farrell suggests in Chapter Eight, "Education in the Years to Come: What We Can Learn from Alternative Education," that there is massing evidence of limits to the effectiveness and completeness of for-

mal educational systems in a complex and interdependent world. He indicates that we may be catching glimpses of newly emerging educational paradigms beyond the horizon of formal education systems – in the so-called informal or non-formal sector – where educational successes are being realized in situations hitherto considered intractable. Farrell's optimistic observation is that educational innovation, especially in the non-formal sector, is often a consequence of bureaucratic exhaustion – the admission by the formal education sector that it simply cannot meet at least some part of contemporary educational needs.

Farrell writes from the standpoint of one of the leaders or organizers of a loose international coalition of scholars, program developers and graduate students who are together trying to make sense of a large group of radically alternative schooling programs. Most of these programs are at the primary and early secondary level, are indeed producing superior learning results among very disadvantaged young people, and happen to fit in well with what we have now come to know from 'brain science' and cognitive psychology about how people (young and older) actually learn best. He does three main things in his chapter: first, he outlines briefly the problems with schools typical of the dominant educational paradigm, and the difficulties in changing them; second, he identifies and analyzes what these researchers are learning from many cases of success; and finally, he suggests how we might continue to learn from these successes, which may give us some hope as to how we might change the schooling of the future.

Farrell's primary contention is that the best hope we have of providing a better form of learning for this and future generations of young people, on a large scale, is to try to learn from those people, seemingly small in number in any one place but actually quite large in international aggregate, who have managed to create these islands of success where so many others have failed, or succeeded only marginally – hence the subtitle of his chapter, "What We Can Learn from Alternative Education." In response to this question, Farrell presents in his chapter a comparative analysis of three core cases selected from a much larger database of cases: one from Asia, one from Latin America, and one from the Middle East. He draws on detailed case studies of these three programs:

Escuela Nueva (New School) in Colombia: This is the oldest and perhaps best known internationally of these programs. Started on a small scale in the late 1970s, this programme had spread to about 8,000 schools by the mid-1980s. It was then declared by the Colombian government as the

standard model for rural schooling in that country, and has now spread to most rural schools there. It is currently spreading slowly to urban schools as well, and has been adopted and adapted in at least ten other countries in Latin America.

The Non-formal Primary Education Program of the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee: This program started in the mid-1980s, has grown to involve about 35,000 rural schools in Bangladesh, and is slowly moving into urban schooling and ethnic minority regions of the country. It has spread further through a diffusion program with other local NGOs, and has also been adopted in countries such as Ethiopia, Sudan and Afghanistan.

The Community Schools Program of UNICEF-Egypt: This program started in the early 1990s, drawing upon the experience of the two programs noted above, and adapted to the local situation in small hamlets in Upper Egypt, where girls' access to schooling was particularly problematic. It has now grown to a system of more than 200 schools, with carefully planned diffusion (in conjunction with the national Ministry of Education) of its non-formal pedagogy to roughly 8,000 government-managed one-classroom schools, and then to the broader system of mainstream schools.

Three core questions guide the long-term research into these cases, and structure Farrell's inquiries in this chapter:

- 1) The *pedagogical* question: How do these young people manage to learn as well as they do, often in very difficult circumstances? What actually happens in the classrooms and other learning sites?
- 2) The *teacher development* question: How do the teachers/facilitators in these programs learn quickly and well a radically different way of acting and being in their schools with their young students?
- 3) The *management/administration* question: How do these systems originate and how do they, as many have, go to scale (often quite large scale)?

Farrell concludes that the standard change model – top-down, centrally driven, regulation-ridden grand reform schemes – has proved to be about as intransigently ineffective as the schooling system it is attempting to improve. The problem in his view is not simply that many children in the world do not yet have access to school – the 'Education For All' issue. It is that those who do have such access are not learning much, even in

rich countries, or that what they are learning is more in spite of than because of what happens in school. In contrast, he reports, we now have a large set of successful examples, some large in scale and some still small and in early stages of development (of which the three cases highlighted in his chapter are exemplars), which are succeeding in significantly improving learning by adopting a radically different form of pedagogy, and spreading it via an innovation-diffusion process which, *inter alia*, demonstrates that teachers can and do quite quickly and easily learn a wholly new understanding of their role and a very different and better way of doing their work in the classroom.

If Farrell is right in his conclusion, to which we alluded in the previous paragraph, that “the standard change model – top-down, centrally driven, regulation-ridden grand reform schemes – has proved to be about as intransigently ineffective as the schooling system it is attempting to improve,” then how might we think about more effective models of leadership for educational change? Part III addresses this question.

Part III: Leadership in Changing the Way Education Changes

Early 21st century patterns of rapidly deepening and broadening global interdependence can arguably be seen as bringing difference into focus as a potential for mutual contribution. Globalization does not, in other words, lead inexorably toward standardization or homogenization. Instead, it can be seen as highlighting the continuing value of the local and particular, to the extent that they can be brought into beneficial reciprocity. Among the central challenges, then, of effective leadership in the 21st century are understanding and responding to the interfusion of local needs and values with global patterns of change and growing interconnection – a challenge, finally, of productively conserving and creatively enhancing diversity. Leaders and policy-makers must now be capable of sensitively and yet critically weighing often quite disparate values, interests, bodies of data, and practices, bringing them into an equitable and sustainable relationship. This marks a paradigmatic shift in the form and function of leadership from the variously competitive and cooperative management of existing resources toward eliciting and coordinating new and contextually appropriate contributory potentials and innovation.

This section aims to synthesize the more conceptual considerations of global dynamics undertaken in Part I and the empirically grounded ‘grass-roots’ realities and practices informing Part II to derive insights into the

distinctive complexion of leadership aimed at articulating and nurturing the conditions of paradigmatic change. While each of the chapters constituting this section aims at drawing globally relevant conclusions about how to foster apt leadership in the context of rapid change and complex interdependence, the particularities of Asian cultural resources for leadership innovation are given special consideration. Attention is also given to the need to bring about institutional as well as ideological change.

Because change in complex systems like those emerging with deepening global interdependence is liable to occur in markedly non-linear fashion, the assumptions of theories of linear causation and change are increasingly likely to prove limiting and potentially counterproductive. As agents of systemic (if not systematic) and complex change, educational leaders need to be apprised of this ongoing shift in causal dynamics and the increasing importance of norms and values in change. At the same time, this rising importance of norms and values implies the deepening relevance of local and regional cultural traditions in initiating and sustaining change. In keeping with the regional focus of the book, this section concentrates on exploring the relevance of Asia Pacific traditions of leadership in contemporary global context.

Opening this section is Peter Hershock's Chapter Nine, "Leadership in the Context of Complex Global Interdependence: Emerging Realities for Educational Innovation," which reprises many of the key issues raised in Part I, in particular the multiple effects and historical dynamics of globalization, the implications of complex interdependence and change, and concerns about the increasing prominence of difference as a post-modern fact and value. Here, however, his interest is in eliciting from this set of issues insight into the changing nature of leadership. The chapter begins with a rehearsal of the widely noted contrary tendencies toward both greater homogeneity/convergence and heterogeneity/divergence within contemporary globalization processes. In a preliminary way, Hershock infers that contemporary realities pose imperatives for rethinking leadership in connection with, on one hand, globalization and issues of scale, and, on the other, the mounting importance of processes of valuation in shaping the course of global interdependence.

The first section of the chapter offers a synoptic history of the past four centuries of globalization processes, with emphasis on bringing to light the arrays of conditions that led to deepening tensions between the conditions for market growth and equitable development, and to the advent of critical concerns about issues of scale. Hershock's argument is that

the many unanticipated ironic consequences of technological development – global climate change surely being the most prominent and troubling among them – can usefully be seen as reflecting a failure to appreciate the complex, history-sensitive nature of the systems of interdependence that technologies of industrial production, transportation, communication, information processing and the like made possible, especially over the past two centuries. In such highly complex, multiple-order systems, there emerge rich topographies of recursion that are capable of remarkably rapid and profound amplifications of what were originally quite small or modest changes. In short, the summative effect of significant, quantitative changes in the scope and depth of globalization processes over the past several centuries has been to bring about profound *qualitative* transformations in the relational systems by means of which societies frame and pursue their own continuity. Emerging interdependencies both within and among the social, economic, political, technological, scientific, and cultural domains are not only a legacy of responses to change, they are also increasingly responsive to change – a fact that Hershock sees as having crucial implications for responsible leadership.

Emerging global realities are such that values, aims and interests are becoming embedded in the concrete relationships and practices that materially constitute our growing interdependence. But rather than abiding thereafter in a steady state of activation, producing changes at set velocities, values, aims and interests have potentially accelerating or decelerating impacts on the nature of our global interdependence – and, hence, our lived environments – as a whole. One outcome of this is the production of increasingly pluralized geographies of innovation or widely distributed sites for and sources of significant change. In the context of such systems, the strategic separation of facts and values becomes a serious liability. Means and ends constitute interpenetrating aspects of a total situation and attempts at separating considerations of them will amplify indeterminacies and challenges, leading to ‘solutions’ that in actuality intensify problem production.

In the context of such complex situational dynamics, exercising leadership becomes inseparable from both broadening and deepening attunement to and critical engagement with the ongoing challenges of coordinated value change. Using the problem-predicament distinction introduced in Chapter Four, Hershock claims that the core task of contemporary leadership is not problem solution, but rather predicament resolution, in a world where responding effectively in the absence of clear

precedents is emerging as a central concern. Echoing some of Mason's intuitions about the benefits of multiculturalism, Hershock identifies *diversity* as a key consideration in regard to both the means and meaning of complex leadership. The final section of the chapter addresses the potential for education to serve as a force for revising the meaning of global interdependence, and how this affects the mandates of educational leadership and innovation. In contrast with presently prevailing tendencies to bring difference into education through curricula aimed at enhancing learning about others and tolerating difference, Hershock calls for education that emphasizes learning from and learning with others in pursuit of actively improvised, shared values, aims and interests, conserving and accentuating differences as the basic condition for mutual contribution.

Victor Ordonez begins Chapter Ten, "The Changing Role of Leadership (or A Changing Leadership for a Changing World)," by pointing out a paradox of globalization that, as the world becomes more interconnected, groups that come together – physically or virtually – are becoming more heterogeneous rather than more homogeneous. While common elements of globalization, such as language use and technological communication systems, are indeed becoming more universal, the various individuals drawn together by these vehicles increasingly represent diversity rather than uniformity. The heightened awareness of such difference can lead to polarization, to a retreat from the surge towards greater interdependence and collaboration, even to a narrow chauvinism or a desperate stance to preserve local identities and cultures at the expense of rejecting all that is not perceived as one's own. On the positive side, a healthy diversity can lead to a mutual respect and understanding of differences, and the potential for growth, harmony, and learning that can come from rich interaction.

It is in the context of this setting that the role of leadership needs to evolve. Management and leadership have commonly been studied, discussed, and practiced in the context of a relatively homogeneous workforce and a static organizational setup. But today's leaders, suggests Ordonez, are frequently called upon to lead a group of individuals with diverse backgrounds, motivations, cultural and ethnic roots, and capabilities. The goals and targets, moreover, towards which leaders guide their groups are themselves changing with the fast changing environment. Leaders therefore no longer have the assurance and credibility of being able to state clearly defined destinations for the rest of the group, if fast changing circumstances compel a regular re-articulation and adjustment

of the desired goals. In many instances, old problems cannot be solved by old solutions. New solutions, indeed entirely new strategies for understanding and addressing problems, are required. What then, asks Ordonez, are the practical implications for leaders in the context of these realities? How do they deal with an increasingly heterogeneous group and increasingly flexible work objectives?

The author responds to these questions by focusing his discussion on leadership in conditions of diversity and rapid change, conditions which are also marked by new modalities of communication and by an absence of maps of the unexplored new territories that emerge as a consequence of the processes associated with globalization. Through a description of three case studies, he examines the importance of leadership qualities such as vision, charisma, commitment and enthusiasm. The case studies describe a project to reform basic education in China's Jilin province; a project aimed at overcoming, through informal education, high rates of illiteracy among girls in India's state of Rajasthan; and a project undertaken by UNESCO in conjunction with nine countries with high rates of illiteracy, aimed at tackling challenges set by Education For All goals. Ordonez draws on his extensive experience with those involved in these projects (he was himself responsible for much of the third in his capacity as UNESCO's Director of Basic Education, tasked with the world-wide coordination of Education For All efforts) to identify key attributes of educational leaders for today's rapidly changing world. Leadership, indeed management, in educational settings, he concludes, needs now more than ever to look beyond improving means to re-articulating existing ends. Since there is growing evidence that education structures, as they currently exist, have largely outlived the environments for which they were originally developed, leaders in this sector should look beyond budgets, facilities expansion and maintenance, textbook production, and so on. They need constantly to search for new ways and new paradigms to meet the learning needs of students facing uncharted futures. Management and strategic planning skills must of course be part of the tool kit of every leader. But leaders of the future can and must be more than managers. They must be able to optimize the potential inherent in the realities of diversity rather than just tolerating or dealing with it. They must cooperatively build visions and strategies rather than just handing them down. They must be prepared to suggest new and different directions as circumstances and changes in the workplace and in the larger environment call for them. And finally, they must be leaders who recog-

nize that their ultimate mandate is the development of their people rather than the achievement of their work objectives, since the latter would follow the former.

Wang Hongyu's position in Chapter Eleven, "Interconnections Within and Without: The Double Duty of Creative Educational Leadership," is that, for the purpose of bringing about creative educational change, experiencing meaningful interconnections of an inward nature is essential to leading outward into today's complexly interdependent world. For Wang, global transformation and self-transformation need to go hand in hand, and some aspects of Chinese philosophy, notably of Confucianism and Daoism, offer her useful inspiration for responding to complex patterns of relationships both internally and externally. Both the Confucian ethics of personal cultivation and the Daoist aesthetics and cosmology of independent personhood situate those engaging them in explicitly dynamic patterns of social, emotional, spiritual, and cosmic interconnections. Such traditions, she maintains, can usefully inform contemporary efforts to initiate and sustain creative educational change.

Wang first examines Confucian and Daoist notions of personhood and leadership, and then elaborates on views of the relationship between interconnectivity and creativity that are substantially associated with these aspects of Chinese philosophy. She then considers the contemporary significance of personal cultivation in the context of present day patterns of globalization, including the implications of personal cultivation for education in 21st century China and for global educational leadership. Her chapter concludes with a call for an inter-space of educational leadership in which creativity can flow from interconnections within and without. For Wang, such an inter-space values conflict and dissonance as potentially constructive. Openness to difference is, in her view, what we need to form a complex, dynamic, and equitable network of relationship and creativity. An inter-space supports meaningful interconnections both within the self and across the globe. New patterns of educational leadership situated in such a space express a fluidity of movement beyond any predetermined procedures, at once extending the *Way* or *Dao* of teaching/learning while forming new educational directions. Wang's double duty of creative educational leadership is to cultivate interconnections within and without, in order to 'lead out' (*educare*) to possibilities yet to come. Working from within and towards the world, educational leadership has the potential to enable both self-transformation and global transformation.

An individual in the Confucian tradition of personhood, Wang

reminds us, is always a 'person-in-community.' As individuals, we relate with others and these relationships are integral to the process of personal cultivation. Readers more familiar with Western philosophical traditions might recognize in Wang's discussions of personal cultivation within and in relationship to the family, the village, the nation, and ultimately, the world, similarities to communitarian perspectives on the nature of the self. Communitarians understand the self as formed in dialogue within the community: our identity is at least partly constituted by moral demands which emanate from beyond ourselves and by Taylor's (1991) "horizons of significance," which constitute the ground with reference to which we are able to generate meaning in our lives. This understanding of the self is offered by communitarian writers in response to what they perceive as an overly analytic focus in liberal perspectives on the notion of a 'disembedded' self whose highest good is understood in terms of an autonomous individual freedom. Thus leaders are, for Wang, thoroughly enmeshed and embedded in the communities which they lead. They do not stand above them or ahead of them as might be the case in much contemporary educational leadership discourse. This integral connection with and embeddedness in the educational community being led we will see again in Vrinda Dalmiya's drawing on the work of Nel Noddings and Chandra Mohanty in defence of a thoroughly relational view of educational leadership.

In Chapter Twelve, "Unraveling Leadership: 'Relational Humility' and the Search for Ignorance," Vrinda Dalmiya shows how a feminist analysis – which foregrounds the importance of relationships – of education and educational leadership commits us not only to rethinking the aims of education but also to re-conceptualizing the processes of crafting educational policy to realize those aims. She suggests, in other words, that changes made in the nature and content of education rebound self-reflexively on what it is to 'lead' educational policy towards those changes. Thus, re-imagining education implies re-configuring the power relations implicated in the implementation of those changes. It is Dalmiya's intention to 'unravel' established notions of educational leadership and policy making and thus to show their integral connections with deeper and wider meta-level networks that create and keep in place existing educational structures.

To do this she begins with the work of two contemporary scholars – Nel Noddings, a philosopher of education working within the framework of care ethics, and Chandra Mohanty, who writes as a post-colonial South

Asian feminist of color, teaching in the American academy. While Noddings centers her discussions on the 'inter-subjective' domain, Mohanty focuses on 'inter-historicity.' Concerned with the relations of empowerment and disempowerment, Dalmiya first fleshes out the difference between these two authors in this regard, but then attempts to synthesize their insights in what she calls 'relational humility.' Education and educational leadership, when structured around the cultivation of such relational humility, become, in her words, 'the search for ignorance.' Educational leaders who are sufficiently humble to acknowledge the limitations of their own knowledge are leaders who are able to draw on the experiences and wisdom of the marginalized in their leadership for educational and societal change in the direction of justice.

Noddings' inter-subjectivity and Mohanty's inter-historicity are both, Dalmiya argues, enabled by self-ascriptions of ignorance, stemming from the cultivation of relational humility. However, for her, this latter concept emerges only through a tripartite conversation that includes the meaning and methodology of education as reflected in the stories of the *Mahābhārata*. She draws on the story of Kauśika to suggest that only when the traditional divide between 'leaders' and 'led' – both in education and in the world at large – is deconstructed, will we begin to see the unraveling of systems of global privilege. The goal of education, she argues, is the crafting of political agency involving three layers – subjective dispositions (as learned by Kauśika), inter-subjective skills of caring-for (as defended by Noddings), and an inter-historical grasp of particular social locations structured by race, class, gender, and other axes along which power is differentially distributed (as defended by Mohanty). This is, in Dalmiya's words, "a far cry from educational accountability conceived in the narrow terms of bridging achievement gaps between students of different ethnic and class backgrounds." As Cambron-McCabe and McCarthy (2005, p.202) suggest, the "discourse of accountability, standards, and quality is safe language that eschews more controversial confrontations about race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and systemic inequities": hence the prevalent contemporary construction of justice in narrow market-based terms. Dalmiya concludes instead that if education is to aim at more robustly transformed and transformative subjects, what is needed is consciousness of oppositional locations of gendered and raced bodies both inside and outside the classroom. Such consciousness and the self-reflective praxis of recovering alternatives to systemic oppressions are motivated, she suggests,

by the virtue of relational humility, which enables us to negotiate power both at the inter-personal and social levels.

What Dalmiya offers is a deconstruction of established concepts of leadership and a step towards what might be a 'relational turn' in the conceptualizing of leadership and policy-making, which encompass a rethinking of established notions of authority, accountability and the very role and nature of leading itself. If Neubauer, Rizvi, Mason, and Hershock will have succeeded in establishing the context and imperatives for paradigmatic change in education in an increasingly globalized world; if Hawkins, Ma, Tan, and Farrell will have succeeded in illustrating the dominant educational paradigm historically and empirically in Asia and more broadly afield by the consideration of case studies of educational change in response to the pressures of globalization and of potentially new educational paradigms; and if Hershock, Ordonez, Wang, and Dalmiya will have succeeded in bringing new perspectives to bear on the challenges of educational leadership in the context of an increasingly globalized world; then this volume will be pertinent to changing education by contributing these perspectives on leadership, innovation and development in a globalizing Asia Pacific.

References

- Gergen, K.J. (2000): 'The Self in the Age of Information'. *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 23, Winter.
- Harvey, D. (1996): *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Taylor, C. (1991): *The Ethics of Authenticity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

I

*The Context and Imperatives for
Paradigmatic Change in Education*

1

Globalization and Education Characteristics, Dynamics, Implications

Deane NEUBAUER

How significant is the ‘globalization’ revolution of our day? Some see it as nothing of the kind, as a mere extension, albeit an important one, of ways in which the world has been integrating economically for centuries (Bentley & Ziegler 2006). Others view it as profound, a collection of changes, rapid and fundamental, that are transforming how the world works, how we perceive each other, indeed, how we make up society (Johnston et al. 2002). I confess that I adhere to the latter school. In my view contemporary globalization has brought into play a set of forces arguably as far-reaching as those that marked the history of the industrial revolution and the political and economic shifts that followed.

Globalization has wrought transformations of similar scale: in how people live, work, identify and aggregate, communicate and engage – locally, nationally, internationally, globally, and how they are educated. Changes are taking place in the nature of the state itself, in how states interact, and in the roles of supra- and non-state actors in organizing and affecting human behavior. At the core of contemporary globalization are transformations in how capital flows throughout the globe and is linked to production and consumption, in how energy is harnessed and consumed, in how information and knowledge are created, transmitted and conserved, how labor is employed and deployed, and how value is created, distributed, conserved and destroyed.

As a social enterprise, from early childhood to post-graduate, public and private, secular and religious, education is located in the very midst of these complex processes of change. In important ways – whatever its

other messages – education is always about some notion of how the world works and how it should work. Through the educational process we seek to organize and convey to others, most particularly the rising generation, a sense of our collective selves, the world we live in, our aspirations, values and wisdom. In situations in which the pace and reach of social change are great, tensions surrounding education are heightened because as a social activity it is framed by its essential conservatism of knowledge transmission and conservation, which are challenged by novelty, invention, and innovation. Educational institutions too frequently find themselves pressed to respond rapidly to changing social environments armed with insufficient resources and uncertain maps of emerging social needs. At such moments, the certitudes of what we seek to impart to the rising generation are threatened, as are those who impart them. Under these conditions social and political conflicts erupt over the disputed propriety of various forms of knowledge, belief and value. Challenged by the rapidly changing social contexts of contemporary globalization, education becomes contested terrain.

This chapter provides some suggestions for navigating this terrain: a set of observations, questions, propositions, perhaps even insights, into possible courses of action directed at aligning emergent education with parallel social, economic and political needs. The task is complicated if only because the processes of education are long and drawn out, whereas the pace of change associated with globalization has quickened and its consequences are far-reaching and substantial. At times it would seem as if the challenge confronting contemporary education is to prepare a generation for hoped-for successes in a world the contours of which we have only begun to glimpse (Friedman 2005).

Globalization appears to have as many definitions as commentators. A useful definition is offered by David Held (1991, p.216) for whom globalization is:

the product of the emergence of a global economy, expansion of transnational linkages between economic units creating new forms of collective decision making, development of intergovernmental and quasi-supranational institutions, intensification of transnational communications, and the creation of new regional and military orders.

Jill Blackmore addresses other dimensions by viewing globalization as “increased economic, cultural, environmental, and social interdependencies and new transnational financial and political formations arising out

of the mobility of capital, labor and information, with both homogenizing and differentiating tendencies” (2000 p.133). The elements that may be extracted from these two definitions – global economy, transnational linkages, new forms of collective decision making, development of inter-government and quasi-supranational institutions, intensification of transnational communication, creation of new regional and military orders, increased economic, cultural, environmental and social interdependences, new transnational financial and political formations, the mobility of capital, labor and information, and the simultaneous homogenizing and differentiating tendencies of all of this – figure in some way or another in literally hundreds of other definitions of globalization.¹ Utilizing these elements as a frame of reference serves us well.

Whatever else people may be thinking about when they speak of globalization, it is likely that they have some sense of a greater interaction between economic actors in the creation and exchange of goods and symbols and the social and cultural consequences that flow from this. In everyday life such features as Michael Jordan and Nike shoes and garments, Asian groceries in mid-western US towns, English language call centers located in New Delhi, Coke signs in the multiple local languages, Japanese and Korean cars, American movies and soap operas originating from a wide variety of cultures, give tangible meaning to the abstraction ‘globalization’ for vast numbers throughout the world.

The complex dynamics of globalization produce effects that impinge significantly on how education is conducted, up to and including the transformation of education as a commodity to be exchanged in globalized markets.

Some Critical Elements of Globalization

Fundamentally, globalization is about exchange dynamics in the contemporary world. David Harvey’s early work on globalization, *The Condition of Postmodernity*, locates the ubiquity of change as a central feature of globalization. Differences in the kind and increases in the rate of change taking place result in the telescoping of time and space, creating a world of proximate immediacy (Harvey 1989). The world capitalist system, which he sees as continuously expanding to inscribe life throughout the globe, is itself characterized by a continued increase in the velocity of exchanges that constitute its primary dynamics. At the heart of these changes have been fundamental transformations in the world economic system.

Modern multi-national corporations, which soon came to be termed transnational corporations (TNCs) were at the forefront of this current historic wave of globalization. Related genealogically to the great international corporations that arose in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, these corporations emerged in the post-World War II period as a new breed of powerful economic actors intent on developing economic capabilities integrated throughout the world (Barnet & Mueller 1974). Often (but not always) retaining 'brand' names that mark their countries of national origin, TNCs operate in a global marketplace, seeking profit through the production and sale of goods and services in ways that increasingly have little to do with their country of origin (including its values, culture and language). These are the attributes that encourage some authors to speak of the invention of a global corporate culture, or global culture, or even "MacCulture" (Barber 1996).

During the 1960s, TNCs led the relocation of manufacturing from the older 'core' industrial countries to developing countries where strategic investments of capital could combine with readily available and cheaper labor to raise returns on investment. Robert Reich (who would become Secretary of Labor under US President Clinton) could write in the early 1990s that, for most important purposes, significant world manufacturing had moved away from the older industrial nations, leaving behind societies caught in the dynamics of de-industrialization and widespread economic restructuring (Reich 1991).

The key to global economic restructuring has been foreign direct investment (FDI), the investment of capital from one nation directly in the ownership of enterprises in another. A key marker of the new global economy, FDI is frequently cited as a measure of inter-dependency signaling the relative success of poorer nations in raising capital from richer ones.² However, the reality of contemporary global interdependence is that FDI is important to some extent for all nations in the global economy. The highest levels of FDI are between the richest nations. A signal feature of contemporary globalization has been the world-wide ownership of capital across national borders irrespective of the relative economic status of the country receiving the capital.

These investment patterns have produced a new global division of labor. Initially, firms sought to replace relatively expensive (and highly unionized) blue-collar workers in the core industrial nations with cheaper labor from the third world. Since the late 1980s improved telecommunications capability has increasingly allowed similar shifts in the global

distribution of service work. White-collar work was traditionally differentiated from its blue collar counterpart. 'Pink-collar' work, referring to a predominantly female workforce of data-centered labor performing informational technology functions, has emerged as a significant global labor factor (Arndt & Kierzkowski 2001). Ignored for years as a political issue, since 2000 the outsourcing of labor has become a major electoral issue in several core countries, especially as it is tied to related issues of both legal and illegal migration.

In retrospect various new technologies combined to make possible the shifts in productivity and marketing associated with contemporary globalization. The introduction of commercial jet aircraft production – especially 'Jumbo Jets' in 1969 – telescoped space, allowing for a much more rapid and relatively inexpensive exchange of people and goods over long distances. Similarly, the introduction of container ships and super tankers permitted significant reductions in the cost of moving heavy cargo throughout the world, allowing the production benefits gained from more inexpensive labor to be spread throughout production and consumption cycles. And modern satellite telecommunications brought about the development of management systems that allowed control over global production and resources in 'real time.' Other technological advances, including the development of more complex financial mechanisms, permitted the rapid spread of capital throughout the globe; a companion occurrence was the emergence of the dollar as a *de facto* global currency after 1970 (Neubauer 2000).

Neo-liberalism has emerged as globalization's predominant ideology.³ The powerful conjunction between US domestic policy and the association of neo-liberal policy directions with US-identified transnational firms convinces a significant part of the world that globalization is largely synonymous with 'Americanization.' Focused primarily on the importance of promoting market mechanisms for creating and sustaining economic growth (economic liberalization), neo-liberalism (especially under its initial proponents, US President Reagan and UK Prime Minister Thatcher) has focused in part on rejecting the premises and spending patterns of post-war welfare states. Neo-liberalism makes explicit links to older notions of free trade (that is to say, those associated 19th century liberalism), trade's primacy within the 'work of nations,' the role of competition in promoting economic (and managerial) efficiency, and the benefits to be gained from reduced state regulation. Within domestic state policy, neo-liberalism is associated with reduced taxation (the better to

promote private sector investment), privatization of state resources (the better to promote efficiency of services), de-regulation (the better to promote competitive industry), and an overall reduced mission for the nation state (Steger 2002).

Contemporary globalization has also produced novel notions of 'global governance,' the creation of supra-national entities that establish 'regimes of regulation' for some aspect of global interaction. The creation of the World Trade Organization out of its predecessor GATT (the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) in 1994, and the subsequent General Agreement on Trade and Services, is taken by many as the paradigmatic instance of a contemporary global governance regime. Other transnational organizations, such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank (outgrowths of the post-WWII reconstruction of the global economy), play critical roles in fostering neo-liberal economic restructuring. The North American Free Trade Act and the European Union are viewed by many as examples of institutionalizing free trade in ways that reduce the role of the nation state itself in defining the relations of international exchange. Such international relationships privilege capital (which benefits most from its mobility under liberalization regimes) over labor (which is far less mobile), and influence the circumstances that define citizen behavior within states (such as the impact of de-regulation on national safety and environmental standards). These economic and governance relationships stand at the center of many perceptions of and reactions to globalization as a phenomenon. To many, for example, 'Seattle' quickly calls forth images of street riots and protesters organized against what are perceived as the forces driving and promoting globalization and which are themselves far removed from influence and control by local political processes.

Some commentators argue that the growth of these supra-national institutions occurs at the direct expense of national sovereignty and the degrees of freedom enjoyed by nation states to direct their own affairs. This aspect of increased global interdependence is often what is meant by the phrase 'the shrinking national state.' While much debate continues over whether nation states are growing weaker or will disappear in an expanded era of globalization, it is clear that the dynamics of a global economy generate consequences that extend far beyond the capacity of individual states to control (Neubauer 1998). The Asian currency crisis of 1997, in which several Asian regional economies followed each other into sharp decline and the mature industrial nations experienced a need to

intervene economically to restore them, is a case in point.

David Harvey argues that the signal feature of contemporary globalization is the contraction of time and space. The heightened levels of resulting social change are marked by increases in both the frequency and immediacy of exchanges within and between societies. In this view people develop new knowledge of themselves and others as a result of such exchanges, leading to the emergence of novel conceptualizations of both self and other, and to new forms of engagement, including, very importantly, how societies collectively produce and distribute wealth. Positing that capitalism is differentiated in its various forms by the frequency and amplitude of the economic exchanges it promotes within and between societies, Harvey's notion of the postmodern condition focuses on the new symbolic economies emerging in the world and their influence on how people live and work, produce and consume, accumulate and spend (Harvey 1989).

Contemporary globalization is creating wholly novel institutions, many based on emergent information technologies. The development of regional equity markets across the world that allow for stock trading on a twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week basis is usually cited in this context, as is the internet. Other innovations include a global currency market that, according to the Bank for International Settlements, accounted for the exchange of approximately two trillion dollars each day in 2004 (BIS 2005). These new institutions of global interdependence are providing the simultaneous benefits of significantly increased global wealth along with the dilemmas associated with interdependence and the inability of national societies to shield themselves from the cascading effects of downside economic developments such as currency crises or recessionary forces (Friedman 2005). Modern media in their globalized form have come to function as novel institutions as well. The vast new media companies of the global economy are changing the way people think about themselves and others, how they develop ideas about identity, how they engage in consumption, and what they hold to be important. Large-scale media operate in two tiers, one global, and one national. The top tier is composed of the five largest firms, AOL Time Warner, Disney, Bertelsmann, Viacom, and the News Corporation, followed by the cable conglomerate TCI, General Electric, Sony, and Seagram. Robert McChesney calls these the "nine firms that dominate the world." A second tier of some sixty or so companies often accounts for media domination within a particular country. In terms of scale, AOL Time Warner is 50 times larger

than the 50th largest global media company. Such firms increasingly bristle when identified in terms of their country of initial origin. As one key AOL Time Warner executive stated at the turn of the century, “We do not want to be viewed as an American company. We think globally” (McChesney 2001). These firms continue to grow as global entities. In 1990, Disney and Time Warner generated about 15% of their income globally. Global income now accounts for 30-35% of their total income (McChesney, 2003).

Anthony Giddens points to other changes in important social institutions arising from contemporary globalization. Family structure has, for example, been strained by the rapid changes associated with globalization, a situation exacerbated by wide-spread labor migration. He points to changes in customary marriage age, in the social roles of elders, and in levels of divorce as cases in point. Globalization has produced a discourse on the role of women, especially in the context of family structure, which is entirely novel in our history. It is, of course, the nature and meaning of these changes that figure so predominantly in people’s attitudes toward accepting or rejecting globalization (Giddens 1999).

Impacts of Globalization and Implications for Education

One of the fascinating and yet frustrating characteristics of globalization is that in its very nature it admits to few boundaries: geographically, socially, politically or economically. Its impacts are, seemingly, experienced in one way or another throughout the world and in virtually every aspect of human endeavor. In this section I focus on six aspects of globalization that impact significantly on how education is constructed and practiced, and which will shape how we think of education in the coming decades.

Inequalities

No question exists that the current regime of globalization produces wealth – one could even argue that it produces astonishing levels of wealth. Globalization as currently practiced, however, also creates widespread poverty. Throughout the world globalization is associated with increasing inequalities of income and wealth. Taking the last thirty years as a baseline, in both developed and developing nations an ever smaller fraction of the population receives an ever larger portion of national income. Within developed nations, income inequality is indicated by trends showing that wages for workers are virtually level in inflation-constant terms, while

relative income shares for the wealthy continue to grow. Among developing nations, 80 countries are poorer than they were two decades ago. The United Nations estimates that 2.8 billion people live in poverty world-wide. Income inequality is a marker – inequalities of income signal relative inequality in gaining access to goods and services including essentials such as food, water, shelter, public health and health-care, the security of law and order, and education (Mullrooney & Neubauer 2006).

Globalization has brought vast numbers throughout the world into the cash economy – the world of goods – without effective minimal resources for them to obtain the threshold levels of these goods to assure basic human security. Sachs and McArthur (2005), for example, estimate that more than 20,000 persons (eight million a year) perish each day because they are too poor to stay alive. Stephen Lewis, the United Nations Special Envoy for HIV/AIDS in Africa points out that “50,000 people starve each day” (Peplinskie 2005). In his review of the massive urban crowding that results from contemporary globalization’s migration patterns, Mike Davis concludes that throughout urban slum settlements, people earn less than what is required to obtain their minimum daily caloric intake (Davis 2004.) A widening body of scholars is concluding that the whirlwind of contemporary globalization has resulted in lessened human security for significant parts of the world.

This context of growing inequalities will have significant negative impacts on how education will evolve over the coming decade, for whatever happens on the ‘front side’ of globalization – a world of change powered by the engines of capital, science, knowledge creation, and technology – will be echoed in challenging ways by the elemental fact that as a part of humanity rockets into the 21st century, another part – a very large part – will be mired in poverty. For much of the world the fundamental educational task will be to create capacity for the delivery of elementary education, however it is defined or operationalized. This task is enormously impeded by these growing and persistent inequalities.⁴ The *2005 Education for All Monitoring Report* indicates that 100 million children are out of school world-wide, and that despite the successes of the UNESCO-led effort, the progress of gaining educational coverage is too slow to assure universal education by the program’s target goal year, 2015 (Guttman 2005).

Changes in How Work is Done

Contemporary globalization is affecting how work is done throughout the

world. Perceptions of what societies require to meet these new labor force needs ripple throughout the policy process resulting in demands that education align itself to better meet those needs. Globally, perhaps the most important single innovation affecting work has been the change from the assembly-line Fordist mode of production, to 'just-in-time,' or flexible production. While flexible production techniques differ, depending on the industry in which they are adopted, their basic features consist of replacing the one-size-fits-all concept of industrial production with design, procurement and productive systems that permit rapid product changes while allowing more efficient use of capital through reduced inventories and, from a relative global scale, low labor costs⁵ (Brecher & Costello, 1998).

Versions of this system have revolutionized global production and consumption, in effect opening up this current era of economic globalization. In the 1970s and 1980s producers developed ways to transfer complex manufacturing and assembly techniques to the developing world, enabling the combination of these techniques and cheap labor to transform it into the source of most of the world's manufactured goods. One key to these new models of manufacturing was the dis-aggregation of industrial manufacturing complexity through engineering innovation that allowed relatively unsophisticated workers to operate at high levels of efficiency with relatively little training and education. One well-cited example in the 1970s was the recruitment by multi-national firms of young women directly from Malaysian villages to work in sophisticated computer chip factories. The central requirement of such production, managers would explain to visitors, was not an educated worker, but good eyes and nimble fingers. The major education costs of such endeavors were apportioned between the engineering genius that had simplified production tasks through machine innovation, and the investment in management routines necessary to operate efficient and integrated production facilities (Greider 1997). Some version of this tale is repeated in the extension of flexible production world-wide. On the consumption side, the linking of swift and increasingly efficient communications and transportation radically shortens the time between production and market, permitting reduced inventories while satisfying differentiated consumer demand. In this 'nimble' system, producers can clear production runs more quickly, allowing time to generate greater product diversity; consumers experience the results as a constant cycle of style and innovation. Some threshold was crossed about a decade ago when those con-

sumers willing to endure relatively short waiting periods could have large scale items such as automobiles custom made for them by the factory. A great boon for the manufacturer, this behavior allows manufacturers to build vehicles that are already sold. A feature of the heated real estate market in the USA in the first few years of this decade has been the decision of many national home construction firms operating in local markets to undertake construction only when projected units have been fully pre-sold.

Equally dramatic changes have taken place in the nature and distribution of service work. While political debates about the relative advantages of out-sourced labor for local economies has escalated in the past 15 years, the phenomenon has been developing for the better part of three decades. By the 1980s out-sourcing had already been responsible for the loss of perhaps 25-30 million manufacturing jobs in the US economy (Bluestone & Harrison 1982). By the early 1990s partnering of software firms in India with US engineering firms was commonplace. The massive US health-care industry was doing over-night billing using clerical labor pools in the Philippines and other English-speaking low wage countries. And clothing firms (especially higher end women's product lines) had fully integrated all aspects of work from design to delivery, often located in newly established export processing zones (IILS 1998). Call centers in New Delhi and Mumbai were soon to follow. As I mentioned earlier, the term 'pink collar' work was added to the industrial age categories 'blue-collar' and 'white-collar' to refer to this largely feminized work relocation. New terms may be added in coming years, perhaps 'white-coat' work, to refer to the outsourcing of medical and scientific work. US radiologists are already making worried noises about inroads into their domestic practices by their professional counterparts in India, who are linked in real-time practices to US medical centers. US radiologists' annual incomes average \$317,000, compared to their counterparts in India who earn \$25,000. Given the choice, American hospitals and health-care plans are happy to opt for the less expensive services (Nautiyal 2006).

Implications of the Knowledge Economy for Work

Robert Reich detailed the logic of relocating global labor in the 1990s in a study entitled *The Work of Nations* (Reich 1991). The important distinction at that historical moment seemed to be between in-place and non-in-place labor. Whereas contemporary globalization had been constructed on heightened foreign direct investment and the relocation of manufacturing,

many service occupations and activities seemingly, could only be performed in-place, especially those that involved direct contact between the service provider and receiver. These constraints have in practice proved far more malleable. It now appears that whatever can be digitized can be relocated and/or outsourced.⁶ Reich focused in his study on occupations that involved the work of symbolic analysts – those whose market value is derived from some intellectual, symbolic, or cognitive activity, for example, lawyers, professors, engineers, writers, researchers. He cautions against underestimating the very great range of things that fall into this category, as well as being unaware of their potential for portability. Driven by the fact that owners and managers of capital constantly seek lower wage rates, portability and lower wages redefine ideas of where and how work is to be performed. Recent events have further challenged this supposed constraint. In addition to the premise that whatever service activity can be digitized can be outsourced, for some service activities in which the marginal costs of transportation are less than the marginal cost gains of seeking distant in-place services, this physical form of personal service outsourcing can take place by relocating the recipient to the provider. Bangkok, for example, is becoming a global center for elective surgery as consumers throughout the world are attracted by the relatively high quality of medical care and its low relative cost compared with many other countries. India and Singapore are offering similar services to growing numbers of clients (*Sydney Morning Herald* 2005).

Despite these remarkable changes in the nature of work and its relocation, it would be a considerable misreading of contemporary globalization to conclude that service workers dominate the global world of work. The reality is that what most people in the world do when they get up in the morning is struggle to make a living from environments in which work is hard, often brutally poorly paid, and all too frequently, just not available. The world of globalized work for most workers is a constant struggle against poor working conditions (including exploitative child labor), long hours (usually without overtime compensation), insecure working conditions, and unsafe working environments (Bales 2004). World-wide, human labor trafficking takes place under conditions barely seen since the 19th century. In a particularly egregious example, sex workers, male and female, are drawn into the industry, used, exposed to disease – especially HIV/AIDS – and then discarded with precious little to show for their productive working time (Skrobanek et al. 1997; Farr & Ehrenreich 2005). The reality of having 2.8 billion people in poverty is that

these stories will continue to be reproduced with unrelenting regularity.

The point of focusing on these transformations of global labor is two-fold. One is to emphasize that the current dynamics of globalized labor are following a hard, if not ultimately inexorable, logic of neo-liberal maximization that will repeatedly affect public and private policies in determining the environments and opportunities facing people when they seek to work. Given that education is in large part about preparing people for work, it is a matter of concern how work will frame and condition what people should be educated for. The second is to emphasize that what constitutes the meaning of 'education for work' is increasingly being established outside the realms of the local, which has historically been the site of primary educational initiatives. The educational agenda setting roles of local government, local school boards, and local social networks are being usurped by the forces of globalization and articulated back down the labor/education chain to the local. As global interdependence proceeds and as societies accept the need to be competitive within the norms of global capitalism, the act of joining the competition imposes its own imperatives. One is the well-known digital divide; another is the increasing prevalence of English as the language of global communication. Education systems that fail to meet these competitive challenges will find it difficult to create the essential forms of knowledge capital required to acquire and maintain manufacturing and service industry capital.

Consumerism and Learning through Consumption

Contemporary globalization is largely about creating a world of goods exchanged through relatively open markets. The various languages of society are increasingly fashioned as complex consumption codes, both fundamental and nuanced, that mark statuses and identify the pathways to wealth access and the rewards it brings. In this consumption oriented world, economic values dominate others, and the acquisition of wealth and income become primary social ends in themselves. Wealth enables access to power – political, social and sometimes cultural – and marketplace norms and the talents and skills that they valorize dominate other culturally focused values. The result is often that values and practices formed and nurtured in the realms of the local are displaced by market centered values associated with the 'global outside,' resulting in much of the storied conflict between the global and the local that populates globalization protests.

The life's blood, as it were, of a market society is media, the ex-

traordinary reach of which permeates almost every aspect of contemporary life. Even a short while ago, we might have written the preceding sentence as 'every aspect of contemporary *urban* life,' but the reality of lived-life throughout the globe is that media and the messages they contain about products, goods and services have extended even to the most remote villages and towns, where wireless phones, VCR and DVD players, powered by portable generators, bring the media of the global center to the remote edges of its periphery. The growth rates of such devices and services are startling. Internet users in China increased in number from 22 million in 2000 to 111 million in 2005 (a growth rate in excess of 400% in just five years); yet, as impressive as those numbers might seem, they still account for only an 8.5% penetration in a population of 1.3 billion. In comparison, North America, with a far smaller population base, but higher initial penetration rates, had an internet use growth over this period of 109%, or 226 million users in a population base of 333 million (Internet World Stats, 2006). Filipinos send approximately 200 million text messages a day, making Manila the text messaging capital of the world (Amojelar 2006). British users sent 3.2 billion text messages in March 2006, and each month the volume grows (Text.it 2006).

The codes of the market, ubiquitously displayed throughout society, constitute a powerful education system, one in which the grammars of consumption are promoted across the life cycle. Within developed nations, children are increasingly viewed as an important 'demographic' to be reached, even before birth, through consumption messages aimed at parents, and subsequently to children themselves from their earliest moments of social awareness, largely through the ubiquity of television. In the USA, public advocacy groups such as Action for Children's Television have since the 1960s lobbied for legislation to protect children from the assault of television commercialism, focusing particularly on the seamless blending of entertainment and product association that translates the child's enthusiasm for fantasy images into related consumption demands (Harmonay 1979). Advertising as an education system is pervasive and well-financed, and promotes a set of social tools that locate identity and self within status alignments identified by consumption (Henry 1965).

Formal education has to compete with this informal education system, often to its detriment. Many of the norms and values of formal education run counter to the pedagogy, codes and grammars of the media. Value codes long associated with formal education such as the importance of hard work, patiently acquired knowledge and the acquisition of social

and critical reasoning skills, and the application of the reasoning process as an essential element of purposive decision making for the self and in one's role as responsible citizen, are arrayed against a profusion of short, compressed messages that promote instant gratification, the truncated and fantasy solutions of the television drama (most spectacularly the soap opera, now in all its multi-cultural forms throughout the world including prime-time drama), and the suspension of criticality. For youth, these messages are increasingly coupled with those of the game world, which is awash in violence, immediate gratification, and tropes that valorize social differences (pitting a familiar "us" against equally familiar "others" to be vanquished in one way or another, often in fantasy combat). In 2005, for the first time in history, the global game industry's products outsold those of the film industry world-wide (Ulmer 2005; Castronova 2005).

The power and persuasiveness of this alternative educational system of consumption stands in ever more stark contrast to the formal in its ability to recruit the brightest graduates from the best universities to develop its technologies. Against this cornucopia of riches and talent, formal educational systems struggle to obtain and maintain their basic necessities. Where public education is the norm, public funding is always challenged (especially under states' neo-liberal fiscal policies), when all comers need to be served, irrespective of the deficits with which they enter the system. Where private education competes with public education, growing inequalities (traceable in part to the effects of neo-liberal economic policies) promote flight from public education into private. While this flight is most obviously witnessed among higher income groups, often the poor themselves flee to private education to escape the realities of overcrowded, under-resourced and neglected public schools.⁷ For the most privileged in society, private education becomes another consumption option, one that is consistent with class position and the status oriented consumption strategies thought necessary to succeed in maintaining class position or gaining upward social mobility. In those countries with rapidly growing middle classes, (e.g., China and India) the superior resources gained in upward social mobility are translated into seeking successful avenues into the best state supported schools and universities (usually through the use of private cram schools to prepare students for examinations), or by purchasing admission to the growing numbers of higher status private institutions of higher education.⁸ A conjunction often occurs between the values of the marketplace (the informal education system) and the status-oriented values of private education. In all this it is

of course worth noting that some private education may represent a contrary case, when religious values are set against the liberal or 'immoral' values and images that are associated with global marketing.

Hyper-urbanization and Globalization

Contemporary globalization is producing the largest migration in the history of the planet. Some of this migration is cross-border as migrants leave one society for another; some is legal, and much, such as that across the USA's southern border, is illegal. But far more of this migration occurs within countries as vast numbers leave the country-side for cities in search of work and the income that will allow them to gain purchasing power in their increasingly market-driven economies. As Ma Wan-hua describes in Chapter Six of this volume, domestic migration in China alone over the decade of the 1990s involved an estimated 150 million people, making it the largest single migration in history (Yardley 2004).

One result is the burgeoning of cities and the urbanscapes that surround them. The largest cities of the world – conurbations, actually – are massive in size: upwards of 30 million people cluster around each of Tokyo, New York, Mumbai (Bombay), Kolkata (Calcutta), Shanghai and the Philadelphia/New York corridor. Twenty five cities support populations in excess of 10 million.⁹ By 2000 the world had 411 cities that counted over a million inhabitants, a figure that is expected to rise to over 600 by 2020. For the first time in human history, we have become an urban planet, with more people living in cities than in rural areas. Most of this growth is occurring in the former third world, especially in Asia. Rapid urbanization's impacts on human life are simultaneously spectacular and devastating. The towers of affluence and the gated communities of global elites exist cheek by jowl with vast squatter settlements where life is as mean and raw as anything conjured up by Dickens or Engels to describe the horrors of 19th century industrialism (Bales 2004). Much of this rapid growth has confronted national governments largely unprepared to deal with it. The legal and governmental structures of these exploding cities are simply overwhelmed by the infrastructural requirements of dealing with such large populations, including communication, sanitation, supplying clean water, and ensuring order and security.

Not surprisingly, things often break down: people go without the necessary basic services, and in the absence of even rudimentary public health measures, disease takes its toll. Throughout the world, emergent diseases such as HIV/AIDS can be linked to practices associated with

globalization dynamics, such as agricultural practices that cross the barriers between country-side and city, thus mixing wild and domestic species in ways that allow microbes to pass from animal to human populations, often through entry into food systems (Garrett 2000). The new transportation pathways of global commerce, from airline travel to cross border trucking, facilitate the rapid spread of disease, e.g., West Nile virus, Ebola and Dengue fevers and anthrax. Other ancient and devastating diseases such as malaria, tuberculosis and cholera are making comebacks, a consequence of public health deficits brought about in part by insufficient funding for this domain. The crowded conditions of global megacities foster the spread of these diseases (Kim et al. 2000; Neubauer 2005).

The challenges of providing education in these mega-city environments are vast. Not least is the absence of governance infrastructure created by uncontrolled growth. Governments' inability to produce routine infrastructure is compounded by the frequent absence of capacity to establish the essential routines required for the rule of law and administrative regularity. In the absence of effective governmental authority, corruption flourishes, which further undercuts governmental authority. Cash economies develop, from which precious few tax dollars flow into the governmental system, and a culture of 'civic purposes,' of which education is one, has no basis to develop (Overland 2006). Yardley (2004) has reported a telling instance of collusion between government and the economic forces promoting growth in China in which migrant workers involved in construction, much of it government authorized, are owed as much as \$43 billion in unpaid wages, some for as many as 10 years' worth of work.

Organizational and political theorists have long been aware that scale is important to how complex organizations function: the larger an organization, the more complex are their interactions, the number of variables at work, and the unpredictability of the recursive feedback loops that reinforce some activities while transforming others. State theorists point to smaller states as the most successful democracies, an indication that size and performance are probably inversely correlated. Megacities in developing societies define the other end of the continuum: their very size and rapid expansion work against good performance, especially in public sector activities.

Media

The ownership and operation of capital in contemporary globalization processes are following similar patterns to those that formed the national

economies of Europe and the Anglo-American world in the 19th and 20th centuries. In general, the pattern was for regional economies to form and increasingly integrate, a process characterized by a codification of law, a centralization of national political power (in part to protect and facilitate these economic relationships), the integration of regional into national markets, a centralized regulatory state, and a progressive concentration of ownership of capital. The underlying rationale for the concentration of ownership for both national and global integration has been the need to assemble larger capital capabilities to supply goods to expanded markets in the face of the competition of other large holders of capital. The result at the national level was economies characterized by large firms contesting market sectors in pursuit of consumers. This pattern is well underway at the global level as well (Castells 1996).

As national firms (many of which had by then become international) assisted in forming the post-war global economy, a similar aggregation of global capital took place. Today, probably all basic economic sectors are characterized by the presence and domination of the largest firms, for example in banking and finance, advertising, media, electronic products, automobiles, aircraft, and transportation. This aggregation of capital has combined with flexible production to account for considerable market choice in many arenas (e.g., automobiles) while simultaneously allowing market domination for the largest firms.

This is the structure of global media and the dominant nine firms identified earlier in this chapter. A decade ago it might have been possible to argue with some credibility that media ownership is not necessarily correlated with control over content. Increasingly, however, we have become aware that a globalized world is a politically attenuated world wherein the media set agendas by what they choose to offer as content and what they do not. Their political role arises not specifically from the particular position they take in relation to national partisan contests (although that, too, happens with increasing frequency), but in their ability to set agendas, decide what is or is not news, conflate entertainment with news, and ultimately affect the macro symbol-flows of national societies. The war in Iraq has produced many examples. The absence of body bag images on television – in stark contrast to the Vietnam experience – formed the initial domestic issues of the war, sanitizing casualty reporting. Embedding journalists with troops during the invasion created the potential for manipulation. The promotion of misleading information by the US and British administrations and the willingness of the media to accept

government claims on the existence of weapons of mass destruction has become a continuing scandal. The successful campaign on the part of US television channel Fox News to conflate the invasion of Iraq with Saddam Hussein's putative role in the events of September 11th, 2001 created an association which, according to poll data, is still alive and well among a majority of those who regularly watch Fox (Lobe 2003). Controversy over the framing and reporting of news about the war has become a source of conflict over its conduct that rivals disputes about its actual conduct.

From the advent of the Iranian revolution onwards, convention held that informal media – video and audio devices, and by extension the internet – would stand as contrast and corrective to national media control, certainly to state media control. The results have been more complicated. The great media firms of the global first tier and the nationally-based second tier create broad patterns of symbol production, reproduction, and dissemination. These media firms are unlike earlier state-dominated or state-controlled counterparts that sought to eliminate all non-state competing media. They function as context-makers that induce the tone of political discussion, influence social values, and above all, assist in the maintenance of economic and political legitimization. It is within this context that the informal (and alternative) media play a role. The world of internet weblogs, or blogs, has amply demonstrated the difficulties of keeping secrets in such a media dense society, an outcome that seemingly has moved governments to classify even more of their activities to keep them from becoming public. And, with the explosion of internet information has come a new state of uncertainty in which traditional standards for judging information sources in terms of a presumed truth value have been eroded. In reality, the truth value of any given bit of information is often uncertain at best, improbable much of the time, and often impossible to establish (McChesney 2001).

The result is that the world becomes media-saturated in complex ways. The increasingly pervasive nature of the global consumption system impacts on values and behaviors at every level. Paradoxically, media functions in various ways to induce a homogenization of value through the extension of common symbolic referents, and a simultaneous heterogeneity of particularism through the ways that generalized media content is translated and transformed within local contexts. These are the homogenizing and differentiating tendencies to which Jill Blackmore refers in the definition of globalization cited at the beginning of this chapter. Buffeted by these counteracting tendencies, 'global truths,' or things held

conventionally in common by most people, dissolve. One result is that 'notions of the world' – what is true, what is to be valued, what is to be sought after – for millions, perhaps even billions, of people become particularized to the point that sustaining generalized and consensual views is strained to breaking point. The great paradox of globalization, viewed from this perspective, is that out of the effort to create global integration, largely for the purpose of producing a common consumer-oriented culture, may come a particularization of the world that contests global integration to its core (Barber 1996).

Some Questions

As if the root question of how to 'do' education effectively were not sufficiently complicated in itself, these considerations of the nature of contemporary globalization appear to raise the ante: how can one achieve effective educational provision in a world that faces the far-reaching consequences of such rapid and profound change? Without pretending to satisfy this inquiry, one can suggest a few responses that begin to frame an approach to the larger question.

The first major issue is that of change itself. *Given that globalization is so fundamentally about change, how should education accommodate such dynamics?* A sense of the magnitude of the issue, only briefly touched upon above, is gained by a moment's reflection on the nature of the knowledge explosion itself. The information/knowledge society is being propelled by various logics that continually chip away at the half-life of effective knowledge. One is tempted to say, "Take a field, any field, and show me someone who can keep up with the knowledge explosion." Approximately half a million articles in the general category of "science" are produced annually (Heylin 2004). In a version of Gresham's law, specialization begets more specialization at the expense of generality as people struggle to obtain and maintain 'mastery' over a subject. And, whatever one learns in content terms (what one 'knows') is threatened with early obsolescence. Those who forecast the expansion of computing, broadband and other devices for creating, storing and manipulation of information point out that if Moore's law (that data density tends to double approximately every eighteen months) holds – and prevailing opinion is that it will hold for at least another two decades – the exponential forces that have driven the knowledge explosion will continue. As

some would phrase it, the 'real' information/knowledge explosion has yet to happen (Webopedia 2006).

As indicated above, no end of mischief is created by the global dynamics driving rapid change. People acquire statuses and identities based on what they are presumed to know, especially when such knowledge is acquired with great expense and effort. The quite natural tendency is to hang on to what one knows and to defend it and the statuses to which it provides access against change. Within education these tensions can exacerbate the bureaucratic conservatism so often attributed to educational faculties and administrations – a conservatism that arises from a system in which incentives have been based on creating and protecting 'discrete' bodies of knowledge that could be transmitted to others. Education in a context of continuous change requires, most importantly, self-consciousness, an embrace of meta-languages about the nature of education, what it means to learn, what it means to be critical of information, inquiry about the values and interests that are lodged in knowledge, and situating the learner in a context of constant reflexivity. Forming education on this basis radicalizes it with respect to received traditions precisely because each learner approaches his or her task with criticality and the awareness that social roles, ranks, values, and truths are socially constructed and thus in some respect always variable and subject to question. Viewing the world in this way normalizes change and one's expectations of its continuous character. It is a view of the world consistent with contemporary physics, with ecological thinking, and with a non-ideological notion of history (Green 2003). But, this view of the world is also challenging to power-holders, if only because its learning paradigm seeks to empower the learner through an attitude of contestation toward 'received reality' and the power relations that constitute it. In the context of this volume, these issues figure strongly in the educational paradigms documented by Joseph Farrell in his review of alternative education systems (see Chapter Eight). Their attraction in the context of globalization, change and the promise of new paradigms is that these alternatives are emerging in institutional contexts where power, authority and the reach of the state are themselves being problematized by changing social relationships.

A second issue situates *education within the context of global demographics and the changing nature of the state*. The world is becoming more populous; more people are living in cities; the rich and the poor are increasingly separating themselves from each other; populations are getting younger in developing countries and older in developed countries; and

the state in resource terms is getting weaker. On the face of it, this is a recipe for radically segmented educational opportunity where those better-off consume most of the opportunities for education and those less well-off get second- and third-rate opportunities, or do without. We already see elements of this scenario throughout the world.

The combination of neo-liberal economic and political policies exacerbates the challenges posed by these demographic changes. At its core, neo-liberalism promotes 'reforms' of the political process that shift the burden of social services away from the state and on to individuals. The operation of these processes is evident in neo-liberal reform projects for both health-care and education. Reformist directions taken in health-care are strikingly similar to those in education. In some ways the health-care equation is easier to understand. Simply put: under a regime of steadily increasing technology applications, health-care costs too much for national states to bear, and their response, calibrated for local consumption, culture, and ideological tolerance is to cut back on what is provided under current funding mechanisms and/or increasingly to privatize what is available, while holding the line on what the state will bear in terms of costs (Anderson & Poullier 1999). This 'retreat from universalism' has been most noticeable within Europe, but similar steps are being taken in other industrial countries. These steps mirror those taken in many places to reduce state budgetary support for education (especially higher education), to place more of the burden for education on its individual consumers, to displace notions of state responsibility with those of the market, and to encourage the growth of the private sector.

The analogy between health-care and education continues to hold when we examine how funds are apportioned within each system. Both contemporary education and health theory emphasize the importance of prevention and primary care. In health, this translates to the importance of providing primary care access to the whole of the population (i.e., universal access) while ensuring that the financial and personnel support exists to sustain such a system. Neo-liberal health policy distorts this logic by reducing support for universal access to primary care, while supporting a system in which the most specialized knowledge nodes of the health-care/medical system receive the greatest rewards. Thus, public health and primary health-care suffer in comparison to tertiary care and its highly priced technology applications. Increased knowledge specialization begets increased professional specialization and the differentiated reward structure that goes with it. Further, on the public health side, the

more evidence accumulates on the importance of behavioral choices in affecting health status, the more neo-liberal reforms seek to hold individuals responsible for their individual health choices (Peterson & Lupton 1996). On the other side of the analogy, evidence continues to accumulate that the most important educational 'quanta' are those available to children in their earliest learning periods. Yet, early childhood education is the most poorly funded, and basic education struggles in budgetary terms with higher education levels. The more basic the education level, the more poorly paid are teachers and administrators; the obverse is true as well. Education, like health-care, rewards its tertiary specialists at a far higher rate than its essential providers.

The retreat from universalism and the privileging of the private sector result in apportioning unequal shares of these public goods, or as is often said in the USA: "Those who got, get; those who don't have, don't get." However, as aggregate costs increase in the face of restricted national and national sub-unit budgets, the state sometimes becomes more receptive to and tolerant of alternative solutions for those whom it, through its own policies, neglects. Again, this is one of the messages of Joseph Farrell's work: with neglect comes opportunity because bureaucratic authority retreats; with limited resources come imperatives to utilize them sensibly by cutting through non-productive administrative paths, barriers and folk-ways because scarce resources impose economies of effort; with local initiative comes (sometimes) innovation because local actors have a strong sense of what the extant situation requires; with local control comes attention to learning relevance because the cost of irrelevance is immediate and obvious (see Farrell in Chapter Eight; Cavallo 2004).

Inequality and Rationalizing the Public Purpose

In the modern period education has been viewed as the great leveler with respect to social disparities. Throughout the industrializing world, education has been both the vehicle for developing productive human capital resources and the pathway into the middle class for millions. The role that education plays in many immigrant communities is legendary as families will make almost any sacrifice to assure that a family member gets the opportunity to gain the skills and credentials that allow entry into approved avenues of social mobility and success. The expansion of education, including public higher education, became a companion piece to the expansion of suffrage in political democracy and, as mentioned earlier,

has been viewed within the modern period as a necessary condition of national economic development for both mature and developing economies. As John Hawkins points out in Chapter Five of this volume, this is the crux of the dominant paradigm in education today.

Will the kinds of inequality that are being created under globalization persist, and if they do, what will be the impact on national programs of social development such as education?

This question allows for several different types of answers. On the one hand it can be seen to ask: will the kinds of globalization currently being experienced continue? And if they do, will they continue to reproduce this pattern of inequality? Certainly, strong evidence suggests that the forces advancing globalization, some of which have been outlined above, will continue. Neo-liberalism as a state ideology continues to spread, embraced on all continents to one degree or another, and modified to fit very different national circumstances (sometimes to the point of perversion) in such diverse settings as South Africa, China, India and Russia. Liberalization allows for new patterns of capital development and realization. That neo-liberal policies result in these patterns of inequality is accepted by neo-liberal advocates as an unfortunate consequence off-set by the overall gains in economic development. Questions of distribution are subordinated to those of aggregate gain.¹⁰

Should the current trajectory of globalization continue in its neo-liberal direction, education in general will be impacted in some predictable ways. First, public education will continue to have high rhetorical value in policy discourse, but overall state commitment to it will even out or decline. Second, market liberalization will promote more private sector responses to education. The results will be mixed. In some situations, private institutions will provide useful alternatives to state educational systems that have grown ineffective and/or are resistant to change. Where education is highly valued, even the relatively poor will increase that proportion of income devoted to education to access it in the private sector, as a necessary investment in human capital (Rodriguez 2006). This phenomenon will be primarily urban – poorer rural areas will be the big losers following the consequences of privatization through liberalization. Third, in rapid growth environments, such as China and India, significant de-regulation of education will trigger significant increases in institutional capacity, but of very mixed quality; market alignment will, furthermore, be problematic (Altbach 2005). In other environments, market liberalization will lead to a further globalization of intellectual labor.

Some societies will continue to find it more useful to 'rent brains' from a global marketplace than invest in creating capacity and assuring quality within their own national settings. The pattern currently visible in many of the advanced industrial countries is likely to persist with the job market producing smaller numbers of highly skilled, highly paid jobs and a larger number of poorly paid jobs, most of them in service industries. In higher education, the current trend for universities to under-replace tenure track positions when they are vacated by retirement is likely to continue, resulting in more short-term contract professorial staff. Newly styled convenience institutions, especially those targeted at adult-learners, will offer degrees focused on specific market needs, and utilize fewer full-time faculty who will teach through pre-structured, standardized curricula (Inayatullah & Gidley 2000).

Neo-liberally driven globalization and the kind of state it seeks to create have, however, been challenged by the post 9-11 security state. Prior to September 11th 2001, arguments that challenged neo-liberal globalization from the standpoint of its negative side-effects were turned aside by the contention that states that did not follow neo-liberal policies by liberalizing their economies, reducing their social budgets by cutting taxes, and de-regulating, would lose out to societies that did. Further, these reforms were to some degree even more beneficial to developing states emerging from periods of strong state control than to developed states. These newly liberalized economies attracted new capital and aimed at the mobilization of cheap labor. In the context of this global competitive logic, the more developed societies had little choice but to stay the competitive course.

Since 9-11, however, numerous governments, including those of the USA, UK, and Australia, have embarked on the dual and essentially contradictory program of continuing on course to develop a full-blown neo-liberal state while simultaneously pursuing a security state intended to thwart domestic and international terrorism. In the USA, the Bush administration has been home to both neo-liberals and neo-conservatives, and has sought to placate each. The result has been the extraordinary budgetary deficits required to support the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, a persistent expansion of federal governmental reach, framed as necessary steps to fight the global 'war on terror' – a war without boundaries either in time or space – while taxes continue to be cut. On the face of it, the dual challenge of tax cuts and increased war expenditures is a partial strategy at best, yet another version of the 'guns and butter' policies that proved so

costly for the USA during the Vietnam War, and very likely economically unsustainable. Coupled with the social forces driving other major budget crises, such as supporting health-care and pensions for rapidly ageing populations, it seems unlikely that both the neo-liberal state and an advanced security state can be jointly pursued (Drucker 2005).

Short of that contingency, however, one might predict a more prosaic outcome for global neo-liberalism. The electoral histories of modern democracies are cyclical and the current relative popular support for governments and political elites to steer the neo-liberal course may wane should electorates become convinced that the economic growth promised by neo-liberalism no longer justifies further social service reductions or continued distortions in the social distribution of wealth. Until that tipping point is reached, however, advanced information economies will probably rely on the private sector to produce the additional educational capacity their economies and societies require. The pattern of one educational experience proving sufficient for an adult employment lifetime is already history for many as individuals in advanced information societies can now look forward to three or four career changes over their working lives. The rise of convenience institutions to satisfy this growing educational need has transformed a significant part of the higher education landscape over the past two decades. At this point it is difficult to say what the overall impact of these lower cost, occupationally-focused institutions will be, but a real possibility exists that they may set a new standard that transforms important aspects of higher education. The largest university in the United States, the for-profit University of Phoenix, represents an attractive business model both for investors and credential focused-students (*The Chronicle of Higher Education* 2006). It may also become an attractive model for liberalizing economies such as China and India, which are already awash with private for-profit institutions focused on meeting narrowly framed occupational needs. If higher education were to become predominantly identified with such narrowly focused occupational institutions, the willingness of the public sector to continue bearing the much higher costs of conventional public universities may be seriously called into question.

Finally, by way of conclusion, let us ask: *In a world of ever-increasing complexity, what are our obligations to teach 'how the world works?' Who will do it? And, how would we know?*

In some respects this has been *the* question for education for at least the past five hundred years, or from that time in the West when Renais-

sance knowledge came to constitute a significant challenge to the monopoly of the Church, when European voyages of discovery touched off the first significant wave of globalization, and when the invention of the printing press began the process of democratizing access to and ownership of knowledge. These events vastly increased the levels of complexity in what constituted the 'knowable world' and the pretence individuals could hold of knowing 'how it worked.' Organizing responses to this vastly increased complexity became the agenda for education in its modern forms, which is to say that answering the question 'how the world works' has always been in some important ways about deciphering power: who holds it and who does not, what outcomes it produces, how it is gained and retained, and how it may be transferred from one social group to another. The holders of power, whether economic, social, religious, or political power, have long understood that its perpetuation was in large part dependent on their progeny having access to the 'best' education, however determined. To repeat the point made above, mass education arose in some countries in combination with expanding political democracy (in the USA, Great Britain, France, the Scandinavian countries). In others it was an integral part of focused national economic imperatives (e.g., under the Meiji Restoration in Japan, the Soviet Union, etc.). These great impulses embedded powerful ideological elements within the educational systems they created. The values associated with the authoritarianism of Japanese Meiji society, French rationalism coupled with nationalism, class relations in Britain, collective responsibility in the Soviet Union, and the peculiar combination of industrial discipline coupled with democratic organization in the United States, underpinned and permeated the formal educational systems associated with them. They were perhaps the most pervasive 'hidden curricula' of formal education.

The power relations and pedagogy embedded in educational structures contain multiple messages about how the world works. At the manifest curriculum level are claims of purported descriptive accuracy of content packages required for social success in reading, writing, some level of complex cognitive operation, and the explicit normative components of national citizenship (whatever its content). These structures carry complex messages at the latent level about who and what imperatives *really* need to be obeyed, respected, followed; how social pathways are arrayed; how things 'really' work. These implicit messages are bundled largely by prior decisions that determine where students matriculate, with whom they learn and by whom they are taught, and are inscribed

throughout the education process. The processes of social hierarchy within which education is situated, which to members of those hierarchies may seem universal, *are* to some extent broadly understood, if not fully accepted. Ordinary people know what the elite schools are (even when they arise out of egalitarian social impulses like magnet schools or those open to membership purely on the basis of achievement) and they know what it means to get into them.

In a world of very rapid change such as that produced by contemporary globalization, the ability to know how the world works – how the world really works – is itself radically problematized. Even those who under normal conditions purport to know, those privy to the select social codes of power and privilege, may discover (if only by their dedicated devotion to the business at hand) that they are no longer in touch with important changes taking place. A world such as this requires special investments in assaying the very processes of change, seeking to render them sensible in the context of our current circumstances. A world such as this needs to privilege inquiry in ways that are often radical – simply to keep pace with the speed and reach of change. The dilemma is that even under such conditions, gaining definitive knowledge about ‘the world’ is fraught with difficulty as ‘definitive knowledge agents’ – those entrusted by society to use science in the interest of gaining greater knowledge of society and rendering it more predictable – ultimately may also fail this test. As society becomes more complex, as the rate and volume of exchanges increase, predictability itself is a victim. The world becomes a less rather than more predictable place; social changes appear to operate within the unpredictable logics of complexity theory rather than the more comfortable predictabilities of linear extrapolations. Education is left with a near impossible task: seeking to explain a world of increasingly complexity even as that world continues to change (Lupton 1999).

This is, I think, the primary challenge following contemporary globalization processes for basic as well as higher education. The requirement is to shift from passive modes of knowledge transmission – knower to learner – to active modes of knowledge engagement – learner to learner. It’s difficult to imagine anything more threatening to the way most existing educational institutions are structured. But, as I suggest above, the change pulsating within contemporary globalization is all about a pervasive reflexivity, and my conviction is that the dynamics impelling it are so broad and complex as to place these processes beyond control in any ordinary sense of that word. Education about how the world works has

proceeded from the former notion of learning how people in power operate the world (presumably so that one has the credentials to join or control them), to seeking to gain some possible understanding of how these complex and unpredictable processes work, or might work. Education at all levels needs to become in novel ways a theorizing activity, a pervasive inquiry about the nature of things, the order of things, and the way of things.

From this, I think it follows that the new educational paradigms that we seek will radically challenge our notions of how knowledge is created, transmitted and conserved. The historical conventions that have produced our subject matter categories (and the professions embodied within them) will increasingly be replaced by imperatives to understand the world in terms of the processes and relations extant within it: ecology, information, political economy, and globalization itself. We will come to educate in terms of problems and dilemmas, both of which require solutions of very different orders, because increasingly this is what the world we have created will present to us.

References

- Altbach, P. (2005): 'India: A World-Class Country Without World-Class Education,' NAFSA: Association of International Educators, available at www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/InternationalEducator/AcrossCulturesNovDec05.pdf.
- Amojelar, D.G. (2006): 'For emergencies, text more effective than voice calls'. *The Manila Times*, January 7.
- Anderson, G.F. & Poullier, J.P. (1999): 'Health spending, access, and outcomes: Trends in industrial countries'. *Health Affairs*, Vol.18, No.3, pp.178-192.
- Arndt, Sven W. & Keirzkowski, H. (2001): *Fragmentation: New Production Patterns in the World Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ashland.edu (2006): 'Course notes for just in time production,' www.ashland.edu/~rjacobs/m503jit.html.
- Bales, K. (2004): *Disposable people: New Slavery in the Global Economy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bank for International Settlements (2005): 'Triennial Central Bank Survey of Foreign Exchange and Derivatives Market Activity'. www.bis.org/pub/rpfx05.htm.
- Barber, R. (1996): *Jihad vs. McWorld: How Globalization and Tribalism Are Reshaping the World*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Barnet, R.J. & Mueller, R.E. (1976): *Global Reach: The Power of the Multinational Corporations*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Bentley, J.H. & Ziegler, H.F. (2006): *Traditions and Encounters: A Global Perspective on the Past*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

- Blackmore, J. (2000): 'Globalization: A Useful Concept for Feminists Rethinking Theory and Strategies in Education?' in Burbules, N.C. & Torres, C.A. (eds.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, pp. 133-155.
- Bluestone, B. & Harrison, B. (1982): *The De-industrialization of America: Plant Closings, Community Abandonment, and the Dismantling of Basic Industry*. New York: Basic Books.
- Blumenstyk, G. (2006): 'Why For-Profit Colleges Are Like Health Clubs'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 5, Vol.52, No.35, pp.A35-A36.
- Brecher, J. & Costello, T. (1999): *Global Village or Global Pillage: Economic Reconstruction from the Bottom Up*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Castells, M. (1996): *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Volume 1: The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Castronova, E. (2005): *Synthetic Worlds: The Business and Culture of Online Games*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cavallo, D. (2004): 'Models of Growth—Towards Fundamental Change in Learning Environments'. *BT Technology Journal*, Vol.22, No.4, pp.96-112.
- City Population (2006): *The Principal Agglomerations of the World*, www.citypopulation.de/World.html.
- China Daily* (2006): 'Middle Class Becomes Rising Power in China' May 11, found at: www.chinadaily.com.cn/english/doc/2004-11/06/content.
- Davis, M. (2004): 'A Planet of Slums: Urban Involution and the Informal Proletariat'. *New Left Review*, March-April, pp.6-34.
- Drucker, P. (2005): 'Trading places,' in *The National Interest*, www.nationalinterest.org: posted March 17, 2005.
- Farr, K. & Ehrenreich, B. (2005): *Sex Trafficking + Global Woman*. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Friedman, T.L. (2005): *The World is Flat*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Garrett, L. (2000): *Betrayal of Trust: The Collapse of Global Public Health*. New York: Hyperion.
- Giddens, A. (1999): 'Runaway world', BBC Reith Lectures, London. [Online]. Available: http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/events/reith_99/.
- Green, B. (2003): *The Elegant Universe: Superstrings, Hidden Dimensions, and the Quest for the Ultimate Theory*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Greider, William (1997): *One World Ready or Not: The Manic Logic of Global Capitalism*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Guttman, C. (2005): 'Defining Quality and Inequality in Education,' *UN Chronicle Online Edition*, www.un.org/Pubs/chronicle/2005/issue1/0105p49.html.
- Harmonay, M. (1979): *The Arts, ACT's Guide to TV Programming for Children*. New York: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Henry, J. (1965): *Culture against Man*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Harvey, D. (1989): *The Condition of Post Modernity: An Inquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

- Held, D. (1991): *Political Theory Today*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Heylin, M. (2004): 'Science is becoming truly worldwide: Bulk of growth in scientific papers is in Europe and Asia; U.S. posts far more modest gains'. *Chemical and Engineering News*, Vol.82, No.4, pp.38-41.
- International Development Association (2006) found at web.worldbank.org/WEBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPOVERTY/EXTPR.
- International Institute for Labor Studies (1998): 'Global production and local jobs: new perspectives on enterprise networks, employment and local development policy'.
- International Workshop: Export Processing Zones: The Cutting Edge of Globalization Geneva March 9-10.
- Johnston, R.J., Taylor, P.J., & Watts, M.J. (eds.) (2002): *Geographies of Global Change: Remapping the World*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kim, J.Y., Millen, J.V., Irwin, A. & Gersman, J. (eds.) (2000): *Dying for Growth: Global Inequality and the Health of the Poor*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.
- Inayatullah, S. & Gidley, J. (eds.) (2000): *The University in Transition: Global Perspectives on the Futures of the University*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Lobe, J. (2003): 'The hazards of watching Fox News.' *Alternet*, www.alternet.org, October 3.
- Lupton, D. (1999): *Risk*. New York: Routledge.
- Martinez, E. & Barcia, A. (1997): 'What is Neo-liberalism? A Brief Definition for Activists'. CorpWatch, www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=376.
- McChesney, R.W. (2001): 'Global media, neo-liberalism and imperialism', pp. 1-16. www.monthlyreview.org/301rwm.htm.
- McChesney, R.W. (2003): 'The Nine Firms that Dominate the World'. *Other Eyes*, www.globalpolicyforum.org.
- Mulrooney, L.A. & Neubauer, D. (2006): 'Globalisation, Economic Justice, and Health'. *Australasian Journal of Human Security*, Vol.2, No.1, pp.33-50.
- Nautiyal, K.H. (2006): 'X-Rayted Careers'. *India Times Women*, www.women.indiatimes.com.
- Neubauer, D. (1998): 'The incredible shrinking state'. *Social Alternatives*, Vol.17, No.3, pp.10-11.
- Neubauer, D. (2000): 'Assaying globalization'. *American Studies*, Vol.41, No.2/3, pp.13-32.
- Neubauer, D. (2005): 'Globalization and Emerging Governance Modalities'. *Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine*, Vol.10 No.5, pp.286-294.
- National Library of Medicine (2006), *Telemedicine Information Exchange*, www.tie.telemed.org.
- NUMMI (2006): "How we do it," www.nummi.com.
- Outsource2India (2005): <http://www.outsource2india.com>.
- Overland, M.A. (2006): 'A Political Education in the Philippines'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 21, Vol.52, No.33, pp.A50-A52.

- Peplinskie, K. (2005): 'Celebrities Join UN Envoy to Urge Action on Poverty'. *Vancouver Sun*, February 12.
- Peterson, A. & Lupton, D. (1996): *The New Public Health: Health and Self in the Age of Risk*. London: Sage.
- Reich, R. (1991): *The Work of Nations: Preparing for the 21st Century*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Rodriguez, J.C. (2006): 'A Private Education for the Poor'. *The Spain Herald*, LibertadDigital, January 12. www.spainherald.com.
- Sachs, J.D. & McArthur, J.W. (2005): 'The Millennium Project: A Plan for Meeting the Millennium Development Goals'. *Lancet*, Vol.365, No.9456, pp.347-353.
- Shah, A. (2005): 'A Primer on Neo-liberalism'. www.globalissues.org/TradeRelated/FreeTrade/Neo-liberalism.asp#Neoliberalismis.
- Skrobanek, S., Boonpakdi, N. & Jantakeero, C. (eds.) (1997): *The Traffic in Women: Human Realities of the International Sex Trade (Global Issues)*. New York/London: Zed Books.
- Steger, M. (2002): *Globalism: The New Market Ideology*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Stiglitz, J.E. (2003): *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Sydney Morning Herald* (2005): 'A Slice of the Action'. October 29.
- Text.it (2006): The UK's Official Guide to Messaging, <http://text.it>.
- Ulmer, J. (2005): 'Broadband rules in rapidly expanding global video game market' September 27, www.hollywoodreporter.com/chr/pwc/talking_display.jsp?vnu_content_id=1000642643
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2004): *Development and Globalization: Facts and Figures*, New York and Geneva.
- Webopedia (2006): 'Moore's Law,' www.webopedia.com.
- Yardley, J. (2004): 'The New Uprooted; In a Tidal Wave, China's Masses Pour From Farm to City'. *New York Times*, September 12.

Endnotes

¹ Joseph Stiglitz anticipates much of the subsequent argument of this chapter in his definition of globalization as "the closer integration of the countries and peoples of the world which has been brought about by the enormous reduction of costs of transportation and communication, and the breaking down of artificial barriers to the flows of goods, services, capital, knowledge, and (to a lesser extent) people across borders" (2003, p.9).

² In 2002, 70.7% of all FDI flowed to developed countries. Africa received 1.7%, Latin America 8.6%, Asia 14.6%, and Central and Eastern Europe 4.4%; 92.7% of FDI originated in the developed countries and 5.7% from developing Asia. FDI is defined by UNCTAD as "Investment involving a long term relationship and lasting interest in and control by a resident interest in one economy

in an enterprise resident in another economy" (UNCTAD, 2005, Chapter 2, p.10).

- ³ Martinez and Garcia's What is "Neo-liberalism"? is widely cited. Its main points include: "The rule of the market – freedom for capital, goods and services, where the market is self-regulating allowing the trickle down notion of wealth distribution Reducing public expenditure for social services, such as health and education, by the government Deregulation, to allow market forces to act as a self-regulating mechanism Privatization of public enterprise (things from water to even the internet) ... [and] changing perceptions of public and community good to individualism and individual responsibility." (Martinez & Garcia 1997, cited by Shah, 2005).
- ⁴ As the 2005 World Economic Forum in Davos acknowledged, poverty and education are powerfully linked. The UN Chronicle frames the linkage as an economic problem: "business and political leaders ranked education as a leading global concern, recognizing it as a key to beating poverty" (Guttman 2005). In the poorest areas of the world, however, poverty itself is the primary barrier to education, creating a logical priority of intervention for the world community. Simply, education cannot be the "answer" to poverty until some societal threshold condition is achieved that creates the minimal requirements for nutritional adequacy, order, and the supporting social structures that permit basic education to be undertaken.
- ⁵ In the Toyota model, Just-in-Time Production is defined as "a philosophy of manufacturing based on planned elimination of all waste and on continuous improvement of productivity" (NUMMI 2006). It has also been described as an approach with the objective of producing the right part in the right place at the right time (in other words, "just in time"). Waste results from any activity that adds cost without adding value, such as the unnecessary moving of materials, the accumulation of excess inventory, or the use of faulty production methods that create products requiring subsequent rework. JIT production (also known as lean or stockless production) should improve profits and returns on investment by reducing inventory levels (increasing the inventory turnover rate), reducing variability, improving product quality, reducing production and delivery lead times, and reducing other costs (such as those associated with machine setup and equipment breakdown). In a JIT production system, underutilized (excess) capacity is used instead of buffer inventories to hedge against problems that may arise" (Ashland 2006).
- ⁶ Tele-medicine and tele-health activities, to take but one example, have spread throughout the globe. For a review of the current state of the art see the website, The Telemedicine Information Exchange, maintained by the National Library of Medicine (NLM, 2006).
- ⁷ This is a rapidly changing landscape. In the USA, to take one example, a recent report in the Chronicle of Higher Education examines the business models being developed by the for-profit 'convenience institutions,' those, like the

University of Phoenix, that offer a limited range of occupationally-targeted programs mainly for working adults. These institutions, writes Goldie Blumenstyk, pursue a business model that more closely approximates that of a health club than a university, pouring great amounts of money into up-front advertising and the recruitment of students, at the eventual expense of the amounts spent on the traditional higher education functions of content and teaching. Such institutions do no research and un-bundle traditional faculty roles so that the classroom instructor performs only that function. This model works well in a society with a plentiful supply of individuals with graduate degrees, and permits the institution to function by maintaining relatively low faculty salaries, usually the largest budget item for conventional universities (Blumenstyk 2006).

- ⁸ The Chinese Academy of Social Sciences estimated in 2004 that the size of the middle class in that country has approached 19% of the population. It defines middle class as “people with stable incomes who are capable of purchasing private houses and cars, and can afford the costs of education and holidays.” In household income terms it includes in the middle class those with assets valued between 150,000 (US\$19,500) and 300,000 (US\$39,000) yuan. The number of such households is expected to rise to 100 million by 2010. (China Daily 2006).
- ⁹ Counting methodologies differ significantly, especially when estimating the size of agglomerations, rather than cities defined by their formal boundaries. At the top of all such lists however are Tokyo, Mexico City, Seoul, New York, Sao Paulo, Mumbai, New Delhi, Shanghai, Los Angeles, Osaka, Jakarta, Kolkata (Calcutta), Al-Qahirah (Cairo), Manila, Karachi and Moscow. Not far behind are Buenos Aires, Dhaka, Rio de Janeiro, Beijing and London. (See City Population 2006).
- ¹⁰ The World Bank and IMF have over the past several years conceded that the market liberalization, or “restructuring,” that attended NGO assistance to poor countries may have over-reached itself and produced considerable unintended negative effects. Both agencies now pursue a more differentiated approach. Note, for example, the requirements countries must meet to receive loans from the International Development Association: “[Countries] must ... respond to the competitive pressures as well as the opportunities of globalization; arrest the spread of HIV/AIDS; and prevent conflict or deal with its aftermath (IDA, 2006).

Rethinking Educational Aims in an Era of Globalization

Fazal RIZVI

Globalization is the term most commonly used to describe our era. It points to the emergence of a set of processes that relate to the rapid movement of ideas, goods and people around the globe, radically transforming relations among people and communities across national borders. Driven largely by developments in information and communication technologies, globalization has given rise to new forms of transnational interconnectivity and interdependence. And while people continue to live in local realities, these realities are increasingly integrated into larger systems of global networks. According to Waters (1995), globalization involves both an objective and a subjective dimension. It represents an objective account of the ways in which geographical constraints on economic, political and cultural activities are receding; but on a subjective level, it suggests that people around the world are becoming increasingly aware of this fact and are reshaping their lives accordingly. People deal on a daily basis with the realities of transnational economic relations, technological and media innovations, and cultural flows that cut across national borders, with greater speed and intensity than ever before. For many people, these developments have provided new and exciting opportunities to travel and trade, while for others they have brought nothing but destruction of their life opportunities and of their communities and cultural traditions.

Education is deeply implicated in these transformations, affected by the accelerating transnational dynamics of globalization. Through major advances in information and communication technologies, educational

ideas and ideologies now circulate around the world at a more rapid rate, resulting in global educational policy networks which are often more influential than local political actors. International organizations like APEC, the OECD and the World Bank are increasingly playing a more important role in the processes of educational policy formation and evaluation at the national level. This role involves negotiating consensus and conventions, such as the Washington Consensus or the Bologna Declaration, ensuring coordinated policy action across national systems, as well as supporting international cooperation in education through the development of global indicators of performance and quality, such as TIMMS and PISA (Rizvi 2004). In the context of such multilateralism (Mundy 1998), developing countries are often coerced by the internationalization organizations that provide them loans, grants and aid to take into account the alleged 'imperatives of the global economy.' Globalization does not, however, affect only education in the realm of policy development. It is also profoundly re-configuring the cultural field within which educational practice now takes place. The lives and experiences of young people growing up today are deeply affected, for example, by new social formations driven by technological and media innovations. Global processes are thus transforming almost every community, no matter how remote or insular. If this is so then we need to consider whether our current ways of thinking about educational aims are adequate; and, if they are not, then what alternatives might there be to the hegemonic conceptions of globalization.

In this chapter, I want to discuss some of the ways in which educational aims are currently being re-crafted in relation to the emerging interpretations of globalization. I argue that while the traditional approaches to thinking about aims are no longer sufficient because they mostly remain nation-centric and do not adequately engage with the new global realities of transnational economic, political and cultural interconnectivities, the new approaches driven by the international organizations are equally flawed. They indicate an unmistakable trend towards uniformity, and demand a convergence in thinking, accepting similar diagnoses of problems confronting educational systems with widely differing social, political and economic traditions. They propose similar solutions and programs of educational reform. They display a major shift to neo-liberal policy thinking, manifested most clearly in privatization policies, and in policies that assume the validity of market mechanisms to solve most of the various crises facing nation-states and civil society. They do this by working with a par-

ticular social imaginary that is largely inimical to the values of democracy and justice. As a result, they fail to develop broader visions of education aimed at preparing students to be critically informed and engaged with globalization's new challenges, threats and opportunities.

Traditions of Thinking about Educational Aims

Issues concerning how best to think about educational aims have been much debated for most of the past century. In the early part of the twentieth century, Whitehead (1929) wrote a highly influential book outlining various philosophical issues involved in thinking clearly about aims. He insisted that educational aims needed to be expressed in explicit terms that were derived from our theoretical assumptions about the nature of knowledge and its transmission, human nature and learning. Education, he argued, should actively "utilize the knowledge and skills that were taught to students to a particular end," of "producing men who possess both culture and expert knowledge in some special direction" (p.1); and that it should "impart an intimate sense for the power and beauty of ideas coupled with structure for ideas together with a particular body of knowledge, which has peculiar reference to the life of the being possessing it" (p.10). Whitehead's conception of educational aims was thus linked directly to the structure of knowledge that was judged to be intrinsically worthwhile, applicable equally to all those who wished to be educated, and necessarily good for all societies in the same way.

Some forty years later, Hirst and Peters (1970) similarly tied their thinking about educational aims to what they saw as education's 'knowledge condition.' Aims, they argued, specify something general and formal, a conceptual truth about the very concept of education as involving a "family of processes leading up to desirable states of mind in people involving depth and breadth" (p.26). They regarded the production of these states of mind as the main aim of education. Now the problem with this analytical approach to thinking about aims is that it leaves a range of important questions unaddressed: for example, how do we determine the desirable states of mind?; which family of processes is appropriate?; and how might this analysis be helpful in thinking about education in a society that is dynamic, democratic and multicultural, where there exist contrasting and competing value positions about educational priorities. This approach fails to link educational aims to particular social and historical formations. Instead it articulates them in terms of highly formal condi-

tions, justified through a transcendental argument that largely eschews any consideration of changing economic, political and social circumstances. Nor does it present aims as outcomes of some political negotiations over competing interests. In the end, the analytical tradition of thinking about educational aims that Hirst and Peters represent is both ahistorical and apolitical.

The analytical approach to thinking about educational aims stands in sharp contrast to the functionalist sociological tradition, the main focus of which is on the processes through which the young are socialized into a given society. One of the founders of this tradition, Durkheim (1972), viewed educational aims in a highly instrumental fashion. Aims, he suggested, reflect underlying processes in society because an educational system is a construct built by society which naturally seeks to reproduce its collectively held values, beliefs, norms, and conditions through its institutions. Educational systems thus contain the imprint of past stages in the development of a society, even as each era seeks to develop that imprint in its own image. According to Durkheim, the main aim of education is first to understand these imprints by analyzing them and, only then, to consider how a society could be developed through the reconstruction of its educational system. For Durkheim, then, educational aims express 'societal needs' at a given time and place. Society constructs its educational system to promote and reproduce its ideal of how human beings should live and how they should relate to each other in meeting societal needs.

Now if Hirst and Peters's (1970) analytical approach to thinking about educational aims is too universalistic, then the functionalist sociological tradition rests on a view of society that is too specific and instrumental. The functionalist tradition leaves little room for social critique and radical transformation, and ties educational aims largely to vocational and other instrumental ends. Moreover, it assumes the borders of a society to be clearly definable and fixed, overlooking issues of inter-societal significance. Issues of power and politics surrounding the determination of 'societal needs' are also left unaddressed, thus privileging hegemonic conceptions over views that might be oppositional but nonetheless more justifiable on some other grounds, such as those relating to democracy, equality and social justice.

The pragmatic tradition of thinking about educational aims associated with the work of Dewey cuts across the binaries between the formal and material, the universal and particular, the instrumental and non-

instrumental, as well as the contrast between the intrinsic and extrinsic aims of education. Dewey provides his most considered account of educational aims in his *Democracy and Education* (1916). Aims of education, he argues, cannot be found outside the activity of education; they are located within the educational act itself. An aim therefore should be a natural outgrowth of existing conditions, and should be formed in the process of realizing it. It should "enable individuals to continue their education." In this sense, "the object and reward of learning is continued capacity for growth" (p.81). Dewey specifies three conditions that he says are found in all good educational aims. First, "an educational aim must be founded upon the intrinsic activities and needs (including original instincts and acquired habits) of the given individual to be educated." Second, "an aim must be capable of translation into a method of cooperating with the activities of those undergoing instruction." And finally, "educators have to be on their guard against ends that are alleged to be general and ultimate" (p.85). Beyond these general conditions, Dewey insists that educational aims should grow out of the context of the educative activity itself.

This account of educational aims has been criticized for its lack of specificity (for example, by Suppes 1995). But this, indeed, as Suppes acknowledges, might be deliberate, for Dewey is reluctant to prescribe a pre-specified ideal of the educated person, a single greatest good, a universal. Aims for him have to be negotiated within the process of education itself, so long as "there is adequate provision for the reconstruction of social habits and institutions by means of wide stimulation arising from equitably distributed interests. And this means a democratic society" (Dewey 1916, p.78). As Noddings (1995, p.3) suggests, Dewey might well have said that the primary educational aim is "to produce people who will understand, appreciate, and use the 'method of intelligence'." However, even this level of specificity might have conflicted with Dewey's contention that educational aims should arise out of the specific contexts in which people find themselves, for Dewey had noted that contexts change in ways that demand different educational responses. Indeed, it is not surprising that the context in which Dewey was writing about aims greatly affected his own analysis of the relationship between society and education. His was an era of strong nationalisms. His remarks were therefore located within a national imaginary, characterized in the USA by various sentiments about democracy and about the role of education in producing certain kinds of citizens.

Dewey's most relevant remark for my argument in this chapter is

that aims are located within the educational act itself. This suggests that while they are often formal, explicitly specified in legislation, statutes or policy documents, they can also be implicit in social practices representing established ways of doing things in various informal arrangements. They have to be discerned and teased out from a particular context, and made explicit. This distinction between formal and informal, explicit and implicit is helpful, but Dewey's insights suggest a deeper insight – that even formal and explicit statements of aims are embedded within a broader context of social relations and practices, or in what Taylor (2004) refers to as a 'social imaginary,' a framework that is at once descriptive and prescriptive of conceptions of how educational practice is best directed towards certain outcomes and is organized around a set of norms. In this sense, educational aims are located within a social imaginary – and their analysis therefore requires not only an examination of the specific policies and programs that are derived from them, but also an investigation of the context which provides them with meaning and legitimacy.

For Taylor, the idea of a social imaginary involves a complex, unstructured and contingent mix of the empirical and the affective – not a "fully articulated understanding of our whole situation within which particular features of our world become evident" (Taylor 2004, p.21). In this sense, his idea of a social imaginary is akin to Bourdieu's notion of 'habitus,' or Raymond Williams's idea of 'structures of feeling,' or what Wittgenstein called the 'background.' The social imaginary is a way of thinking shared in a society by ordinary people; it involves common understandings that make everyday practices possible, giving them sense and legitimacy. In this way, a social imaginary is both implicit and normative; it is embedded in ideas and practices and events, and carries within it deeper normative notions and images which are constitutive of a society. It involves

something much broader and deeper than the intellectual schemes people may entertain when they think about social reality in a disengaged mode. I am thinking, rather, of the ways in which people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations. (Taylor 2004, p.23)

A social imaginary is carried in images, characteristic metaphors, myths, parables, stories, legends, and other narratives and most significantly, in

the contemporary era, in the mass media. It is through their shared social imaginary that relations and sociability among strangers within and across societies become possible.

Taylor maintains, however, that a social imaginary is not only embedded in the everyday notions and images, but also in theories and policies, and by implication in fully articulated statements of aims. He thus regards as highly significant the distinction between social theory and social imaginary. Theories are often in the possession of a relatively few people, while a social imaginary is more broadly accepted, and makes possible a widely shared sense of legitimacy, without which people might not be able to work collectively towards common goals. Theories emerge out of an established social imaginary, even if they suggest an alternative way of interpreting the world. While they might start off as theories held by a small group of people, for them to be successful theories they must infiltrate the wider community, and then the whole society, creating a new sense of imaginary. For a theory to become a part of the social imaginary, it must evolve into a kind of common understanding that enables us to carry out our everyday social practices. In this way, a social imaginary is both factual and normative, "that is, we have a sense of how things usually go, but this is interwoven with an idea of how they ought to go, of what missteps would invalidate the practice" (Taylor 2004, p.24). It articulates the dynamism of our discourses, social practices and institutions.

It is important to stress, then, that a social imaginary is not simply inherited and already determined for us; it is rather in a constant state of flux (Goankar 2007). It thus represents an enabling concept that describes the ways people act as world-making collective agents within a given symbolic matrix that refuses to assume an 'ontology of determinism' (Castoriadis 1987). It is a creative force in the making of social-historical worlds, a force that has to be attentive to the 'signs of the time' and interpret all those particular, rather uneven and emotionally charged, events that make up everyday life (Maffesoli 1993). A social imaginary thus involves a collective social force that is not only specific to time and space but is also always multiple and highly contested within and across communities. Jason Tan's Chapter Seven in this volume provides an excellent illustration of how the government of Singapore has, futilely, I would suggest, tried to legislate a nationally oriented social imaginary through some of its education policies. It is through the *collective* sense of imagination (rather than, for example, that of the state) that a community is created, given coherence and identity, but is also subjected to social

change, both mundane and radical. In this way, communities are created differently, subsist differently, and are transformed differently through the exercise of collective political agency. It follows then that communities interpret and engage with the world outside their borders differently, but invariably within their always-emerging social imaginary.

This analysis suggests that educational aims too are embedded within social imaginaries; and that their transformation requires the exercise of collective political agency, in imagining them differently. Significantly, then, a social imaginary exists in a double sense. It exists through representations or implicit understandings embodied in existing discursive and material practices, but it is also the means by which individuals and communities are able to understand their identities and their place in the world, and are able to suggest transformations of the prevailing social order. The transformation of social imaginaries is indeed never easy to achieve, and requires a whole range of formal and informal strategies to shift the popular images that people associate with educational practice, which is sometimes expressed in explicit statements of aims, and sometimes not.

Appadurai (1996) has analysed the role of the social imaginary in the formation of subjectivities within the globalizing context in which we now live, a context that is characterized by diffusion of social images, ideas and ideologies across communities around the world. This diffusion is facilitated by electronic media, mass migration and the mobility of capital and labour, creating conditions through which most societies around the world have become culturally diverse and hybrid, and cannot avoid, in a fundamental sense, engaging with social relations transnationally. As Appadurai (2001, p.4) puts it, the "system of nation-states is no longer the only game in town," not only insofar as international governance and transnational economic and political traffic are concerned but also with respect to cultural formations. We live in a world in which ideas and ideologies, people and capital and images and messages are constantly in motion, transforming the vectors of our social imaginaries. We now live amid many social imaginaries, in addition to those that are dictated by the dominant national expressions. Each has a different point of origin, a different axis. Each travels through a different route and is constituted by different relationships to institutional structures in different communities and nations. Any attempt to rethink educational aims in the era of globalization can no longer overlook how our social imaginaries are being re-shaped by global and local processes simultaneously, and how we

might critically engage with these processes in order to develop alternatives to their hegemonic expressions.

Social Imaginaries of Globalization

In this global era, as I have noted already, we live amid a multiplicity of social imaginaries. But, as Appadurai (2001, p.15) has pointed out, imagination as a collective social fact in the era of globalization has a split character:

On the one hand, it is in and through imagination that modern citizens are disciplined and controlled, by states, markets and other powerful interests. On the other hand, it is also the faculty through which collective patterns of dissent and new designs for collective life emerge.

This suggests that competing social imaginaries now exist side by side in a constant state of struggle. There are different and competing ways of interpreting the contemporary realities of global interconnectivity and interdependence, and deriving educational implications from them. However, these competing imaginaries do not exist in a neutral space, but in a context in which, I want to argue, a particular imaginary has become dominant. It is in terms of this imaginary that most recent statements of educational aims around the world appear to be couched. These statements are expressed in a language that is magisterial in tone and assumes the authority of its claims, a language that demands implicit consent so that people can develop a shared sense of legitimacy. It brings factual and normative aspects of policy together in an effort to forge a shared implicit understanding of the problems to which policies are proposed as solutions. The authority structure within which policies are located demands, of course, as I have suggested, a shared social imaginary, without which such policies could not be held as legitimate.

In an effort to secure this legitimacy, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) have, I believe, played an important role in recent years in shaping and popularizing a particular social imaginary with which to interpret globalization and its supposed implications for re-thinking educational aims. IGOs, such as the OECD, the EU, APEC, UNESCO and the World Bank, have become major sites for the organization of knowledge about education, and have created a cajoling discourse around the 'imperatives of the global economy' for education. Recognizing that deve-

developments in communication and information technologies have enabled increased circulation of ideas, images and ideologies across national spaces, they have created a space within which ideas are now explored, exchanged, promoted and steered, leaving few nations entirely free to choose their own educational priorities. Their efforts have led to policy borrowing, modeling transfer, and appropriation and copying of ideas across national boundaries; so much so that it is often difficult to determine the extent to which there is free exchange of ideas, or whether the terms of the policy debates have not already been constructed within a particular imaginary. In a research report, Henry, Taylor, Lingard and I (2001) have demonstrated, for example, how the OECD, traditionally a site for the free exchange of educational ideas, has become a policy player in its own right, influencing, cajoling and directing member states and others towards a pre-determined ideology of globalization and its educational implications.

It is, of course, possible to imagine the dynamics of globalization in a variety of ways. Globalization is a highly contested term. However, the dominant social imaginary of globalization promoted by the IGOs is a neo-liberal one. It consists of a range of images, precepts and generalizations about how the world is becoming increasingly interconnected and interdependent, giving rise to a set of social processes that imply

inexorable integration of markets, nation-states and technologies to a degree never witnessed before – in a way that is enabling individuals, corporations and nation-states to reach round the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper than ever before (Friedman 2000, p.14).

Such integration is of course variously described and is far from entirely complete or coherent. As Larner (2000) has pointed out, the neo-liberal imaginary of globalization can be interpreted simultaneously as policy, ideology and governmentality – “a system of meaning that constitutes institutions, practices and identities in contradictory and disjunctive ways” (p.12). While it has some generalized characteristics, its use in the development of policies is rather more historically specific, multi-vocal and often contradictory.

The policy applications of the neo-liberal imaginary of globalization clearly benefit some communities more than others. However, such is its logic that it assumes that if nation-states, for example, deregulate their economy, privatize their major institutions and pursue ‘free trade’ then

their development is all but assured. In their development, education is thought to play a major role because the emerging global economy is thought to be a knowledge economy that requires people with the capacity to operate in an ill-defined and ever-changing labor market, with expanding geographical and temporal horizons. The neo-liberal imaginary demands a system-wide understanding of the global processes that are assumed to flow from technological developments in transport, communication and data processing. These developments, it is assumed, have transformed the nature of economic activity, changing the modes of production and consumption. They have also altered the nature of politics and cultural relations, propelling an enormous increase in the movement of people and ideas, leading to the hybridization of cultural practices. This has implied the need to develop a range of cross-cultural skills and what has been referred to as 'global competence.'

The neo-liberal imaginary of globalization thus represents a range of loosely connected ideas concerning new forms of politico-economic governance based on the extension of market relationships. It replaces an earlier imaginary that regarded the state provision of goods and services as a way of ensuring the social well-being of a national population. In contrast, the neo-liberal imaginary is associated with a preference for a minimalist state, concerned to promote the instrumental values of competition, economic efficiency and choice, and to deregulate and privatize state functions. As Peck and Tickle (2002, p.394) maintain, neo-liberalism promotes and normalizes a "growth-first approach" to policy, making social welfare concerns secondary. It rests on a pervasive naturalization of market logics, justifying them on the grounds of efficiency and even 'fairness.' It promotes an ideology of choice, and of 'lean' government, privatization, deregulation and competitive regimes of resource allocation. It preaches the principle of global 'free trade,' applying it to both goods and services, even to services such as health and education that were traditionally marked by their highly national character.

But such a view has "a disorientating and disruptive impact on politico-economic practices, the balance of class power, as well as upon cultural and social life in communities around the world" (Harvey 1989, p.23). In the global era, capitalism has become fragmentary, as time and space are re-arranged by the dictates of multinational capital. Improved systems of communication, information flows and rationalizations in the techniques of distribution have enabled capital and commodities to be moved through the global market with greater speed. At the same time,

there has been a shift away from an emphasis on goods to greater trade in services, not only in business, educational and health services, but also entertainment and life-style products. The rigidities of Fordism have been replaced by a new organizational ideology that celebrates flexibility as a foundational value in economic relations, expressed most explicitly in ideas of subcontracting, outsourcing, and vertically disintegrated forms of administration, just-in-time delivery systems and the like. The primary effect of this transformation has been an increased emphasis on instrumental values and the virtues of speed and instantaneity, rather than on moral and social obligations.

The neo-liberal imaginary of globalization also prescribes a new conception of governance, requiring a radically revised view of the roles and responsibilities of national governments, minimizing the need for their policy intervention, with greater reliance on the market (Strange 1996). This interpretation of the declining role of the state in policy development dislodges one of the central tenets of the modern nation-state system – the claim to distinctive symmetry and correspondence between sovereignty, territory and legitimacy, an assumption that was fundamentally embodied in traditional ways of thinking about educational aims. While nation-states continue to protect fiercely their sovereignty, in the age of globalization, the exclusive link between territory and political power appears to have been broken. As Held and McGrew (2000, p.9) argue, “the state has become a fragmented policy-making arena, permeated by transnational networks (governmental and non-governmental) as well as by domestic agencies and forces.” So, while the modern state retains much of its authority, it is increasingly unable to determine its own fate, and has to negotiate forces beyond its control, not only of international organizations and regimes but also of transnational capital.

Within the traditional system of modern nation-states, considerable cultural importance was attached to education’s nation building role. Educational systems were expected to carry the ideas and narratives of the nation. As Gellner (1983) points out, the mass educational systems played a crucial role in providing a common framework of understanding that enhanced the processes of state-coordinated modernization. Through the diffusion of ideas, meanings, myths and rituals, citizens were able to imagine the nation, and filter their relations with others. Under the conditions of globalization, this understanding of discrete national cultural formations can no longer be taken for granted, as there is now an ever-increasing level of cultural interactions across national and ethnic com-

munities. With the sheer scale, intensity, speed and volume of global cultural communication, the traditional link between territory and social identity appears to have become destabilized, as people are more readily able to detach identities from particular times, places and traditions. Not only the media but also the greater transnational mobility of people has thus had a 'pluralizing' impact on identity formation, producing a variety of hyphenated identities that are less 'fixed or unified' (Hall 1996). This has led to the emergence of perhaps the beginnings of a 'global consciousness,' which, according to Falk (1995) may represent the cultural basis of an 'incipient civil society.'

What this discussion indicates is that a particular way of interpreting globalization, as an objective set of social processes that suggests their historical inevitability, has, in recent years, emerged as a powerful new social imaginary. As an imaginary, this characterization of globalization contributes to the emergence of a particular formation of subjective or phenomenological awareness by people. It encourages not only a particular reading of recent changes in the global economy and culture – a specific way of interpreting the 'facts' of global interconnectivity and interdependence – but also a set of values associated with that reading. In this way, the neo-liberal imaginary is highly normative, and pushes us towards a collective consciousness of the world as a single space in which our problems are said to be interconnected, requiring a cosmopolitanism that encourages us to recognize our interdependence, but from a particular point of view. Cohen and Kennedy (2000) refer to this phenomenon as 'globalism,' which they contrast with the term globalization, which "mainly refers to a series of objective changes in the world that are partly outside us." Globalism, however, suggests a set of subjectively internalized "changes associated with globalization so that they are now incorporated into our emotions and our ways of thinking about everyday life" (Cohen & Kennedy 2000, p.34).

This distinction between objective and subjective interpretations of globalization is helpful, but perhaps too simplistic, for the ways in which we think about and imagine the world are linked necessarily to how it is described to us. Objective and subjective dimensions are, therefore, inseparable. One of the main problems with many recent theories of globalization is that they often treat globalization as "a pre-given thing, existing outside of thought" (Smith 2001, p.21), with its own developmental logic. But this mode of analysis pays scant attention to the subjectivities of people, and how these are formed, and how people develop a sense of

global interconnectivity and interdependence in their distinctive ways. As Smith (2001, p.27) notes, in not attending to “the discursive and material practices by which people create the regularized patterns that enable and constrain them, these discourses lack an effective theory of political agency, or any other kind of agency.” Such discourses fail to view global processes as ever-changing products of human practices, seeing them instead as expressions of the deeper logic of economic imperatives. They fail to come to terms with the ‘situatedness’ in the world of people and nations alike.

In so doing, this mode of analysis conceives various aspects of globalization as historically inevitable, representing it as a juggernaut, with which people and nations simply have to come to terms, and negotiate as best as they can. This analysis is based on a politics of meaning that seeks to accommodate people and nations to a certain taken-for-grantedness about the ways the global economy operates and the manner in which culture, crises, resources and power formations are filtered through its universal logic. It thus ‘ontologizes’ the global market logic, creating global subjects who view policy options through the conceptual prism within which its main precepts are located. These precepts include an emphasis on market principles and production of profits, a minimalist role for the state, a deregulated labor market, and flexible forms of governance. From this perspective, as a social imaginary, the term ‘globalization’ designates certain power relations, practices and technologies, playing a “hegemonic role in organizing and decoding the meaning of the world” (Schirato & Webb 2003, p.1).

Images of Neo-liberal Education

This discussion suggests that neo-liberalism is better viewed not so much as an economic theory or even a political ideology but as a social imaginary that implies a tacit and implicit understanding of current global processes. As an imaginary, it suggests the re-imagining of educational aims for an era of globalization in ways that indicate the need to restructure education to meet the requirements of the global economy. Since imaginaries are neither static nor entirely coherent, the neo-liberal imaginary allows also for a range of conflicting precepts about the specific implications of globalization for education. However, its tacit assumptions and core images remain uncontested, implying the need to develop a specific attitude to recent economic, political, and cultural transforma-

tions. As I have already noted, this attitude is vigorously promoted by IGOs and many national governments alike through both formal and informal means. As a result, there has been an unmistakable trend towards a global policy convergence in dealing with the various pressures educational systems confront and in articulating a similar conception of educational aims and programs of procedural and organizational reform. As Schugurensky (1999) points out, this trend toward global convergence is intensifying. What is most striking about the current programs of educational reform, he has observed, is "the unprecedented scope and depth of changes taking place as well as the similarity of changes occurring in a wide variety of nations having different social, historical and economic characteristics" (p.284). While the actual dynamics and pace of change vary across national systems, the direction of change appears to be unmistakably similar, located within the same neo-liberal imaginary.

This imaginary represents an almost universal deepening of a shift from social democratic to neo-liberal orientations. There is enormous pressure on educational systems not only to increase the amount of formal education young people are now required to have, but also to align this education with the alleged requirements of the global economy. As a result, new requirements of policy have emerged, resulting in the corporatization and marketization of education. This has involved greater and new demands for accountability, surveillance and increased bureaucratization of institutions, creating new pressures on teachers' work. In most Western countries, as public resources for education have declined, there has been a growing emphasis on increasing the role of the private sector. Yet, in the midst of all this change, and despite pressure on educational systems around the world to diversify – to meet the diverse needs of the global economy – educational systems have seemingly mimicked each other, pursuing a common set of solutions to their fiscal and organizational problems. Indeed, they have even interpreted the requirements of reform themselves in a broadly similar fashion.

At a very general level, a new human capital theory has informed discussions of educational aims. Popularized by international organizations such as the OECD, APEC and the World Bank, the new human capital theory postulates, as the old theory did (Becker 1964), that expenditure on training and education is costly, but should be considered an investment since it is undertaken with a view to increasing personal incomes and can be used to explain occupational wage differentials. The new human capital theory extends this claim to the requirements of the

global economy and to the competitive advantage of individuals, corporations and nations within the transnational context. Of course, the new human capital theory is technically complex, has been the subject of much debate, and incorporates a number of strands to its claims. However, in its popular form, it considers all human behavior to be based on the economic self-interest of individuals operating within free competitive markets. It assumes economic growth and competitive advantage to be a direct outcome of the levels of investment in developing human capital. It suggests that, in a global economy, performance is increasingly linked to people's knowledge stock, skills level, learning capability and cultural adaptability. It therefore demands policy frameworks that enhance labor flexibility not only through the deregulation of the market but also through reform to systems of education and training, designed to align them with the changing nature of economic activity.

In its most radical form, the new human capital theory not only requires reform of systems of educational governance, it also demands a re-conceptualization of the very purposes of education. In line with this imperative, the OECD (1996a) has suggested, for example, that advances in information and communications technologies have so transformed the nature of knowledge production and utilization, the organization of work and labor relations, modes of consumption and trade, and patterns of cultural exchange that education now needs to produce different kinds of persons who are better able to work creatively with knowledge, are flexible, adaptable and mobile, are globally minded and inter-culturally confident, and are life-long learners. What this view implies is that learning for learning's sake is no longer sufficient, and that education does not have any intrinsic ends as such, but must always be linked to the instrumental purposes of human capital development and economic self-maximization. This should, of course, not be taken to mean that ethical and cultural issues are no longer relevant to education, but rather that they should be interpreted within the broader framework of education's economic ends. In this way, the neo-liberal imaginary rests on what George Soros (1998) has called 'economic fundamentalism,' a kind of conceptual scheme through which even such moral notions as diversity and equity are re-articulated.

Within this imaginary, the idea of the knowledge economy features prominently. It suggests that globalization has fundamentally altered the relationship between the production of knowledge and its economic application; and that the emergence of knowledge-intensive activities and

the production and diffusion of information technologies have led to the development of new models of work organization (Paul 2002). New Zealand was one of the first countries to embrace this philosophy. The so-called 'New Zealand experiment' (Peters 2001) assumed that "a knowledge-driven economy is one in which the generation and exploitation of knowledge play the predominant part in the creation of wealth. In the industrial era, wealth was created by using machines to replace human labor." In the knowledge economy, in contrast, it suggested, the new quality jobs will be in high-technology industries such as telecommunications and financial services. This view of the relationship between economy and educational aims has now become commonplace around the world, from the OECD countries to the newly industrializing countries of Asia such as Singapore and India to countries, such as China and Vietnam, where communist parties remain in government.

Almost everywhere it is assumed that the so-called knowledge economy will require a larger proportion of workers to be prepared for highly skilled jobs, workers who have competencies linked to both their ability to use new technologies and their cultural attitudes towards change, even if most new jobs are in low paid and highly casualized service industries. In a rapidly changing world, it is believed, these competencies must involve certain behavioral features such as adaptability, organizational loyalty, and the ability to work in culturally diverse contexts and provide leadership. This conception of education involves a new approach to human capital development, grounded not so much in the amount of schooling individuals have but in the learning attributes they are able to develop, with which to deal effectively and creatively with unfamiliar and constantly changing conditions of work. It emphasizes the development of broad generic skills such as communication skills, problem-solving skills, the ability to work independently, often under pressure, and the capacity to take responsibility for decisions and to obtain field-specific knowledge quickly and efficiently and to spot its commercial potential.

In the knowledge economy, hence, knowing facts and theories is less important than an understanding of the world of social relations and of the networks through which knowledge is converted into innovative and commercially viable products. The principles of flexibility and dynamism demand skills of ascertaining relevant information and using it commercially. These skills are considered more important than formal, codified, structured and explicit knowledge. Against these assumptions,

the new growth theorists such as Foray and Lundvall (1996) suggest that a nation's capacity to take advantage of the knowledge economy depends on how quickly it can become a 'learning economy.' Learning, Foray and Lundvall argue, should not only involve the ability to use new technologies in accessing knowledge, but should also mean using technology to better communicate with other people about ways of improving productivity. They maintain that in the knowledge economy, individuals, corporations, and nations will create wealth in proportion to their capacity to learn and share innovation. If this is so, then learning must be continuous, and not restricted to formal schooling.

The idea of life-long learning has been an important component in the neo-liberal imaginary of globalization. It has been promoted enthusiastically by international organizations such as the OECD and APEC. At one level, of course, the idea of life-long learning appears perfectly reasonable. How could anyone object to learning new knowledge and gaining new skills on an on-going basis? But the concept of life long learning promoted by international organizations has been somewhat more specific, and is located within a broader discourse of economic growth and competitiveness. As Field and Leicester (2000, p.xvii) point out, this discourse has arisen primarily from changes in the economy, including such developments as "the rapid diffusion of information and communication technologies, the constant application of science and technology, and the globalization in trade of goods and services." This observation mirrors the OECD's contention (1996b) that the "increased pace of globalization and technological change, the changing nature of work and the labor market, and the ageing of populations are among the forces emphasizing the need for continuing upgrading of work and life skills throughout life." These developments, the OECD suggests, have made constant investment in education necessary for both individuals and nations. They have also shifted the focus of learning from 'knowing that' to 'knowing how,' giving rise to new conceptions of the ways in which learning is defined, arranged, valued, utilized and promoted.

The renewed emphasis on the teaching of Science and Mathematics around the world displays a similar logic. The teaching of these subjects is encouraged, not for its own sake or for better understanding the natural world around us, but as a way of better engaging with the knowledge economy. Even more emphatically, the potential of teaching about information and communications technologies in transforming educational practice is stressed, not so much as a way of enabling people greater ac-

cess to each other, but in facilitating economic growth and productivity. Consistent within the neo-liberal imaginary is the assumption around the world that the language of global trade is English. APEC (1996) suggests, for example, that “English has become the most common medium for communication in a global world; it is the language that provides job opportunities, access to higher education and a broader flow of information, as well as facilitating diplomatic discussions and business negotiations. English has also become the primary medium for communication in science and technology.” Global processes, so it seems, cannot be imagined in any language other than English.

Another imperative for educational reform implied by the neo-liberal imaginary is the internationalization of education. Of course, the idea of international education itself is not new. There has long been an international mobility of students and researchers in search of new knowledge and training where this has not been available within national borders. And there has long been an interest in intercultural knowledge and in programs in foreign languages and studies as a way of enhancing levels of international understanding and cooperation. In the past, the more ‘developed’ nations sponsored incoming international students with a view to developing skills, attitudes and knowledge so that, upon their return, graduates could make a robust contribution to national development in the image of their sponsors. However, the neo-liberal imaginary has transformed these sentiments into a new economic discourse of trade, which seeks to re-define the ways in which educational institutions need to engage with the emerging ‘imperatives’ of globalization (Rizvi 2005). This discourse points to the commercial opportunities offered by the increasing movement of people, capital and ideas. It encourages a new kind of knowledge of international relations, and programs based on a particular interpretation of the changing nature of the global economy, which is assumed to be knowledge-based and in need of increased levels of intercultural skills. So, international cooperation and the value of knowledge networks is couched almost exclusively in economic terms, as education itself is commodified and converted into a commercial product for sale.

Working With and Against Neo-liberal Globalization

I have argued in this chapter that neo-liberalism is best viewed as a social imaginary that has acquired considerable ascendancy in education thinking. Its dominance is secured through a range of political strategies, em-

ployed by international organizations and national governments alike. In some countries, it is embraced as a matter of policy preference, while in others it is imposed through a range of coercive strategies, such as those associated with structural adjustment schemes. However, in all countries it is reshaping educational aims, making them subservient to economic goals. Education is now increasingly viewed as a private good, providing benefits to the individual consumer. This should be a matter of concern for all who see in education rather the potential to benefit the entire community, as a public good. It is important to note, however, that it is not the conditions of globalization, *per se*, that have linked education increasingly to the logic of the market, but a particular neo-liberal imaginary of globalization. This imaginary re-defines the way in which education's role in society should be conceptualized. As a private good, education is viewed as a commodity that can provide an individual with advantage over others and can differentiate people in terms of their economic value.

Now, if the neo-liberal imaginary of globalization has become as dominant as I have suggested, then how should we think about educational aims in ways that do not simply accept its tacit assumptions? How might it be possible to develop a more critical view of education that embraces both its public and private functions? Is the development of an alternative imaginary of globalization and its implications for education even possible? It needs to be acknowledged, to begin with, that the ideological dominance of the neo-liberal imaginary is as complete as many of its critics suppose; but that it is at the same time not an entirely coherent ideological doctrine free of contradictions. It involves a range of claims, some of which are more contentious than others. It is unwise, therefore, to reject out of hand all of its various claims about contemporary social and economic relations. Some of the reforms it has spawned have brought unexpected benefits in providing, for example, educational access to some marginalized communities. It has highlighted the need to re-examine the curriculum, in the light of demographic and technological changes driven by globalization.

What this suggests is the need to think strategically and pragmatically with respect to the neo-liberal imaginary of globalization, stressing both its educational possibilities and its deeply destructive effects on particular communities. It needs to be acknowledged, of course, that education systems have seldom been defined around a single consistent set of aims, but a multiplicity of aims that often conflict with each other. But perhaps more than ever before, we live in an era that is characterized by a

multiplicity of ideas about the goals education should serve and about how education systems should be organized and governed. If this is so then we cannot avoid the neo-liberal vocabulary. But we can nevertheless work with it in ways that are at once critical and creative, recognizing its major achievements in naming fundamental changes, but seeking to articulate its limitations and offering alternatives that suggest new ways of working with the processes of globalization. It is clear that there is no turning back from the global processes driven both by various developments in technology and by the new institutions of global economics and politics. So the challenge lies in how best to work with competing ideas about educational aims, through conversations rooted much more in democratic traditions, within which to imagine and work with alternative forms of globalization, which do not rely entirely on the logic of the market, and are able to tame its excesses.

Labaree (2003) has observed that education has traditionally been thought to have three distinct but, sometimes, competing purposes: democratic equality, social mobility, and social efficiency. While these three purposes of education are not mutually exclusive, educational ideologies have often given precedence to one over others. So, for example, in post-World War II social democracies, the idea of democratic equality became dominant in many parts of world, interpreted in some countries like Australia and New Zealand from a liberal perspective. In socialist countries, a very different form of equality was promoted. In other countries, social mobility and meritocracy were considered essential to the realization of the social goals of education. In many postcolonial countries, it became an ideological mantra in educational thinking, even if it was seldom realized. In recent years, within the neo-liberal imaginary of globalization, it is social efficiency that appears to be more highly prized by many citizens, large corporations and intergovernmental organizations, as well as by an increasing number of national governments.

For Labaree, the concept of democratic equality has long suggested the need for education to facilitate the development of democratic citizens, who can participate in democratic communities in a critically informed manner. It is a view central to Dewey's philosophy of education. Its focus is on equal access to education, on equal treatment of all citizens, and on regarding education as a public good. This implies that maximum benefit to society can be realized only if every member of a community is educated to realize their full potential. The primary purpose of education is, then, the creation of productive citizens, and not necessarily efficient

workers, able to maximize personal fulfillment. This is not to deny the importance of vocational training, but to insist that such training be located within the broader role education should play in the development of a socially cohesive democratic community. The purposes of education are thus more social and cultural than economic, focused more on the community than on the individual.

If the democratic equity view of education focuses on its role in promoting public good, then the social mobility view gives precedence to education's role in providing individuals with a range of private goods that they can exchange in the labor market for money, power and prestige. The social mobility view thus regards education as both inherently rivalrous and desirably competitive, serving the function of allocating economic benefits and social status to individuals. It suggests that social rewards should be based on both effort and intelligence. The market rewards those who work harder and have inherently superior skills and talent. The social mobility view denies a role for education in contributing to social justice or economic redistribution, leaving processes of social formation to the market. Insofar as this view is concerned with social equity, it is to strengthen structures that provide everyone with formal access to educational institutions. It suggests that education's main purpose is to provide students with the knowledge and skills they will require to find an appropriate place in the labor market and to achieve upward mobility.

The third view of the purposes of education under consideration highlights its role in achieving social efficiency. While the social mobility view focuses predominantly on individuals, the social efficiency view requires education to play a more important instrumental role in developing workers able to contribute to the economic productivity of nations and corporations alike. Its focus is not as much on the needs and development of individuals as it is on the efficiency with which education systems operate. The emphasis is on the system's capacity to provide an adequate return on investment, assessed in terms of its contribution in producing workers with knowledge, skills and attitudes relevant to increasing productivity in a 'knowledge economy.' In this way, education is viewed both as a public and a private good: public because it contributes to the economic well-being and social development of a community; private because it serves individual interests within a competitive labor market. However, it is important to stress that the notion of public good that the social efficiency view promotes is markedly different from the

public good associated with social democratic conceptions, which regard education as intrinsically good, and not linked instrumentally to organizational efficiency or economic outcomes and productivity.

Over approximately the past two decades, the focus on social efficiency as a key goal of education appears to have become almost ubiquitous. Almost throughout the Asia Pacific and elsewhere, as I have suggested, much of what is now regarded as educational reform is based on the ideological belief that social and economic 'progress' can be achieved only through systems of education oriented towards satisfying the needs of the market. It is often assumed that education systems have for too long been inefficient and ineffective in ways that prevent them from meeting their functional goals. Popular media and corporations in particular have propagated this opinion, and have called on governments to pursue reforms that are not only more socially and economically efficient but are also cognizant of the new 'realities' of the knowledge economy in an increasingly globalized world. This has required the purposes of education to be more instrumentally defined, in terms of its capacity to produce workers who have a grounding in basic literacy and numeracy, are flexible, creative, and multi-skilled, have a good knowledge of new information and communications technologies, and are able to work in culturally diverse environments.

Of course, this account of educational purposes does not mean that social efficiency has entirely displaced concerns for democratic equality and social mobility. In fact, both democratic equity and social mobility can be incorporated within the broader discourse of social efficiency. For example, it has been argued by the OECD (2004) that a focus on efficiency can in fact lead to greater equality and opportunities for social mobility. It is suggested that, without workers who are able to perform effectively in the global labor market, the potential for social mobility is severely reduced; and that since the global economy requires appropriate social conditions for capital accumulation and economic growth, equity concerns cannot be overlooked by policy makers committed to social efficiency. As the OECD (1996a) has suggested,

A new focus for education and training policies is needed now, to develop capacities to realize the potential of the 'global information economy' and to contribute to employment, culture, democracy and, above all, social cohesion. Such policies will need to support the transition to 'learning societies' in which equal opportunities are available

to all, access is open, and all individuals are encouraged and motivated to learn, in formal education as well as throughout life.

Ultimately, what this synthetic discourse implies is that social efficiency must now be regarded as a 'meta-value,' subsuming within its scope educational aspirations such as social equality, mobility and even cohesion.

This much is evident in the current popularity of notions associated with education such as life-long learning and education as social capital. The idea of life-long learning has of course existed in education for a long time, but in recent years, as I have already noted, it has been rethought and broadened. According to UNESCO (quoted in OECD 1996b, p.17), "Not only must it adapt to changes in the nature of work, it must also constitute a continuous process of forming whole human beings – their knowledge and aptitudes, as well as the critical faculty and the ability to act." Life-long learning should thus be promoted through a system-wide network of 'learning pathways' extending from early childhood through to all stages of adulthood in both formal and informal educational settings, fulfilling "social and economic objectives simultaneously by providing long-term benefits for the individual, the enterprise, the economy and the society more generally" (OECD 1996b). In this account, social mobility becomes a functional outcome of economic efficiency, while the egalitarian impulse has also just about been lost. However, and in the light of changing economic circumstances and the need to ensure community legitimation, there is also a determination to rework and rearticulate the traditional notion of equality, adding it to the overriding goal relating to the development of human resources for the changing global economy.

The concept of social capital displays a similar political logic, and has received a good deal of attention in recent years. Thomson (1999), for example, suggests that the interest in social capital stems from three impulses: a response to the dominant individualism underpinning the development of human capital for purposes of national competitiveness; a recognition that economic success requires a certain level of social cohesion, stability and trust; and a growing recognition that many people are de-coupling economic success from the sense of well-being. In this way, social capital appears as a policy for managing economic marginalization, social exclusion and heightening levels of cultural differences within societies, in order to enhance social cohesion. But such a view of social cohesion is couched within the social efficiency paradigm of economic liberalism and growth. It effectively represents a residual framing for social

cohesion, not as a good in itself but essential for economic productivity. Educational purposes are thus assumed to be one of the strategic tools for the management of change, in as much as exclusion is interpreted as a matter of failure to engage with the global economy, either through a lack of appropriate skills and dispositions, or through ineffective governance.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have considered some of the ways in which globalization has been interpreted through a neo-liberal imaginary and how this has, in recent years, re-configured the discursive terrain within which educational policy is developed, articulated and enacted in countries around the world. I have argued that this imaginary has re-defined educational aims in largely economic terms, linked to the concerns of social efficiency. It has emphasized the importance of market dynamics in the organization of education around a view of education as a private good. It has linked the purposes of education to the requirements of the global economy. I have suggested that there is, however, nothing inevitable or necessary about locating globalization within this imaginary. It is indeed possible to understand the facts of global interconnectivity and interdependence in radically different ways, with implications for rethinking educational aims that do not simply call for a return to some imaginary and romanticized past, but require us to engage with transformations brought about by recent developments in information and communications technology in ways that do not prioritize the economic over all other human concerns.

While there is no sign that the neo-liberal imaginary of globalization is in decline, it is becoming clear that it has given rise to a range of contradictions that can be exploited. For example, the promotion of devolved systems of governance has left many educators and educational systems substantially disenfranchised, especially when they are expected to conform to unrealistic accountability regimes and to deliver outcomes for which they have not been adequately funded or resourced. Their professionalism has been sapped of any real meaning, as they are required to become efficient and effective in contexts that are much more culturally, economically and politically complex than many governments and IGOs often assume. At the same time, the policy shift towards privatization has compromised the goals of access and equality, and has widened inequalities not only across nations but also within communities. It has made the goals of gender and racial equity more difficult to realize. Indeed,

while globalization's consequences have greatly benefited some countries and groups of people, they have had disastrous consequences for others, whose economic prospects have declined and whose cultural traditions have been seriously eroded.

Globalization thus demands that we re-think educational aims. It has been argued that the global economy demands a new kind of worker who is multi-skilled, service-oriented, can easily adapt to changes in both the nature of work and labor conditions, and can work in a global environment characterized by cultural diversity. The ability to work with new information and communications technologies has been highlighted. Yet, the global distribution of technologies across the world has been very uneven, creating conditions for a digital divide, and thereby perpetuating and increasing social and economic inequalities. The increased focus on the English language has had a similar outcome, and the ability to communicate in English has become a major source of differentiation between people and communities. Similarly, international education has also become a marker of social status in many countries. Yet, in the context of emerging policies and practices of global trade in education, it is increasingly dependent on the student's ability to pay for it, rather than on merit or educational excellence. International education, which was once defined in terms of political and intercultural terms, has now become thoroughly commercialized, and has perpetuated class and national distinctions that run counter to its cosmopolitan aspirations.

In the end, there are always irreconcilable tensions among the various aims of education, not least between those relating to social efficiency and those emphasizing education's potential to create democratic communities committed to the goals of social justice. Of course, these purposes are not mutually exclusive: it is possible both to promote democratic equality and to ensure that education is efficiently and effectively organized to serve the changing conditions in which it takes places. The balance, however, as I have argued in this chapter, has shifted decidedly towards a social efficiency view of educational aims, based upon a set of neo-liberal assumptions that are assumed to be universally applicable. In the long run, this universalism, enhanced by various global processes, fails education in that it needs necessarily to be tied to local as well as global requirements. It is clear that there is no turning back from global processes driven partially by various developments in technology. But globalization need not necessarily be interpreted in such neo-liberal terms.

It is possible to imagine and work with an alternative form of globalization, a form rooted much more in democratic traditions, which does not rely entirely on the logic of the market, and is able to tame its excesses. Such a view of globalization demands not ready-made technocratic solutions to problems of education, but focuses instead on open dialogue across cultures and nations. It requires thinking and acting both locally and globally, simultaneously. It demands an education that teaches students to see our problems as inextricably linked to the problems of others. It requires that they develop both critical skills and an attitude that enables them to imagine our collective futures, for humanity as a whole. Once again, it involves viewing education as a public good in which all can share. In a globally interconnected world, education, more than ever before, needs to be viewed as expanding the general welfare of communities. In the end, what this argument suggests is that it is possible to conceive of education as contributing to both public and private goods, to both social and economic ends, and to both national and global concerns. But this requires new ways of imagining how relations within a community and across the world might be constituted.

References

- APEC (2004): '3rd APEC Education Ministerial Meeting: Sub Theme Paper 1, Strategic Plan for English Language/Foreign Language Learning,' Santiago, Chile, http://biblioteca.mineduc.cl/documento/English_APEC_strategic_plan_final_21-4-04.pdf Retrieved: January 2006.
- Appadurai, A. (1996): *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appadurai, A. (2001): 'Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination', in Appadurai, A. (ed.), *Globalization*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Becker, G. (1964): *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Castoriadis, C. (1987): *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, translated by Kathleen Blamey. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cohen, R. & Kennedy, P. (2000): *Global Sociology*. New York: New York University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916): *Democracy and education*. London: Macmillan.
- Durkheim, E. (1972): *Selected Writings*. Edited and translated by Anthony Giddens. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Falk, R. (1992): *Explorations at the Edge of Time: The Prospects for World Order*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Field, J. & Leicester, M. (2000): *Lifelong Learning: Education Across the Lifespan*.

- London: Routledge Falmer.
- Foray, D. & Lundvall B. (1996) *Employment and Growth in the Knowledge-Based Economy*, Paris: OECD.
- Friedman, T. (2000): *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: First Anchor Press.
- Gellner, E. (1983): *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goankar, D. (2002): 'Toward New Imaginaries: An Introduction' *Public Culture*. Vol.14, No.1, pp.1-19.
- Hall, S. (1996): *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. London; Routledge.
- Harvey, D. (1989): *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Held, D. & McGrew, A. (eds.) Second Edition (2000): *The Global Transformation Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp.1-19.
- Henry, M., Lingard, B., Rizvi, F. & Taylor, S. (2001): *The OECD, Globalization and Education Policy*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Hirst, P. & Peters, R. (1970): *The Logic of Education*, London: Routledge.
- Labaree, D. (2003) *How to Succeed in School without really learning: The credential race in American education*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Larner, W. (2000): 'Neo-liberalism: Policy, ideology and Governmentality' in *Studies in Political Economy*. No.63, pp.5-25.
- Maffesoli, M. (1993): 'Introduction: The Social Imaginary' *Current Sociology*, 41(2), pp.1-7.
- Mundy, K. (1998): 'Educational Multilateralism and World (Dis)order, in *Comparative Education Review*. Vol.42, No.4, 1998, pp.448-478.
- Nodding, N. (1995): 'Response to Suppes', http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/95_docs/noddings.html, Retrieved: January 2006.
- OECD (1996a): *Globalization and Linkages to 2030: Challenges and Opportunities for OECD Countries*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (1996b): *Life-Long Learning for All*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2004): *Innovation in the Knowledge Economy: Implications for Education and Learning*. produced by CERI, Paris: OECD.
- Paul, J. (2002): 'University and the Knowledge-based Economy' in Enders, J. & Fulton, O. (eds.) *Higher Education in a Globalizing World*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Peters, M. (2001) 'National education policy constructions of the 'knowledge economy': Towards a critique' in *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, Vol.2, No.1, pp.58-71.
- Peck, P. & Tickell, A. (2002) 'Neoliberalizing Space' in *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography*, Vol.34, No.3, pp.380-409.
- Rizvi, F. (2004): 'Theorizing the Global Convergence of Restructuring Policies in Education' in Lindblad, S. & Popkewitz, T. (eds) *Educational Restructuring: International Perspectives on Traveling Policies*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, pp.94-115.
- Rizvi, F. (2005): 'Globalization and the Dilemmas of Internationalization in Aus-

- tralian Higher Education', in *Access: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural and Policy Studies*. Vol.24, No.1, pp.86-101.
- Schirato, T. & Webb, J. (2003): *Understanding Globalization*. London: Sage.
- Schugurensky, D. (1999): 'Higher Education Restructuring in the Era of Globalization: Toward a Heteronomous Model?' in Arnove, R. & Torres, C. (eds) *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, pp.283-304.
- Smith, M.P. (2001): *Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalization*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Soros, G. (1998): *The Crisis of Global Capitalism*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Strange, S. (1996): *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*. Cambridge England: Cambridge University Press.
- Suppes, P. (1995): 'The Aims of Education', http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/95_docs/suppes.html, Retrieved: January 2006.
- Taylor, C. (2004): *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Thomson, P. (1999) Towards a Just Future: Schools working in Partnership with Neighborhoods made poor' paper presented at UNESCO conference on Reforming Learning, Bangkok Thailand, December.
- Waters, M. (1995): *Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Whitehead, A.N. (1929): *The Aims of Education and Other Essays*. New York: Free Press.

Multiculturalism, Shared Values, and an Ethical Response to Globalization

Mark MASON

In the Introduction to this volume, the editors describe the concerns of the chapters in this section in terms of the following aims: to establish some empirical realities of contemporary patterns of global interdependence; to explore how and to what extent these realities are related to crises in equity and the need to re-emphasise values and ethics as pivotal in education; to examine how complex global realities point to the importance of developing shared values and norms in the equitable enhancement of global diversity; and to consider the implications of complex interdependence for educational change. With respect to the first aim, and by way of justification of the second, I consider in this chapter five critically important features of our contemporary world that are closely associated with the process of accelerated globalization, each of which raises difficult moral questions, principally to do with equity, sustainability and social justice. The five phenomena that I consider are:

- the exponentially increasing gap between rich and poor, or, the persistence of poverty, hunger, malnutrition, and unsafe water supplies for the great majority of people in the developing world in the face of the advantages of a globalizing economy accruing predominantly to the rich;
- the destruction of the planet's natural environment and the probability of imminent and catastrophic environmental instability and possible collapse;
- the fact that for the first time in history, more than half of hu-

manity lives in urbanised environments, and the United Nation's estimation that by 2030, a quarter of the world's population will live in urban slums;

- the proliferation of HIV/AIDS and the threat it poses, more than to the economies of some societies, to the very social fabric of those societies; and,
- the intercultural and international, even inter-civilizational tensions that are associated with globalization's increasingly multicultural societies and a smaller, more interconnected world.

The third aim of the chapters in this first section of the book has to do with the question of how we might respond to the moral questions that each of these features raises by the development at least of some shared values and norms across cultures. My response to this question is to identify some core moral principles that do indeed have transcultural normative reach, that all (who accept at least the moral principle of multiculturalism) are obliged to honor, whatever their cultural background. This is the most difficult – and controversial – challenge of this chapter, and the bulk of the chapter's philosophical argumentation is devoted to defending my conclusion that we need not and in fact should not accept all culturally-specific ideals and practices as legitimate, but only those which honor the values and ethics that are consistent with the principle of multiculturalism itself. These ethics might then constitute at least some values and norms that can be shared across cultures and that might, then, contribute to the equitable enhancement of global diversity.

And in response to the fourth aim, which is concerned with the implications of complex interdependence for educational change, I consider, in conclusion, how an education in these values and norms, an education for a global rather than a national citizenship, and an education informed by and committed to the principles and processes of democracy, might together constitute a good start.

Equity, Sustainability, Social Justice and the Processes of Globalization

The phenomenon of globalization is well defined by Deane Neubauer in the first chapter and by Fazal Rizvi in the second, and is discussed throughout the volume. For the purpose only of setting out my key premises and with an eye to the integrity of this chapter's structure, I offer

only a brief consideration here. Giddens maintains that "globalization ... is not the same as internationalization. It is not just about closer ties between nations, but concerns processes, such as the emergence of global civil society, that cut across the borders of nations" (1998, p.137). In Waters' (1995, p.3) definition, it is "a social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding." It is about, in Delanty's version, the diminishing importance of geographical constraints in defining the nature of economic, political, social and cultural interactions; in other words, about the transformation of space or, more specifically, the "deterritorialization of space" (2000, p.81). Cultures and civilizations are thus more exposed to each other, more likely to clash, or to merge, or to develop new hybrids or a universal culture, with as much impact on the local and specific as on the global and universal, as a consequence of the diminishing constraints of geography. It should be stressed, however, that globalization by no means leads necessarily to a global society, and not even to a global culture (other than perhaps the rule of the market and its orientation towards global elites as a consequence of the transnationalization of capitalism). Most of the literature points as much to increasing diversity and fragmentation as it does to increasing homogeneity. It is in the moral questions raised by this diversity and fragmentation that I am interested in this chapter.

As the scope and intensity of global interdependence broadens and deepens, and as the pace of change across the spectrum of socio-economic, technological, political and cultural processes accelerates, significant and often quite profound tensions emerge both within and among societies. Many educators and policy makers have seen these tensions as constituting a growing imperative to mount an explicit and substantial curricular engagement with values and ethics. For a variety of reasons, including the relatively recent advent of modern nation-states in the region, educational responses to these tensions in the Asia-Pacific have been fairly direct, ranging from the institution of citizenship education programs (for example, in Singapore and, to a lesser extent, in Hong Kong), through the development of multiple cultural, linguistic or ethnic educational tracks (for example, in China and Malaysia), to the formal inclusion in public education of religiously grounded general ethics courses (for example, in Thailand and Indonesia). In the Asia-Pacific region, as well as in the United States (at least some of which may, of course, be considered part of the Asia-Pacific), such responses are often cast in terms of a reaf-

firmation of traditional values and moral sensibilities. But the realities of the rate of contemporary globalization and of accelerating, often non-linear and complex change render impotent in perhaps all but a rhetorical sense any efforts literally to restore traditional moral and ethical institutions. What this indicates is the importance of addressing moral issues in education in ways that are sensitive to the role of values and ethics in contributing to social and cultural continuity, but which are sensitive also to the increasing importance of innovation and adaptation as key values with which to negotiate contemporary realities. This approach and its underlying tensions are not, however, always and everywhere welcome, often because innovative engagement with moral issues poses a challenge to established and familiar ways of coming to know and agree on what is true, right and good. Valuing innovation involves, at least implicitly, holding received notions of truth, rightness and goodness in critical regard. To the degree, then, that contemporary realities require innovative responses, they open possibilities for novel and bold ethical arguments and positions.

Given these moral questions underlying this domain, we turn our attention now to a brief consideration of five features of our contemporary world that are closely associated with the process of accelerated globalization, whether as contributors to or as consequences of the process, or, in a recursive sense, both: features that have been identified, not only by the United Nations, as critical in their consequences for human development, and which raise questions about equity, sustainability and social justice.

First, we see an ever-widening gap between rich and poor. In spite of the oft-made claim that the benefits of an increasingly globalized market economy will accrue primarily to the poor, poverty and mal-nutrition persist, and safe water supplies remain a pipe dream for the great majority of people in the developing world. In the face of this, it is the antecedently wealthy who enjoy the greatest advantages of a globalizing economy. Many commentators describe a world that is increasingly globalized in terms of a world that is getting smaller, that shows increasingly the characteristics of a 'global village,' albeit not a happily or equitably organized village. If our contemporary world is characterized by increasing rates of interdependence across the globe, a more accurate description might rather highlight one of its most stark attributes as the increasing degrees of inequity in an untold number of spheres, among the most serious the inequalities in the distribution of wealth between rich and poor. Global interdependence and its associated structures have come to be

inflected or oriented by values embedded within the primary drivers of contemporary patterns of globalization, few of which are aligned with the ideal of greater equity. Free-market economics, for example, are rooted in values of competition and domination that almost inexorably produce an uneven pattern of development – a pattern that has come under considerable criticism as resulting inequities in the distribution of the benefits of globalization have become pervasively and painfully apparent, especially to those systematically disadvantaged by it. Certainly the globalization of production – commonly described as manufacturing ‘offshore’ – became possible by virtue of new and cheap information and communications technologies, improved and cheaper transportation technologies (containerisation, hub-and-spoke airline routes), and the like. Historically it became possible because of the huge disparities in the cost of wages between the developed and developing world following the colonial period. A benign interpretation of this process would suggest that people in the developing world are being employed when perhaps they might not otherwise have been. A more sceptical interpretation throws up the obvious moral questions that accompany big capital’s search for the least regulated business environments with the lowest labor costs and cheapest tax regimes: questions about exploitative wages, and the power of transnational corporations that almost forces regions in the developing world virtually to prostitute themselves in competition with each other for the manufacturing investment offered by these corporations by keeping company and expatriate taxes low, by minimising workers’ rights, by the absence of legislation protecting the environment, and by spending thus-depleted tax revenues on infrastructural development to facilitate the transport and export of manufactured goods rather than on public goods such as education, housing and welfare.

Second, in all the cautions about sustainable ways of living that emanate from the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development, the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, the 2002 Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development, and from similar sources, we cannot avoid the conclusion that we face imminent environmental catastrophe, never mind increasing rates of environmental destruction. In the face of our environmental impact, the ability of our planetary ecosystem to sustain itself by constant repair, renewal and rebalancing is argued by many commentators to be under serious threat. On one side of the coin we see levels of consumption in the West that are excessive to say the least, and in some countries almost obscene. And on the other side we see a

country like China allowing its natural environment to be turned into a wasteland through minimal environmentally protective legislation as it seeks the wealth generated by industrial manufacturing in service of the apparently insatiable appetite of Western consumerism (and latterly, it must be added, its own domestic consumption). Globally, that which can be commodified, and recently developed technologies have increased the possibilities of what can be (by 'adding value' and repackaging), is manufactured or reprocessed and sold in ignorance of or disdain for the environmental consequences. The moral issues raised by this feature of our contemporary world hardly need further elucidation. That huge numbers of consumers in the developed world feel free to pollute the earth, to contribute to global warming and climate change, to leave an 'environmental footprint' that is astonishingly selfish in its excess, while citizens of other countries in the developing world face the destruction and poisoning of their environment by poorly regulated export-oriented manufacturing industries sited in their neighborhood in service of developed-world consumer demand, is both unsustainable and inequitable.

Third, we see in the processes of globalization a massive migration of people, whether to other countries and territories as legal or illegal immigrants or as refugees, or into cities in their own region in search of work, education, health-care or other social services. This widespread urbanization of the global population has been driven by the disparity of economic benefits that globalization bestows upon the urban and rural, and has been enabled by technological advances that have transformed possibilities for moving large numbers of people in relatively short periods of time. The process of urbanization has escalated so rapidly that the United Nations has concluded that in the early years of the 21st century, more than half of humanity, for the first time in history, now lives in an urbanised environment. The tipping point coincides with the publication of this book, in 2007. Add to this the persistence of poverty – despite the proclaimed virtues of a global market economy – to which I alluded a few paragraphs back, and it is easy to understand why the UN has also estimated that by 2030, a quarter of the world's population will live in urban slums. Rural poverty aside, a quarter of humanity will be off the land and largely unemployed, unable to eke out even a subsistence existence in high density urban slums. Every fourth person globally will be at increased risk of exposure to diseases such as tuberculosis and cholera as they face problems of inaccessibility to clean drinking water similar to those experienced in poverty-stricken rural areas. Customary patterns of

relationship will be placed under more serious threat. In the absence of other available employment, human-trafficking, prostitution and drug-dealing, with the associated gang warfare over drug-distribution turf, will increase. Yet in the face of the consequent need for increased investment in housing, welfare and social services, governments in the developing world will remain under pressure to invest rather in infrastructural development oriented to manufacturing and export: factories, truck routes, railway lines, container terminals and airports, rather than houses, waterborne sewerage, schools and hospitals.

Fourth, in the proliferation of HIV/AIDS, the disease that is almost synonymous with accelerated rates of globalization and the associated movement of large numbers of people very quickly and easily across the world, we see a threat, as I asserted earlier, more than to the economies of some societies, but to the very social fabric of those societies. The processes of globalization have contributed thus not only to the global spread of the disease, but are also associated with the increasing marginalization of the poor – and HIV/AIDS has become a disease of the poor. The statistics are staggering and do not bear repeating here, not least for the simple reason that the rate of proliferation of the disease globally means that they will be immediately out of date, and far worse. Suffice to say that across whole swathes of southern Africa, alarming numbers of orphaned families are headed by the eldest sibling, that child perhaps not yet twelve or thirteen. And if cultural prejudices towards the disease and its victims are anywhere near as bad as those in Africa, whole generations in India and China could be cut down in the silence and ignorance that surrounds it. The economic collapse that might well follow would probably not be as serious as the disintegration of the social fabric of the society, however. The entire family structure, whether extended or nuclear, could be destroyed by the orphaning of a generation.

The fifth and last feature of an increasingly globalized world that I consider here has to do with a crisis in intercultural tensions in society, in international relations, even in a so-called clash of civilizations. Huntington's thesis (1996) with respect to the last has been well rehearsed elsewhere and I shall not comment on it here, except to note as a prime example the frequently resurfacing clashes in values between liberal democratic Western societies and Islamic cultures and societies. Recent technological developments which have made the global transmission of information and the transport of goods both practicable and profitable have also made the movement of people both within and among societies

increasingly rapid and far-reaching, as we have noted. Relatively homogenous societies in history have given way to increasingly pluralist ones. Because of the uneven geography of development, these mass movements of populations – primarily from rural to urban areas, both within and across national boundaries – have brought about what amounts to an unprecedented layering of histories within any given community and, all too often, a clash in cultural and moral values. Contemporary communities exhibit a remarkable marbling of moral perspectives and increasing tensions regarding the scope and traction of traditional ethical systems.

In the domain of intercultural and even international relations, a case can be made that globalization processes have contributed to a shift from a world in which cooperation serves fundamentally competitive ends to one in which the challenges of coordinating basic aims, values, and interests across national and regional boundaries become predominant. Yet these same processes make apparent the absence of both conceptual and practical resources for negotiating significant normative consensus. To date, where global consent has been achieved on such matters as the need for basic human rights accords and for common commitments to maintaining or improving environmental quality, it has been achieved by identifying lowest common denominators regarding their meaning in terms of concrete practices. That is, the cost of universal consensus to respecting human dignity and environmental health has been a watering down of these values to make them relevant across often quite acute cultural and political boundaries. Normative consensus, in short, is often achieved at the cost of practical traction – a trade-off that is ultimately inconsistent with the prospect of orienting our deepening interdependence in ways that are more equitable and sustainable.

Multiculturalism and the Development of Transcultural Normative Ideals

These five features of the contemporary world point inescapably to the importance of the third aim of the chapters in this section of the book: not only to explore how and to what extent these features are related to crises in equity, but also to re-emphasise the importance of values and ethics in education – and more specifically, as indicated by the fourth aim, to examine how these complex global realities point to the importance of de-

veloping shared values and norms in the equitable enhancement of global diversity. Writers in the field have commonly highlighted the significance of the concept of multiculturalism, both as an empirical fact of contemporary society and as a moral value to be cherished in itself. Multiculturalism, after all, is founded in a moral principle that obliges us to respect those who are different (and this is crucial for my arguments that follow in defense of what values and ethics might have transcultural normative reach, or what values might be shared across all cultures). Multiculturalism as a normative principle, by definition, values diversity: it is clear about the advantages of diversity over the stultifying effects on creativity and on innovation of a monolithic homogeneity. Diversity lies at the heart of nature's ecosystems; from a systems perspective, diversity lies, along with incredible scale, at the core of the complex emergence of new properties and behaviours, such as the emergence of life itself, or of consciousness, as described by complexity theory (see Johnson, 2001). If global interdependence and questions around equity are both our empirical starting points in this volume and values that we aim to develop and defend, diversity as a fact of contemporary societies and as a normative ideal is no less so.

Writers in the field have also commonly pointed to the importance of tolerance as an especially important normative ideal for contemporary societies: even if we do not accept, let alone embrace, cultural practices different from our own, we ought at least to tolerate them. But while toleration as a minimum is commonly asserted, I would argue that it makes insufficiently strong moral demands, in the sense that we need to reframe the discourse on tolerance in terms of the appreciation of difference and the importance of this for the fostering of diversity (but this is less my concern here as it is addressed elsewhere in this volume, especially by Peter Herschok in Chapter Four). At the same time, however, I would argue that it begs an important question: must we tolerate those practices in our and in other cultures that violate the principles associated with multiculturalism?

After all, the question arises in intercultural contexts whether there are ethical principles (and educational ideals) that can be justified across all cultures. Following the postmodern turn – that has accompanied and helped to theorize the processes of globalization – and the concomitant denial of the possibility of universal ethics, strong multiculturalist positions hold that imposing the principles of one culture, which are in their view culturally specific, on other cultures that reject those principles, is

morally illegitimate. Some principles and ideals, such as, for example, the right of all to literacy, might challenge the traditions and beliefs of members of different cultures, might indeed challenge the very fabric of their worldview and sources of existential meaning. My thesis in this chapter, defended in terms of arguments that I have made elsewhere at greater length (see Mason, 2005), is that there are principles and ideals that are transcultural; and my aims here are to justify them and to elicit their educational implications. I draw on Harvey Siegel's (2002) arguments to conclude that contained within the principle of multiculturalism itself is the obligation to respect each other, and especially those who are different, as persons. Such a principle is, as Siegel shows, universally applicable to all cultures. What this means is that cultural practices that are disrespectful of the rights of, for example, women, other ethnic groups, lower castes, the poor, or children, may justifiably be understood as morally illegitimate. At a time when we have realized the importance of diversity, when we know the importance of treading sensitively where the traditions and beliefs of others who are different are concerned, this chapter's conclusions may appear rather controversial. And a careless interpretation might well have consequences that are oppressive of those who are different. But I hope I will have shown here that embracing its conclusions of ethical universality is all the more morally responsible, and critical in addressing the challenges raised earlier in the chapter.

In a world where phrases such as 'the celebration of diversity' and 'respect for difference' are common currency, we tend to have less faith in what we used to believe to be right, good and true. Zygmunt Bauman conceptualizes the postmodern perspective as concerned with the unmasking of the "illusions" of modernity, arguing that the essence – if of course it has one – of the postmodern approach to ethics lies in "the rejection of ... the philosophical search for absolutes, universals and foundations in theory" (1993, p.4). Our search for these has probably been tempered by our realization, as a consequence of the multicultural spaces we now inhabit in an increasingly globalized world, that ours is a plural world, with a diversity of perspectives and claims to truth, beauty, and goodness. Postmodern ethics is thus, to use Bauman's (ibid., p.31) aphorism, "morality without ethical code." While the moral thought and practice of modernity may have been "animated by the belief in the possibility of a *non-ambivalent, non-aporetic ethical code*," what is postmodern is the "disbelief in such a possibility" (ibid., pp.9, 10). The postmodern view of morality is that in an era when the range of our moral choices and the

consequences of our actions are more far-reaching than ever before, we are unable to rely on a universal ethical code that would yield unambiguously good solutions. And if we now have so little faith in what we used to know to be the right thing to do, how much less faith do we have in the applicability of our (now more tenuously held) beliefs and practices in other cultures? In our humility that followed our own collapse of faith, we have learned to become more sensitive to different ways of doing things. In such a multicultural world, is it possible that we might still be able to defend principles that have normative reach across cultures?

Siegel defends the possibility of transcultural educational and philosophical ideals by setting out what a commitment to multiculturalism entails and finding in this a commitment to at least one transcultural moral principle: respect for the rights of others. He defines multiculturalism as “that movement ... which celebrates cultural differences [and] insists upon the just, respectful treatment of members of all cultures...” (2002, p.26), and characterizes (*ibid.*, p.29) the justification of the multiculturalist position thus:

1. Educational/philosophical ideals are meaningful, applicable, or relevant only within the particular cultures which acknowledge and embrace them.
2. Therefore, there can be no absolute, universal, or transcultural ideals.
3. There can be no culture-neutral standpoint ... from which fairly and impartially to evaluate alternative, culturally-relative ideals.
4. Therefore, the imposition or hegemony of culturally specific ideals upon other cultures which do not recognize the legitimacy of those ideals cannot be morally justified.
5. Reason therefore requires that cultures tolerate, and recognize the culture-specific legitimacy of, the ideals of other cultures. This commitment to multiculturalism demands that all cultures accept the legitimacy of all other cultures living in accordance with their own, culturally-specific ideals.

He then points out that the conclusion equivocates on two senses of legitimacy. It is, he reminds us, one thing to say that “educational and philosophical ideals are necessarily culture-specific – legitimate only intra-culturally – in that the legitimacy or force of such ideals does not extend beyond the bounds of the cultures which embrace them” (*ibid.*) (a culture-specific sense of legitimacy). But is quite another to say that “all

cultures must accept the legitimacy of all other cultures living in accordance with their own, culturally-specific ideals" (ibid., p.30) (a transcultural or universal sense of legitimacy). The first "denies the possibility of transcultural legitimacy," while the second "propounds the transcultural duty to accept every culture's right to live in accordance with its own ideals" (ibid.). Despite this equivocation, multiculturalists would obviously be keen to hold to both senses of legitimacy. Their arguments would commit them to the first sense that educational and philosophical ideals are legitimate only within the bounds of a particular culture because they would reject any culture's attempts to establish hegemony over another by "unjustifiably dictating the terms of cultural adequacy to other cultures" (ibid.). But their arguments would also commit them to the second, transcultural sense of legitimacy, that we all have a duty to respect the right of every culture to live according to its own ideals and values. They obviously cannot embrace both a culture-specific and a transcultural sense of the term. And giving up both would mean giving up their commitment to multiculturalism. So they've got to give up one, but it cannot be the second, transcultural sense, that they forego, for if they do, then "there is nothing to underwrite the multiculturalists' sense of moral outrage over what [they] perceive to be the patent injustices perpetrated by an indefensible cultural hegemony" (ibid., p.31). Here then is an argument that if we accept the principle of multiculturalism, we must accept this principle transculturally or universally: that is, that we *all* have a duty to respect the right of every culture to live according to its own ideals and values. Siegel reminds us how this obligation to treat other cultures with respect cannot simply be a culturally-relative truth, one that is true only from the perspective of a particular culture. If it were regarded thus, monoculturalists would simply claim that while you may hold this principle, it's not true from their cultural perspective. Multiculturalists have no response to this unless they see the principle of multiculturalism, with its attendant moral principles of justice and respect, as universal moral truths, applicable to all cultures, including those that do not recognize them as moral truths. To return to the justification of the multiculturalist position and, in particular, the equivocation on legitimacy in Point 5, its last sentence needs to be modified thus:

"all cultures must accept the legitimacy of all other cultures living in accordance with their own, culturally-specific ideals, *in so far as those culturally-specific ideals and attendant practices are consistent with the*

moral imperatives of multiculturalism itself” (ibid., p.32).

In other words, advocates of multiculturalism need not and in fact should not “regard as legitimate *all* culturally-specific ideals and practices, but only those which do not violate the multiculturalist ideal itself” (ibid.), and which do not violate the principles of justice and respect that are contained within this ideal. Multiculturalists must, in other words, “reject the idea that cultural values and ideals have legitimacy only within cultures” (ibid.). Here are grounds then to reject, even to condemn, practices in our own and in other cultures that violate the principle of multiculturalism and its associated principles.

There is, however, a related question here: what of those who reject the principle of multiculturalism in the first place? Siegel’s arguments have assumed that one is committed to multiculturalism, and he has thence justified transcultural educational and philosophical ideals by arguing that they are contained within the ideal of multiculturalism itself. At its core, his argument is based on the inescapable (but not always recognized) conclusion that if we are committed to multiculturalism, we are committed to the universality of the principle of respect for the rights of others. From this we know that no culture has the right to oppress any other. But if, for example, a religiously fundamentalist culture rejects multiculturalism and does not accord women the same degree of respect accorded to men, does it mean that we should, in terms of Siegel’s argument, regard such practices as illegitimate and hence condemn them? His argument, after all, assumes the premise that one is committed to multiculturalism, and this culture rejects it. Bear in mind that the committed multiculturalist (who mistakenly doesn’t recognize its universal features) would regard such judgment of the practices of another culture as akin to colonialist oppression. Nevertheless, it would appear that we should, because if we are committed to multiculturalism, we are committed to the universality of the principle of respect for the rights of others, and we are thus committed to regarding as illegitimate any practices that violate this principle. While the oppression of women within one culture may not be a case of intercultural oppression, the generalized principle of respect must, in the view of anyone committed to multiculturalism, apply to all.

To argue that certain principles that originated locally have transcultural normative reach and are binding on all is a very strong claim to make indeed. A conclusion as powerful as this may seem both frightful and frightening to some, who may accuse us of coming full circle and

returning to something akin to colonialism in claiming that one culture's view of what is true, right and good is binding on other cultures. They may grant that the obligation to respect other human beings is certainly not a moral concept that emerged only in the West (and is probably honored universally, if in different interpretations); and they may grant that the associated principles of this argument, such as the obligation to accept the probative force of reasons and to respect other cultural practices in the spirit of multiculturalism (but of course only in so far as such practices do not violate multiculturalism's associated principles), are principles worthy of claiming transcultural normative reach. But their fear may be that if we have demonstrated how some (originally) local principles have transcultural normative reach, can we not use similar arguments to claim universal applicability for other principles that could be quite objectionable? Could somebody not make parallel moves to defend as universally true and good the view that men deserve more life chances than women?

I think not. The arguments presented here are based ultimately on three concepts that are both essential to the justification of the conclusion and uniquely able to justify that conclusion. It is not, in other words, just a case of "if we accept the moral principle of respect, and if we accept the probative force of reasons, then we are committed to the principle of multiculturalism, which requires that all are committed to respecting only those practices that are consistent with multiculturalism." It is a case of "if, *and only if*, we accept the moral principle of respect, and if, *and only if*, we accept the probative force of reasons, then we are committed to the principle of multiculturalism, which requires that all are committed to respecting only those practices that are consistent with multiculturalism." The premises may be accepted as sufficient, but are they indeed necessary as I have claimed? Testing the truth of the contra-positive shows that at least the first is. To show the necessity of the premise, we need to show that a commitment to multiculturalism implies a commitment to respect for others. The contrapositive is indeed true: having no respect for others certainly implies having no respect for others with different cultural practices.

It is, however, more than just that the moral principle of respect and the probative force of reasons are necessary and sufficient conditions for a commitment to multiculturalism. It is also that multiculturalism is a particular moral position that is uniquely able to provide the bridge in this argument from local to transcultural normative reach. It is both the principle that enjoys transcultural normative reach and, itself, the bridge that enables the transcultural move. It is not just any moral principle, but the

fulcrum about which such arguments turn. For the person who believes that men deserve more life chances than women to make parallel moves to defend his views as universally true and good, he would have to identify a moral principle able to do just that. So the conclusion we have reached is not as frightening or as frightful as might have been thought. It is, with its justification, the only way, as far as I can see, of reaching a conclusion with such significant consequences of transcultural normative reach.

If we accept, then, that we are morally obliged to treat others with respect, and that we are bound to accept the force of that which has been justified in reason, then we are committed to honoring the principle of multiculturalism. A commitment to multiculturalism (from which we cannot escape if we accept these premises) commits us to the universal applicability of its associated principles, which commits all to the transcultural normative reach of its principles. This means that we are bound to respect the right of all cultures to live in accordance with their own beliefs and practices, but only in so far as these beliefs and practices are consistent with the principles associated with multiculturalism itself, primary among which is the principle of respect for the rights of others. And we are committed to rejecting practices that violate this and its associated principles. From moral and epistemological principles that originated locally we are led inexorably to their normative reach across all cultures. This is a very significant conclusion, that there are ethical principles and educational ideals that can be justified as applicable to all cultures, whether or not those cultures reject such principles and ideals. It requires that we condemn the disrespectful treatment in our and in other cultures of women, members of other ethnic groups and of lower castes, the poor, children. But it requires that we tread very carefully and sensitively. We might in some cases be challenging some aspects of what may have been held dear for centuries. But at least we are challenging these practices in terms of the rights of every person to respect and human dignity. And in these principles that underlie, are associated with, and follow from the principles of multiculturalism and diversity, lie the beginnings of the cross-culturally shared values that we so importantly seek. The ethics that are consistent with multiculturalism might then constitute at least some values and norms that are able to be shared across cultures, that might then contribute to the equitable enhancement of global diversity.

The fact of our almost ubiquitous and inextricable level of global interdependence means that we have the responsibility to consider before

acting the consequences of our actions for all, at both a human and at a planetary level; and we have at the same time, I would claim, following the conclusion we have now established, the right to demand of others that they proceed with similar levels of consideration. We have both the right and the responsibility to condemn such selfish practices in our and in other cultures. Because we are so inextricably connected, we will all sink or swim together. Elsewhere I have developed what I refer to as the ethics of integrity (Mason, 2001), constituted by the obligation to respect our own and each other's dignity and by the obligation to take responsibility for the consequences of our actions, and defended the normative reach of these principles across cultures.

An Ethical Stance with Respect to the Consequences of Globalization

Before turning in conclusion to some of the educational implications of what we have discussed so far, let us consider some of the moral implications of this argument and its conclusions for the normative questions raised by the five features of our contemporary world that we identified in the first section of this chapter. With regard to the first three – the increasing gap in the distribution of wealth between rich and poor, the probability of imminent environmental catastrophe in the face of unsustainable levels of human impact on the planet's ecosystem, and the probability that by 2030 more than a quarter of the world's population will be living in urban slums – I will do no more than state the obvious moral implications: that we have the responsibility, and more than this, the right, to condemn and to work against practices that contribute to the inequitable distribution of wealth in the global economy and to the persistence of poverty, hunger, malnutrition and disease in the developing world and in its urban slums – and the obligation to cease such practices ourselves in our own lives; and that we have both the right and the responsibility to condemn and to work against the massive environmental impact of the consumerist Western lifestyle (and the obligation to reduce our own levels of consumption and waste), as well as the wanton environmental destruction associated with the industrialisation of the developing world and the exploitation of its natural resources.

With regard to the fourth – the threat posed by the proliferation of HIV/AIDS, we have the responsibility and the right to condemn the eco-

conomic and political arrangements, and the social and cultural practices that contribute to its spread: the poverty and the paucity of social services that drive some into prostitution; the maverick approach of some governments to the disease (most obviously the South African government, in a country wracked more than any other by HIV/AIDS); the stigma attached to being HIV-positive in so many societies and cultures; and the patriarchal and promiscuous practices of men in so many cultures, dare I say in predominantly traditional cultures where self-serving myths (such as that sex with a virgin will cure AIDS, or that sex with each of the tribal elders will relieve a bereaved woman of the demons that widowed her, or indeed the belief quite simply in a man's right to force himself on whatever woman [or child] he chooses).

With regard to the fifth – the crisis in intercultural tensions in increasingly pluralist societies sparked by frequent clashes in cultural and moral values, beyond what is already clear from my conclusions about honoring shared values and norms that have transcultural normative reach, I want to draw some controversial conclusions about the principle of unbridled state sovereignty. One of the hallmarks of modernity is the development of the nation-state, and, since the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, the principle of state sovereignty has been entrenched to the point that it has become the paramount principle governing international relations. What I have defended here, however, challenges that principle. States have, after all, the responsibility to protect their citizens – this is a widely accepted indicator of a legitimate state – and the argument that I have advanced here, as do other arguments, some in the domain of human rights, raises questions about when it is appropriate for the international community, and I stress the international community, rather than individual states or small groups of states acting unilaterally, to challenge the sovereignty of abusive states. When states fail, whether through lack of will or because of insufficient capacity, to protect their citizens, or when they wilfully abuse their citizens, they lose that legitimacy. In terms of my conclusions here, the international community, whether under the auspices of the United Nations or in concert with international non-governmental organisations, has an obligation to act. In both its name and its actions, an organisation such as *Médecins Sans Frontières* typifies my position in this regard.

Some Consequences for Education

To conclude with a consideration of some of the consequences for education of what I have defended here, perhaps the key question is how students from different cultural backgrounds who might not share the same values or the same moral perspectives might learn how to engage with each other over these moral issues. The first and most obvious response is that students need education in these shared values and ethical principles – that is, in the principle of multiculturalism and in the values and ethics that underlie it, are associated with it, and follow from it. Principles associated with multiculturalism, such as equal liberty, equal opportunity, justice as fairness, the fostering of critical judgment in education, asserted as transcultural by the likes of Robert Fullinwider (1996), Amy Gutmann (1996) and Charles Taylor (1992), are quickly able to be derived from the key principle underlying the ethics of multiculturalism, that of respect for each other as persons. For example, by the truth of the contrapositive, to deny somebody equal liberty and opportunity is to treat them without respect; hence to respect others implies that we acknowledge that they enjoy equal liberty and opportunity. This has consequences for teacher education, curriculum design, school management, and for teaching and learning.

Second, students need a globally oriented rather than a nationally oriented citizenship education. Education for global citizenship would encourage students to question the Westphalian principle of state sovereignty, so that it is weakened in both popular consciousness and in formal discourse in this domain. Such a citizenship education would educate students in their rights, responsibilities and commitments as global citizens. In *Educating Beyond the Nation*, Ian Lister (1996, p.89) suggests that “global education” can be characterized by its three main features:

the taking of a global perspective and the recognition of an interdependent world; teaching and learning about global issues – war and peace, development, multicultural societies, human rights, environment, and alternative human futures; [and] an activity-based pedagogy, influenced by humanistic educators such as John Dewey and Carl Rogers, with an ideal of holism.

What global education does that is different from the curriculum content, pedagogy and perspectives of traditional education, according to Lister, is to emphasize the values and perspectives of a discourse of globalism, rather than nationalism. Global education recognizes “the need to recon-

struct citizenship in order to create a kind of citizenship appropriate to a society which is multicultural, diverse, pluralist, and part of an interdependent world" (ibid., p.93). He suggests that the discourse of human rights can provide a value framework appropriate for education for global citizenship. This is because "human rights hold the ideal of universalism, that is, they are *universal* rights for *all humanity*. They are rights which human beings have, and should enjoy, as *human beings*, and not as a gift of a government or because they belong to a particular social system" (ibid., pp.93, 94). Following Lister (p.95), some ways of educating for global citizenship might include:

- Teaching and learning for global awareness and understanding;
- Building international and global dimensions on to school programs already in place;
- Developing school programs to promote international and intercultural understanding;
- Contributing through schools to a global civic culture;
- Helping young people to recognize and respect human diversity; and
- Encouraging young people to participate in voluntary service programs, both locally and further afield.

And third, an education informed by and committed to the principles and processes of democracy would, together with an education for global citizenship and with an education in shared values and ethical principles, constitute a good start. Lister suggests that educating "active citizens," who might be more responsive to the challenges of a world that is increasingly interconnected and interdependent, depends in part on developing the following values and skills: "freedom, fairness, toleration, respect for truth, respect for reasoning, ... skills of analysis and argument, skills of negotiation and conciliation" (ibid., pp.88, 89). These values and skills are, he points out, those of democratic discourse and the basis of many claims to human rights. Education for democracy is informed by values and skills substantially similar to the values and skills associated with education for global citizenship. Following Gutmann (1987), Bull, Fruehling and Chattergy (1992, p.57) suggest that "to be and remain a democracy, a society must provide to all children a political education that develops their capacities to take advantage of the political rights and responsibilities they will enjoy as adults." The political function of education in democratic societies, according to Bull, Fruehling and Chattergy

(ibid., p.58), aims “to develop in young people the knowledge, skills and dispositions that will enable them as adults to participate fully in the processes of democratic decision-making.” It is governed by the basic moral principles and concepts of democratic theory. In order to participate effectively in the process of democratic deliberation, children therefore need knowledge about ‘how the world works’; the standards and processes of rationality; different visions of society and the different possible economic, political, social and cultural arrangements and institutions of different societies; and knowledge about their own society, its arrangements and institutions, its issues and debates. They need the skills of personal expression, persuasion, negotiation and debate; of judgment, and of rational decision-making. They need the disposition to act democratically, fairly and justly, and to seek information and to deliberate thoughtfully.

These are the priorities of an education that takes an ethical stance with respect to the consequences of an increasingly globalized, interconnected and interdependent world.

References

- Bauman, Zygmunt (1993): *Postmodern Ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bull, B., Fruehling, R. & Chattergy, V. (1992): *The Ethics of Multicultural and Bilingual Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Delanty, Gerard (2000): *Citizenship in a Global Age: Society, Culture, Politics*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Fullinwider, Robert K. (1996): ‘Multicultural Education: Concepts, Policies, and Controversies’, in Fullinwider, Robert K. (ed.), *Public Education in a Multicultural Society: Policy, Theory, Critique*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.3-22.
- Gutmann, Amy (1987): *Democratic Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gutmann, Amy (1996): ‘Challenges of Multiculturalism in Democratic Education’, in Fullinwider, Robert K. (ed.), *Public Education in a Multicultural Society: Policy, Theory, Critique*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.156-180.
- Giddens, Anthony (1998): *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1996): *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Johnson, Steven (2001): *Emergence: The Connected Lives of Ants, Brains, Cities, and Software*. New York: Scribner.
- Lister, Ian (1996): ‘Educating Beyond the Nation’, in Lo, Leslie Nai-kwai & Man,

- Si-wai (eds.), *Research and Endeavours in Moral and Civic Education*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Educational Research, pp.83-97.
- Mason, Mark (2001): 'The Ethics of Integrity: Educational Values Beyond Post-modern Ethics'. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, Vol.35, No.1, pp.47-69.
- Mason, Mark (2005): 'A Justification, after the Postmodern Turn, of Universal Ethical Principles and Educational Ideals'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, Vol.37, No.6, pp.799-815.
- Siegel, Harvey (2002): 'Multiculturalism and the Possibility of Transcultural Educational and Philosophical Ideals', in Malachowski, Alan (ed.), *Richard Rorty: Volume IV*. London: Sage Publications, pp.25-44.
- Taylor, Charles (1992): *Multiculturalism and 'the Politics of Recognition'*, with commentary by Gutmann, A. (ed.), Rockefeller, S., Walzer, M. & Wolf, S. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Waters, Malcolm (1995): *Globalization*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Education and Alleviating Poverty

Educating for Equity and Diversity

Peter D. HERSHOCK

In what follows, I want to examine a set of connections among the structures and direction of 21st century global interdependence; deepening poverty and inequity both within and among societies; and the now almost ubiquitous experience of educational shortfalls emerging at rates and intensities that outstrip any conceivable pace of educational reform. My conclusion will be that the same realities that now serve as engines of inequity and are driving education into locally distinct and yet virtually universal crisis also open opportunity spaces for education to serve as a driver for reorienting global interdependence and alleviating poverty. In order to do so, however, education must abandon the globally dominant model of curriculum-based and competence-biased education. Instead, education must be locally adapted to the globally conditioned task of fostering embodied virtuosity in the sustained achievement of ever-greater equity and diversity.

Education and Poverty Alleviation

Poverty alleviation and education are widely viewed as related, in the specific sense that there is simply *not enough* education available to the poor. This mainstay of governmental and non-governmental agendas for addressing poverty contains an indisputable measure of truth. The more critically relevant truths, however, are that while any amount of education will undoubtedly improve the ability of individual poor to cope effectively with their situation, the primary drivers of poverty do *not* lie in the poor themselves and education along now globally standard lines will

do little to true the patterns of local and global interdependence that lie at the roots of poverty. Education's lack of traction in addressing these wider conditions is *not* primarily a result of inadequate funding and access. Rather, it is a function of genealogically shared values between globally standard educational aims/practices and the system of free-market economics which has crossed crucial thresholds of scope and density to become a principal driver of global inequity.

In an era of triumphant market liberalism and the plausibility of talk about the "end of history" (Fukuyama 1992), this is not an intuitively credible claim. Consider, however, the more moderate and immediately credible linkages identified among poverty, development and education by the Nobel laureate, Amartya Sen. For Sen (2000, p.xii), while development is rightly regarded as crucial to alleviating poverty and its associated tragedies, expanding individual agency or freedoms of choice – not economic growth – should be regarded "the primary end and principal means of development." Education, he goes on to claim (*ibid.*, p.293), is historically the single most effective means of directly expanding the range and depth of agency individuals can exercise "to lead lives they have reason to value and to enhance the real choices they have." Simply stated, education brings freedoms of choice; economic growth is a happy but indirect consequence.

Appealing as it is in many ways, Sen's approach to linking poverty alleviation and education sheds scant explanatory or strategic light on the ironic fact that while contemporary patterns of global interdependence have been able to foster remarkable economic growth, increase capacities for choice and rapidly expand educational opportunities, these same patterns of interdependence have also generated both globally increasing inequity and locally intensifying conditions for educational crisis. The key fact – one that begs questioning the underlying metaphysics of Sen's analysis – is that in becoming ever less favorably or valuably situated, the poor are in relational terms worse and worse off than in the past *even if* they are 'better educated' and capable of exercising wider ranges of choice. Becoming relatively worse off means, ultimately, being relationally disadvantaged. Acquiring increased *freedom of choice* is quite compatible with becoming less capable of *relating freely*.

To draw out at least the broad outline of the co-dependency of market growth and education, and to gain critical traction with respect to this co-dependency's ironic consequences, we need to develop an explicitly relational understanding poverty and an appreciation of the complex

nature of contemporary patterns of global interdependence.

Poverty as Chronically Compromised Relational Quality

It is a global commonplace to associate poverty with chronic shortages of basic material needs and/or the means of acquiring them – now most typically taken to be income or savings, though, in the past, more often, land or access to forest, riverine or oceanic resources. This condition of chronic lack is most commonly assumed to be the result of misfortune and/or misdeed. Poverty, in other words, can be blamed on either chance (bad luck) or character (bad choices combined with ill or inadequate effort).

This naïve and rather uncharitable view of the causes of poverty is, of course, woefully incomplete if it is not simply misguided. There are myriad, often quite intentionally established and sustained, extra-individual social, economic and political conditions and forces that factor into the depth and distribution of poverty. Nevertheless, the concepts and measures with which we customarily work in analyzing and addressing poverty remain very much wedded to identifying poverty as a measurably chronic state of ‘not having enough’ that afflicts the poor, singly or in groups. This conception of poverty is increasingly at odds with the realities of dynamically evolving global interdependence, and is a significant factor in the feeble record, to date, of global poverty alleviation efforts.

The dynamics of global economic integration over the past half-century have been most prominent in bringing the term interdependence into widespread public discourse. But, conceptual engagement with interdependence has come to be seen as requisite within virtually every field from medicine to politics, and across all the knowledge domains from the natural and social sciences to the humanities. This marks a transition of no lesser global historical importance than the late 16th and early 17th century birth of modernity. Contemporary realities in virtually every aspect of human endeavor are compelling recognition that very real practical liabilities attend continued appeal to such purportedly natural or ontological distinctions as those between freedom and determinism, self and other, subject and object, knower and known, reason and emotion, and facts and values. In effect, contemporary realities are forcing the realization that ultimately there are no independently existing things or beings. Rather, all things, beings and situations come to be only on the basis of dynamic and mutually conditioning relational networks. Forcefully stated, relationships are more basic than things related.

Such a resolutely relational understanding of the nature of things has

long been affirmed by many traditions of indigenous knowledge (e.g., Hoppers 2005), as well as within the East Asian cultural sphere and Buddhist thought (e.g., Ames & Hall 2001, Macy 1991, and Hershock 2006). More recently, it has come to the foreground in some expressions of post-modern skepticism about the category of the given (e.g., Harvey 1989), in feminist discourse (e.g., Mohanty 2003), and in care ethics (e.g., Noddings 2003). It resonates strongly with developments in contemporary science, especially in physics, biology, general systems theory and ecology.

Within a relational ontology, not only do states of affairs and fixed identities give way to processes and ongoing patterns of identification, individually existing things or beings give way to qualities and directions of relationships. To take a single example, while most of us would unthinkingly agree that parents exist prior to their children, in actuality there are no 'parents' without 'children.' 'Parents' and 'children' emerge together over time as meaningful distinctions made and sustained within the ongoing relational dynamic of a particular family, in a particular cultural and historical setting. Familial *relations* are, in actuality, more basic than – or, ontologically prior to – the *individuals* we come to refer to as 'parents' and 'children,' 'aunts' and 'uncles,' 'grandfathers' and 'grandmothers.' Similarly for all things, beings and states of affairs: each emerges as a distinctive abstraction-from, expression-of, and contribution-to an already obtaining pattern of relationships. Provocatively stated, things *are* what they *mean* for one another.

These considerations, far from being of purely philosophical importance, have quite concrete implications for understanding the nature and origins of poverty. In the context of a fully relational ontology, interdependence is an ultimately horizonless – but by no means uniform or unidirectional – process. Granted that poverty arises interdependently, it cannot, in actuality, have any fixed origin. Thus, although the state of material lack typically cited as a signal characteristic of the poor can be linked to such locally prevailing conditions as the effects of a severe flood, the arising of poverty clearly depends on other conditions also prevailing – for instance, a lack of savings reflecting long-standing sets of economic conditions and patterns of employment, earning and spending; ineffective or absent social safety nets or insurance; the location of residences and workplaces in areas of environmentally high risk; and, a lack of the political foresight and will that would have been necessary to institutionalize proper severe weather warning and relief systems. Neither the causalities nor responsibilities for poverty can be strictly localized.

Taking this a step further, the incidence of poverty cannot be strictly objectified. Insofar as poverty, like all things – our own selves included – arises as a particular complexion of always dynamic and ultimately horizonless relationships, poverty cannot arise without our being implicated in it. Poverty does *not* consist of a particular state of affairs into which we as individuals or groups can, on tragic occasion, find ourselves to have fallen. Rather, poverty is an *eventuality* that expresses a particular inflection (or perhaps, distortion) of an abiding pattern of relationships. It marks a persisting confluence of conditions conducive to a distinctive, and at times locally quite intense, quality and orientation of interdependence.

Most generally stated, poverty marks the persistence of an increasingly constraining relational pattern – a relational dynamic that is qualitatively stagnant or degrading. Poverty is not something occurring *in* a given situation, afflicting only some specific person or people. It signals a distinctive meaning or heading *of* a situation – a heading that is not spatial, but qualitative. Poverty *means* a persistent situational depreciation eventuating in all present becoming less and less valuably situated, but also less and less able to relate in ways that are appreciative or capable of both valuing and adding value to their situation.¹

Such a conception of poverty entails seeing poverty and its engagement as playing out across the full spectrum of relationships from the most ‘private’ and ‘subjective’ to the most ‘public’ and ‘objective.’ *When* poverty manifests, it does so – in varying intensities and with varying ramifications – from such micro-level patterns of interdependence as those involved in the arising of consciousness and intentionality, to such macro-level patterns as those subsumed within the geopolitics of post-industrial market operations. As it does so, there form mutually reinforcing patterns of impediments either to bringing about situational appreciation or to halting situational depreciation. This means, at one level, the arising of deficient and/or misdirected patterns of attention that both result-from and result-in ignorant/errant patterns of relationship. At another level, it means the arising of contributory blockages or disincentives and an unbalancing or de-harmonizing of the means-to and meaning-of subsistence. At still other levels, it means the institutionalization of relational dynamics – e.g., the normalization of fast food consumption – that work against qualitative refinement or the development of situation-transforming appreciative and contributory virtuosity.

Material deprivation is one possible effect of poverty, but not its root cause. Poverty is ultimately rooted in an abiding network of conditions

that are conducive to the emergence of relational impediments-to or diversions-from distinctively appreciating or adding-value to our situation. Poverty is not most fundamentally evidence of a personal or communal lack or incapacity. Poverty evidences the relational collapse of opportunities for offering. It is the eventuating of stagnant or attenuating capacities-for and commitments-to enriching differences or differing in ways that make a meaningful difference.

It must be stressed that, from the perspective of a relational ontology, the more common practice of seeing poverty as an objective state of affairs which can be defined simply in terms of material lack constitutes a strategy for denying complicity in poverty's occurrence and persistence. To the extent that poverty can be seen as an objective phenomenon that afflicts some, but not others, strictly as a function of 'accident' or 'misfortune,' those not afflicted can deny responsibility for the suffering of those who are. A fully relational understanding of poverty disallows such a distancing exemption.

In sum, and in terms that will be crucial in establishing and framing the poverty-alleviating potential of education, poverty can be seen as a function of compromised or collapsed *diversity*, where diversity consists of self-sustaining and difference-enriching patterns of mutual contribution to meaningfully shared welfare. Strategies for poverty alleviation that are not ecological in the sense of addressing the meaning or direction of an impoverishing situation as a whole are doomed to failure. Yet, this is precisely the type of poverty alleviation that is presently afforded by the globally dominant educational paradigm – a paradigm that focuses on inculcating market-relevant competencies rather than appreciative and contributory virtuosity. It is, as a result of conditions I hope to sketch clearly, an educational paradigm that is compatible with institutionalizing inequity through market-driven conversions of diversity into mere variety.

Curriculum and the Modern Value of Control

Over the last two hundred years, formal (especially public) education has come to be carried out globally as the sequentially structured transfer/acquisition of information and knowledge; as a systematic means of inculcating circumstantially relevant competencies; and as a forum for principle- or rule-based character development and socialization.² This educational paradigm arguably took shape (see, e.g. Doll & Gough 2002, especially Chapter Two) as a function of sustained convergences, across a

wide range of domains, on the values of control, universalism, autonomy and equality – a legacy of what Stephen Toulmin (1990) has termed the second phase of modernity.

These convergences occurred from the late 16th to the mid-17th centuries, as religious, political and social conflict in Europe reached devastating intensities and as innovations in science and engineering initiated what James Beniger (1986) has referred to as a “control revolution” – a distinctive axis of technological development that continues to radically affect societal structure and that has been a continuing factor in the growth of global market economics and standardized education to the present day.³ The result was a distinctive interweaving of political, socio-economic, scientific, and technological ideals, institutions and practices, expressing the legitimacy of segregating reason/mind/theory and emotion/body/practice; of asserting the inherent danger or irrelevance of difference; and, of seeking an isomorphism of cosmic, political, social, and epistemic orders.

The nearly ubiquitous association of education with curriculum neatly illustrates the modernist heritage of the dominant educational paradigm. The term ‘curriculum’ was first used in an educational context by Peter Ramus in 1576.⁴ Ramus innovatively claimed that knowledge could be mapped, that its dissemination could then be logically and universally ordered or methodized, and that education not only could, but also *should* follow a particular and explicitly terminal course. The term *curriculum* captures this perfectly, originally referring to a circular course of standard length used to order the competitive movement of charioteers.

With the notion of a curriculum, Ramus forwarded an understanding of *an education* as a deliverable: a quantifiable product of logically ordered sequences of instruction transferring predetermined knowledge content. Shaped in fundamental accord with the modern values of control, universality, autonomy and equality, there developed a now globally dominant approach to education centered on the disciplined completion (that is, consumption) of methodically structured, standard curricula. This educational approach matured in interdependence with other modern institutions, including those of the nation-state and global commodity, labor and consumer markets.

By the mid-20th century, the shared genealogical roots of modern, curriculum-based education and market economics became particularly explicit. Education was openly drafted into inculcating labor forces with market-relevant competencies, schools were reorganized in keeping with the science of efficiency then being used to rationalize factories and

management organization, and students were brazenly identified as ‘raw material,’ which schools were in the business of turning into uniform ‘finished products’ over set periods of time. These affirmations of modernist, market-oriented educational aims and practices were, perhaps, most pronounced in the USA, but they were more openly acknowledged in pre-Maoist, Republican China, where the hope was that a modern education would help the Chinese people throw off the legacy of a century of humiliation at the hands of European colonialists and reclaim their place as global leaders in culture *and* commerce.

In spite of several waves of theoretical challenges, from a variety of perspectives,⁵ to control-biased modern curricula – and in spite of widespread dissolution of modern political, economic, and social institutions under the force of decidedly post-modern pressures – formal educational institutions have changed remarkably little since the mid-18th century. Indeed, biases toward controlled progress and standards are now undergoing a remarkable resurgence wherever they had been temporarily eclipsed – resurgence tied to growing convictions that education has become seriously decoupled from patterns of global change. Unfortunately, what truth there is in seeing existing educational institutions as out of step with contemporary realities is being largely overwritten by reaffirmations of controlled, standard curricula and intensifying assertions of the market values of competition and choice as avenues for substantive educational innovation. In the context of contemporary patterns of *complex* change, reforming education to better deliver populations that embody market-determined competencies is a blind step backward on a path that is steadily and, in all likelihood, irreversibly dissolving.

Complex Change, the Transition from Problems to Predicaments, and Market Ironies

Present day rates, scales and patterns of change are bringing about global systems of interdependence that are not merely complicated, but complex.⁶ Distinctively, complex systems are both *autopoietic* (self-creating or self-organizing) and *novogenous* (or innovation-generating). Developing in ways that are at once typical and responsive to the effects on their environment of their own behaviors, complex systems are manifestly dispositional in nature, recursively expressing ongoing negotiations between relatively abiding value sets and relatively changeable factual conditions. Because of this, complex systems are prone to non-linear development, changing in ways that in retrospect will appear consistent with their own

values and histories, but that in principle could *not* have been anticipated.^{7,8}

The emergence of truly complex (and not merely complicated) global realities is thus synonymous with increasing indeterminacies regarding the meaning or direction of change. As complex systems interact, so do their informing values. Hence, the interdependent growth or evolution of complex systems is inseparable from generating and consolidating meaning. How well or how errantly (and conflictingly) complex systems evolve and interact finally turns on how their distinct value systems accord both with one another and with changing situational dynamics. Complex realities therefore implicate us in a strategic space less favorable to competitive determinations of specific outcomes than to coordinative modulations of shared opportunity. In responding to complex change, the strategic value of control is best subordinated to commitment.

From Problems to Predicaments

This can be illustrated by one of the signal ramifications of the global prevalence of complex interdependence: an epoch-making shift in the *kind* of difficulties, trouble and suffering associated with increased globalization: a shift from *problems* to *predicaments*. Problems develop when changing circumstances render existing practices ineffective for meeting continuing needs and interests. Problems signal the failure of specific means for arriving at ends we intend to keep pursuing and are solved by removing factual blockages or disruptions in a particular and still desirable pattern of situational development or meaning. Solutions are improved or novel means for arriving at abiding ends. Predicaments arise with the confluence of contrary patterns of development or meaning. Signaling a situated incompatibility of values and interests, predicaments mark the emergence of impasses regarding the *direction* of interdependence and *cannot* be solved. Instead, they are only open to resolution.⁹ Responding skillfully to predicaments involves sustaining detailed attention to factual dynamics, while realizing clarity of commitment with respect to harmonizing situationally complex flows of meaning and valuation.

To take a single example, despite rising global wealth, global hunger is at an historical peak and growing with nearly one billion people now chronically hungry. The intensifying co-existence of global wealth and global hunger points factually to the inequity of prevailing patterns in the distribution of new wealth. But such inequities also reflect patterns of

outcomes and opportunities in political, social, and cultural relationships – patterns resulting from the sustained presence of particular values, intentions and practices in these non-economic domains. It is to globally prevalent conflicts among values that we must look in explaining how global hunger continues rising even as there is a rise in global food surpluses. People do not go hungry because of food shortages, but because their suffering is considered a lesser ‘cost’ than that of restructuring global regimes of food production and distribution. Global hunger is not a problem; it is a predicament.

The emergence of truly complex global interdependence is bringing about an accelerating conversion of problems into predicaments. In part, this is a collateral effect of advances in science and technology. We now possess such powerful means of factual control that very little stands in the way of the living of decent lives by all, other than insufficient commitment. We have crossed a threshold beyond which there is no longer any real question about whether we *can* eliminate the vast majority of factual conditions leading to human suffering, but only whether we will resolutely affirm that it is *worth* doing so and *how well* we follow through.

In transiting from an era of problem solution to one of predicament-resolution, we are compelled to recognize the ontological primacy of relationality and the irreducibly directed or meaning-laden nature of interdependence. But we are also compelled to recognize the crippling incompleteness of any body of knowledge restricted to knowing-that and knowing-how. Epistemic wholeness depends on the inclusion of knowing-to: the exercise of wisdom. Yet at the same time, because complex interdependence is conducive to both the emergence of novel or unanticipated outcomes and opportunities, as well as the convergence of distinctive systems of values and interests, the unsettling reality is that predicament resolution cannot be effectively undertaken from any fixed position. Skillfully and wisely responding to complex, predicament-generating change requires virtuosity in improvising shared pathways for revising relational qualities and coordinating interests across ever-escalating numbers of domains and scales.

Taken altogether, complex global interdependence, non-linear change, and the shift of dominance from problem solution to predicament-resolution constitute a forceful imperative for decisively turning away from the modernist conception of education as a controlled delivery of specific, predetermined and standardized bodies of knowledge and skills. Needed instead is education systematically focused on innovatively fos-

tering *capabilities* for responsive virtuosity and *commitments* to shared meaning-making. Doing so, however, in any sustainable and effective manner will require breaking the co-dependency of education and market economics.

Market Growth as Limit to Alleviating Poverty

The world market economy has come to be the single most important complex system affecting the direction of increasing interdependence. For present purposes, the most salient points in the history of market economics center on the relationships among market growth, market content, and the contributory capacity of the consuming public. At once stimulated by and sustaining the control revolution in technology and international competition, resource and commodity markets grew with remarkable rapidity in terms of both *reach* and *density* throughout the modern era. As markets attained global scope, growth dynamics shifted from a predominant stress on geographic expansion to maximizing market density. The single most crucial means of bringing about increased market density was – and, indeed, remains – a controlled faulting of the familiar amounting to a systematic generation of new needs capable of being addressed by market designed and delivered goods and services. There gradually emerged an *economy of dissatisfaction* based on the normalization of living circumstances not only subject to remarkable options for choice and control, but also in apparent and increasing need of them.

Consuming market delivered commodities to meet a proliferating array of needs has readily experienced advantages: most notably convenience and choice. But the costs in terms of relational depth are quite significant. Consider the differences in relational depth and richness that ensue when parents make use of market goods to meet the needs of their children for sensory stimulation and imaginative engagement. Prior to the marketization of children's entertainment and play, family members and neighbors met these basic human developmental needs directly through, for instance, improvised games and sport, live storytelling, and the adaptation of adult literature and oral narratives. As mass-produced and mass-marketed children's toys, games, books, television programs, films, and computer games have become increasingly pervasive intermediaries in the process of meeting these needs, both children and parents have been significantly 'freed' from the demands of active imagination, improvisational attentiveness and shared meaning-making. Parents largely have become suppliers of professionally designed entertainment and play

experiences; children have been converted to avid consumers of such experiences. In the USA, children now spend an average of four hours *daily* in direct consumption of mass media (TV, computer games, films, music) and less than one hour a *week* one-on-one with their parents. While the market-mediated meeting of the need for sensory stimulation and play brings increasing *freedoms-of-choice* among experiential outcomes, it also represents a significant forfeit of immediate relational opportunity for developing capacities-for and commitments-to *relating freely*.¹⁰

The market-induced compromise of relational quality can be more generally and strikingly illustrated from a synoptic perspective on the expanding circuits of production and consumption associated with global markets. The intensity of consumption needed to continue fueling economic (that is, market) growth enforces a radical compression of the production-consumption-waste cycle that systematically undermines the conditions for virtuosity- and diversity-enhancing patterns of engagement with our own, immediate situations and development. The undeniable freedoms associated with contemporary global regimes of market economics are literally *compelling freedoms* to conveniently control or manage the content of our individual experiences by choosing – as continuously as possible – among market designed and delivered commodities, which are then as quickly as possible relegated to either real or metaphorical landfills, recycling plants and combustion sites. Consumers produce waste.

This is not innocent employment. The compulsive exercise of convenient freedoms of choice is not a linear process, but rather a process that ramifies recursively. The patterns of values-intentions-actions that inform the production of consumption opportunities are fed back into the production cycle by way of consumption outcomes, bringing about a revision of production processes to better meet market-induced consumer ‘demands.’ Market growth at present scales and densities – especially under prevailing consumption regimes fueled by the systematic export of attention itself, primarily via mass media – necessarily diminishes contributory diversity. Beyond a certain threshold of scope and density, markets not only produce goods and services for global circulation, they also produce populations in need of such goods and services.

Herein lies the core tragedy of the co-dependence of market growth and education. The growth of global markets has not only been driven by, but has been a primary driver of, expanding and deepening social, political, and cultural interdependence and complexity. Yet, the expansion and intensification of market operations ironically depends upon the at-

rophy of the very personal and communal capacities needed for relating freely (in contrast to simply enjoying 'freedoms of choice') and for skillfully improvising shared meaning across plural domains of fact and value – the very capacities mandated by the emergence of truly complex realities and non-linear change.

To the degree that globally complex social, economic and political interdependence mandates heightened skills in diversity-conserving predicament resolution, to the degree that a primary aim of education is to enhance capacities-for and commitments-to contributing to society – that is, to the extent that education serves/serves as public good – and, to the degree that continued market growth along present lines compromises contributory opportunity, market-driven enhancements of freedoms-of-choice lay an ever-shifting foundation for the emergence of educational crises.

The Liability of Competence

It might be thought that the globally dominant model of education, focused on using standard curricula to foster market-relevant competencies would be well-suited to preparing individuals and communities to respond effectively to the challenges of complex change. Ironically, this is in actuality not the case.

Education biased toward standard competencies is ultimately education that valorizes sufficient consumption. Rather than fostering contributory virtuosity, it promotes learning only what is *necessary* to be enabled to do *well enough* what present and anticipated circumstances command. This might be acceptable in the context of gradual and predictable change. But when situational needs are rapidly shifting and reflect the complex convergence of distinct and frequently contrary sets of values and norms, emphasizing curricula oriented toward building predetermined competencies will marginalize the relevance of education in direct proportion to the time required to move through such curricula. In the context of contemporary realities, education focused on delivering presently relevant knowledge and skills is highly susceptible to institutionalizing competency traps that ultimately compromise responsive virtuosity, heightening (rather than lowering) frictions between available attentive and responsive resources and actual needs.

These frictions are disastrous in their impacts on affected populations – those whom education fails to equip with the sensitivities and sensibilities needed to contribute resolutely to alleviating and perhaps

even eliminating their relative disadvantage and poverty. Yet, to the degree that education is reformed subject to market pressures and protocols, the ensuing problems will quite profitably extend and deepen the markets for still further education. Education – or more properly, competence-biased schooling – will cross the threshold of its utility to begin generating problems of the sort that only more education or schooling is apparently capable of solving. To paraphrase Ivan Illich (1971; 1973), to the extent that education is reframed according to market dynamics, education will fare ever less well in alleviating poverty because it will instead be institutionalizing ever growing classes of the relationally disadvantaged or poor – a population in need of ever further education. *Life-long learning* must be very clearly differentiated from already powerful market imperatives for normalizing a regime of *life-long schooling* that amounts to the life-long dependence of educational consumers on goods and services delivered by educational markets with maximal control and convenience to compel profit-generating exercises of individual consumer agency and choice.

To urge privatization and market-like competition among schools as a solution to our education woes is (whether knowingly or unknowingly) to advocate the duplication in education of disparities already painfully manifest in the quality of goods and services available to the wealthy few and to the global majority. Indeed, the more effectively we ‘solve’ our educational ‘problems’ from *within* the existing pattern of education/market co-dependency, the greater will be the educational predicaments with which we find ourselves being faced. Education that fails to prepare individuals and communities to improvise mutually enriching relationships, going beyond mere tolerance to articulate robustly shared sets of values and concretely enhance both diversity and equity, will disadvantage them relationally. Simply stated, education will, in the end, prove to be impoverishing.

From Competence to Virtuosity: Towards a Pluralistic Educational Ethos

What, then, is the alternative? What, if any, are the common features of educational paradigms that are responsive to the complex realities of contemporary global interdependence and consonant with the alleviation of poverty and the global redress of inequity?

At the very least, any such paradigm should foster education that

both demonstrates and enables innovating innovatively. It is not enough that existing educational systems be subjected to reforms aimed at generating specific, already identified educational outcomes. Instead, educational revision must be seen as an ongoing activity. A major implication of this is that while educational change must undoubtedly be coordinated at various scales to maximize equity of access and quality, it must also be understood as rooted ultimately in local responses to local conditions. Whereas the marketization of education suggests the need for greater efficiency in delivering continuously changing *curricular commodities*, responding educationally to complex global realities in ways that might truly alleviate poverty requires a revitalization of commitments-to and capacities-for *educational craft*. That is, educational innovation must not only be directed to engendering virtuosity in learning, it must be sustained by engendering continuously enhanced virtuosity in teaching.

Importantly, in order to foster greater equity, in education, but also throughout the public sphere, education should also be resolutely diversity enriching. That is, education should be generative of the sensibilities and sensitivities needed to appreciate – and not merely tolerate – difference. In practice, this means that educators at all scales of activity must be poised to contribute distinctively – and to enable contributing – to realizing intimately and yet concretely shared welfare under unpredictably changing circumstances.

Finally, education needs to embody patterns of values-intentions-actions that will yield learning outcomes and opportunities related to allying wisdom and compassion. Failing to do so is to fail systematically at dissolving the basic conditions underlying the persistent relational impoverishment presently fueling the ever more inequitable distribution of the benefits of rapid change and global interdependence.

More specifically, if education is to engage responsibly and thrive within contemporary realities, a basic shift needs to be made from relying almost exclusively on curriculum approaches structured in accord with the values of control, competition and choice, to developing a pluralistic educational ethos that exemplifies and engenders the valorization of commitment, coordination, and contributory virtuosity. The curricular mode of associating learning with ‘getting it’ or taking cognitive possession must be abandoned in favor of understanding learning as ongoing, situationally improvised, and resolutely enriching *relational maturation*. Such an understanding counters the modernist severance of mind/reason and body/emotion, affirming that learning is always both bodily and so-

cial praxis: learning understood to be an activity of a thinking body as a nexus of qualitatively transforming social and natural relationships.

At the same time, revising education to open 'spaces of hope' within 21st century realities is itself a project of relational transformation that can only be initiated and sustained by aptly appreciating present situational resources – a project that must, in other words, be undertaken resolutely on the basis of present patterns of interdependence, *as* they have come to be.¹¹ As global as are the conditions making new educational paradigms necessary, these paradigms cannot be universal in origin or intent; they can only be *homegrown*.

This said, it must be stressed that, as contemporary patterns of globalization render porous every 'border' imaginable – geographic, social, economic and political, but also personal and cultural – the relational patterns constitutive of both learning and community become correspondingly 'borderless.' The relational meaning of 'home' becomes less exclusive and more explicitly ecological – a dense nexus of intimacies shading off without natural limit. Truly being 'at home' is, almost paradoxically, coming to mean being ever more broadly and deeply concerned. Demonstrated compassion is a key measure of successful educational innovation.

Three important implications ensue. First, educational innovation is a task that cannot effectively be undertaken as exclusively 'mine' or 'yours,' but only as 'ours.' Secondly, there can be no illusions about educational innovation being a task to be summarily comprehended and completed – something to 'get done' *once* and hopefully *for all*. Successful educational change involves establishing *shared vectors* for reorienting *how* we are interdependent – an ongoing and ever ramifying practice. Finally, caution must be taken to not identify improved education with heightened capacities for individual agency or choice. While it is undoubtedly much better to have options for exercising freedoms of choice than to lack them altogether, choice alone is not enough to guarantee lives worth living. The *power* to choose to do or get what one wants is not the same as the *strength* needed to be truly unblocked-by-any-circumstance – a strength arising only out of mounting improvisational mastery and relational maturation.

The educational contrast of competence and virtuosity can usefully be understood as parallel to this distinction between *freedom as power* and *freedom as strength*. Virtuosity does not consist of an ability to determine desired outcomes, but rather a capacity for responding skillfully to situational opportunity in ways that keep possibilities open for further con-

tribution. In this sense, virtuosity is the meaning or expressed function of relational commitments to cultivating wisdom, attentive mastery and moral clarity. Virtuosity means embodying resolutely appreciative patterns of situational engagement – a qualitatively transformative orientation toward truly strengthening and mutually liberating interdependence.

Concluding Remarks

In drawing out the implications of complex interdependence for the role of education in addressing poverty, we are finally compelled to see that while the education of individual humans is crucial, each human being, in whatever his or her local circumstances, focuses a horizonless pattern of dynamic and meaningful interdependence. It is to the enrichment and maturation of the totality of relationships through which humanity is expressed that educational change ultimately must be addressed.

The realities of accelerating, non-linear change and complex interdependence can be seen as threatening or as opportune. They clearly threaten the positive outcomes of continuing to value self-interested action, control and competition, disclosing their manifest liabilities when taken to global scale. Yet they also very clearly pose the question of how most skillfully and appreciatively to differ. We are now witnessing the birth of a world that commends – even commands – expanding concerns about qualities of relationship, continually generating opportunities for enhancing diversity in the achievement of more equitable and sustainable interdependence. Very real ‘spaces of hope’ are opening in our midst.

There is, however, nothing certain about our capabilities-for or our commitments-to working out from our globally shared present with sufficient shared wisdom, attentive mastery and moral clarity to realize the kind of interdependence in which relating freely is truly possible *for each of us* and *for all*. To paraphrase the 8th century Chinese Buddhist master Mazu, activating this possibility will require realizing together a virtuosic harmony of bodies and heart-minds that reaches out through the myriad limbs of the body politic to benefit what cannot be benefited and do what cannot be done. As merely a means to this end, education cannot but fail. Education can, however, demonstrate the meaning of such transformative and fully embodied virtuosity: alleviating relational poverty in pursuit of ever-greater equity and diversity.

References

- Ames, R.T. & Hall, D.L. (2001): *Focusing the Familiar: A Translation and Philosophical Interpretation of the Zhongyong*, Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Beniger, J. (1986): *The Control Revolution, Technological and Economic Origins of the Information Age*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Doll, W.E. & Gough, N. (2002): *Curriculum Visions*, New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Egan, K. (1997): *The Educated Mind*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992): *The End of History and the Last Man*, New York: The Free Press.
- Harvey, D. (1989): *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Harvey, D. (2000): *Spaces of Hope*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hershock, Peter D. (1999): *Reinventing the Wheel: A Buddhist Response to the Information Age*, Albany: SUNY Press.
- Hershock, Peter D. (2004): 'Poverty Alleviation: A Buddhist Perspective,' *Journal of Bhutan Studies*, Vol.11, Winter 2004, pp.33-67. (available online at: <http://www.bhutanstudies.org.bt/journal/vol11/v11-3.pdf>).
- Hershock, Peter D. (2006): *Buddhism in the Public Sphere: Reorienting Global Interdependence*, London: Routledge/Curzon.
- Hoppers, C.A.O. (2005): *Culture, Indigenous Knowledge and Development: The Role of the University*, Johannesburg, South Africa: Center for Educational Policy Development (CEPD).
- Illich, Ivan (1971): *Deschooling Society*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Illich, Ivan (1973): *Tools for Conviviality*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Macy, J. (1991): *Mutual Causality in Buddhism and General Systems Theory*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mohanty, C.T. (2003): *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Noddings, N. (2003): *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sen, A. (2000): *Development as Freedom*, New York: Anchor Books.
- Toulmin, S. (1990): *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Endnotes

- ¹ This approach to thinking about poverty has, in my case, been heavily informed by traditional Buddhist analyses of poverty and its causes. For a fuller exposition of such a relational conception of poverty, see Hershock, 2004.
- ² Kieran Egan sees these three strands of educational theory and practice as being both in competition in modern schools and fundamentally incompatible—a recipe for educational disaster. His analysis and suggested response—quite

different from that which will be offered here – can be found in Egan, 1997.

- ³ Importantly, this technological revolution proved to be crucial in the sequential flowering of the global colonization of land and labor; the consolidation of extended and dense commodity markets; the postindustrial marketization of information and knowledge; and a presently ongoing colonization of consciousness through the commodification of meaning and the systematic export and circulation of attention as the most basic form of economically relevant energy. This, as we shall see, plays crucially into the shortfalls of education as we enter the 21st century. For more on this general historical sequence, see Hershock, 1999.
- ⁴ Peter Ramus (1576): *Professio regia*. Basle, Switzerland: Thomas Fregius Publisher.
- ⁵ Early challenges came from, for example, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Johan Heinrich Pestalozzi, and Friedrich Froebel in the late 18th and early 19th century, followed, e.g., by John Dewey and Maria Montessori in the early 20th century and, in the 1960s, by such theorists/critics as Paul Goodman, John Holt, Jonathan Kozol, Herbert Kohl, George Dennison, James Herndon and Ivan Illich.
- ⁶ It is perhaps useful to stress that there are many complicated systems or situations that are not complex. A complicated system resists predictive analysis because of the sheer number of variables that would need to be taken into account. In principle, however, given time and sufficient resources, a merely complicated system's behavior could be accurately anticipated – at least within reasonable statistical parameters. By contrast, complex systems are liable to exhibiting behavior that is in principle impossible to anticipate.
- ⁷ Indeed, it is part of the complexity of contemporary patterns of change that our efforts at anticipating the direction of change are increasingly factored into the dynamics of situational transformation. For example, predictions of stock market behavior factor into – and thus alter – the processes driving the behavior of the market. Stated over simply, perhaps, we can no longer expect to happen anything that we have expected happening.
- ⁸ To give a historically recent example: the sudden collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War was not predicted by even the most astutely equipped experts. Yet, the collapse made perfect sense, after the fact, of relational dynamics that had been playing out over decades in political, economic and social arenas.
- ⁹ More precisely, predicaments are not open to solution, except at the cost of silencing one or another of the diverse stakeholders in the situation – that is, through precluding the possibility of dissent with respect to meaning. This is by no means uncommon. Unilateralism is, in spite of the evidence of global interdependence, at least still alive if not entirely well. But silencing opposition, in the larger scheme of things is to limit situational resources. It is, in Buddhist terms, to deny the emptiness of the situation or its capacity for supporting infinitely complex, mutual contributions to shared meaning. Unilateralism is, then, a strategy for solving problems that will be liable to

severe ironic consequences.

¹⁰ A more thorough consideration of the impact of mass-media on relational quality can be found in Hershock 2006, Chapter Four.

¹¹ This is a point made powerfully and persuasively by David Harvey (2000).

II
Outcomes and Opportunities
for Change:
Education in a Renewing Asia

The Intractable Dominant Educational Paradigm

John N. HAWKINS

On a recent research project in Ethiopia I was often reminded by proud Ethiopian educators that they were one of the only African nations never (other than a brief occupation by the Italians) to have been colonized by the West, and that they therefore did not suffer from many of the post-colonial educational legacies found in other African and Third World nations. Yet, visits to pre-collegiate schools and universities in Ethiopia revealed little that one could call specifically 'Ethiopian.' In fact, they appeared remarkably like schools one would visit almost anywhere else in the world, only poorer. Of the few traditional features that were notable, most were being dismantled in favor of more contemporary and readily familiar arrangements. The globally dominant "grammar of schooling" (Tyack & Cuban, 1995) was everywhere in evidence and, more to the point, there were clear commitments actively to emulate schools in the West, especially those of the United States (although one prominent educator expressed interest in learning more from China's educational experiences). When pressed as to the rationale for this emulation of models from the West (or global North), the answer almost invariably was, "so we can develop like them." Education in Ethiopia – in spite of the country's rich and distinctive cultures and history – is an actively pursued variant of what I will refer to here as the globally dominant educational paradigm.

In an age when skepticism about meta-narratives of every stripe has become the norm, references to a "globally dominant educational paradigm" will undoubtedly be held at critical arm's length. And, in fact, ac-

tual observations of educational systems and environments around the world arguably reveal the existence of multiple and often interleaving educational paradigms – highly variable patterns of educational practice that are tied in many and intimate ways to specific local-national-regional (LNR) conditions. These conditions do not, of course, arise autonomously. They reflect, to a greater or lesser extent, global forces, global historical dynamics and globally emerging patterns of interdependence among societies. To the degree that this is so, the uniqueness of educational systems world-wide can be affirmed, but only in a qualified sense.

Our view in this book is that there is value – and potential critical leverage – in stepping back far enough to discern significant, global trends and patterns in the history of formal education. Apart from the considerable theoretical interest in doing so, a major incentive for taking up such a meta-perspective is the potential insights that may be afforded into how most effectively to enhance LNR educational access and quality and to translate educational successes from around the world into locally viable and vibrant institutional and pedagogical idioms. If LNR educational institutions and practices reflect the shifting global dynamics of complex interdependence and emergence – a point made in several of this volume’s chapters – then changing education even at the most local level can be effective only if pursued on the basis of a clear understanding of the interwoven developmental trajectories of local, national, regional and global historical, social, political, economic, cultural, technological and educational processes. What is here referred to as “the global dominant educational paradigm” is a surprisingly consistent pattern of interrelationships among these often quite distinct development trajectories.

It is the intent of this chapter to trace the broad historical outlines of this paradigm – one centered on development-enabling, curriculum-based formal education – and to shed some useful light on why it remains as widely and deeply entrenched as it does. We do so in full awareness that a *paradigm* of education is not an empirical entity, but rather a *way of structuring educational relationships*. There are no schools or educational systems to which one can point as instantiations of the dominant paradigm. Tyack and Cuban’s invocation of grammar as a metaphor is apt in that it steers us away from Quixotic searches for educational chimera and focuses attention instead on discerning structural commonalities that indicate a history of convergences explaining why education has come to mean such similar things to so many very different people in so many quite distinct settings.

The Emergence of a Global Paradigm for Education

It is not easy or even possible to identify when formal educational systems first developed, but schools of varying types and sizes have existed since early antiquity in China, India, Greece, Rome, Egypt, and, no doubt, elsewhere. The Confucian Academy was well established by the 4th century BCE and remained a major cultural institution through the 19th century. The Buddhist University at Nalanda – one of many in pre-modern India and Central Asia – had, in the 7th century, a student body of more than 10,000 and a faculty of over 2,000 teaching a range of both sacred and secular subjects.

Importantly, however, while the rise of formal schools to serve the state seems to have been well established early in history (Fagerlind 1989, p.35), it was not until quite recently that the link between formal schooling and economic and social development became well established or accepted. A key turning point was Adam Smith's seminal 18th century work, *The Wealth of Nations*, in which he lays out an argument for the public provision of education as a means to enhancing citizenship capacities and cultivating the kinds of moral sentiment and virtues needed to sustain accelerating wealth generation. Yet, the idea that there might be an economic rationale for providing education as a public good did not reach full maturity until the mid-20th century when, as Fagerlind (1989, p.40) notes:

This conviction [that education contributes to economic growth] was to become more widespread throughout the West such that by the end of World War II, education was seen as the *most important*, and indeed an essential engine for both the "take-off" into industrialization by the less developed countries, as well as for the transition of the already developed countries to post-industrial stages.

It is at this point that we will begin our story, looking in turn at particularly influential concepts of social development; at how education came to be seen as a panacea for all manner of social problems; at how the now dominant paradigm spread throughout the developing and developed world; and where we find ourselves today, given the altered complexion of global developmental dynamics as the modern world faces the post-modern.

Concepts of Development

If pre-modern temporality was predominantly cyclic, modern temporality has been expressly vectoral – evidence of a biasing away from Platonic

associations of the real with the timeless toward a more Aristotelian emphasis on progressive development. Undoubtedly, the rapidly broadened ambit of human control over environmental factors, made possible by scientific and technological advances, contributed greatly to this revision of the meaning of time. Darwin's theory of competitive and adaptive change in nature dovetailed well with the free market notions championed by Smith and Ricardo. And processes of nation-building provided a template for political progression based on a reconfiguration of power dynamics that came to be seen by most as irreversible. Yet by the middle of the 19th century it was clear that visions of progress by some were not the same as progress in reality for all.

Notions of social progress, forward movement, and social change began to characterize the global intellectual temper from the mid-19th century and were in full bloom by the early 20th century. Modern values of universality and equality, hitherto restricted primarily to service in political discourse, began to be interpreted in social and economic terms, and many of the progressive ideas and ideals that circulated ever more widely during this period were conceived as direct responses to the consequences of unbridled industrialization and trade globalization – as means to understanding and reshaping their dynamics. Thinkers like Hegel and Marx each sought to reveal, from a global perspective and with aspirations to comprehensiveness, how and why societies change and develop.

Of these grand theories, perhaps the most influential in terms of providing an underlying theoretical rationale for what we are calling the dominant educational paradigm is that of Darwinian evolution. Although it was not among Darwin's explicit intentions, his theory of speciation came to inform a wide array of socio-cultural change theories that were applied in the emerging nations of Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East from the late 19th century onward. Darwin's conceptual emphasis on the importance of environmental factors, adaptation, and niche dominance ("survival of the fittest") contributed substantially to social scientists' notions of unilineal development and underscored the fusion of learning and competition that was epitomized in the term "curriculum" – Latin for a "racecourse," first used in an educational context at the birth of the modern era in 16th century Europe.

Influenced by Darwin's concept of evolution, widespread consensus emerged that socio-cultural development is not only a unilineal process, but, once initiated, also inevitable. As summarized by the sociologist, M.J.

Levy (1967, p.190):

We are confronted – whether for good or for bad – with a *universal* [emphasis added] social solvent. The patterns of the relatively modernized societies, once developed, have shown universal tendencies to penetrate any social context whose participants have come in contact with them The patterns *always* penetrate; and once the penetration has begun, they *always* change in the direction of some of the patterns of the relatively modernized societies.

This line of thinking – now caricatured as a version of impact theories of cultural change – has been considerably qualified over the past half century in favor of theories of social change that accept the reality of causal interactivity. In this new guise, notions of socio-cultural progress have continued to shape the development of educational institutions, primarily through approaches such as functionalism, systems theory, and ecological theories of co-evolution. This has remained true, even after the advent of explicitly multi-lineal theories of socio-cultural evolution from the mid-20th century onward.

As Tyack and Cuban (1995) argue in analyzing the history of American public education, American educators and policy makers around the turn of the 20th century already had well ingrained in their thinking the notion that progress in education was axiomatic for social progress in general. Later, more interactive models of progress and social change would lead to a readiness to see revised understandings of the meaning of progress as bringing about the need for revising the meaning and means of education, but probably at no point has the co-implication of education and progress been seriously and systematically challenged. Granted that the dominant notion of progress in the modern West incorporated firm commitments to the intrinsic value of economic growth, education from this point forward was married in principle, if not practice, to the ideal of furthering economic development en route to broader socio-cultural evolution.

It is conceivably a matter of simple historical accident that unilineal approaches to understanding social change and progress came to be wedded to educational theory. Unilineal theories of socio-cultural evolution were coming into being over the same decades that West European and American national public education programs were being activated. But the marriage has proved quite resilient and it is therefore worth considering at least briefly a set of socio-cultural development theories that

have been particularly influential in educational policy and practice: equilibrium theory, conflict theory and development/modernization theory.

Of these, equilibrium theory – a perspective that strongly influenced the development of functionalism, systems theory, and both cultural lag theory and human ecology theory – has been particularly important in the entrenchment of the dominant educational paradigm. Equilibrium theory centers on the concept of homeostasis, or the maintenance of optimal or near-optimal functioning through regulative variations. As summarized by Homans (1950, pp.303-304), the key insight of equilibrium theory is that in any stable system, changes impacting individual elements within the system affect the relationships obtaining among all of its elements, triggering changes in other elements of the type and intensity that will allow the overall effects of the original impact to be minimized. In other words, such stably organized systems will “naturally” return to equilibrium.

Equilibrium theory influenced an important generation of social scientists (Davis 1949; Ogburn 1922; Parsons 1951, 1966) who sought to explain how societies and cultures manage the contrary needs for both change and continuity. Yet as Applebaum (1970, pp.67-72) has observed, equilibrium theory and perspectives drawing upon it exhibit “a conservative bias against endogenous structural change Nothing new and unique, no important transformations, ever happen in the normal world of equilibrium theory.” Whatever its other merits in *explaining* the capacity of systems – educational systems included – to endure sudden environmental shocks and to adapt to more gradual shifts in environmental conditions, equilibrium theory came to be associated with a conservative *normative* bias as well. Although a strict interpretation of the theory need not imply anything about *strategies* for change, a common tendency has been for equilibrium theory and its offshoots to be deployed in support of conceiving the process of negotiating systemic challenges as one of internal adjustment rather than systemic innovation.

It is perhaps this tendency to view change as a function of incremental adjustments that leave the overall system substantially intact that, at a certain level, explains the dispirited testimony of many scholars and practitioners of educational reform. All too often, no sooner is a reform (an external “shock”) introduced into an educational system than the latter “spontaneously” adjusts so as to modulate or absorb the reform, effectively disarming its potentially disruptive contribution to the practice and/or administration of education. It is by no means coincidental that equilibrium theory resonates rather strongly with conservative, neo-liberal

interpretations of Smith's theory of markets as self-organizing and self-regulating systems, guided by a beneficent "invisible hand," and that mass education, delivered as a public good, has through the 20th century been championed as a key factor for and result of economic development. If educational systems are assumed to be self-organizing and self-regulating systems existing within national (and later global) economic systems, educational change will be managed in a homeostatic fashion. Educational policy makers and scholars can be relieved of responsibilities for thinking outside of the box in any significant way. Change will simply happen, when, and as, it should. So keen is the bias toward a homeostatic understanding of education systems within the dominant paradigm that even in national systems that are highly regulated – as many in East Asia traditionally have been – the assumption has remained powerful that educational change will be slow and incremental if it occurs at all.

The change theories just discussed commonly tend toward stability as a central goal, constructing progress and social development as smoothly articulated processes. Conflict theory, on the other hand, coming out of a Marxist tradition that is resolutely critical of global capital and market-based economies, insists on a quite opposite construction of the dynamics of change. According to it, systems are inherently unstable; desires for social stability and denials of the need for change in actuality produce the conditions for rapid and dramatic change, as elements of the social system struggle to transform themselves.

While much of early Marxist theory has been rejected, not least because of its totalizing tendencies, elements of conflict theory have nevertheless remained influential. Scholars such as Dahrendorf (1959), Aron (1966), Brinton (1952), Kerr (1954), Coser (1956) and others, while operating outside the mainstream of sociology, revived the notion of conflict as a driving force for social change. Shifting focus from the stage of world history to the play of competing ends and values within interest groups, this generation of conflict theorists was most concerned with illustrating how reiterated patterns in the evolution of group dynamics can be seen as implying the presence of inherent tensions within all evolving systems. Like individuals, groups and classes struggle to organize social structures to advance their own self-interest, setting the stage for sudden and potentially revolutionary changes.

From the standpoint of conflict theory, educational institutions and practices can, along with other elements within a given social system, be seen as having a destabilizing role, spurring systemic social change

through challenging traditional constructions of knowledge and socio-economic, political and cultural realities. The images of the university as a research or knowledge-generating institution and as a breeding ground for countercultural perspectives are neatly overlaid within a conflict theoretical view of the progressive character of education vis-à-vis society at large.

Such a reading was quite plausible as radical, change-oriented student riots swept much of the globe in the 1960s. From the perspective of conflict theory, student activism was a legitimate expression of a key social function of education. In the decades since, however, consciousness of stable group/class identities has waned considerably, perhaps as a function of the deepening penetration of market forces into the social sphere and a consequent commodification of identity-formation and the celebration of contingent patterns of affiliation. At any rate, the revolutionary potential of education seems to have been disarmed, as educational systems world-wide seem to have successfully modulated the conflict-generating, countercultural potentials of education. In a kind of "homeostatic" adjustment, conformity has largely been displaced as a normative value (one that was common within the industrial model of education that was particularly popular in the early 20th century), replaced by explicit affirmations of positive difference – or as is more commonly stated now, "diversity" – as a key strategic aim and structural value within educational processes. Conflict has, in a sense, been normalized, stripped of its transformative force, and incorporated within the dominant paradigm's commitments to fostering and exhibiting stable patterns of essentially linear (especially economic) development and progress.

Although the early to mid-20th century did witness the advent of various grand theories of social change, speculative accounts of the rise and fall of civilizations, and universal taxonomies of the processes of growth and decay – one might mention the works of Spengler (1969), Sorokin (1947) and, to some degree, Weber (1964) as examples of this trend – none had as powerful an impact on, or is as illuminating in respect of dominant attitudes toward educational change as equilibrium theory. But in the aftermath of World War II a new wave of more specifically economic developmental theories emerged, seeking to explain how and why nations develop and grow. Rostow's (1960) stages of growth theory is perhaps one of the most well known. Drawing upon a broadly teleological concept of development shared by some Marxist theories, Rostow saw all societies progressing through five stages: traditional society, pre-

conditions for take-off, take off, drive to maturity, and finally, the age of high mass consumption. Each stage is held to have its own proper educational character, which is conceived as working in close coordination with the unseen forces that propel the society to the next stage.

Development theories like that of Rostow postulated a strong, and strongly deterministic, link between society and education, and suggested that it is misguided to think of educational systems as triggering, rather than consolidating, social change. As society changes and grows, so education changes and grows. From the outset there were pointed criticisms of this theoretical stance, particularly among economists who saw the limitations associated with taking a 'stages of growth' approach as a basis for policy-making and who noted its intrinsic hostility toward proactive innovation and change (Sen 1959). Surprisingly, however, one can still find advocates of this way of understanding and managing social change and growth among policy-makers today, among the most obvious those who insist upon the need to pass through democracy as a condition for initiating and sustaining accelerating development.

At roughly the same time that development theory was first being articulated, the allied approach of modernization theory began to emerge. A central tenet of modernization theory was that mass media play a central role in modern development processes, and that media penetration into society is itself progressively staged. The theory also held that modernization is a universal phenomenon in which developing societies become acculturated to values and institutions that first developed in the Euro-American West, but that have subsequently achieved global normative status. A largely optimistic view of development (and, many would say, a rather ethnocentric one), modernization theory affirmed the universal value of progressive achievement (McClelland 1961) and measurement (Inkeles & Smith 1974) – the legacies of which are very much a part of the now globally dominant educational paradigm.

Like mass media, mass education was viewed as having huge capacity for inculcating modern values and reproducing modern social institutions. The basic proposition was that there was a causal link between five sets of variables: modernizing institutions (i.e. schools), modern values (promoted by schools), modern behaviors (exhibited by school graduates), modern society, and economic development. Stronger educational institutions implied increased capacities for strengthening linkages among all five variables and an acceleration of the modernization process. Formal schools offered, of course, the most reliable medium for adminis-

tering modern education – institutions well suited to the delivery of planned curricula, a strict definition of disciplines, the implementation of progressive units of study, graded classrooms, and standardized testing and evaluation.

As Peter Hershock notes in Chapter Four of this volume, the use of the term *curriculum* in an educational context introduced a departure from the *studio* or master-apprentice model of teaching/learning and introduced an understanding of education as a deliverable – a notion implicitly invoked by Adam Smith’s affirmation of the need to provide mass education as a public good. The understanding of education as a quantifiable product of sequentially delivered, standardized content resonated particularly well with modernization theory, affirming the modern values of universality, control, order, precision and certainty. Educational *media* – like other mass media – have the function of fostering the disciplined consumption of socially and economically advantageous content.

The centrality of curricula in the dominant educational paradigm has been an important factor inhibiting the development of viable educational alternatives. As the basic skeleton or infrastructure of the dominant paradigm, curriculum articulates in advance quite specific ranges of motion beyond which the system simply breaks down. Without going into the origins of prevailing systems of the structure of knowledge (an enterprise that took Randall Collins [1998] over 1000 pages to come to terms with), suffice it to say that course identification, organization, presentation, content, and prioritization came to be identified with and supported the goals and objectives of the dominant paradigm to an extent that rendered it almost impervious to change. Concerns about what knowledge is worthwhile, about the appropriateness of teaching patterns, and about assessment have been vigorously disputed over the years, from Dewey to Apple, yet fundamental patterns of curriculum at both pre-collegiate and collegiate levels have remained readily recognized world-wide, with little controversy or contest, for more than half a century. Given the depth of changes – often quite fundamental – that have occurred, for example, in the realms of engineering, technology and business, the resilience of the dominant, curriculum-supported paradigm is quite remarkable.

These theoretical perspectives and the sub-theories they have propagated have contributed to the emergence and shoring up of what we are calling the dominant educational paradigm. Evolutionary, equilibrium, structural-functionalist, modernization, human capital, Marxist, dependency, liberation and other such theories all viewed education as a

central force for socio-cultural development and saw *formal* schooling as one of the agents, if not the principal agent, of desirable social change. They went hand in hand with a series of policy initiatives that were being discussed world-wide and with a more fully developed formula of the relationship between education and national development.

Education as Panacea

By the end of World War II and through the 1950s and 1960s the belief that education was the most important factor in development was well entrenched among academics, scholars, policy-makers and practitioners, as well as in agencies such as UNESCO and the OECD. It was not, it should be emphasized, simply held that education was one of many crucial factors; education was seen as *the most* crucial factor for development. The theoretical and practical belief in this causal link was so high and the evidence so weak that Don Adams (1977, p.300) referred to it as "one of the most romantic tales of the century." Yet it persisted and became central to the thinking of many in the field of education and national development, and a major component of the dominant paradigm. As an archetypal expression of this perspective, a main thrust of the United Nations' 1948 Declaration of the Basic Rights of Man echoed the widespread conviction that in order for many to realize their basic rights in the midst of great inequalities in economic development, the gulf between rich and poor nations of the world would have to be bridged, and that education would necessarily serve as the sector of society that would accomplish this. These convictions were summed up by U.S. President Truman, who declared:

[W]e must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. More than half the people of the world are living in conditions that approach misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas. For the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these people. (Mountjoy 1971, p.9)

Apart from some terms that are no longer in common use, this statement could have been made yesterday. The key point of Truman's appeal was that knowledge and skills were the missing ingredients in redressing

global inequity and poverty. While he did not specify formal schools as the principal mechanism to disseminate this knowledge and transfer these skills, others in the development field did. With the backing of major organizations like the United Nations and of political leaders like Truman, it is not surprising that the 1950s and 1960s came to be dubbed the development decades – decades over which the ‘enlightened’ and rich developed nations would come together to solve the problems of the less developed world, largely through the importation and adaptation of Western economic and social models, not least that of formal schooling. The rebuilding of both Japan and Germany after World War II was evidence to many that investment in education and manpower would allow other devastated nations, this time in the less developed world, to achieve remarkable growth.

Gradually, the architecture of the dominant paradigm became clearer. Essentially a Western model, it stressed the relationship between investment in education and the economic development that would take place as a result. It was, however, as several critics noted, overly optimistic. By the late 1960s it was already recognized that problems existed with this approach. The expansion of formal schooling resulted in many cases in a shortage of qualified teachers. Wastage of resources was widely evident. Schools were often unable to retain students. The inappropriateness of the curriculum became apparent, and an increasing imbalance between rural and urban development emerged. Women’s and girls’ education lagged behind, as did that of minorities within systems with a dominant culture. Higher education was training not for development but for the bureaucracy and the professions (Adams & Bjork 1969).

An interesting aspect of the development decades was the degree to which development came to be defined as primarily economic development, which ultimately meant the providing of capital and training for human resource development. As Tuqan (1975, p.23) notes:

It seems to follow ... that if schools and other higher institutions of learning are ... assigned the task of filling the manpower gap, the development of society will in turn follow from formal schooling. Educational aid ... thus came to occupy a significant place in the development effort.

This in turn created rising expectations, in which education played a central role. Myrdal (1957) spoke of the “Great Awakening,” in which most nations of the world would move toward freedom and national

growth, with education paving the way.

The populations of most Asian developing nations came to see the role of developer as simple – to transfer substantial resources to the developing nation, which would encourage them to exploit their own resources to the maximum. Development was seen as a straightforward and powerful process: as one scholar noted, “the accompanying intense propaganda regarding the potency of development aid ... induced the belief that this aid would lead straight to prosperity for all” (Tuqan 1975, p.24). A series of bilateral and multilateral agreements were entered into by many nations, one result of which was to make people more development minded. As education was touted as being one of the main routes to a better life, it was not surprising that “the consumptive capacity for schooling grew out of all proportion to the concomitant increase in its productive capacity” (Tuqan 1975, p.25). As newly independent states began building for the future, the modern bureaucratic sector became the main source of employment for the newly educated. A powerful vested interest in the furthering of formal schooling had been created.

The main component of the dominant educational paradigm’s formula (investment in education leads to economic growth) had much to recommend it. The human capital theorists were on some solid ground in this respect. But even in the midst of this optimistic view, studies were demonstrating that the formula – applied at certain scales and within particular scopes – was, in fact, incomplete. Questions were raised about what kind of education was appropriate and at what levels, the quality and nature of instruction, the appropriateness of the curriculum, the nature of the tracking system, the limitations of the formal lock-step system, and about other issues (Fagerlind 1989). Yet, while increasing numbers of studies pointed out the simplistic nature, and, in many cases, inaccuracies of the formula, educational policy makers and aid and technical assistance agencies continued to promote the idea uncritically; ministries of education and government bureaus continued to accept it rather blithely and poured funds into the formal education system, apparently without seriously considering educational alternatives.

Another component of the dominant paradigm was the idea that ‘more years of formal schooling equals greater learning’, which in turn yields greater income. Again, data can be marshaled to support this thesis, but there are also data to show that formal schools are only a part of this equation. Studies conducted from the 1960s through the 1980s demonstrated convincingly that a great deal of learning and cognitive develop-

ment takes place outside of formal schooling and that, in some cases, more appropriate and significant learning takes place in this context (Resnick 1987). Yet the informal sector generally took a back seat to the formal system, if it was countenanced at all. Formal schools, and more of them, were the order of the day for most developing nations. By the mid-1980s educational expansion at all levels characterized education and development.

Finally, along with this entrenched belief in and deepening expansion of the formal school system came what Ronald Dore called the “educational displacement phenomenon” (Dore 1976, p.43). The “diploma disease” became linked to the job market and the increasing demand for education and credentials. As the number of those receiving various levels of educational credentials rose, requirements for jobs expanded accordingly and credentials or degrees became screening devices, contributing to the over-qualification of many for the available jobs. As the formal system expanded, the cost of education rose, and the demand for credentials grew. A parallel expansion occurred in the educational bureaucracy to plan, manage and support this system, which contributed in turn to an increase in the number of those with a vested interest in maintaining or growing the dominant educational paradigm. An industry had been built and options for imagining any alternative to the formal system declined. It was not until 1999 that a Nobel Prize-winning economist would question this developmental model and suggest some major alterations to it (Sen 1999).

To sum up, by the mid-1980s several features of this dominant paradigm had become so entrenched that alternatives were difficult to imagine. Observations of formal schooling noted that:

- An authoritarian relationship often lies at the core of the teacher-learner interaction;
- Teachers are generally insecure because of a lack of training and poor remuneration;
- Teaching methods do not generally benefit from knowledge of cognitive psychology and child development;
- Teachers generally discourage discussion and questioning, and adhere to textbooks;
- A principal function of schooling is to select entrants to the next educational level;
- This selection is through a highly competitive examination sys-

tem which requires the reproduction of rote learning rather than critical thought; tracking thus becomes a permanent feature;

- The main activities of the formal school system are directed toward preparing pupils for these examinations; and,
- Students and parents are preoccupied with certificate-status rather than with the essence of what is taught (Tuqan 1975; Oakes 1985)

Each of these features of the formal educational system, taking place at first in just a few countries, would eventually spread almost world-wide.

The Paradigm Spreads

As Cummings (2003) has indicated, educational expansion is a complex matter and no single experience dominates the history of formal school expansion. He notes that in Japan, France, England, Prussia/Germany, the USA, and Russia education expanded differently and for different reasons. In the colonies that these nations occupied, the pace and method of expansion varied, but the basic model of curriculum-structured formal education was reproduced and spread aggressively. The key point here, however, is that the differential patterns of development and of the development-education linkage did not challenge underlying beliefs in the utility of the formal school and in the transparent 'naturalness' of the dominant paradigm as a whole. As indicated above, human capital theory was perhaps the theory most responsible for this enchantment with formal education and development (Schultz 1961; Denison 1962; Becker 1964). As we have seen, there was general agreement among this group of economists that for economic development to take place two factors were essential: technological development, and the development and expansion of formal schools. These beliefs lasted largely unchallenged until the mid-1980s.

It is instructive to examine once again the context in which this paradigm expanded. By the late 1950s and early 1960s, the following notions were largely accepted as truisms in the developed nations: economic development being linked to manpower development; formal schooling contributing to that growth and promoting national unity; external aid as essential; and a growing demand for schooling requiring educational expansion. This was the model that was consciously promoted to the less developed nations. To this end, four international and regional conferences were held in the 1960s, each of which promoted variations on this

model to ministers of education and other educational policy makers in the region.

The Conference of African States and the Development of Education was held in Addis Ababa in 1961. Among the recommendations made to participants from Africa was the goal of establishing universal and compulsory formal education for six years by 1980. Certain minimum educational enrollment ratios and years of schooling were based on UNESCO recommendations (UNESCO-ECA 1961). In Asia, a similar conference was held in Karachi, which gave rise to what became known as the Karachi Plan. In 1962, a follow-up meeting was held in Tokyo which focused on the future needs of secondary and higher education: it was agreed that by 1980 expenditures for education should reach 5% of GNP for participating nations. A conference in Santiago covered a similar agenda for Latin America. A process that had begun in the 1950s had thus been enshrined and validated by several international conferences that set ambitious quantitative targets for enrollments, school levels, achievement, and expenditure as a percentage of GNP – all based on the assumed validity of linking formal education with development and economic growth. Very few questioned this overall approach or suggested comprehensive alternatives.

Establishing a formal school system for economic development was not the only priority for leaders of newly independent nations. They were also concerned about national unity, a major task being the building of nations out of diverse populations. Differing ethnic groups, castes, linguistic groups and subcultures threatened to disrupt the social fabric of many new or newly independent nations. Education was seen as the principal way to mould heterogeneous populations into more homogeneous groups with common *mores* and values. Education for national integration also became a rallying cry in the 1960s. In many nations, education had to shift from its colonial goals of socialization and training administrators to producing technocrats with specialized skills for the expansion of agriculture and industry and other skilled professionals, especially in the medical, educational and planning fields.

The critical role that formal schools were to play in national integration and upward mobility evolved further, as James Coleman noted in 1965 (p.358):

When an essentially static society marked by widespread illiteracy and a predominance of ascriptive criteria moves toward a dynamic

and modernizing society where education is the principal criterion of upward mobility and stratificational position, each successive wave of better educated persons presents a challenge to its predecessor.

Coleman refers to these as “generational discontinuities,” which help to explain the sense of investment that political and other leaders had in the formal schooling system. They themselves were products of this system and many became bureaucrats and educated civil servants who managed and reproduced it. The school was also expected to perform a much more active role in the socialization of the child than was the norm in the West. As Coleman (1965, p.22) further notes:

[In the West] the school had only a modest socialization task to perform In the developing countries today schools are expected to carry a much heavier load of socialization Whatever they accomplish, they will have a proportionately larger marginal effect upon the lives of the residents ... than do most schools in the West.

The effect of formal schooling was, in other words, intensified in developing nations. The route to better jobs, the ability to move from rural to urban areas, gaining admission to the civil service and to politics, and traveling abroad all depended to a large degree on whether or not one was schooled.

In truth, the juggernaut of the dominant paradigm did not go entirely unchallenged. In the 1970s, spurred by ideas such as those offered by Ivan Illich in his *Deschooling Society* (1970), a number of scholars challenged the formal school and all that it stood for. Illich (1970, p.1) made the argument as to why the formal school ought to be disestablished:

The pupil is ... ‘schooled’ to confuse teaching with learning, grade advancement with education, a diploma with competence, and fluency with the ability to say something new. His imagination is schooled to accept service in place of value. Medical treatment is mistaken for health care, social work for the improvement of community life, police protection for safety, military poise for national security, the rat race for productive work Not only education, but social reality has become schooled.

He suggested replacing educational “funnels” with educational “webs” and, foretelling in a manner aspects of the internet, proposed replacing

formal schools with learning webs so that a new educational approach would:

provide all who want to learn with access to available resources at any time in their lives; empower all who want to share what they know to find those who want to learn it from them; and finally furnish all who want to present an issue to the public with the opportunity to make their challenge known (1970, p.75).

The internet, of course, some thirty years after Illich wrote this, makes a way of learning through such an “educational web” feasible for those who are sufficiently privileged to enjoy access to the internet, and indeed many are learning precisely in this way, outside the formal educational structure. Illich’s ideas and those of others in the nonformal and alternative education movement were, however, pushed off stage as the dominant paradigm continued to roll forward.

In Chapter Eight of this volume, Joseph Farrell discusses some of the strengths of educational alternatives. It is indeed the case that during the 1970s and 1980s a number of innovative and in many respects successful efforts were launched in various regions of the globe to provide an alternative to the formal system of schooling. In China, *minban* schools (now back in vogue but in a different form) provided local, community-based practical training for rural development, while Freirean schools in Latin America focused on empowerment and consciousness raising. Across much of the developing world radio education, worker and peasant colleges, women’s cooperatives, and a host of other alternatives were proposed and enacted, but none really succeeded in challenging the formal system to any great extent. By the 1980s they had either been transmuted into educational options fused to the formal system or had been marginalized altogether. Farrell points out that several innovative efforts have been reintroduced and are once again demonstrating that it is possible to offer meaningful, transformative education outside the formal system. The sustainability of these efforts is once again in question, however. Nevertheless, these projects are worth watching as perhaps the initial indications of a new paradigm.

By the late 1970s and through the 1980s and 1990s scholars such as Hans Weiler (1978), Bowles and Gintis (1976), and others challenged the belief that education was a panacea for all of society’s ills. While not denying the links between formal schooling and productivity, they raised questions about the degree to which this dominant model was in fact

promoting the interests of certain social classes, asking whether social inequities were being altered by the formal system or indeed shored up by it. During this period a number of competing theories openly critiqued the dominant paradigm: deficit theory, dependency theory, varieties of conflict theory, and neo-Marxism, among others. As I discussed earlier in this chapter, the efficacy of these critiques is able to be called seriously into question, however. Scholars were finding that educational reformers had underestimated the inflexibility of the formal educational system and its ability to adapt to and absorb the impact of change. In addition, holding the system together – a bureaucratic glue of rules and regulation – became an industry in itself, centered on certification, accreditation and evaluation. And of course, greater global forces also played their role in sustaining the dominant paradigm.

Where We Are Today

This very cursory survey of some relevant educational developments since WWII has obviously left out many important events, decisions, policies and critiques. And one could of course debate many of the propositions and interpretations presented above. Nevertheless, writers and observers from a variety of perspectives and periods have reached similar conclusions regarding the structure and dominance of formal schooling. Illich (1970, p.74), perhaps overdramatically, concluded:

In other words, schools are fundamentally alike in all countries, be they fascist, democratic, or socialist, big, small, rich or poor. This identity of the school system forces us to recognize the profound world-wide identity of myth, mode of production, and method of social control, despite the great variety of mythologies in which the myth finds expression.

More recently, Tyack and Cuban (1995, p.7) stated more prosaically:

Over long periods of time, schools have remained basically similar in their core operation, so much so that these regularities have imprinted themselves on students, educators, and the public as the essential features of a ‘real school.’

Somehow, we know what a ‘real’ school is when we see it. Most of us have attended one or more and most have opinions about education and schooling. And, we resist activities that presume to be educational but do

not resemble real schools: hence the rise and fall of alternative education movements across the world. Most nations now invest heavily in constructing formal systems of mass education with the usual three levels. It is hard to find a nation anywhere (including such isolated countries as North Korea) where this dominant model is not immediately recognizable. And, in the context of globalization and its associated processes of policy convergence, the homogenization of the real school, whether it be a pre-school or a research university, appears to be a world-wide phenomenon.

Stromquist (2002, p.1) notes that while many believe globalization has affected primarily the political-economic context, while leaving space for national and cultural differences, it has in fact had a powerful impact on local values and *mores*, "moving us toward greater homogeneity," not least in the realm of values. The dominant paradigm really is dominant now in most spheres of life, to the extent that "individualism and competition are highly dominant values, with little space left for contestatory and liberatory thought." In the author's own multi-national study of values education (Cummings, Totto & Hawkins 2001) dominant values such as individualism, entrepreneurship, and self-direction were found to be pre-eminent in such disparate political, economic and cultural settings as Taiwan and China, the USA and Russia.

World-wide forces have been shaping educational processes at least since the 18th century, so what is happening in the globalized era is not necessarily new (see Deane Neubauer's Chapter One in this volume). But contemporary scales and forms of globalization processes have brought about conditions that powerfully reinforce tendencies toward further aligning schooling with the dominant paradigm. Carnoy (2002, p.2) suggests:

It is true that education appears to have changed little at the classroom level in most countries: ... teaching methods and national curricula remain largely intact. Even one of the most important educational reforms associated with globalization, the decentralization of educational administration and finance, seems to have little or no effect on educational delivery in classrooms, despite its implementation.

Globalization's associated processes contribute to the spread of the dominant paradigm while at the same time altering it to suit the needs of a globalized economy. Demand for education is even more intense as

nations (still important policy actors, even in the midst of globalization) seek to attract foreign capital by producing the kind of skilled human resources demanded by the new economy.

Correspondingly, in order to provide for comparable educational products, evaluation, testing, and other measures and standards have become more universal and ubiquitous. Accountability is the order of the day. Because of parallel trends in reducing the state share of educational expenditures, information technology is being increasingly utilized to increase the scope of educational provision at lower cost. Taken together, these conditions have led to some interesting paradoxes, where variations of institutional structure and pedagogy occur within, rather than as means for, exiting current educational conventions. As Carnoy points out (2002, p.6), "policies prescribed by the same paradigm but applied in different contexts produce different practices – so different in some cases that it is difficult to imagine that they were the result of the same policy." Variations occurring in fact well within the dominant paradigm offer the illusion of innovative and radical alternatives to it.

This can lead us to ponder several propositions as we contemplate where we are with respect to educational change:

- Educational restructuring and reform is occurring less from democratic, national development policy deliberation, and rather more from external processes and pressures linked to economic globalization, the dismantling of the welfare state, and the increasing commodification of knowledge.
- There has been a shift toward a global standardization of educational curricula and credentials greater than has been evident before.
- Educational policy makers have sought to improve national competitiveness in the global market place by changing their educational systems and the role of the state with respect to the provision, financing, and regulation of education.
- Globalization has introduced a new language to educational policy makers, with terms such as privatization, marketization, corporatization, strategic planning, decentralization, branding, accountability, and assessment.
- Globalization has contributed to a shift in higher education, from being a cultural institution to being a service institution.
- The WTO General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) has

redefined education to the extent that it is now treated almost as a commodity, like soybeans, which can therefore be exported to nation states, and which thus competes with national systems.

This is just one set of drivers for educational change of the many that could be identified at the present moment. But they illustrate the point that globalization has and continues profoundly to affect how we navigate the world of education. Contemporary globalization processes have even more firmly entrenched reliance on the dominant paradigm of formal schooling, making little space for substantive change of the basic system of real schools. Even Cummings (2003), who has persuasively argued the case for differentiation, notes that there is, nevertheless, great pressure toward homogeneity, toward a dominant convergence on a particular kind of schooling. Schugurensky (2003) goes further and argues that in higher education there has been a convergence unprecedented in the history of its institutions, leading under globalization to what he calls the "heteronomous" model in which institutional autonomy is largely replaced by an external locus of control.

What might we expect in the way of alternatives to this well entrenched paradigm? Innovative development economists like Sen (1999) have captured the attention of some reformers by suggesting that we can make a distinction between the dominant human capital approach and that which he calls "human capability as an expression of human freedom." Sen (1999, pp.292-94) acknowledges the power of the dominant paradigm when he states that

through education, learning, and skill formation, people can become much more productive over time, and this contributes greatly to the process of economic expansion [T]his can add to the value of production in the economy and also to the income of the person who has been educated.

But he goes on to say that education can and should do more: that it can help people to have "the freedom to achieve more." It is this focus on development for freedom that offers an alternative to the dominant paradigm that we have been discussing. Or, as Sen notes, it offers a way of going *beyond* human capital to include social change.

This is of course not a new argument; nor, as Sen acknowledges, is it a true alternative. Rather, it shifts the focus from the formula of "more education equals development" to a consideration of education for development as freedom. Not enough has been heard of Sen's optimistic

outlook, however, since his book was published. In fact, he appears rather to contradict his own arguments when he discusses earlier in the book the contrast between India and China, noting that China, with fewer social and political freedoms, has outperformed India. He attributes this to China's earlier investment in basic health and education which have now paid off, even as China turns to the market. India is still struggling with these basic health and educational issues (Sen 1999, p.42).

Scholars such as Stromquist (2002) are not sanguine about the possibility of significant alternatives to the dominant paradigm. The effect of globalization, if anything, has further solidified the dominance of the paradigm we have been exploring. Power differentials have changed and decision-making has shifted from national educators to other actors (corporations, international agencies); these have in turn contributed to frequent attacks on experimentation in the public schools. Schools therefore generally choose to go about their business as usual. Any reshaping of education that is occurring is largely at the behest of business corporations and the market, and less based on what educational research tells us. Most reforms are shallow and aimed at the reduction of public costs for education rather than at better schools or any alternative to the present formal system. Those alternatives that have been touted have reflected an emphasis on things like privatization and voucher programs that benefit the wealthy more than the poor.

Nevertheless, as Joseph Farrell points out in Chapter Eight, innovative non-formal and alternative educational efforts have continued largely through the efforts of NGOs and other local initiatives. Some of these programs offer promising insights for educators world-wide, yet little educational research is being conducted on this sector and the promise it might hold for the future. Educational reforms in the USA and elsewhere have been perennial, yet, as Tyack and Cuban (1995, p.85) argue,

The basic grammar of schooling, like the shape of classrooms, has remained remarkably stable over the decades. Little has changed in the ways that schools divide time and space, classify students and allocate them to classrooms, splinter knowledge into 'subjects' and award grades and 'credits' as evidence of learning.

This template applies to all levels of education, from precollegiate to the most advanced graduate work. Variations exist, to be sure, but as we have seen, it is a well-established model which has resisted change over the decades.

We have, in conclusion, these two issues: the 'why' of education, the theoretical rationale for why we conduct schooling the way we do (which we considered in the first part of this chapter); and the method of education, which has flowed from the 'why.' We can see what has driven this system and the method in which it has been implemented, a method or 'grammar' that has been almost impervious to change and reform in any significant degree; we certainly have not witnessed a paradigm shift to match those found in other social sectors and professions. Despite the increasing complexity of an increasingly globalized world, formal education has trudged forward in a unilinear fashion, as has most of the thinking about how to think about education. The dominant paradigm reigns. Paradoxically, however, globalization, while further strengthening its position, has nevertheless created a consciousness about the paradigm's key features and some resistance to its supremacy that might lead to more proactive reforms or revisions that could reinterpret the means and meaning of education and set in motion a true shift of paradigm. What seems probable, however, is that if a paradigm shift in how we think about and practice education does not begin to take place in the near future, development as we know it will no longer proceed in even the most highly developed nations.

References

- UNESCO (1961): *The Needs of Asia in Primary Education: A Plan for the Provision of Compulsory Primary Education in the Region*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (1962): *Proceedings of the Meeting of the Ministers of Education of Asian Member States on the Development of Education in Asia*. Tokyo: UNESCO.
- Adams, D. (1977): 'Developmental Education'. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 21, No.2 & 3, pp.296-310.
- Adams, D. & Bjork, R.M. (1969): *Education in Developing Areas*. New York: David McKay & Co.
- Appelbaum, R.P. (1970): *Theories of Social Change*. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company.
- Aron, R. (1966): 'Social Structure and the Ruling Class', in Bendix, R. & Lipset, S.M. (eds.), *Class, Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification*. New York: Free Press.
- Becker, G.S. (1964): *Human Capital: An Empirical and Theoretical Analysis With Special Reference to Education*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976): *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books.

- Brinton, C. (1952): *The Anatomy of Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Carnoy, M. (2002): 'What Does Globalization Mean for Educational Change? A Comparative Approach'. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.46, No.1, pp.1-9.
- Coleman, J.S. (ed.) (1965): *Education and Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Collins, R. (1998): *The Sociology of Philosophies: A Global Theory of Intellectual Change*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Coser, L. (1956): *The Functions of Social Conflict*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Cummings, W.K. (2003). *The Institutions of Education*. Oxford: Symposium Books
- Cummings, W.K., Tatto, M.T. & Hawkins, J.N. (2001): *Values Education for Dynamic Societies: Individualism or Collectivism*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1959): *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Davis, K. (1949): *Human Society*. New York: Macmillan.
- Denison, E.F. (1962): "Education, Economic Growth and Gaps in Information," *Journal of Political Economy*. LXX (October).
- Dore, R. (1976): *The Diploma Disease*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Fagerlind I. & Saha, L. (1989): *Education and National Development: A Comparative Perspective*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Homans, G. (1950): *The Human Group*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Illich, I. (1970): *Deschooling Society*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Inkeles, A. & Smith, D.H. (1974): *Becoming Modern*. London: Heinemann Education Books.
- Kerr, C. (1954): 'Industrial Conflict and Its Mediation'. *American Journal of Sociology* (40), pp.36-51.
- Levy, M.J. (1967): 'Social Patterns (Structures) and Problems of Modernization', in Cook, E.R. (ed.) *Readings on Social Change*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- McClelland, D. (1961): *The Achieving Society*. New York: The Free Press.
- Mountjoy, A.B. (ed.) (1971): *Developing the Underdeveloped Countries*. London: Macmillan.
- Myrdal, G. (1957): *Economic Theory and Underdeveloped Regions*. London: Duckworth.
- Oakes, J. (1985): *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ogburn, W. (1922): *Social Change: With Respect to Culture and Original Nature*. New York: B.W. Heubsch.
- Parsons, T. (1951): *The Social System*. New York: Free Press.
- Parsons, T. (1966): *Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Resnick, L. (1987): 'Learning in School and Out'. *Educational Researcher*, Vol.16, No.9, pp.13-20.
- Rostow, W.W. (1960): *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non Communist Manifesto*.

- Cambridge: The University Press.
- Schugurensky, D. (2003): 'Higher Education Restructuring in the Era of Globalization', in Arnove, R.F. & Torres, C.A. (eds.) *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Schultz, T. (1961): "Investment in Human Capital". *American Economic Review*, Vol.51 (March), pp.1-17.
- Sen, A. (1999): *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor.
- Sen, S.R. (1959): *The Strategy for Agricultural Development*. All Indian Agricultural Economic Conference: New Delhi.
- Sorokin, P.A. (1947): *Society, Culture and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Spengler, O. (1964): 'The Life Cycle of Cultures' in Etzioni, A. & Etzioni, E. (eds.) *Social Change*. New York: Basic Books.
- Stromquist, N.P. (2002): 'Globalization, the I, and the Other'. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, Vol.42, No.2, pp.1-7.
- Tuqan, M.I. (1975): *Education, Society and Development in Underdeveloped Countries*. Den Haag: CESO.
- Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1995): *Tinkering Towards Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- UNESCO-ECA (1961): Conference of African States on the Development of Education in Africa, Addis Ababa. Paris: UNESCO.
- Weber, M. (1964): *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York: Free Press.
- Weiler, H. (1978): 'Education and Development: From the Age of Innocence to the Age of Skepticism'. *Comparative Education*, Vol.14, No.3, pp.179-198.

6

Globalization and Paradigm Change in Higher Education The Experience of China

MA Wan-hua

In reviewing the many changes within Chinese higher education over the last 30 years, one cannot help but note the impact of the macro-level context in which they have occurred. At the end of the 1960s, China's economy was seemingly headed toward bankruptcy, schools throughout the country had been closed for nearly four years, and the structures of social, political and cultural authority were in substantial disarray. China managed, however, to pull back from the verge of chaos, largely overcoming its internal ideological disputes by the end of the 1970s, the more specifically political turmoil of the late 1980s, and the Asian financial crisis during the late 1990s to establish a pattern of stable and remarkably rapid growth. (Since the 1990s, China's economy has been growing at a rate of around 8% to 10% annually.) Importantly, this pattern of growth has been maintained apparently without social or political chaos. It has, moreover, been accompanied by social transitions that have helped to propel no less rapid educational change. In this chapter, China is discussed as an example of a large, rapidly growing transitional society in which higher education change is playing a central role in social transformation. While many of the changes are specific to China, there may well be lessons for other transitional societies seeking new educational forms and practices.

***Kaifang* and Economic Globalization**

Marginson and Rhoades (2002) have coined the term “glonacal” to describe the dynamics of globalization in linking global, national and local forces and actors. By drawing attention to the vertical dimension of globalization processes, a glonacal perspective on policy change and reform in China invites construing such initiatives as inherently complex and multi-level phenomena. Yet, as stressed by Mason (2004) in his application of complexity theory to understanding this dynamic, complex educational change does not occur in a certain order – from the global to the national and then the local – but rather as a function of multi-directional influences that are dependent on specific historical and contextual factors, many of which may be unique to a given local, national or regional situation. In the case of Chinese higher education, it is helpful to combine Marginson and Rhoades’ (2002) concept of the glonacal as an analytical tool for bringing into focus the interrelationships among three levels of control with Mason’s appeal to complexity theory and its emphasis on the multi-dimensional dynamics of change.

Contrary to popular (and some policy-makers’) opinion, economic growth does not depend only on the confluence of locally cheap labor and heavy foreign investment. Although there is much to recommend in seeing markets as self-regulating and self-organizing systems of production, exchange and consumption, it remains true that national governance and initiative are needed to take advantage of market dynamics to further national interests. Sustaining national economic growth requires acutely responsive patterns of policy creation and adaptation to redirect a country’s developmental efforts. Needed as well are ongoing strategic planning to mobilize different available social forces; a culture of reforming institutional structures that are either intrinsically problematic or poorly aligned with current realities, whether in industry, agriculture or the society at large; and clear protocols for evaluating socio-economic systems in terms of their recursive impacts on development. In short, despite the decentralization approach often cited in the literature on globalization, the state still has an important role to play in setting the course and proper pace of social change.

The changes China has undergone over the past three decades are so fundamental that virtually no aspect of social life has remained unaffected. Higher education is no exception. At the system level, Chinese higher education has experienced changes with respect to expansion, diversification, massification, and commercialization. Each of these changes

has been a consequence of both national and global economic, political, and social drivers. In Chapter One of this volume, Deane Neubauer discusses the characteristics of globalization, which include among others the exchange of values and symbols as well as goods, the privatization of social functions, the increasingly ambiguous nature of the state, and growing inequality. In a country like China, which is changing from a planned to a market economy, one can easily see these multiple dynamic elements both generating and being generated by commitments to press reform forward.

Globalization in China is not a new phenomenon. Trade along the Silk Roads from as early as the first century CE linked imperial China with the societies of Central Asia, the Middle East and Europe, and each of the naval trade missions of Zheng He in the early years of the 15th century included more than 300 ships and nearly 30,000 troops, traders and diplomats. But it is only relatively recently that globalization processes have come to be seen as central factors in economic development and social transition, reflecting both changes in China's self-understanding and global historical developments associated with the onset of late modernity. During the late 1970s, the term *kaifang* (開放, which means "to open up") came into currency, which in the context of economic policy connoted an opening up in the sense of removing impediments to foreign trade and investment. The purpose was to activate receptivity to new ideas and new ways to rebuild the country economically.

Among the most evident effects of the policy informed by *kaifang* is the city of Shenzhen, which was designated China's first special economic zone and, in 12 years, developed from a small town to a city of more than five million people. Subsequently, other special economic zones were created, and foreign joint-venture investments and businesses, as well as vibrant local business environments can be found in Shanghai, Guangzhou, and many other coastal cities. In addition to such direct – and largely planned effects – the *kaifang* policy had important collateral effects. For example, when McDonald's opened its first restaurant in Beijing, it not only offered food that seemed exotic to Chinese people, it also brought in a new way of service, a new eating style and the vision of a new lifestyle. Ironically, while McDonald's is considered cheap fast food in the United States, in Beijing at that time it symbolized wealth and status. As people began to consider how and why such food could become so popular world-wide, they realized that business strategies that took account of cultural psychology could raise competitiveness – a les-

son that proved quite instructive to the Chinese food service industry.

More to the point of the present discussion, as many more foreign companies established branches in China, needs became apparent for new kinds of local talent. Succeeding in business environments characterized by intensive time-space compression required workers who were capable of greater productivity, able to work with individual initiative, and to do so in increasingly intercultural contexts. For young men and women, working in high-paying international corporations and enterprises not only promised higher salaries and greater status, but also offered a different sense of social mobility and change. People, especially the young generation, rushed to go abroad for knowledge and education. The studying abroad (留學潮, *liuxuechao*) movement began in the mid-1980s and continues to be a significant aim and practice. In response to these conditions, Chinese higher education began opening up (*kaifang*) to the possibility of changing its approaches both to training the national labor force and to producing new knowledge.

Those university teachers who did not go abroad for a degree and who were not satisfied with their low salaries and heavy teaching loads left their positions to “jump into the sea” of business or *xiahai* (下海). Although it is difficult to determine how many young professors “jumped into the sea” in pursuit of economic fortunes either inside the country or abroad, one thing is clear – during the late 1980s and early 1990s, because of the difference in living standards and research conditions, many university teachers and students who studied abroad chose to stay abroad rather than return to China. So instead of creative minds returning from abroad to reinvigorate the country with science and education, China faced the problem of brain drain in the 1990s. Current statistics show that since 1978, 700,000 students have gone to study abroad and only 179,000 have returned, although in recent years the rate of return appears to be greater.

Kaifang policies stimulated another major change that continues to be of considerable importance in China’s developmental trajectory and in the dynamics of both basic and higher education reform. *Kaifang* also has the connotation of giving people the freedom to migrate domestically and allowing individuals to establish *minying* (民營, business). Before 1978, the Chinese labor force was strictly controlled through local registration in work units or communes, which were called *danwei* (單位). Collective communes were initially allowed to lease their land to farmers for 30 years, and from the late 1950s to the mid-1970s Chinese farmers worked like the proverbial ‘yellow cow’ (老黃牛, *laohuangniu*, a metaphor de-

scribing those who fervently believe in communist ideology and spend their lives working toward the realization of communism), but still faced problems of poverty and supply shortage. Chinese economic reform actually began affecting the countryside when thousands of farmers began leasing out or abandoning their lands in pursuit of wage-earning opportunities in the cities and elsewhere in the country. The land reform immediately released farmers, men and women, from the bondage of the farmland all year round. Of the migrating ex-farmers, some got rich quickly and were labeled *dakuan* (大款), 'rich with no manners'; others became landless wanderers, surviving through a series of odd jobs on the margins of cities. After living for years in the city, many of those who were without readily marketable skills – including basic literacy and numeracy – gave up on their dreams of prosperity. Upon returning home, however, many found that they no longer fit there either and could not comfortably re-adapt to the lifestyle of the countryside.

In spite of these and other very real and increasingly well-known risks, farmers' migration did not stop. People kept pouring into the cities not least because agricultural production did not bring much profit to farmers in the 1990s, and because the income gap between rural and urban areas only kept widening. Cities like Beijing quickly expanded with many more fortune-seekers – some seasonal workers in construction, others setting up businesses. Official statistics indicate that there are currently three million migrants in Beijing, but the actual number, because of under-reporting, could be four to five million. Nationally, the number of migrants may number in the hundreds of millions, many of whom face long working hours, lack of employment security and ill treatment from employers, all in intensifying social inequity.

Importantly, at the same time that rural populations were moving to the cities, many state-owned factory workers were laid off or had to take temporary leave because of the comparative inefficiency of state-owned enterprises in the newly competitive industrial environment. Most of the laid-off workers in their 40s and 50s lacked skills, and were effectively consigned to existing on social welfare services that themselves were dwindling as the Chinese government began encouraging the privatization, for example, of health care.

All of these conditions – the often quite tragic 'side-effects' of rapid, market-driven economic growth – led to the spreading of demands for improved educational access and quality well outside of the limited portions of the population with prospects of directly entering China's new

international business and investment sector workforce. The rural and urban poor – and, it must be stressed, the central government – realized the importance of a better education as a means to better living circumstances and as insurance against the clear prospect of spreading social instability.

In an era of great social and economic transition, knowledge and the building of human capacity have been considered by many scholars to be one of the most crucial elements for sustaining and broadening the ambit of development. China is no exception. A major concern since the open-door policy was adopted has been how to produce creative minds that will meet the changing needs associated with different phases and scales of economic transition. Before the era of reform, the curricula of colleges and universities focused largely on ideological or political issues rather than on encouraging creativity. In addition, stringent selection criteria prevented many young people from entering higher education. In the last 20 years, a series of national reforms in Chinese higher education has taken place as an active response to social need, economic reform and the preparation for deepening integration into the complex dynamics of contemporary globalization.

The first important reform was system expansion. Since 1978, Chinese higher education has been growing fast. In 1978, there were about 400 higher-learning institutions across the country. Between 1978 and 1985, more than 600 new higher-learning institutions were established, bringing the total in 1985 to more than 1,000. At the same time, system expansion was followed by diversification of the system. A policy was issued by the central authorities to allow the civil sector to open colleges and universities with collective or private funds, and the first non-governmental college was founded in Beijing in 1982. Since then, there has been rapid development of *minban* universities and colleges, which are run by various non-governmental (essentially private) organizations or individuals. The appearance of such universities and colleges in China reflects a kind of 'liberal' ideology – that education for the common good could be privately provided. Today there are more than 1,300 such higher-education institutions with an enrollment of more than one million students.

At the same time, the Chinese adult higher-education system has developed at a remarkable rate. (Chinese adult higher education was originally established for professional training, especially for those who worked in the government sector. It now also provides undergraduate

education to those who already have two or three years of vocational training.) Today there are approximately 1.2 million students in such colleges for professional training. There is additionally the self-study program conducted by the National Examination Center. Though it aims at life-long learning, the program attracts many young students who do not have the opportunity to go to college. In China, *minban* colleges and universities are still in the developmental stages: laws protecting their rights and articulating their responsibilities were passed only in 2002. Even now, compared to the state's higher-education system, *minban* colleges and universities are struggling both financially and professionally. In the Chinese higher-education system today, there are 1,081 regular public institutions, more than 1,300 *minban* institutions, and 689 adult education institutions. Together with system expansion and diversification, student enrollment has increased dramatically: in the last 20 years, the Chinese gross enrollment rate has reached 18% of the eligible high school cohort. In Trow's (1973) terms, Chinese higher education is now in the process of massification.

***Fangquan* and Change in Educational Structures**

As China gradually opened up to the world, it became evident that the new economic dynamics, emphasizing information technology, accelerating knowledge growth and deepening imperatives for international cooperation, could not effectively or efficiently be conducted through old organizational structures. Requests for autonomy or more decision-making power came from both the industrial and education sectors. As we have seen, state higher education first experienced an organizational structural adjustment in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Most of the reforms were executed under the guidelines of two important documents: the *Decision on the Reform of the Education System*, issued by the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee in 1985, and the *Outline for the Reform and Development of China's Education*, adopted in 1993. These two documents set the basic direction for the structural adjustment of higher education in China. As stated in the *Outline for the Reform and Development of China's Education*, China's explicit higher-education goal for the 1990s was to accelerate economic reform by using new approaches to increase its scale and rationalize its organizational structure.

As is well known, the original structure of China's higher-education system was modeled on the Soviet system of the early 1950s, which was

organized mainly around areas of study. The purpose was to produce specialists for socialist construction. For a time, this model was helpful in meeting the country's immediate reconstruction needs after a long period of war, but as the economy grew, diversified and became more international, this highly specialized approach to human resource development became outmoded. In the present age of globalization, China's policy-makers have advocated a more comprehensive and general form of higher education. The comprehensive university has been adopted as a model for general education: thus, in the 1990s, 612 colleges and universities were merged into 250. For example, Beijing Medical University was merged into Peking University in 2000. Beijing Institute of Arts and Crafts was merged into Tsinghua University. In Changchun, the capital of Jilin Province, several universities – Jilin University of Technology, Bethune Medical University, Jilin University of Agriculture, Jilin Institute of Post and Telecommunications, and Changchun Institute of Geology – were all merged into the new Jilin University. The mergers were justified by educational policy-makers with several reasons, including building capacity for training qualified, all-around personnel and preparing the university for full participation in international competition and cooperation.

Administering the new higher-education system has become a major challenge, since the country's economic structure and labor market have changed and the social need for higher education continues to increase. Many Western researchers use the term 'decentralization' to discuss the changing nature of higher-education administration in China. John Hawkins (2000) uses terms like centralization, decentralization and recentralization to capture the nature of Chinese higher-education reform in governance and administration. In China, the term *fangquan* (放權) is used, which means to give more decision-making power to lower levels. In this *fangquan* process, the Ministry of Education manages at the macro level. It is somewhat similar to the English term decentralization, though in the Chinese context the term primarily means to give the university more decision-making opportunities. In this respect, the most significant change is to reset the relationship between the state government and higher-education institutions.

Until the 1970s, higher education in China was highly centralized and tightly controlled, which meant that all universities and colleges were primarily under the administration of the central government, though they had affiliations with different ministries of the state. Colleges and universities could not admit students without permission from the Min-

istry of Education. The central government was responsible for the provision of core funding, senior staff appointments, the authorization of new academic programs, and the selection of textbooks and university curricula. Since the *fangquan* process was implemented, the central government has imposed only macro control through legislation, funding and appraisal. Gone is the micro-management previously followed by the central government, which sought to guide day-to-day practices in the higher education sector. Now an individual institution can make adjustments to major fields of study, develop cooperative relationships with industrial and research organizations, offer short-term training programs in addition to its regular curriculum, and appoint or remove its vice presidents and lower-level administrators and faculty members. Individual institutions can also establish teaching, research and production entities. The new policies also permit institutions to generate additional revenue through tuition and fees, research and consultation, commissioned training programs, school-run enterprises, and other services to industry and communities. Universities are also allowed to receive social contributions and to seek private donations.

Some researchers have concluded that the reforms in Chinese higher education have another purpose – to mobilize all possible resources to raise the nation's educational level and to keep up with the increasingly high social demand for higher education. Although China's economy has been growing steadily, public investment in education is still quite low. In 2004, total GDP investment in higher education was 3.14%, below the world's average of 4% in 2000.

To help secure funding, a strategy of *gongjian* (共建), which means to build together, is being used to tap different resources. Through *fangquan* and *gongjian*, colleges and universities in the state sector can now be divided into three categories by administration. Among the 1,081 regular higher-education institutions, about 100 are under the full administration of the state Ministry of Education. Most other institutions are under the leadership of both the Ministry of Education and the local government, while smaller institutions fall under the control of the local government. Provincial and municipal governments are thus also responsible for financing state higher education. Though there are almost no statistics available to show how much is being invested by local governments in higher education, one thing is clear: universities located in provinces are better financed than they were before.

***Shuangying* and the Commercialization of Higher Education**

During the last few years there has been an often heated debate among university leaders, professors, and the central authorities over the issue of the commercialization of higher education in China. Why should there be such a debate? Could higher education be a commodity? After nearly 30 years of isolation from the rest of the world, China made substantial efforts to join the World Trade Organization (WTO) and to be part of the global economy. Though ordinary people did not seem to pay much attention initially, shortly after China joined the organization in November 2001, the term globalization became one of the more frequently read or heard terms in government documents, academic journals and the mass media. The level of concern about how globalization would affect Chinese society was reflected in the fact that there have been numerous conferences, seminars and talks on business, finance, education, industry and agriculture aimed at understanding the meaning and process of China's entrance into the World Trade Organization. Among the most frequently asked questions in education are: What would be the government's response once foreign investors wished to open a university in China? What would be the effect on China's higher education, since most foreign investors are more financially, pedagogically and technologically competitive than their Chinese counterparts? The discussion has been so pervasive that some scholars have warned, "The wolves are coming."

The "wolves" are not only coming, they're actually taking part in the process. Just about a year after China joined the WTO, many foreign banks, supermarkets, construction industries, and the like, opened branches in China. While the pursuit of profit is of course the nature of international business, one of the positive effects is that such foreign investment provides many job opportunities. The term, *shuangying* (雙贏), which means "to be mutually beneficial," has become popular in describing this process. There have been many higher education exhibitions organized by foreign embassies and international education corporations in different parts of the country. Many intermediate organizations have been established to introduce students to studying abroad, charging high fees in the process. There are many reasons why so many Chinese young people are prepared to pay high fees to study abroad, but among the most important is that, although the nation's higher-education system has greatly expanded and enrollments have dramatically increased, domestic higher education still cannot satisfy the demand. It is estimated that in the 2000-2001 academic year, some 120,000 Chinese students were admitted

by foreign universities – 50% in the United States, 23% in Japan, 9% in Great Britain, 8% in Germany and 3% in Australia. There are currently in excess of 380,000 Chinese students studying abroad.

At the same time, China's fast-growing economy has been so attractive to foreign higher-education institutions that many have already developed or seek to develop joint training programs, to establish research centers and to build campus extensions in China. At the end of 2002, there were 712 foreign-related educational institutions in China. Geographically, most of them are in the more developed areas in the East. In Shanghai, there are 111 such institutions; in Jiangsu Province, 61; in Shandong Province, 78; and in Beijing, 108. Of these institutions, 154 are co-sponsored by the United States, 146 by Australia, 74 by Canada, 58 by Japan, 40 by Great Britain, 24 by France, 14 by Germany, and 12 by South Korea. Eighty-two are three-year vocational institutions at the postsecondary level, 69 are the four-year college level institutions, and 74 concentrate on postgraduate study (Yang 2005). In order to ensure that these institutions meet the national requirements for post-secondary learning, regulations for Chinese and foreign cooperative educational institutions were published in July 2003. The regulations state that such cooperative institutions should not engage in profit-seeking activities. As educational institutions, they should be nonprofit and under the general administration of the state Ministry of Education.

Meanwhile, universities from the state sector have made great efforts to establish regional and international research centers, to sign exchange agreements with universities from different countries, and to set up exchange programs for scholars and students with foreign universities and education-related organizations. Peking University, for example, has established a joint teaching project with the University of California; opened a Stanford branch on campus; set up a Peking-Waseda joint teaching center; started a London summer school; and carried out student-exchange programs with Yale and universities in Moscow and Paris. Some of the programs are funded with outside resources, and some require fees from students.

There exists also a substantial market in MBA, MPA, leadership training and human resources development programs in universities and in the private sector. Some are very expensive: one such MBA program organized a training session at Harvard for two weeks at the cost of 200,000 RMB (about US\$25,000). All of these make the certificate programs, course packages, training projects and e-learning courses look

more like educational commodities than education for any other purpose. While the general public considers globalization as a means to build capacity throughout the nation, and government policy also aims to invigorate the country through science and education, some educational institutions and corporations appear to consider higher education as little more than a market for profit.

These are some of the factors that have contributed to the debate on the commercialization of higher education. Some researchers argue that higher education should be commercialized, since it is a very expensive enterprise anyway. The term *shuangying* (“to be mutually beneficial”) can be applied, though it seems rather ambiguous when equity and issues of public good are taken into consideration, because those who cannot pay will probably lose the opportunity and be left behind. The danger here, then, is that as education becomes increasingly commodified the notion of education as a public good will be challenged by those seeking to privatize previously public institutions.

***Jiegui* and the US Model for Change**

The term *jiegui* (接軌, which means “to be in line with”) was recently coined to describe the direction of change of the nation’s economy and the policy for international trade. But the concept has been seriously questioned by both government officials and the general population since high-pollution industries proliferated across the country, since working conditions deteriorated, and since workers have frequently not been properly paid. In higher education the situation has been no less troubling, and has perhaps been compounded by the lack of clear parallels with other national experiences. A goal of many nations has been to attempt to preserve local culture and characteristics while participating in the global economy. In higher education, these perhaps conflicting aims seem to have been appropriately balanced by higher education institutions in the USA. The US model has thus been of considerable interest to Chinese educators.

Since the 1980s, many Chinese students have gone to study in the USA. The success of American research universities in contributing to the US economy, the competitiveness of American industry and the superiority of US military power have of course caught not only China’s attention. When Peking University celebrated its centennial anniversary in 1998, many US research university presidents were invited to the campus to exchange views and experiences. And recently, building research uni-

versities has been added to the agenda of the policy-making process. Though Chinese higher education has used the US model as a reference for change or reform, it still maintains its own characteristics. For example, some Chinese universities have recently adapted the US tenure system. In the USA, the tenure system was originally introduced for the protection of academic freedom, and tenure begins at the associate professor level. But in China, the tenure system is used to increase the productivity of academic staff. At Peking University, for example, tenure begins only at the full professor level. To attain a full professorship at Peking University, faculty members must publish eight papers in key professional journals and at least one book in their specialty within five years. They must also obtain 30,000 RMB in research funds annually.

American research universities also have close relationships with American industry. In 1995, American industry invested \$1.5 billion in research universities in that country. Chinese universities borrowed this concept, but instead of licensing their inventions to industry, as do North American universities, Chinese universities have tended to open high-tech companies themselves. For example, Peking University has six big companies, the most famous one being Founder, which is listed on the stock market in Hong Kong and Japan. There are many reasons why Chinese universities tend to open companies themselves, but the most convincing one is that during the 1980s and 1990s, high-tech industry in the country was weak, and companies did not generally have the ability to absorb new inventions in technology. University faculties, together with their students, could transfer the knowledge or invention into production directly.

The focus now is on finding a way to build 'world-class universities' with limited financial resources. But what is a 'world-class university'? Since there are no universal standards, the idea has been constantly challenged. What was finally proposed followed the models of Harvard, Stanford, Oxford and Cambridge universities. China's central government intends to increase its investment in higher education – specifically, to invest more money in the country's best universities for further development. Peking University and Tsinghua University have been chosen as the first two for such development. Here again we come to the US model of federal government investment in research universities. In China, two government funding projects were established in the 1990s: the "211 Project" and the "985 Project." The goal of the 211 Project is to have the state government develop 100 key universities in the 21st century.

Many of China's universities have competed for this project. The 985 Project is so named because it was the celebration of the centennial of Peking University in May 1998 (5/98) that marked the starting point of building world-class universities. At first only Peking University and Tsinghua University were included, but when the final plan was approved by the central government, nine universities received approval for state investment. In 2004, the 985 Project was expanded to include 34 universities in the second stage of development; these 34 are also considered to be China's leading research universities. Now these universities are making great efforts to strengthen their capacity in research, scholarship, cooperation with business, and scholarly exchange with well-known universities in the world. These state initiated projects have been one major public response to the challenge of globalization.

In 2002 it was decided that universities would be required to offer 15% of their courses in English by 2005. Of course, the purpose of such a requirement is for the training of leadership personnel who could work globally without an English language barrier and who might thus tend to think with a more global perspective. How practical this decision is and how to carry it out are of some concern, because teaching and learning in English require the appropriate English language competence on the part of both staff and students, and appropriate levels of curriculum support and textbook provision. Universities like Peking University do not seem to have much of a problem with this decision since more than a third of their staff members have been educated in English-speaking countries. For most other universities, it is difficult to say.

Globalization and Educational Paradigm Change

As a developing country undergoing rapid transition in a period of accelerated globalization, China's economic and education reforms are taking place in the context of the processes associated with and the consequences of globalization. What does globalization mean for higher education in China? How does information technology influence such change, and what will Chinese higher education be like in the future? We have considered some aspects of how Chinese higher education has changed in response to and in tandem with the country's economic reform and increasing integration into global circuits of exchange. Altbach (2002, p.1) describes the globalization and internationalization of higher education as follows:

In broad terms, globalization refers to trends in higher education that have cross-national implications. These include mass higher education; a global marketplace for students, faculty, and highly educated personnel; and the global reach of the new internet-based technologies, among others. Internationalization refers to the specific policies and initiatives of countries and individual academic institutions or systems to deal with global trends. Examples of internationalization include policies relating to recruitment of foreign students, collaboration with academic institutions or systems in other countries, and the establishment of branch campuses abroad.

A recent survey conducted by UNESCO showed that at the end of 2000, "there were 1.6 million overseas students studying in 108 countries throughout the world. Among them, more than 547,000 were studying in the United States." This survey does not mention the amount of money students spent studying abroad, but it was estimated that foreign students contributed \$10 billion to the USA in 1994. According to the *Straits Times* of May 2004, international students in the USA contributed \$11 billion to its economy, and the total revenue from foreign students studying in Australia grew from \$701 million in 1998 to \$1.4 billion in 2002.

As the proportion of government funding for education has declined in most countries, it is likely that universities will turn to fee-paying foreign students to fill the funding gap. Higher-education institutions in developed countries have the ability to attract many Chinese students. As we noted above, an imbalance between supply and demand is one reason why so many high school graduates in China have had to go abroad for tertiary study. In order to increase supply, a decision was made in 1999 by the central government to increase tertiary enrollments by 30%. In 1998, the number of students enrolled in universities and colleges was 1.08 million, and in 1999 it rose to 1.59 million, an actual increase of nearly 50%. Because of this enrollment increase, high school students who might have had to go abroad for higher education were able to go to university at home. It is estimated that this increase alone saved over 10 billion RMB for those students. Given the magnitude of the sums involved in higher education as a commodity, the globalization of higher education has already produced an important economy in its own right, with its effects felt particularly strongly in China.

From an economic point of view, it can be argued that globalization emphasizes uniformity in the regulation of business, finance, trade and

commodity transactions. Organizations and structures such as the WTO, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) contribute to this process. Where education is concerned, however, there are fewer commonly accepted rules for regulation. Even if education is considered an international commodity, it is not of course bought like a pair of shoes. As is commonly recognized, education is not culture- and value-free: it is the inheritance of cultural traditions and values that helps to make education interesting and meaningful to different people around the world. As Douglas Kellner (2000, p.305) emphasizes, culture provides

forms of local identities, practices and modes of everyday life that could serve as a bulwark against the invasion of ideas, identities, and forms of life extraneous to the specific local region in question. Education, in turn, transmits the skills and materials that enable individuals to participate in their culture in a creative way.

Thus, when we look at the paradigm change in Chinese higher education, we should look not only at the economic growth and money being saved or made, but also at the culture and social value that higher education has contributed to students and to society in general.

China is going through a period of rapid and unprecedented economic development, with which is associated the massification of its higher education system. As I indicated earlier, China's gross enrollment in higher education reached 19% of the eligible secondary school cohort in 2004. There are currently more than 3,000 higher-learning institutions in China with a total enrollment of about 19 million students. While colleges and universities continue to increase their enrollments, many different educational agencies, both domestic and international, are also offering academic programs, on campus or through e-learning. With so many agencies in the market, quality control has become a central concern of administrators: who should monitor quality, how to ensure quality, and what the standards of quality should be are serious considerations in this domain. International experts have been invited by universities, scholarly organizations and the central government to exchange ideas, and state projects have been initiated to address these issues. Some researchers suggest that the quality of mass higher education should be different from the quality of elite higher education. It is argued that since different in-

stitutions have different educational goals, there should not be just one quality standard by which to measure all educational institutions.

Globalization does not mean equalization, not least because not all countries participate in its processes from the same economic, cultural and social background. For the haves and have-nots, there will be massive imbalances in development, as other authors in this volume have made clear (see especially Neubauer, Chapter One; Mason, Chapter Three; and Hershock, Chapter Four). A lack of resources prevents the poor from benefiting from the consequences of globalization. The World Bank Report (Task Force 2000) clearly points out the challenges facing people in developing countries: "Higher education is no longer a luxury. It is essential to national, social and economic development." Providing higher education to the disadvantaged should be a matter of concern for national and local policymakers, not least in China. There is substantial concern about the unequal distribution of educational and economic resources across the country, limited access to higher education for disadvantaged groups, and disparities in regional educational development. Leadership training to increase awareness of these problems at the system level has therefore attracted considerable attention. The Ministry of Education recently held two Chinese/foreign university president conferences, in which the majority of the participants were Chinese. They were called conferences, but actually they were a kind of training program for Chinese university presidents, the main purpose being evident in the invitation to foreign university presidents to present their views and experiences to their Chinese counterparts. The participating Chinese university presidents were expected to become more aware of the interplay of local, national, regional and global forces and issues in their decision-making for institutional change and development.

Globalization impacts differently on countries at different developmental stages. To developed countries, globalization might primarily mean the opportunity to open up more international markets and to gain access to more natural and human resources. In the case of China, globalization is about much more than economic reform. Although it can be argued that China first opened up to globalization processes through economic reform, the ramifications have been not only economic, but also political, social, cultural and educational. In many ways, the trajectory of change in higher education in China has been unique – a transit from a Soviet-modeled system aimed at engineering socialist industrialization, through the interregnum of the Cultural Revolution, and on to a gradual assimilation into the

globally dominant educational paradigm (see John Hawkins, Chapter Five of this volume), albeit with “Chinese characteristics.”

China’s alignment with the dominant educational paradigm is explicitly driven by the need for national economic development. In 2002, the government proposed that in the following 20 years China should make great efforts to become a middle-income country. In order to realize this goal, education, and especially higher education, has been put in the forefront. Since 1993, the importance of higher education to economic development has been repeatedly emphasized, and policy adapted to reinvigorate the country through science and education. Just recently there has been a lively discussion among scholars and policy-makers on how to enhance the level of skills in the country’s population of 1.3 billion. This massive challenge is more than just a matter of monetary investment, and many different ideas have been proposed. One plan in action now involves teaching migrant farmers vocational, social, and legal skills.

It is clear that globalization and the associated economic reforms and educational paradigm changes in China constitute an ongoing process. In this process, higher education is being used as a strategy to increase the country’s economic growth and development – a fairly standard expression of the still globally dominant paradigm. The challenge that lies ahead for higher education, and one which has important implications for the emergence of new educational paradigms, is not only to improve the competency of students, but also to address moral and social values and issues, educational, social and gender inequities, cultural diversity, and environmental protection. These are among the basic elements for the sustainable development of a society. They also constitute key concerns for higher education development, globally and in the still emerging China of the 21st century.

References

- Altbach, P. (2002): ‘Perspectives on Internationalizing Higher Education’, *International Higher Education*, The Boston College Center for International Higher Education, No.27 (Spring). http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News27/text004.htm.
- Hawkins, J. (2000): ‘Centralization, Decentralization, Recentralization: Educational Reform in China’. *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol.38, No.5, pp.442-454.
- Kellner, D. (2000): ‘Globalization and New Social Movements: Lessons for Critical Theory and Pedagogy’ in Burbules, N.C. & Torres, C.A. (eds.) *Globalization*

- and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, pp.299-321.
- Marginson, S. & Rhoades, G. (2002): 'Beyond national states, markets and systems of higher education: a glonacal agency heuristic'. *Higher Education: an International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, Vol.43, pp. 281-309.
- Mason, M. (2004): 'Complexity theory and educational change'. Paper presented at the International Forum for Education 2020 at the East-West Center, Honolulu HI, 21st September.
- The Task Force on Higher Education and Society, World Bank and UNESCO (2000): *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*. New York: UNESCO.
- Trow, M. (1973): *Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education* Berkeley: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.
- Yang Yinfu (2005): *Chinese-foreign Cooperation in Running Schools*. Beijing: National Center for Education Development Research. Document no. 20050919.

Pulling Together amid Globalization National Education in Singapore Schools

Jason TAN

Forging a sense of national identity has been a preoccupation of the People's Action Party (PAP) government in Singapore for over four decades. This preoccupation is linked to the top political leadership's "garrison mentality" (Tan, K.P. 2001, p.97), which manifests itself in a perennial concern with issues such as the country's limited territorial and natural resources, the maintenance of the country's economic and social achievements, and the country's vulnerability as the only majority-Chinese state in the midst of a majority Malay/Muslim region (Hussin 2002). The government has consistently adopted a substantially top-down approach towards education policymaking, and has assigned the national education system, in which over 90% of primary and secondary school-age children are enrolled, a central role in socialising students into their roles as future citizens. Since the attainment of self-government from the United Kingdom in 1959 and subsequent political independence in 1965, the Education Ministry has instituted various civic and citizenship programs, only to dismantle them later and replace them with yet other programs.

In the early 1980s, two locally designed programs were developed and implemented: "Good Citizen" for primary schools, and "Being and Becoming" for secondary schools. Between 1984 and 1989, Religious Knowledge was made a compulsory subject for all upper secondary students amid fears of a moral crisis among young people. Six options were offered: Bible Knowledge, Buddhist Studies, Confucian Ethics, Hindu Studies, Islamic Religious Knowledge and Sikh Studies. Students were segregated on the basis of their choices. The government had originally

intended to offer a World Religions option but abandoned its plans, claiming that it was too difficult to formulate such a syllabus (Tan, J. 2000).

One of the main reasons why Religious Knowledge was made an optional subject in 1990, after having been compulsory for the previous six years, lay in its role in contributing to religious revivalism and evangelistic activities among Buddhists and Christians. In place of Religious Knowledge, a new compulsory civic and moral education program was designed for all secondary school students. Its main objectives were to foster cultural and religious appreciation; to promote community spirit; to affirm family life; to nurture interpersonal relationships; and to develop a commitment to nation building (Ministry of Education 1991). Meanwhile, the Good Citizen program remained compulsory for all primary school students.

This chapter focuses on the National Education policy initiative that was introduced into all Singapore schools by the Ministry of Education in 1997. The initiative aims at developing in students a sense of national identity, an awareness of Singapore's recent history and of the country's developmental challenges and constraints, and a confidence in the country's future (Ministry of Education 1997a). The chapter describes the origins of the initiative and discusses some challenges and contradictions that policymakers need to grapple with as they attempt to ensure the success of this initiative. It argues that the National Education initiative was drawn up in direct response to the growing pressures of globalization, as Singapore attempts to situate itself firmly within the global economy. Even as Singaporeans are being encouraged to foster greater regional and international economic and cultural links, they are, somewhat paradoxically, being urged to root themselves firmly within the local context. The chapter also demonstrates the limits to a top-down approach to fostering social cohesion and national identity in a national education system.

The Call for National Education

At a Teachers' Day rally in September 1996, the then Prime Minister, Goh Chok Tong, lamented the lack of knowledge of Singapore's recent history among younger Singaporeans, as reflected in the results of a street poll conducted by a local newspaper. The Ministry of Education had also conducted a surprise quiz on Singapore's history among 2,500 students in schools, polytechnics and universities. The results proved equally disap-

pointing. For instance, only a quarter or fewer of these students could explain why Singapore had separated from Malaysia in 1965 (Goh 1997a).

Goh claimed that the gap in knowledge was the direct result of a deliberate official policy not to teach school students about the recent political past and the events leading up to political independence. This was an attempt to downplay what were officially perceived to be sensitive issues related to the brief period between 1963 and 1965 when Singapore was part of Malaysia, and to the subsequent expulsion of Singapore from Malaysia. However, he felt that this ignorance was undesirable among younger people who had not personally lived through these events. He claimed too that these events, constituting "our shared past," ought to "bind all our communities together, not divide us We should understand why they took place so that we will never let them happen again" (Goh 1997a, p.425). Goh highlighted the possibility that young people might not appreciate how potentially fragile inter-ethnic relations could prove to be, especially in times of economic recession. Not having lived through poverty and deprivation meant that young people might take peace and prosperity for granted.

Calling on all school principals to throw their support behind this urgent initiative, which he termed National Education (NE), Goh pointed out that NE needed to become a crucial part of the curriculum in all schools. Emphasizing the importance of nation building in existing subjects such as social studies, civic and moral education, and history would be insufficient. More important was the fact that NE was meant to develop "instincts" in every child, such as a "shared sense of nationhood [and an] understanding of how our past is relevant to our present and future" (Goh 1997a). NE was to make students appreciative of how Singapore's peace and stability existed amid numerous conflicts elsewhere around the world. This meant that what took place outside the classroom, such as school rituals and examples set by teachers, would prove vital in the success of NE. Goh announced the establishment of an NE Committee that would involve various ministries, including the Education Ministry, in this effort.

Goh's remarks came on the heels of increasing concern on the part of senior government officials over how to satisfy the consumerist demands and material aspirations of the growing middle class. Since the mid-1980s, access to higher education in Singapore has widened tremendously. By the year 2000, more than 60% of each age cohort was enrolled in local universities and polytechnics. This massive expansion of a better educated citi-

zenry was also a cause for official concern. For instance, in 1996 former Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew (Lee, K.Y. 1996, p.30) commented that

thirty years of continuous growth and increasing stability and prosperity have produced a different generation in an English-educated middle class. They are very different from their parents. The present generation below 35 has grown up used to high economic growth year after year, and take their security and success for granted. And because they believe all is well, they are less willing to make sacrifices for the benefit of the others in society. They are more concerned about their individual and family's welfare and success, not their community or society's well being.

Likewise, Goh had in 1995 claimed that

[g]iving them (students) academic knowledge alone is not enough to make them understand what makes or breaks Singapore Japanese children are taught to cope with earthquakes, while Dutch youngsters learn about the vulnerability of their polders, or low-lying areas. In the same way, Singapore children must be taught to live with a small land area, limited territorial, sea and air space, the high cost of owning a car and dependence on imported water and oil. Otherwise, years of continuous growth may lull them into believing that the good life is their divine right [Students] must be taught survival skills and be imbued with the confidence that however formidable the challenges and competition, we have the will, skill and solutions to vanquish them. ("Teach students," 1995)

The Launch of National Education

The NE initiative was officially launched in May 1997 by the then Deputy Prime Minister, Lee Hsien Loong. Lee claimed that countries such as the United States and Japan, with longer national histories, still found it necessary to have schools transmit 'key national instincts' to students. Singapore, being barely one generation old, therefore needed a similar undertaking in the form of NE. NE aimed at developing national cohesion in students through:

- Fostering Singaporean identity, pride and self-respect;
- Teaching about Singapore's nation-building successes against the odds;

- Understanding Singapore's unique developmental challenges, constraints and vulnerabilities; and
- Instilling core values, such as meritocracy and multiracialism, as well as the will to prevail, in order to ensure Singapore's continued success (Lee, H.L. 1997).

Lee called on every teacher and principal to pass on six key NE messages:

- Singapore is our homeland; this is where we belong;
- We must preserve racial and religious harmony;
- We must uphold meritocracy and incorruptibility;
- No one owes Singapore a living;
- We must ourselves defend Singapore; and
- We have confidence in our future (Ministry of Education 1997a).

Several major means were suggested for incorporating NE in all schools. First, every subject in the formal curriculum would be used. Certain subjects, such as social studies, civic and moral education, history and geography were mentioned as being particularly useful in this regard. Social studies at the primary level would be started earlier, at Primary One instead of at Primary Four. It would also be introduced as a new mandatory subject for all upper secondary students in order to cover issues regarding Singapore's success and future developmental challenges. The upper secondary history syllabus would be extended from 1963, where its coverage had hitherto ended, to include the immediate post-independence years up until 1971.

Second, various elements of the informal curriculum were recommended. All schools were called upon to remember a few major events each year:

- Total Defence Day, to commemorate Singapore's surrender under British colonial rule to the Japanese in 1942;
- Racial Harmony Day, to remember the outbreak of inter-ethnic riots in 1964;
- International Friendship Day, to bring across the importance of maintaining cordial relations with neighboring countries; and
- National Day, to commemorate political independence in 1965.

In addition, students would visit key national institutions and public facilities in order to develop feelings of pride and confidence about how Singapore had overcome its developmental constraints. A further means of promoting social cohesion and civic responsibility would involve a

mandatory six hours of community service each year. An NE branch was established in the Ministry of Education headquarters to spearhead this initiative. Furthermore, to provide extrinsic motivation for school heads to take NE seriously, the degree of students' sense of national identity and of their social and moral development were included as assessment criteria in the School Excellence Model (under which each school undertakes self-appraisal with regard to a number of key processes and outcomes, and undergoes external validation once every five years).

Challenges

One can read in the importance accorded to NE a pressing concern among the political leadership about how, on the one hand, to satisfy the growing desires among an increasingly affluent and materialistic population for car ownership and bigger housing, amid rising costs of both commodities, and on the other, to maintain civic awareness and responsibility. A related concern is that the population might translate their dissatisfaction with unfulfilled material aspirations into dissatisfaction with the ruling party, which has based much of the legitimacy for its uninterrupted reign over the past four-and-a-half decades on the promise of delivering ever-expanding material affluence.

There is also concern that social cohesion might suffer, should the economy falter and fail to sustain the high growth rates of the past few decades. Social stratification has assumed a growing prominence on the government's policy agenda, especially in the wake of the 1991 general elections, when the PAP was returned to power with a reduced parliamentary majority (Rodan 1996). Whereas the issue of income stratification was largely taboo in public discussions before 1991, there has since then been growing acknowledgement on the part of the PAP government of the potential impact of income disparities on social cohesion. For instance, Goh Chok Tong has acknowledged on several occasions that not all Singaporeans stand to benefit equally from the global economy. He has also pointed out that highly educated Singaporeans are in a more advantageous position compared to unskilled workers, and that there is a great likelihood of widening income inequalities and class stratification (Goh 1996, 1997b).

Goh has drawn an explicit link between income inequalities and the need to maintain social cohesion. However, he thinks that "we cannot narrow the [income] gap by preventing those who can fly from flying

Nor can we teach everyone to fly, because most simply do not have the aptitude or ability" (Goh 1996, p.3). In the late 1990s, Goh introduced the terms "cosmopolitans" and "heartlanders" to illustrate the class divide between the well-educated, privileged, globally-mobile elite, on the one hand, and the working class majority, on the other (*Parliamentary Debates* 70(20), 1999, Col.2284). A PAP Member of Parliament expressed his fervent hope that Singaporeans would not "allow our system of education [to] create a bipolar society of cosmopolitans and heartlanders that will be destructive for nation-building" (*Parliamentary Debates* 71(2), 1999, Col.87). Such divisions have intensified in the wake of an economic recession in 1997/98 and worries about Singapore's continued economic viability amid growing economic competition from China and India. The ruling elite has also begun to realize that calls for Singaporeans to establish firm economic and cultural links at both the regional and international levels, in the name of economic survival, do not come without risk of calling into question national loyalties and citizenship obligations.

This tension between social inequalities and social cohesion permeates the underlying framework of NE. Different emphases are planned for students in various levels of schooling. For instance, students in technical institutes are to

understand that they would be helping themselves, their families and Singapore by working hard, continually upgrading themselves and helping to ensure a stable social order. They must feel that every citizen has a valued place in Singapore. (Ministry of Education 1997b, p.3)

Polytechnic students, who are higher up the social prestige ladder, are to be convinced that "the country's continued survival and prosperity will depend on the quality of their efforts and that there is opportunity for all based on ability and effort" (Ministry of Education 1997b, p.3). Junior college students, about four-fifths of whom are bound for local universities, should have the sense that "they can shape their own future" and should, as future national leaders, appreciate "the demands and complexities of leadership" (Ministry of Education 1997b, p.3).

One sees in these differing messages clear and unmistakable vestiges of the stratified view of society espoused by Lee Kuan Yew more than thirty years earlier. Speaking to school principals in 1966, Lee stressed that the education system ought to produce a "pyramidal structure" consisting of three strata: "top leaders," "good executives," and a

“well-disciplined and highly civic-conscious broad mass.” The “top leaders” are the “elite” who are needed to “lead and give the people the inspiration and the drive to make [society] succeed.” The “middle strata” of “good executives” are to “help the elite carry out [their] ideas, thinking and planning,” while the “broad mass” are to be “imbued not only with self- but also social discipline, so that they can respect their community and do no spit all over the place” (Lee, K.Y. 1966, pp.10, 12, 13). Lee also lamented the tendency among many Singaporeans to be more concerned with individual survival, rather than national survival, a theme that both he and Goh later repeated, within the setting of a much more materially prosperous society.

This task of holding on to citizens’ sense of loyalty and commitment will come under increasingly severe strain as globalization and its impact mean that Singaporeans are exposed via overseas travel, the internet, news and print media to social and political alternatives outside of Singapore. Increasing wealth also means that individuals are able to send their children to be educated outside of Singapore, after which work opportunities beckon. Furthermore, the government itself has been calling upon citizens to work outside of the country in order to broaden Singapore’s external competitive economic advantage. It has also been government practice for four decades now to sponsor top-performing students in the General Certificate of Education Advanced Level examinations for undergraduate studies in prestigious universities such as Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard and Stanford. It is perhaps ironic, if somewhat unsurprising, that the well-educated elite, in other words, the very individuals who have been accorded generous support and funding in their schooling in the hope that they will take on the mantle of national leadership, are the most globally-mobile, and who are best placed to take advantage of economic opportunities around the world, to the point of contemplating emigration. This policy dilemma was exemplified in the late 1990s when parliamentarians debated the merits of publicly naming and shaming individuals who had been sponsored for their undergraduate and/or postgraduate studies in elite foreign universities, only to repay the government the cost of their studies upon graduation instead of returning to Singapore to work for the government (*Parliamentary Debates* 68(7), 1998, Cols. 855-996). A few years later there were echoes of the “cosmopolitans-heartlanders” issue in the wake of Goh Chok Tong’s National Day rally speech about two categories of individuals, the “stayers” (Singaporeans who were “rooted to Singapore”) and the “quitters” (“fair

weather Singaporeans who would run away whenever the country runs into stormy weather") (*Parliamentary Debates* 75(8), 2002, Cols.1110-1201).

Entangled with the question of class-based disparities is that of ethnic inequalities. Data from the population census in the year 2000 indicated that the ethnic Malay and Indian minorities, constituting 13.9% and 7.9% of the total population respectively, formed a disproportionately large percentage of the lower income strata and a correspondingly small percentage of the higher income strata vis-à-vis the majority ethnic Chinese. There is sufficient cause for concern that these disparities will not narrow as the effects of economic globalization make further inroads into Singapore society.

These ethnic disparities play out in the area of educational attainment as well. Ethnic Chinese are heavily over-represented in local universities and polytechnics, forming 92.4% and 84.0% of the respective total enrolments in 2000, as compared with their 76.8% representation in the overall population. Ethnic Malays (2.7% and 10.0%, respectively), and Indians (4.3% and 5.2%, respectively) are correspondingly under-represented (Leow 2001, pp.34-36). Despite ethnic Malay and ethnic Indian students having made tremendous quantitative improvements in educational attainment over the past four decades, their public examination results continue to lag behind those of their Chinese counterparts (see, for example, Ministry of Education 2004). A disproportionately large percentage of Malay and Indian students are streamed on the basis of national examinations into the slower-paced streams at both primary and secondary levels. In other words, the educational gap is already present at the lower levels of schooling (Ministry of Education programs, such as the Learning Support Program, notwithstanding) and perpetuates itself at the higher levels. This gap also translates into ethnic minority under-representation (and working class under-representation) in some of the most prestigious schools and a corresponding over-representation in some of the least prestigious schools. All these gaps may raise doubts about how meritocratic and fair Singapore is, as well as whether there is indeed an equal place at the table for all Singaporeans.

There is evidence that four decades of common socialisation in a national school system have still not managed to eradicate racial prejudice among school students (see, for instance, Lee et al. 2004). The existence of Special Assistance Plan primary and secondary schools, which are almost entirely ethnically Chinese in enrolment, has been the subject of periodic discussion because of their perceived ethnic exclusivity (see, for example,

Parliamentary Debates 55(4), 1990, Col.371; 64(5), 1995, Col.486; 70(9), 1999, Col.1027; 76(10), 2003, Col.1635). Moreover, the practice of streaming students into various tracks at the primary and secondary levels within the context of a highly competitive, high-stakes education system has, since its inception in 1979, contributed to prejudice on the part of students in faster-paced streams, and teachers as well, towards students in slower-paced streams (see, for instance, Kang 2004; Tan & Ho 2001). These sorts of stratification sit somewhat at odds with the government's claim that

Everyone has a contribution to make to Singapore. It is not only those who score a dozen 'A's, or those who make a lot of money who are important and an asset to the country Each one of us has a place in society, a contribution to make and a useful role to play As a society, we must widen our definition of success to go beyond the academic and the economic. (Government of Singapore 1999, p.11)

The various tensions and dilemmas that have been discussed in this section have serious implications for efforts to impart the key messages of NE to all students. Further compounding the situation in recent years has been a renewed heightening of awareness of religious differences, especially between Muslims and non-Muslims. In 1999 there was a public controversy over the future of privately-run Islamic religious schools following the publication of a Ministry of Education report recommending six years of compulsory education for all children in state-run schools (Ministry of Education 2000). This was followed by events in the aftermath of the attacks on the World Trade Center in New York in September 2001, when, at the end of that year, Singapore authorities arrested several Muslim Singaporeans on suspicion of involvement in terrorist activities. In early 2002, another domestic controversy broke out over the Education Ministry's insistence that female Muslim students not be allowed to don Islamic veils in state-run schools (despite female Muslim teachers' being allowed to do so). In the midst of these potential flashpoints, government leaders have renewed calls for all Singaporeans to remain united, and for schools to play their role in fostering social cohesion.

In a sense, the Singapore government has never pretended that ethno-religious tensions have been swept away as a result of various educational policy initiatives (including civic and moral education) and other economic and social policies. In fact, certain government pronouncements may have served (unintentionally) to make the task of

forging social cohesion more problematic. For example, the question of ethnic Malay representation in the Singapore Armed Forces (SAF) has remained controversial ever since the establishment of the SAF in 1967. Government leaders have openly stated that Malays are not recruited into certain military units in case their religious affinities come into conflict with their duty to defend Singapore (Hussin 2002). In addition, Lee Kuan Yew has stated publicly that Singapore needs to maintain current ethnic ratios in its population in order to ensure continued economic success. These ethnic-based controversies have been complicated in recent years by the influx of new immigrants, many of whom are highly skilled, from countries such as China and India. The ruling elite have justified this importation of "foreign talent" on the grounds that Singapore lacks sufficient domestic talent for the needs of the global knowledge economy. These new immigrants have had at times to cope with resentment among some Singaporeans over perceived competition for jobs. NE will have to grapple with the task of socialising the children of these immigrants. There is also resentment that highly skilled male adult immigrants need not serve national service alongside Singapore citizens, but are nevertheless eligible to apply for permanent residence in Singapore. Even in the schools arena, there is worry among some parents, teachers and local students about the added competitive element that talented foreign students are perceived to represent (see, for instance, Quek 2005; Singh 2005).

At the same time, the question of national vulnerability in terms of resource constraints has leapt to the forefront of public consciousness in recent years, adding further urgency to the task of NE. In particular, the governments of Malaysia and Singapore have been unable to agree on the terms under which Malaysia will continue to supply the bulk of Singapore's water needs. The two governments have also traded words over a disputed island lying between the two countries. One may raise the question about whether the perennial siege mentality perpetuated by the ruling elite, far from arousing Singaporeans' patriotic sentiments, may instead have served in part to heighten their insecurities about Singapore's continued viability. Appealing to Singaporeans to be proud of the country's rapid economic growth under the People's Action Party's rule does not appear sufficient to engender emotional attachments and to bind Singaporeans, especially the well-educated elite, to their country (Kluver & Weber 2003).

On a more practical note, it is not always easy to get teachers and students to accord sufficient importance to NE, amid the general scramble

to prepare students for examinations within a highly competitive education system. As Chew (1997, pp.90-91) has pointed out,

there is a conflicting moral orientation in parts of the written curriculum that socialises Singaporean pupils to behave in a very individualistic and self-serving way in their relationships with other people. The message is clear: if an individual and a small nation-state are to survive in a highly competitive world, then they must work smartly and try to 'keep ahead of the pack.' Herein lies the strongest driving force in Singapore society, a force that encourages unbridled competition and selfish individualism, and one that is reflected in the education system. The school program poses some dilemmas to its pupils. Given the reward structure of the wider society, pupils are responding in an expected way. In this sense, the whole educational system is geared towards sustaining a competitive ethos rather than an ethos of cooperation and caring for others. An important consequence is that much of the effort put in by the school to give pupils a balanced education is in danger of being nullified by the entrenched value system.

This individualistic and competitive spirit has been exacerbated by the marketization of education over the past 15 years (Mok & Tan 2004). Among the manifestations of this marketization has been the annual publication of league tables based on secondary schools' academic performance and the borrowing of business-world quality assurance models in the form of the School Excellence Model. Attempting to quantify the success of NE (which essentially involves intangible emotional attitudes and beliefs), through the collection of hard data for the annual School Excellence Model reports, leads more often than not to students' chalking up the necessary hours of community service for the sake of complying with school requirements, rather than undertaking these activities in a genuine spirit of helping one's fellow citizens (see, for instance, Tan, S.H. 2005). The Singapore government has over the years instituted a system of incentives and disincentives to encourage citizens to comply with official policies (Lee, K.Y. 1966). There is, therefore, a possibility that schools might treat community service as yet another means to compete for national trophies and awards for schools that have chalked up demonstrably outstanding achievements in terms of community service or for NE, and might not manage to evoke genuine, intrinsic passion for the objectives of NE on the part of students.

Another concern with regard to NE is exactly how comfortably it sits within the *Thinking Schools, Learning Nation* (TSLN) initiative. This initiative was launched simultaneously with NE in 1997, with the major aim of promoting creative and critical thinking skills in all students in order that they might better meet the needs of the global knowledge economy. One might argue that the patriotic nature of NE requires a certain degree of convergence among teachers and students in terms of the emotions and passions that are officially deemed desirable. In other words, a common set of responses is deemed more worthy than others. However, it might be said that this sort of convergence of thought is somewhat incompatible with the sort of critical thinking skills that TSLN would appear to encourage.

Conclusion

The NE initiative is by no means new in its desire to impart a sense of 'Singaporean National Identity.' It has been part of a long-standing concern over the past four-and-a-half decades of PAP rule to foster social cohesion through schools through a top-down approach to education policymaking. What is new is the changed social context, that is, the greater income disparities in a materially wealthier society, amid the economic vagaries of globalization, as well as a more fragile socio-political world-wide environment, characterized by heightened fear and tension following the events of 11th September 2001. After a decade of NE, the Ministry of Education implicitly acknowledged in 2006 that NE has been less than wholly successful in fostering cross-racial cohesion and in promoting students' intrinsic commitment to "shaping Singapore's future" (Tharman 2006, p.6). A Ministry-led committee was established the same year to review the implementation of NE. School-based programs such as NE, located within a relatively centralized school system, will likely have to fight an increasingly uphill struggle as they attempt to foster social cohesion and a sense of rootedness to Singapore.

References

- Chew, J.O.A. (1997): 'Schooling for Singaporeans: The interaction of Singapore culture and values in the school', in Tan, J., Gopinathan, S. & Ho, W.K. (eds.), *Education in Singapore: A book of readings*. Singapore: Prentice Hall, pp.75-91.
- Goh, C.T. (1996): 'Narrowing the income gap.' *Speeches*, Vol.20, No.3, pp.1-4.

- Goh, C.T. (1997a): 'Prepare our children for the new century: Teach them well', in Tan, J., Gopinathan, S. & Ho, W.K. (eds.), *Education in Singapore: A book of readings*. Singapore: Prentice Hall, pp.423-491.
- Goh, C.T. (1997b): 'Singapore and the East Asian "miracle."' *Speeches*, Vol.21, No. 1, pp.13-19.
- Government of Singapore. (1999): *Singapore 21: Together, we make the difference*. Singapore: Singapore 21 Committee.
- Hussin, M. (2002): 'The socio-economic dilemma in Singapore's quest for security and stability.' *Pacific Affairs*, Vol.75, pp.39-56.
- Kang, T. (2004): 'Schools and post-secondary aspirations among female Chinese, Malay and Indian Normal Stream students', in Lai, A.E. (ed.), *Beyond rituals and riots: Ethnic pluralism and social cohesion in Singapore*. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press, pp.146-171.
- Kluver, R., & Weber, I. (2003): 'Patriotism and the limits of globalization: Renegotiating citizenship in Singapore.' *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, Vol.27, pp.371-388.
- Lee, C., Cherian, M., Rahil, I., Ng, M., Sim, J., & Chee, M.F. (2004): 'Children's experiences of multiracial relationships in informal primary school settings', in Lai, A.E. (ed.), *Beyond rituals and riots: Ethnic pluralism and social cohesion in Singapore*. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press, pp.114-145.
- Lee, H.L. (1997): *The launch of National Education*. Retrieved February 8, 2005, from <http://www1.moe.edu.sg/ne/KeySpeeches/MAY17-97.html>.
- Lee, K.Y. (1966): *New bearings in our education system*. Singapore: Ministry of Culture.
- Lee, K.Y. (1996): 'Picking up the gauntlet: Will Singapore survive Lee Kuan Yew?' *Speeches*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp.23-33.
- Leow, B.G. (2001): *Census of population 2000 statistical release 2: Education, language and religion*. Singapore: Department of Statistics.
- Ministry of Education. (1991): *Civics and moral education syllabus: Secondary 1-5*. Singapore: Curriculum Planning Division, Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (1997a): *About NE*. Retrieved February 8, 2005, from <http://www1.moe.edu.sg/ne/AboutNE/SixMSGs.html>.
- Ministry of Education. (1997b): *Launch of National Education*. Ministry of Education press release no. 017/97.
- Ministry of Education. (2000): *Report of the committee on compulsory education in Singapore*. Singapore: Author.
- Ministry of Education. (2004): *Performance by ethnic group 1994-2003*. Retrieved February 8, 2005, from <http://www.moe.gov.sg/press/2004/pr20041122a.htm>.
- Mok, K.H., & Tan, J. (2004): *Globalization and marketization of education: A comparative analysis of Hong Kong and Singapore*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Quek, T. (2005, February 13): 'China whiz kids: S'pore feels the heat.' *The Straits Times*, pp.3-4.
- Rodan, G. (1996): 'State-society relations and political opposition in Singapore', in

- Rodan, G. (ed.), *Political oppositions in industrialising Asia*. London: Routledge, pp.95-127.
- Singh, S. (2005, February 15): 'But Montfort principal says: We are improving local standards.' *The New Paper*, pp.2-3.
- Tan, J. (2000): 'The politics of religious knowledge in Singapore secondary schools', in Cornbleth, C. (ed.), *Curriculum politics, policy, practice: Cases in comparative context*. Albany: State University of New York Press, pp.77-102.
- Tan, J., & Ho, B.T. (2001): "'A' Levels or a polytechnic diploma? Malay students' choices of post-secondary options', in Tan, J., Gopinathan, S. & Ho, W.K. (eds.), *Challenges facing the Singapore education system today*. Singapore: Prentice Hall, pp.207-223.
- Tan, K.P. (2001): "'Civic society" and the "new economy" in patriarchal Singapore: Emasculating the political, feminizing the public.' *Crossroads: An interdisciplinary journal of Southeast Asian studies*, Vol.15, pp.95-124.
- Tan, S.H. (2005, February 13): 'No vision? Youths need role models.' *The Sunday Times*, p.26.
- Tharman, S. (2006): *Address by Mr Tharman Shanmugaratnam, Minister for Education and Second Minister for Finance, at the Ministry of Education National Education forum for principals 2006, on Thursday 24 August 2006 at 8.30am at the Ministry of Education auditorium*. Retrieved August 28, 2006 from http://www.moe.gov.sg/speeches/2006/sp20060824_print.htm.
- 'Teach students to live with S'pore's constraints: PM.' (1995, March 5). *The Straits Times*, p.1.

Education in the Years to Come

What We Can Learn from Alternative Education

Joseph P. FARRELL

We are all too familiar with how education and national development have evolved over the past several decades, growing into large and small national systems of formal education, linked in a variety of ways with national planning goals and sustained by systemic bureaucracies. The evolution of this paradigm has been discussed in some detail by John Hawkins in Chapter Five. We are also familiar with the shortcomings of this system, especially in the more globalized environment in which we now find ourselves. What might elements of a new education look like in 2020, and where can we look now to catch a glimpse of these elements?

I will commence this venture in thinking about 2020 and beyond with an old, probably apocryphal, proverb: "Prediction is always very difficult, especially with respect to the future." Had we been engaging in this exercise some 20 to 25 years ago, probably none of us would have predicted the collapse of the 'Eastern Bloc' or the 'Soviet Empire' with all of its subsequent effects on how the world is ordered, and the reverberating effects that has had on formal and non-formal education programs and possibilities throughout the world. Nor would we have predicted the imminent arrival of the internet and the ways in which this has affected our ways of working, means of communicating, and ways of accessing information. We have very few ways of knowing to any degree of certainty what further 'surprises' are in store for us over the next twenty or more years. But there is one prediction that I will venture to offer with some certainty: in 2020 or 2030, or whenever, whatever those surprises may be, most schools, whether early primary level or university level, will

look and work pretty much as they do now. This will be true unless, and this is the key point of this chapter, we learn how to learn from our own collective experience at inventing and implementing those major changes in schooling which have actually worked, frequently among desperately poor and marginalized groups, to improve dramatically the learning of those young people. There are, as it turns out, many such experiences available, most of them little known and very poorly understood, from which we could learn if we chose to.

I write from the standpoint of one of the 'leaders' or 'organizers' of a rather loose international coalition of scholars, program developers, and graduate students who are together trying to make good sense of a large group of radically alternative schooling programs. Most of these programs are at the primary and early secondary level, are indeed producing superior learning results among very disadvantaged young people, and happen to fit in well (certainly much better than the standard schooling model) with what we have now come to know from 'brain science' and cognitive psychology about how people (young and older) actually learn best. I do three main things in this chapter. First, I outline briefly the problems with schools-as-we-know-them, and the difficulties in changing them – the 'bad news'. Second, I identify and analyze what we are learning from many cases of success – the 'good news'. Finally, I suggest how we might proceed over the next years to continue to learn from these successes which may give us some hope as to how we might change the schooling of the future.

The Bad News: Formal Schooling as It Exists and Why It Seems Impermeable to Change

We are observers of and parties to a most peculiar pattern. Over the past century or more, we have come to learn much about how human beings, young and old, actually *learn* best. Yet very little of this knowledge has penetrated the standard practices of formal schools, which generally carry on the rituals and traditions associated with the conceptions of how learning occurs and what is worth knowing that were developed over a century ago, first in Western Europe (Prussia in particular) and then around the world following a combination of colonial imposition and cultural borrowing. Although I have been making this point for many years I am certainly not the first to observe it, nor the latest (see Farrell

1989, Farrell 1998, Farrell 2004, and the other authors I cite therein). In 1995 two major books were published which chronicled and tried to understand a century of failed attempts at educational reform in the USA (Tyack & Cuban 1995, Ravitch & Vinovskis 1995; for an essay review of both, see Farrell 2000). The stories told there of dysfunctional formal schooling and of failed reform initiatives were noted in another review article I published in 1997 (Farrell 1997), which indicated that the patterns found in the USA are generalizable to most of the world. What we have come to understand about human learning has almost nothing to do with how 'schooling' continues to be conducted. What I have come to call 'the forms of formal schooling' (what Tyack & Cuban, 1995, refer to as the

Figure 8.1: The Forms of Formal Schooling

One hundred to several hundred children assembled (sometimes compulsorily for at least a period of time) in a building called a school:

- From approximately the age of 6 or 7 up to somewhere between the ages of 11 and 16
- For three to six hours per day, where
- They are divided into groups of 20 to 60
- To work with a single adult (a certified teacher) in a single room
- For (especially at the upper grades) discrete periods of 40 to 60 minutes, each devoted to a separate subject
- To be studied and learned in a group of young people of roughly the same chronological age
- With supporting learning materials, e.g. books, chalkboards, notebooks, workbooks and worksheets (and in technical areas such things as laboratories, workbenches, practice sites) all of which is organized by
- A standard curriculum, set by an authority level much above the individual school, normally the central or provincial/state government, which all are expected to cover in an age-graded fashion.
- Adults, assumed to be more knowledgeable, teach, and students receive instruction from them
- In a broader system in which the students are expected to repeat to the adults what they have been taught, if they are to go any higher in the system
- Teachers and/or a central exam system evaluate students' ability to repeat what they have been taught, and provide formal, recognized certificates for passing particular grades or levels.

Most or all of the financial support comes from national or regional governments, or other kinds of authority centers (e.g., Church-related schools) well above the local community level.

“grammar of schooling”) were set in the mid- to late 19th century, primarily (at least originally) in Europe, and reflected the misconceptions about human learning of the intellectual and political-economic elite of that very different time and place. But now that we have set these structures so firmly in place, we do not seem to know how to change them, at least on any large-scale level. Figure 8.1 illustrates this.

The existence of these forms of formal schooling and their seeming intractability to efforts at change have continued to be a source of great frustration to many individual citizens seeking a better and more productive form of organized learning for their children, to well-intentioned reformers, who see their efforts constantly fail, and to scholars of learning who have consistently seen their hard-won findings knocking fruitlessly on the door of the school-house.

Among the first group – individual citizens (or small groups of them) seeking a better and more productive form of learning for their own children – there has been over the past years, especially but not exclusively in North America, a small movement toward ‘charter’ schools, home-schooling, and other forms of ‘alternative’ schooling (see, for example, Armstrong 1998, Bransford 2000, Caine & Caine 1997, www.newhorizons.org, www.educationrevolution.org, www.learndev.org, www.pathsoflearning.net). These efforts have resulted, in some cases, in very local alternative schools or school programs (a recent source suggests that there are more than 12,000 alternative schools in the USA, and there are estimates of at least a million parents opting in that country for home-schooling – many of the latter, it must be acknowledged, primarily for religious reasons). These efforts represent, however, a withdrawing from the forms of formal schooling among a still very small minority of parents, and have had no perceptible effect upon that broader formal system. Indeed that very withdrawal may reduce pressure to change the standard-issue formal system.

Two voices from the ‘well-intentioned reformers’ group (both of whom might well be called ‘public intellectuals’) are worth noting. In 2001, in a special issue of *Harpers Magazine* entitled “New Hope for American Education” (I noted in an editorial essay for *Curriculum Inquiry* a few months later that it might have been better labeled “Old Ideas about American Education” – see Farrell 2001a), TheodoreSizer (2001, p.45) noted the following in a forum discussion:

You are assuming that Americans make educational policy ration-

ally. But I think history will show that the system follows a kind of *mindless* thread. In the sixties, Charles Silverman wandered around and visited all of these schools and listened to all these state superintendents, and concluded that the whole thing was mindless, that we do what we do because we've always done it. The basic architecture and ideas behind the high school [for example] haven't changed in a fundamental way since Charles Eliot and the Committee of Ten designed it in the 1890s. We know more about human learning. We understand that the culture and the economy have changed. But we are so stuck in what has become the conventional way of schooling that we don't think twice about it. So we still say that the mainline subjects that Charles Eliot and his colleagues established in 1893 are the core of the school. We still assume that one can test children's mastery of those mainline subjects in a way that is rigorous and useful. We still persist in thinking that school is school is school. It runs for 180 days. You take English, math, social studies, science, in forty-seven-minute periods, taught by teachers who have more than a hundred students, sometimes two hundred. The students march forward on the basis of their birthdays, in things called "grades" – like eggs – and we tell ourselves that we can ascertain whether these kids have profound intellectual competence. The system is mindless.

Two years later, John Taylor Gatto, one of the participants in that original forum with Sizer, noted the following in a follow-up essay in *Harpers Magazine*: "Do we really need school? I don't mean education; just forced schooling: six classes a day, five days a week, nine months a year, for twelve years. Is this deadly routine really necessary? And if so, for what?" (Gatto 2003, p.33). A similar 'cry of desperation' from psychological researchers has recently been published by my colleague, David Olson, a leading cognitive psychologist (Olson 2003). In the preface to his latest book he notes:

For some time I have been struck by the fact that whereas the psychological understanding of children's learning and development has made great strides, conspicuously through the pioneering work of Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky, and the Cognitive Revolution beginning in the 1960s, the impact on schooling as an institutional practice has been modest if not negligible. With most of my colleagues I had assumed that if only we knew more about how the mind works,

how the brain develops, how interests form, how people differ, and, most centrally, how people learn, educational practice would take a great leap forward. But while this knowledge has grown, schools have remained remarkably unaffected. Thus, whereas the research assures us that what people learn depends upon what they already know, in school what they learn depends upon what the school mandates. Whereas the research suggests that people learn because they are intrinsically interested or because they love learning, in school they pursue knowledge because, as they say, they 'need the credit.' Whereas researchers insist that learning is inspired by the search for meaning and the growth in understanding, what, in fact, they learn depends upon what books, chapters, or pages they believe they are responsible for. For the theorist the growth of the mind is spontaneous and continuous; for the school it is a matter of obligation and duty.

The various observations above sum up rather well the dilemmas we face around the world: what we know now about how humans learn has little or nothing to do with how we try to enable young people to learn in places called school; and we seem generally not able to change those places called school in any fundamental way. What we mostly get, even with enormous efforts in some nations, are small changes, dearly bought, with small effects in terms of the actual learning of young people, especially those who are most disadvantaged. What we seem to have ended up best at is modestly increasing the learning levels of those who are, by advantaged social circumstances of birth, already well ahead of the game. This is not to say that there are not a lot of quite good schools out there, in both very wealthy and very poor places. A major part of the problem, as Michael Fullan (Fullan & Watson 1999) and others have identified it, is that while we are quite good at noting a really good school, and characterizing it, we do not have any serious idea about how to create such schools, at least in very large numbers, nor particularly, how to change traditional schools in large numbers into places which better match what we have come to know about human learning. This does not *explain* the problem, but it does at least *identify* it. Several explanations have been offered in recent years.

Tyack and Cuban (1995) refer to the problem as an issue of a widely understood grammar of schooling – a kind of mental model of what a school is supposed to look like and do: these 'grammars' may vary

slightly from place to place, but once set they are difficult to change. I have made my own contributions to this literature, noting among other things that schooling is such a pervasive institution that large arrays of other institutional sets, patterns and habits of living have become institutionalized in such a way as to assure the continued existence of those forms of formal schooling (Farrell 2001a). More recently David Olson has, from a cognitive psychology perspective, drawn on Tyack and Cuban and on my position to suggest that the institutional demands on the formal school generally preclude the “human development” goals of cognitive and learning psychology:

Now we may see why the cognitive psychology created by the developmentalists of this generation is of marginal relevance to the problem of understanding either schooling or school reform. How children perceive, explore, understand, and enjoy the world and others, the bundle of concerns defining child-centered education, appears to have little to do with attaining institutional norms and goals. Put bluntly, schools as institutions do not ‘care’ whether students enjoy quadratic equations as long as they solve them quickly and accurately. But schools as environments for human development not only serve the impersonal institutional goals of passing on a knowledge tradition; they also, as do parents, pursue fulfillment, competence, understanding, and enjoyment for children. A psychology developed to address institutional processes and goals may turn out to be quite different from one designed to address the issues of personal growth and understanding. (Olson 2003, p.85)

Whatever the explanation here, the phenomenon remains: whatever we learn about learning, schooling systems of the traditional sort seem generally unable to change significantly. That is the ‘bad news.

The Good News: The Quiet Revolution in Primary Schooling

This section of the chapter draws upon some of the results of the international research program noted in the introduction. It seeks to understand how and why a large number of often radically alternative educational programs, generally at the primary school level but in some cases at the secondary level, mostly in developing nations but some in rich nations, work very well in enabling learning for often severely marginalized young people who have been badly served, or not reached at all, by the

traditional forms of formal schooling. We are collectively working from a database of well over 200 such cases, some quite new, relatively small (perhaps 20 to 50 schools) and not well documented, and others which are older, much larger (from 20,000 to 40,000 schools), and quite well documented and researched and carefully evaluated in terms of learning results. This entire enterprise is still in its early days and thus anything I note in this section must be taken as preliminary and provisional. Simply establishing useful grounds for comparison and analysis is still on-going; this can be best read as an early report from a large and complex international grounded-theory exercise, utilizing cases not only from Asia, but from other settings as well. There is *much* that we still have to learn. But there are some things that, even now, seem reasonably well established.

Figure 8.2: *The Emerging Alternative Model*

- Child-centered rather than teacher-driven pedagogy
- Active rather than passive learning
- Multi-graded classrooms with continuous progress learning
- Combinations of fully trained teachers, partially trained teachers and community resource people
- Parents and other community members are heavily involved in the learning of the children and the management of the school
- Peer tutoring – older and/or faster-learning children assist and teach younger and/or slower-learning children
- Carefully developed self-guided learning materials, which children, alone or in small groups, can work through themselves, at their own pace, with help from other students and the teacher(s) as necessary – the children are responsible for their own learning
- Teacher- and student-constructed learning materials
- Child-centered rather than teacher-driven pedagogy
- Active rather than passive learning
- Multi-graded classrooms with continuous progress learning
- Use of radio, correspondence lesson materials, in some cases television, in a few cases computers
- On-going and frequent in-service training and peer mentoring for teachers
- On-going monitoring/evaluation/feedback systems allowing the system to learn from its own experience, with constant modification of/experimentation with the methodology
- Free flows of children and adults between the school and the community
- Community involvement includes attention to the nutrition, health and learning of young children long before they reach formal school age
- Locally adapted changes in the cycle of the school day or the school year
- The focus of the school is much less on teaching and much more on learning

In Figure 8.2, I note what seem to be the most common characteristics of these alternative programs. It should be noted that not all of these alternative programs share all of these characteristics. But from our comparative analysis thus far, most seem to have most of them, although there are variations, especially across geo-cultural regions – and what meaning that has is not yet clear.

When comparing Figure 8.1 and Figure 8.2, one should note that they have different kinds of truth-value. I assert that Figure 8.1 is a reasonably accurate representation of how most of the schools in most of the world are. There are minor variations on the theme, but Figure 8.1 represents pretty much what happens to most children in most places most of the time. Figure 8.2 is closer to a Weberian ideal type scheme. It is an intellectual construct to capture what we now seem to understand about these alternative programs, but there is much more variation and much more we need to know. The last section of Figure 8.3, as we shall see, represents a next stage in the analysis, depicting the differences between some aspects of Figures 8.1 and 8.2 not as dichotomies, but rather as continua. This better represents where we are now in the analysis.

The primary contention of this chapter is that the best hope we have of providing a better form of learning for this and future generations of young people, on a large-scale, is to try to learn from those people, seemingly small in number in any one place but actually quite large in international aggregate, who have managed to create these islands of success where so many others have failed, or succeeded only marginally – hence the subtitle of this chapter, “What We Can Learn from Alternative Education.” Three core questions are guiding this long-term work:

- 1) The *pedagogical* question: How do these young people manage to learn as well as they do, often in very difficult circumstances? What actually happens in the classrooms and other learning sites?
- 2) The *teacher development* question: How do the teachers/facilitators in these programs learn quickly and well a radically different way of acting and being in their schools with their young charges? By almost all extant literature on teacher training, teacher development, and school reform, this is not supposed to happen.
- 3) The *management/administration* question: How do these systems originate and how do they, as many have, go to scale (often quite large-scale)? This too, according to standard reform implementation literature, is not supposed to happen.

Initially I focus on the first of these questions, the pedagogical one. This focuses on the core of the schooling enterprise – what and how well are the students actually learning? Whatever else schools are, they are places where learning is expected to occur. Everything else, such as management, administration, policy work and teacher development, is presumably in support of that fundamental goal of learning. I also turn briefly to the questions of teacher development and of going to scale. (These are part of a long-term research agenda not yet pursued in any depth). Here I present a detailed comparative analysis of three core cases selected from the much larger database of cases: one from Asia, one from Latin America, and one from the Middle East. I draw upon detailed case studies of these three programs, which have recently been written under contract in association with the Academy for Educational Development (under the USAID/EQUIP2 program). They were designed to provide not only the facts of the case – its history, context, measured learning results, costs, teacher development programs – but also a narrative account of what actually occurs in the day to day life of the school. These three cases were chosen for this first exercise for several reasons: they are exceptionally well documented and evaluated; they are exemplars of different approaches to alternative pedagogy, with a common core of understanding, in different cultural locations; in two of the cases they have been widely adapted to other cultural locations; and we had access to individuals who knew the programs intimately and could thus provide the sort of ‘day in the life of the school’ accounts we were seeking. The three cases are noted below.

Escuela Nueva (New School) in Colombia

This is the oldest and perhaps best known internationally of these programs. It started on a very small scale in the late 1970s, was carefully grown and nurtured, with constant experimentation and learning from experience, until it had spread to about 8,000 schools by the mid-1980s. It was then declared by the government as the standard model for rural schooling in that country, and has now spread to most rural schools there, with varying degrees of faithful implementation; it is currently spreading slowly to urban schools as well. It has been adopted and adapted in at least ten other countries in Latin America, and there is a recent effort by the World Bank to ascertain how and under what conditions the model might be adapted for rural schooling in Africa. It is noteworthy that this model has also, in one rural region of Colombia, spread upward to the *pos-primaria* (junior and senior secondary) levels of formal schooling. This

allows us to consider how this successful primary level alternative model might be adapted as youngsters move to more senior levels of schooling.

The Non-formal Primary Education Program of the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC)

This program is another of the 'grandparents' here. It started in the mid-1980s, has grown to involve about 35,000 rural schools in that country, and is slowly moving into urban schooling and ethnic minority regions of the country. It has spread further through a diffusion program with other local NGOs, and has also been adopted in countries such as Ethiopia, Sudan and Afghanistan.

The Community Schools Program of UNICEF-Egypt

This program started in the early 1990s, drawing upon the experience of the two programs noted above, and adapted to the local situation in small hamlets in Upper Egypt, where girls' access to schooling was particularly problematic. It has now grown to a system of more than 200 schools, with carefully planned diffusion (in conjunction with the national Ministry of Education) of its non-formal pedagogy to roughly 8,000 government-managed one-classroom schools, and then to the broader system of mainstream schools.

The Learning Results

There would not be much point in analyzing and comparing the pedagogical approaches of these programs, and the broader groups they seem to represent, unless one can demonstrate that they are producing good learning results. This is obviously a complex and difficult issue. All three programs, and almost all of the broader array of programs which they represent here, are targeted at young people who are generally thought to be the hardest to reach and hardest to teach: severely marginalized children. In all of these cases, the achievement of a primary school leaving certificate, or its equivalent, is a very high-stakes matter indeed, not only in terms of future life prospects but also in terms of the possibility of carrying on to the next level of formal education. In all of these cases the youngsters who pass through these alternative programs do better than children who have gone through the forms of formal schooling. Given the conditions from which these children come and the stakes involved, this

can be considered a major triumph, truly succeeding against the odds. In economic terms this is a value added accomplishment of considerable degree. Our three case studies provide evidence of these results.

For *Escuela Nueva*, Pitt (2004, p.12) notes:

Throughout its 27 years' existence several international and national agencies have performed evaluations of the *Escuela Nueva* program. These evaluations have shown that third grade *Escuela Nueva* students score higher than students in traditional schools in standardized Spanish language and mathematics tests, and fifth grade *Escuela Nueva* students have higher Spanish scores. These same evaluations show that the *Escuela Nueva* students demonstrate reduced repetition and dropout rates *Escuela Nueva* students have increased self-esteem and more developed civic values In 1998 UNESCO performed the First International Comparative Study on educational quality for the Latin American Laboratory of Evaluation. This study demonstrated that Colombia was the only country, out of the 11 countries that participated, where the rural students outscored the urban students. This discrepancy was credited to *Escuela Nueva* schools

With reference to the *BRAC NFPE PROGRAM*, Haiplik (2004a, p.4) notes:

In 1999 the program operated more than 35,000 schools in more than one quarter of rural Bangladeshi villages By September 2002, 2.4 million children had graduated from all of BRAC's primary education programs and 2.2 million of these graduates had been admitted to formal government schools, 66.5% being girls [that represents a 92% pass rate to junior secondary schooling, a quite astonishing accomplishment among very poor rural students, particularly girls, in a country such as Bangladesh] The demand for BRAC schools is continuous. Some parents, whose children do not meet BRAC's criteria for admission (low level of family income) push hard to have their children admitted to the local BRAC school as they know that the quality of a BRAC education is superior to that offered by the local government primary school. BRAC student attendance is high and the annual pupil dropout is low, somewhere between 2% and 6.5%. This contrasts sharply with the high dropout and low attendance rates in the formal primary system. Oxfam states that approximately 95% of BRAC students complete the five grade, four

year long, program.

Concerning the Egyptian community schools program, I have noted (Farrell 2004b, p.7):

The community schools system has been regularly formally evaluated, starting in 1993 with the first four 'pilot' schools, and most recently in 2001. There is also a great deal of internal report and anecdotal evidence available. All of the available evidence points to very positive results Dropout rates are very low, ranging around 5%. Formal academic achievement results are quite positive [In 1994, when] the community school students took standard district achievement tests, 100% passed, compared to 76% for government-supported private schools and 67% for government public schools. Those achievement results have stood the test of time and experience. The most recent formal evaluation showed similar results. Achievement results at all 'grade levels' were at least comparable to those in mainstream schools, and typically superior. Considering that the 'target' population for these schools is by far the most educationally disadvantaged youngsters in Egypt, these results are quite remarkable. This level of success is widely understood in Egypt The anecdotal evidence ... consistently notes that in addition to solid academic achievement, the students exhibit high levels of self-confidence and self-esteem, enthusiasm for and dedication to learning, are well-mannered, collaborative and courteous among themselves and with adults, and act as conduits of knowledge regarding such matters as health, sanitation, child-care and nutrition, and the environment to their parents and the broader community. A very large proportion (approximately 90%) of the children who 'graduate' from the community schools continue on to junior secondary education. Most who start at this level finish 'on time' and do very well.

In sum, in terms of results in all three of these cases, extremely poor children come to school, stay in school, finish the primary cycle, not only learn the necessary academic material but also develop self-confidence and self-esteem, and, in large proportions, carry on to the next level of formal education – and all of this, generally, at far superior levels to their compatriots in the traditional formal schools. Thus, the *pedagogical* question has considerable relevance. What exactly are these teachers and their students doing which enables this remarkable level of learning to occur?

At this early stage in our inquiry the answer to that question is not at all clear. As I consider my own observations of many of these programs, including the three noted here, and the observations of many others of the wide array of programs in our large data base, sometimes reported formally in the academic literature and often in the lore shared among people working in this area, I have a hunch or suspicion that in some sense the answer to that question is simple. That is, that Maria Montessori and Robert Baden-Powell were (at least partially) right all along. More than a century ago they began to develop and implement, she for younger children, he for older children, a form of pedagogy which echoes strongly in these new alternative programs in poor nations and which turns out to reflect clearly some of the main discoveries of recent cognitive science.

This resonance between these two pedagogical innovators is particularly interesting because they were each founders of what have become successful mainstream alternative educational programs over the past century or so. Montessori schools are found across the world, at least in the wealthier parts of it (there are by some estimates over 5,000 Montessori schools in the USA alone), but mostly they attract parents and children from well-to-do families, and thus, as noted above, represent a kind of opting out of the regular system, which thus has no effect upon it. Scouting and Guiding, a movement founded by Baden-Powell, is far more widespread, and it generally works well among both well-off children and poor children in very poor places. Current estimates suggest that there are between 25 and 35 million youngsters enrolled in Scouting and Guiding world-wide, in almost every country on the planet, and most in developing countries (Farrell, 1990). As Jeal noted, "Since its inception in 1908, Baden-Powell's Movement has attracted approximately 500 million members With the exception of great religions and political ideologies, no international organization has exerted a greater influence upon social behavior" (1991, p.ix). The World Organization of the Scouting Movement (the international scouting headquarters) was the first organization to receive from UNESCO its International Prize for Peace Education. Baden-Powell was a 'disciple' of Maria Montessori, and she an enthusiast of his work with older children. In 1914 Baden Powell observed that "Dr. Montessori has proved that by encouraging a child in its natural desires, instead of instructing it in what you think it ought to do, you can educate it on a far more solid and far-reaching basis. It is only tradition and custom that ordains that education should be a labor One of the original objects of *Scouting for Boys* was to break through this tradition" (Jeal 1991,

p.412). Montessori later wrote of Scouting as freeing children “from the narrow limits to which they have been confined” (Jeal 1991, p.413). Toward the end of her life Montessori received a letter from a ‘believer’ in her early childhood learning program, asking if she had ever had the opportunity to extend her ideas about learning to older children. She replied that no, she had not had the time nor the opportunity to work that out, but it was no problem because, “There is this fellow in England, Mr. Baden-Powell, who is doing that for me” (Correspondence copies from the archives of the World Organization of the Scouting Movement, Geneva, June 1990). But Baden-Powell never intended to influence or change the schools, as he regarded them (even in his time) as irretrievably bad for learning and unchangeable. His objective was to develop a learning system for youngsters outside of the school system, which would work along what he understood to be the ways in which children actually learn best.

Many of the core pedagogical ideas and practices involved one way or another in these programs go historically well before the ideas and practices of Maria Montessori and Robert Baden-Powell. For example, multi-grading (the inclusion of children of different ages in the same classroom), which also permits cross-age peer tutoring and continuous progress learning, characterizes many of the programs we are examining: children learn best when they progress at their own pace; and older or better learners can teach well those who are younger or less advanced than themselves. This idea is built in to the pedagogies of both Montessori schools and Scouting and Guiding. But even 100 years ago this was hardly a new idea. According to anthropological data this is actually a very old idea: almost all traditional societies, including those of Europe long ago, have depended upon older children teaching younger children, and upon various forms of continuous progress learning. A plaque on the grounds of Oxford University dedicated to Andrew Bell (1753-1832) brings to light an example of this precept:

It was while serving in Madras in India that he developed [it would be more historically accurate to say ‘discovered’ as he learned about this method by observing local forms of learning] a form of schooling where the older pupils taught the younger. When he returned he introduced his ‘Madras’ or monitorial system as an economical form of mass education. The idea spread, Madras schools appearing in Canada and Australia.

Unfortunately, these schools were soon washed away by the then new

industrial society with its age-graded, 'egg crate' schools.

Almost two centuries later we are learning that these traditional societies had it right and when they go back to their original models of learning provision the children do indeed learn well. So in some respects, with all the benefits of modern cognitive science and learning psychology we may have come to learn what we already knew, but had collectively forgotten. Folk knowledge has in this case finally been validated by the academy.

Consider the core dichotomies in Olson's Preface noted above:

What Cognitive Science Says	What Schooling Does
What people learn depends upon what they already know.	What they learn depends upon what the school mandates.
People learn because they are intrinsically interested or because they love learning.	They pursue knowledge because they 'need the credit'.
Learning is inspired by the search for meaning and growth and understanding.	What they learn depends upon what books, chapters, or pages they are responsible for.
The growth of mind is spontaneous and continuous.	It is a matter of obligation and duty.

This is not all so different from the set of contrasts one can draw by comparing Figures 8.1 and 8.2. The origins of these two figures predate Olson's (2003) work by several years, but the core ideas seem to be roughly the same. A central theme here, in comparative education terms, is the sense of continua, similarities and differences among these programs. Each of the exemplar programs considered here represents a major break from standard-schooling forms of pedagogy, and they seem to have some basic set of similarities, but given their local conditions these of course manifest different degrees and forms of change. Figure 8.3 presents a still-preliminary way of considering some of the similarities and differences among them. Although three exemplar programs have been noted above, there are actually four, since *Escuela Nueva* at the *pos-primaria* level is in some significant ways different from the original primary school version. Just as Baden-Powell had to adapt Montessori's ideas and methods to an older age group, while maintaining the essence of the pedagogy and combining its associated practices with other progressive pedagogical ideas of the time, so the program developers and implementers in Colombia have had to adapt the essence of *Escuela Nueva* Pri-

mary to the needs, capabilities, and demands upon, an older age group.

Figure 8.3: Comparison of Alternative School Pedagogies

ENP = Escuela Nueva Primary, Colombia;
 ENS = Escuela Nueva Secondary, Colombia;
 B = BRAC/NFPE, Bangladesh;
 CS = Community Schools, Egypt

Textbooks and Learning Materials
ENP: Specially designed texts and learning materials, designed for self-guided learning; much teacher- and student-developed learning materials
ENS: Specially designed texts and learning materials, designed for self-guided learning; much teacher- and student-developed learning materials
B: Combination of standard, and specially designed, texts and learning materials; some teacher-developed materials
CS: Combination of standard, and specially designed texts and learning materials; much teacher- and student-developed learning materials

Curriculum
ENP: Standard national curriculum, plus strong emphasis on local relevance (e.g. "Coffee Curriculum") and democratic citizenship education (School Councils)
ENS: Standard national curriculum, plus strong emphasis on local relevance (e.g. "Coffee Curriculum") and democratic citizenship education (School Councils)
B: Standard national curriculum, slimmed down to "essentials", plus some emphasis on local relevance, especially through "co-curricular" activities
CS: Standard national curriculum, plus strong emphasis on local relevance and "arts"

Age-graded or multi-graded
ENP: Multi-graded, with continuous progress learning and peer tutoring
ENS: Partially age-graded, but with multi-age work and peer tutoring involved
B: Age-graded, but multi-age groups with some peer tutoring; class group stays together with same teacher from beginning to end of primary cycle
CS: Multi-graded, with continuous progress learning and peer tutoring

Some pedagogical continua
 Teacher centered <-----B-----CS-----ENS-ENP-> child-centered
 Passive learning <-----B-----ENS-----CS-ENP-> active learning
 Pre-set "periods" <-----B-----ENS-----CS-----ENP-> time flows freely
 Standard school cycle <-----B-----CS-ENS-ENP-> local adaptations

"Visible pedagogy" / "invisible pedagogy"

Classification
 Strong <-----B-----ENS-----CS-ENP-> weak

Framing
 Strong <-----B-----ENS-----CS-ENP-> weak
 Rote/frontal <-----B-----ENS-----CS-ENP-> constructivist

In Figure 8.3 several different pedagogically related categories of comparison are used. The first is a learning support category: textbooks and learning materials. In all four cases specially designed texts and learning materials are used, in conjunction with various forms and degrees of teacher- and student-developed learning materials. Two of the cases (BRAC and the Egyptian Community Schools) also use standard government-issue textbooks. One thing seems clear: standard textbooks do not work well, certainly not as a sole learning resource, with these alternative forms of pedagogy. This is hardly a surprise, as they are designed for use with the established forms of formal schooling. They can, however, be used in some cases in combination with textbooks and learning materials especially designed for the alternative forms of pedagogy.

The second comparison category is curriculum. All of these programs follow the standard national curriculum, if one thinks of that as a set of learning goals and objectives for a particular schooling cycle or stage (i.e., end-primary or end-junior secondary). What these programs do is provide a way of learning that allows even extremely marginalized children opportunities to learn that curriculum to a far superior degree compared to what happens in the established formal schools. They also provide opportunities for children to learn material of local relevance (or to convert the national curricular objectives into locally relevant material and ways of learning), and also for teachers to add to the learning such things as democratic citizenship education, or arts education.

The third comparison category is age-graded or multi-graded. This is another learning support category. Two of these cases (*Escuela Nueva* Primary and the Egyptian community Schools) are fully multi-graded, with continuous progress learning and peer tutoring. The BRAC program is age-graded, in a sense, as the children all go together through Grade 1, Grade 2, etc. But the class group is composed of children of different ages: they all move together through the primary program together, covering a five-year curriculum in four years, with the same teacher(s) from beginning to end, which thus provides many opportunities for a form of continuous progress learning, and peer tutoring. It is thus a locally appropriate means for accomplishing the same core pedagogical changes. Similarly, although in a somewhat different fashion, the *Escuela Nueva* Secondary is formally age-graded, and classes are divided by subject matter, reflecting the subject-content orientation and testing routines of standard secondary schooling (or more properly junior-high school versions of those pressures), but they still manage to maintain much multi-

grade and multi-age peer-tutoring as part of the pedagogy. Again, we see a locally adapted way of getting at the same core pedagogical changes.

The final portion of Figure 8.3 deals with a variety of pedagogical aspects that fit well into the model discussed above: that is, we can think of these as continuous variables rather than as discrete categories. Two of these continua relate to the structuring of the school day and school year: pre-set periods (by subject or type of activity) *versus* time flowing freely; and standard school day/year cycles *versus* local adaptations. The next two continua attempt to locate these programs on now-standard categories of pedagogical difference: teacher-centered *versus* child-centered; and passive *versus* active learning. We then move to a somewhat different way of understanding these pedagogical variables, as found in the now classic work of Basil Bernstein, where he distinguishes between visible and invisible pedagogy. In Bernstein's formulation, this distinction rests on two dimensions – classification and framing. Visible pedagogy involves strong classification and strong framing, while invisible pedagogy involves weak classification and framing. 'Weak' in both cases is essentially defined as the absence of 'strong' (see Bernstein 1975; Bernstein 1990; Bernstein 1996). Thus:

- Strong classification: school 'subjects' are sharply distinguished; school activities are insulated from the outside, and confined to spaces within the school.
- Strong framing: the teacher, following a carefully defined curriculum, determines and decides the content, sequencing and pacing of the learning. Since Bernstein's work was originally published, his distinction between visible and invisible pedagogy has been, in much pedagogical debate, conflated with the distinction between traditional rote/frontal teaching (as in the forms of formal schooling) and constructivist teaching, which by most definitions is something close to what Olson argues for. In a recent article Fowler and Poetter (2004, p.312) argue that this conflation is not correct. As they note, "What most people think of as traditional pedagogy is *one form of* (emphasis added) visible pedagogy." Their main point is that constructivist pedagogy, as generally understood, can and does occur in both visible and invisible pedagogies; these are distinct dimensions. Thus the final continuum in Figure 8.3 is rote/frontal versus constructivist teaching.

It must be noted that the placement of these various programs along these several continua can only be taken as approximate. First of all, the terms used are subject to various interpretations: what exactly does one mean by child-centered or active learning, or constructivist pedagogy, etc.? A careful examination of the pedagogical literature, especially comparatively, shows enormous variations in what one would actually expect to see in a classroom with respect to such terms. Beyond that, in any of these programs there are considerable variations in the degree to which the basic ideas or principles of the program are actually implemented – which is true of most if not all large-scale human institutions. Thus, the placements of these programs on these continua should not be considered as exact points, but as approximations based on careful first-hand observations. They are more rough and ready than exact; but as one scans these placements some general patterns of importance nevertheless emerge.

Escuela Nueva Primary and the Egyptian Community Schools are the closest and most faithful to the emerging model. *Escuela Nueva* Secondary is generally at a sort of mid-point, but demonstrating nevertheless that it is indeed possible even at the secondary level of schooling to move well beyond the established forms of schooling. The BRAC schools are farthest from the emerging model, but they have moved far from the forms of formal schooling as outlined above. Haiplik's work (2004b) indicates that this reflects some particular Bangladeshi understandings of teaching and learning, for people of all ages, which are deeply culturally embedded. Each program then, in its own way and in its own circumstances, has found ways to move well away from the established forms of formal schooling while remaining true to its own local cultural traditions.

There is still a lot to understand about how these alternative pedagogies work and how they produce the learning results noted here. The comparative information and analysis presented here is only a beginning. Beyond that we have only begun to consider the questions of how these teachers learn so well so quickly, and how these programs have managed to go to scale. But even at this very early stage in this long-term research enterprise there are some conclusions which seem relatively firm.

What We Know to Date about These Alternative Success Stories

The most important thing which these alternative programs teach us is that the established model of schooling *can* be changed, on large-scale, and generally at a per-pupil recurrent cost that is no greater than, and

often less than, the established model (there is not space here to deal in detail with the cost issue, but each of the case studies noted above considers this question carefully). These programs demonstrate that child-centered, active pedagogy, with heavy involvement of parents and the community in the learning of young people works – it can be done, and where it is done it generally produces remarkable learning gains among even the poorest and most disadvantaged children. Considering the bad news noted in an earlier section of this chapter, that is an extremely important finding. It is also important to note that these change programs do not simply alter one feature of the standard established school (for example, adding more textbooks or improving teacher training of the standard sort, or altering this or that bit of the standard curriculum), or provide extra money to the school. Rather, they represent a thorough reorganization and fundamental re-visioning of the standard model of schooling, such that the learning program for the youngsters, although occurring in, or based in, a building called a school, is far different from what we have come to expect to be happening in a school, and far more effective than what we have typically seen in even very good schools, even for young people from very well-off families.

These programs also demonstrate that, contrary to a commonly held belief, teachers are not obstacles to fundamental school change – in these cases when it happens they are the promoters and agents of such change, even when they are working in very difficult situations, are not formally very well trained, and are very poorly paid. They, like the equally disadvantaged young people in their charge, can accomplish remarkable feats of learning and change, in quite short periods of time, under these alternative education programs. There is an important parallel here between the young and older learners. Just as the success for the young people seems based fundamentally on a focus on learning rather than teaching, so the changes in teachers seem based on the same change in focus. These successful change programs typically spread, or go to scale, not by a centrally planned and commanded reform plan with goals and objectives set from afar, and agents or supervisors from the national centre, or perhaps a regional university, going out to teach teachers about the latest educational scheme. Rather, they spread by an innovation diffusion process – teachers learning from other teachers, sharing their practical professional knowledge (see Clandinin & Connelly 1998) and teaching skills with other teachers, and together exploring how their shared and growing knowledge and experience can help them all, together, experiment with ways to im-

prove their ability to serve the young people in their care.

What of the role of government itself, and of policy? Some of these programs have grown under government sponsorship (e.g., *Escuela Nueva*); others have grown outside of government sponsorship and control (e.g., the BRAC program); and still others have been or are working well under various forms of combined sponsorship and ownership (e.g., the Egyptian Community Schools Program). This is a critical issue, from the experience to hand. Government agencies and bureaucracies have a predictable tendency to want to command, decree, regulate, control, supervise, organize, and generally keep administratively tidy all things that fall within their jurisdiction. That is part of what has led to the forms of formal schooling. Whatever else they are, they are predictable, controllable to a degree (as long as one doesn't ask too persistently what the children are actually learning, beyond what they display on – typically bad – tests), and potentially, if not really administratively, tidy.

In contrast, the programs discussed here are somewhat anarchic, unpredictable, uncontrollable, and constantly changing as they learn from their own experience (as should the children they work with). This is all typically unsettling to a bureaucracy intent upon control, regulation and standardization. The first role of government in these cases is to get out of the way, to loosen control and regulation. The second role is to provide space for, and indeed encourage, a healthy degree of anarchy, scary as that may be to those who comfortably inhabit offices and bureaucratic positions in the national capital or its regional dependencies (and often also to the officials of international donor agencies who similarly require predictability and accountability before they will release or renew funds). If you are seriously interested in promoting learning rather than teaching, probably the last thing you want is predictability. All of this requires a massive attitude and behavioral change among those in positions of bureaucratic and political power. What is perhaps most remarkable about these cases of successful major educational change is that they have somehow managed to find or develop that bureaucratic attitude to provide space for, or perhaps welcome, change, or to get past or get around the power of the established bureaucracy. Investigating exactly how this has been accomplished is a big task before us. Knowing that it has been done provides a major incentive.

Another lesson is this: children do not have to be forced or coerced into learning. It is what they do naturally – indeed what they are genetically compelled to do, if given the opportunity. This is not a new obser-

vation, but it seems to be constantly overlooked. It is what Olson and his cognitive science colleagues have long observed. But you don't have to be in an expensive learning laboratory in a place like Toronto to see this. In the late 1980s I was in a small village in Colombia visiting yet another of the early examples of *Escuela Nueva*. I was chatting with a group of the parents of the children in the new school. I asked them what they saw as the main difference between the experience of their older children who had attended and mostly failed in the established school which had more or less functioned in the village, and the experience of their younger children in the new school. After some mumbling among themselves, one mother replied, obviously speaking for the group:

Look, with my older kids, they hated going to school. I always had to force them out of the house in the morning. Both of them repeated first grade twice, they weren't learning anything, and they were not happy. So finally I said OK, you can go with your father out in the fields and work – at least you'll be doing something useful there. My younger kids in the new school now? The problem is the opposite. I can't keep them away from the school. Even when they're sick. And they don't come home in the afternoon – they're in the school working on things. I have to send my oldest down there to tell them that they have to come home to eat dinner and do their chores. And they complain to me, "Mamita, it's so much fun at school and we're doing such interesting things – why do we have to come home to do these boring chores?"

Where established forms of schooling restrict and try to channel the learning potential of children, these new alternative programs unleash it.

Multi-grading is not simply a second-best expedient for use when there are not enough children in a school catchment area to support age-graded schooling. It is, in and of itself, pedagogically superior to age-graded schooling; it matches much more closely what we now know about how children actually develop.

Early childhood education, or more properly put, attention to the nurture, health and learning needs of children before they reach formal school age is as important as, probably more important than, the primary school itself in improving ultimate learning outcomes. Children start learning at birth and learn continuously thereafter. Nothing fundamentally changes in that pattern of continuous development at the age we have arbitrarily set for starting formal school attendance. And their de-

velopment thereafter does not come in the system-convenient, nine to ten month bursts which the age-graded school year assumes. Continuing education or life-long learning is not something which starts *after* one has completed formal schooling. It starts at birth and ends at death, and formal schooling as we know it generally can by all evidence be more of a hindrance than a help to its continuance in the crucial years between early childhood and adulthood. These alternative programs demonstrate that that dysfunctional pattern can be broken.

These sorts of successful learning enhancement programs need to be grown and nurtured carefully and slowly. Trying to go too fast can destroy potentially promising innovations. (*Escuela Nueva* in Colombia was almost destroyed in its middle years by the insistence of the World Bank that it expand more rapidly than was possible given the administrative capacity of the educational system.) Things take time. Unfortunately, this does not match well with the frequent need of governments to have demonstrable results in the short term, nor with the short-term funding cycles of most donor agencies. If one is, as a government or donor agency, to be in the learning enhancement enterprise, one must be in it for the long haul or not at all. There are no large-scale quick fixes. What we do have is an increasing number of slowly and carefully developed long-term successes. They are what we must learn from.

Summary

I return to a central point: as educators our ultimate objective is learning and its enhancement. Schooling as we have come to know it (the forms of formal schooling or the grammar of schooling) is but one system we have socially constructed in pursuit of that end, and it has turned out to be a not particularly useful tool, particularly for poor and marginalized young people, but also for more well-off children. Moreover, efforts to change and improve that system have turned out, no matter how wealthy or poor the country, generally to be expensive failures. And in the few cases where a group or country does manage to get it right, what they generally end up with is a slightly improved version of the standard model with only marginal learning gains procured at great price.

The standard change model – top-down, centrally driven, regulation-ridden grand reform schemes – has proved to be about as intransigently ineffective as the schooling system it is attempting to improve. The problem we face is not simply that many children in the world do not yet

have access to school – the ‘Education For All’ issue. It is that those who do have such access are not learning much, even in rich countries, or that what they are learning is more in spite of than because of what happens in the school. In contrast, we now have a large set of successful examples, some large in scale and some still small and in early stages of development, of which the three cases highlighted here are exemplars, which are succeeding in significantly improving learning by adopting a radically different form of pedagogy, and spreading it via an innovation-diffusion process which, *inter alia*, demonstrates that teachers can and do quite quickly and easily learn a wholly new understanding of their role and a very different and better way of doing their work in the classroom.

There is much to be learned here, if we choose to. If we choose not to, then the prediction I ventured at the start of this chapter will almost surely be accurate: in 2020, or 2030 or whenever, whatever surprises the future may hold for us, our schools will look and work pretty much as they do now. To help that learning process, a major, long-term comparative research process is required. Some of us have started that. More is needed.

References

- Armstrong, T. (1998): *Awakening Genius in the Classroom*. ASCD.
- Bernstein, B. (1975): *Class and Pedagogies: Visible and Invisible*. Paris: OECD.
- Bernstein, B. (1990): *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1996): *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Bransford, J.D. (2000): *Brain, Mind, Experience and Schooling*. Washington, D.C.: Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences, National Research Council, National Academy Press.
- Caine, R, & Caine, G. (1997): *Education on the Edge of Possibility*. ASCD.
- Clandinin, J. & Connelly, F.M. (1998): ‘Stories to Live By: Narrative Understanding of School Reform’. *Curriculum Inquiry*, Vol.28, No.2, pp.149-264.
- Farrell, J.P. (1989): ‘International Lessons for School Effectiveness: the View from the Third World’ in M. Holmes, (et. al, eds.) *Policy for Effective Schools*. New York and Toronto: Teachers College Press and OISE Press.
- Farrell, J.P. (1990): ‘And the Boys took It Up for Themselves: A Preliminary History of Scouting as an Alternative Non-formal Educational Movement’. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society. Los Angeles, CA.
- Farrell, J.P. (1997): ‘A Retrospective on Educational Planning in Comparative Education.’ *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.41, No.3, pp.270-313.
- Farrell, J.P. (1998): ‘Improving Learning: Perspectives for Primary Education in

- Rural Africa'. Core Comparative Background Paper prepared for the World Bank/UNESCO regional seminar on Improving Primary Education in Rural Africa. Lusaka, Zambia.
- Farrell, J.P. (2000): 'Why is Educational Reform So Difficult? Similar Descriptions, Different Prescriptions, Failed Explanations'. *Curriculum Inquiry*, Vol.30, No.1, pp.83-103.
- Farrell, J.P. (2001): 'Can We Really Change the Forms of Formal Schooling, and Would It Make a Difference if We Could?'. *Curriculum Inquiry*, Vol.31, No.4, pp.289-308.
- Farrell, J.P. (2004a): 'Alternative Pedagogies and Learning in Alternative Schooling Systems in Developing Nations: A Comparative Analysis'. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society, Salt Lake City, UH.
- Farrell, J.P. (2004b): 'The Egyptian Community Schools Program: A Case Study'. Case Study paper prepared for the Academy for Educational Development/USAID.
- Fowler, F. & Poetter, T. (2004): 'Framing French Success in Elementary Mathematics: Policy, Curriculum and Pedagogy'. *Curriculum Inquiry*, Vol.34, No.3, pp.283-314.
- Fullan, M. & Watson, N. (1999): 'School-based Management: Reconceptualizing to Improve Learning Outcomes'. Paper prepared for the World Bank Seminar: Improving Learning Outcomes in the Caribbean.
- Gatto, J.T. (2003): 'Against School: How Public Education Cripples Our Kids, and Why', *Harpers Magazine*, Vol.307, No.184, pp.33-40.
- Haiplik, B. (2004a): 'BRAC's Non-formal Primary Education (NFPE) Program'. Case Study prepared for the Academy of Educational Development/USAID.
- Haiplik, B. (2004b): *An Educational Success Story from Bangladesh: Exploring BRAC's NFPE Model and Teacher Training and Development System*. Unpublished PhD thesis. (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto).
- Jeal, T. (1991): *Baden Powell*, London: Pimlico.
- Olson, D. (2003): *Psychological theory and Educational Reform: How School Remakes Mind and Society*, U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- Pitt, J. (2004): *Case Study for Escuela Nueva Program* Case study prepared for the Academy for Educational Development/USAID.
- Ravitch, D. & Vinovskis, M. (1995): *Learning from the Past: What History Teaches Us About School Reform*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sizer, T. (2001): 'Forum' in *Harpers Magazine*, September, pp.44-51.
- Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1995): *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

III

*Leadership in Changing the Way
Education Changes*

Leadership in the Context of Complex Global Interdependence Emerging Realities for Educational Innovation

Peter D. HERSHOCK

Among the central challenges of effective leadership in the 21st century are understanding and responding to the patterns of interdependence that now increasingly characterize the social, economic, and political spheres. It is no longer possible to address effectively local concerns except in complex, global contexts. Neither is it possible to respond aptly to confounding, large-scale global issues without assessing and attending to local subtexts. Leaders and policy-makers must now be capable of sensitively and yet critically weighing often quite disparate aims, bodies of data, and practices, bringing them into productive and sustainable relationship.

The scale and depth of interdependence characteristic of the contemporary world are bringing widely differing social, economic, and political communities and institutions into unprecedented close relationship. But it is also bringing about the interfusion of widely differing cultures and interests. The choices confronting contemporary societies thus cannot be limited to deciding upon factual solutions under the assumption of essentially shared values, but necessarily entail negotiating broad assent on both common norms and the meaning of beneficial change.

Importantly, while widely differing sets of values and norms must now be taken into account in crafting mutually beneficial trajectories of development *among* societies, this is also true *within* individual societies. Although pluralism as a socio-political ideal is by no means universally embraced, the contemporary world has become undeniably pluralist as a

matter of fact. Global patterns of interdependence and population movements are affecting both the degree and mode of 'external' interactions among societies, but also the fabric of 'internal' relationships constitutive of every society drawn into these patterns. In correlation with this, we are witnessing ever-growing numbers of previously silent (or silenced) members of societies who are now voicing their own, unique interests. In some societies, the most prominent of these new voices are those from within ethnic or religious minorities; in others, they are the voices of women; in still others, they are the voices of farmers or factory workers or the poor. In sum, the advent of increasingly pluralist societies entails the emergence of new perspectives on the meaning of truly common good.

This trend stands in sharp contrast to the broadly accepted claim (hoped for by some; feared by others) that globalization will bring about a planetary monoculture. The kind of globalization witnessed over the past century has undoubtedly driven (and been driven by) increasing institutional compatibility and, at times conformity. Mention might be made, for example, of the commercial institutions enabling global transfers of goods and capital or the human rights conventions and legal institutions guaranteeing the minimum conditions for human dignity. At the same time, contemporary globalization processes have been associated with increasingly serious recognition of the importance of difference. At the most commercial level, this has led to niche marketing of globally circulating goods and services. At a more profound level, it has led to previously disenfranchised individuals and classes of individuals being warranted careful (if not always caring) attention as they have claimed rights to participate in the full contemporary spectrum of social, economic, and political processes or to maintain their traditional cultural practices.

It would be naïve to suppose, however, that the counter-movement to planetary monoculture has always been beneficial for those claiming an abiding and significant place on the social, economic, and political map. Some critics of globalization have noted that the emergence of new classes and the rising status of already existing classes has been following the familiar pattern of advantaging a select few and disadvantaging a great many, exporting functionally rigid hierarchies of power into hitherto fluidly structured social, economic, political, and cultural domains. Others, myself included, have claimed that late 20th and early 21st century patterns of globalization are conducive to a systematic translation of functional *diversity* into merely formal *variety*, to an associated commodification of subsistence, and to an institutionalization of new classes of the poor.

Like the claims celebrating the benefits of globalization, claims criticizing its effects can and are being contested. What cannot be contested, however, are the imperatives and opportunities made evident by increasing interdependence for leaders to take differing perspectives, values, and interests into global account as they work to discern and open possibilities for realizing sustainable common good. Leadership in the context of 21st century realities involves taking into account both historically unprecedented effects of widespread, boundary-crossing *convergence* (of peoples, institutions, practices, and ideals), as well as the effects of an accelerating multiplication of relational possibilities or unanticipated patterns of *emergence*.

Two crucial sets of considerations, then, should be infused into the leadership processes of discerning and opening passages to realizing and globally sustaining common good. The first has to do with the historical nature of *globalization* and the importance of *scale*; the second, with the importance of meaningfully orienting interdependence through *processes of valuation* that are viable and forceful along the full spectrum of scales from the local to the global. In brief, it is now clear that strategies which work well in establishing and maintaining a desirable pattern of relationships within a specific set of spatial and temporal limits, often cannot be effectively scaled-up or scaled-down because the affected patterns of relationships undergo qualitative changes as these limits are exceeded. So-called scale variance drives home the point that there are very few (*if any*) 'one size fits all' approaches to managing change. This implies, however, that there are likely to be multiple inter-weavings of values, ends, and interests layered within any given leadership situation. Leadership is not just about adjusting our means of arriving at already existing ends, shifting from competitive to cooperative interactions with others as needed. Instead, complex interdependence practically compels going beyond this to realizing truly coordinative interactions based upon jointly articulated concepts and values that have traction across both multiple scales and domains. In a word, 21st century leadership involves skills for initiating, sustaining, and qualitatively enhancing shared meaning making at multiple scales and among plural actors and perspectives.

The Changing Landscape of Leadership

Globalization and interdependence are not new phenomena. There is abundant written evidence of trans-continental trade in a wide range of

goods, both material and otherwise, extending back well over two millennia. Archeological evidence suggests that such trade can be pushed back substantially further. In the broadest senses of the terms, it would seem that cultures have, from earliest times, taken shape in commerce with one another. This has been through ongoing exchanges of luxury and subsistence goods, as well as plant, animal, and human populations. But also, and perhaps more importantly, it has taken place through exchanges of narratives, ideas, and ideals. While this commerce typically took place between nearby locales, a quilted domain of transmissions came into being by means of which significant interfusions took place among (especially) Oceanic, Asian, Australasian, European, African and (to a somewhat lesser extent) Amerindian cultures. Thus, at the imperial court of the Tang in 9th century China, one could find luxury goods and animals from as far away as southern Africa, and representatives of virtually every major religion or polity from Western Europe to the Pacific coast of Asia. Globalization is not new.

These patterns of commerce among cultures began undergoing significant change in scale and character with a wave of technological innovations in transportation and communication from roughly the 16th century onwards. These included faster ocean-going ships, new navigation devices, improved maps, and, somewhat later, trans-continental railway systems, teletype and telegraphy. The rapid and widespread deployment of such technologies occasioned an accelerating compression of the temporal magnitudes associated with global trade, making possible both politically defined colonial empires and business or commercial entities of multi-continental reach, like the British East India Company. The rapid compression of temporal magnitudes and associated expansion of geographic reach were generally perceived as positive by those extending their spheres of influence (the colonialists and traders), but in a much more mixed and at times quite negative fashion by those colonized and/or exploited.

Moreover, as capital became increasingly global, national and regional differentials in wages, in labor organization (or the lack thereof), and in environmental favors and restrictions came to play an increasing role in both 'rationalizing' and 'de-localizing' production processes. Inequities in working conditions and in the distribution of new wealth being generated by globalizations of both production and consumption were subjected to critical analysis from the middle of the 19th century. These analyses reached revolutionary pitch over the first half of the 20th

century, resulting in large-scale (Soviet and Maoist) experiments in centrally managed, ostensibly worker-biased attempts to redirect social, economic and political interdependence at national and international levels.

By and large, these experiments have not proven effective. The dissolution of global colonialism over the first half of the 20th century did not alleviate the deep disparity in wealth between European colonial powers and their colonies – a disparity correlated with sharp differences in the cost of living and the cost of labor across the world. While much hope has been attached over the past half century to technological development as a means of ameliorating such differentials, the dramatic development and proliferation of new technologies – in particular, information and communications technology (ICT), and transportation – has tended instead to reinforce them. ICT enabled patterns of ever quicker, simpler, and cheaper global transfers of information and money, combined with similarly efficient patterns of transferring goods and people through containerized shipping and ‘hub and spoke’ airline connections, have brought about a world of increasingly rapid and yet globally mediated economic, political, social and cultural interaction. Largely freed from geographical constraints on communication and transportation, transnational corporations (TNCs) now site manufacturing processes wherever it is most profitable. Typically, this is in regions of the developing world where labor has remained relatively cheap, where corporate taxes are lowest, where bureaucratic red tape and labor rights are minimal, and yet where the infrastructure (especially the transport infrastructure) is sufficiently developed. This has spurred considerable competition among regions, countries, and cities seeking global investment and the employment benefits associated with it – a competitive ‘race to the bottom’ that has effectively served to keep wages and taxes low and to minimize bureaucratic controls (such as anti-pollution laws) and human rights legislation. The increasing extent, depth, and power of markets have, thus, come to be correlated with a decreasing ability of states (especially in the developing world) to provide public goods and services (education, health-care, housing) crucial to the welfare and wellbeing of their people.

Nevertheless, throughout much of the 20th century, the ever-increasing speed and scope of exchanges taking place world-wide was widely considered promising. While uneven development and distribution of the benefits of growing interdependence were acknowledged, the belief remained strong, well into the final quarter of the century that as the world became a ‘smaller place’ and as the diffusion of innovations

proceeded, these disparities would be substantially addressed, almost as a matter of course. The 'invisible hand' of the market, first invoked by Adam Smith in the 18th century would over time smooth out wrinkles in the economic playing field in a way maximally benefiting all. In the first decade of the 21st century, however, this belief seems in retrospect almost painfully naïve and it is a growing concern for many that 'faster' and 'more' do not always mean better.

This shift – for some, a shock of disillusionment – is tied to mounting acknowledgment of what are widely referred to as problems of scale. Perhaps the most succinct way of focusing the crucial function of scale in contemporary patterns of globalization is by analogy to how scale factors into the structure and dimensions of biological systems. It is now well understood, for example, that there are clear limits to the size of the human body, which evolved in the context of specific gravitational conditions. As the product of specific global environmental conditions, the basic structure of the human body cannot be amplified much beyond the size of the largest known individuals today. Traditional mythologies and modern science fiction to the contrary, five or ten meter tall humans could never walk the earth. With respect to organic structure and processes, size truly matters. Likewise, the institutional structures and processes that are constitutive of market-mediated global commerce evolved under certain constraints in terms of their reach and density. Until quite recently, it was assumed that free market economics as theorized by Adam Smith – on the basis of then existing 18th century British markets – could be readily scaled up to global dimensions. The processes of competition that Smith insisted were most conducive to building both social wealth and morality were believed to be functionally scale-independent. This turns out not to be the case – a fact that has become tragically manifest to the global poor, whose ranks have swelled 50% over the past quarter century, to now comprise fully 45% of the total world population.

A related scale issue – that of the fallacy of composition – can be best illustrated with reference to the production of ironic or revenge effects by technologies deployed at a sufficient scale that they begin producing the conditions of their own necessity, re-shaping their own environments to insure their continued (although globally eroding) utility. The fallacy is that if something is good for each and every one of us, considered individually, that it must be good for all of us, considered as a whole. Perhaps the most visible, annoying, and apparently intractable example of this fallacy is the way in which the spread of automotive technologies even-

tually *increases* average per capita travel time, as urban and rural communities are reshaped by the scale of automotive velocities and the urban, industrial, and commercial sprawl they initially make both feasible and profitable. As those unfortunate enough to have been caught in a Bangkok transportation gridlock well know, the summative effects of using automobiles to get from place to place are very different when there are not hundreds or thousands spread across a hundred square miles, but millions.

It might be imagined that, at least for leaders, problems of scale are simply practical matters, best left to technical or engineering experts. This, however, is not the case. The ironic consequences associated with ignoring the realities of scale variance point toward a much deeper problem rooted in the historical nature of the processes in question. Consider what is involved, for example, when the scale of a technology's deployment increases to the point that this technology crosses the threshold of its own utility. Up to this threshold, the technology delivers anticipated and desired consequences. Beyond this threshold, however, the technology begins bringing about the conditions of its own necessity by *generating problems* of the sort that only it (or some closely related technology) is apparently able to address. These problems are not logically entailed by the technological activity under consideration, in and of itself. Rather, they emerge when the scale of this activity is so great that the technology and its environment become functionally interdependent. At such scales, the technology and its environment are linked by feed-back and feed-forward processes into a higher order, *emergent* system with characteristics and consequences other than those determined by the sum of its parts. The historical implications of this core principle of general systems theory are seldom fully appreciated. As new systems of interdependent processes form, the logic of strict entailment breaks down. It is for this reason that technologies deployed at sufficient scale begin generating so-called unintended, revenge, or ironic effects. The *conditional* pattern "*if this, then that*" can no longer be relied upon.

This transition holds true for all higher order emergent systems, not just those that result when technologies and their environments – whether physical, social, economic, or political – become functionally and fully interdependent. What remains when the logic of strict entailment breaks down – and what is most generally true of all systems for which history makes a difference – is the *narrative* pattern of "*first this, then that.*" Here it is not the case that the prior conditions of a system *necessarily* result in

those that follow. All that is implied is a meaningful sequence, one in which both the behavior of a system *and* its consequences are intrinsically underdetermined, open, and subject to change. For the simplest systems of this type – one can include such inanimate systems as forest fires or hurricanes and such rudimentary animate systems as amoebas or bacteria – the degree of indeterminacy is fairly modest. Their individual histories – at less than evolutionary time scales for animate systems – are almost always quite *typical*. But this is less true of increasingly complex systems like higher vertebrate animals and entire ecosystems, and still less so where the history of the system is consciously woven into the ongoing nature of the process itself, as is true of human beings and their social institutions, economies, and political systems.

In such highly complex, multiple-order systems, there emerges rich topographies of recursion that are capable of remarkably rapid and profound amplifications of what were originally quite small or modest changes. In complexly reiterating systems, it is not only the case that emerging differences are able to make a real difference; it is possible for significant changes in the state and quality of the system as a whole to be triggered from any point within the system. While hierarchical organizational patterns may still obtain, the capacity for innovation comes to be increasingly widely (though not necessarily uniformly) distributed. This means, however, that the sensitivities of such systems to change or difference undergo considerable refinement, as do the responsive capabilities by means of which these systems take their own histories into account and alter the dynamic patterns of interrelatedness through which they arise.

For example, animals do not just act upon their environments in seeking out nourishment and safety; through their perceptual systems, they continuously map the responses of their environment and feed these back into their motor system activity. Dogs attend to environmental feedback in the form of their masters' habits and preferences, and then feed these forward into their own activity. As a dog's *newly improvised* activity affects its master's behavior, this change is fed back into yet another iteration of their spirally structured relational history. If all goes well, a qualitatively distinct and continuously deepening inter-species friendship emerges. The same process is involved in the learning of expert computer systems that at once attune themselves to their users and at the same time help bring the behavior of these users into what are experienced as ever more transparent patterns of interaction with the computer system's operational values and programming logic.

For all complex systems, the same basic process of recursion plays out. They are, in sum, both *auto-poetic* (self-making) and *novogenous* (novelty-generating) systems in continuous and active correspondence with their environments. But because such systems arise *as* patterns of interdependence or mutual interrelatedness, this does not amount to simple one-way adaptation. As they actively change themselves, they are at once changing their larger-scale environments and the smaller-scale systems or patterns of relationship that they comprise. The causality of complex systems is thus decidedly non-linear, flowing both 'upward' (from part to whole) and 'downward' (from whole to part). Put somewhat differently, the persistence of complex systems involves contributions to *directing* patterns of dynamic relationality playing out over time and across an essentially unlimited range of scales and domains. In a sense that is by no means merely metaphorical, their histories can be seen as patterns of *generating meaning*. Complex systems are not only capable of, but are also prone to, changing the very ways things change.

The main point of this synoptic narrative of the modern and early post-modern history of globalization and its increasingly complex nature can be simply stated: the summative effect of significant, quantitative changes in the scope and depth of globalization processes over the past several centuries has been to bring about profound *qualitative* transformations in the relational systems by means of which societies frame and pursue their own continuity. Emerging interdependencies both within and among the social, economic, political, technological, scientific, and cultural domains are not only a legacy of responses to change, they are also increasingly responsive to change – a fact that has crucial implications for truly responsible leadership.

Implications for Leadership and Innovation

A few of these implications should perhaps be noted here, in at least a preliminary fashion. First, all systems for which history makes a difference are always making history. As implied in the above remarks, this is especially true of such higher order systems as human beings, societies, economies, and political entities. Contrary, however, to the idiom of "history repeating itself," the histories made by recursive, complex, and highly ordered systems cannot be repeated. They are constantly fed back into the very process by means of which such systems continuously transform themselves and their environments. Simply stated, it is part of the nature

of such systems to learn. Complex recursive systems are not only continuously changing, they are continually *innovating*. With the advent of complex systems, cyclic patterns of change are translated, at the very least, into spiral dynamics; repetition gives way to adaptive reproduction.

Emerging global realities are such that it is not true only that certain values, aims and interests are becoming embedded in the concrete relationships and practices that materially constitute our growing interdependence, abiding thereafter in a steady state of activation, producing changes at set velocities. Rather, such values, aims and interests have a potentially *accelerating* impact on the nature of our global interdependence – and, hence, our lived environments – as a whole. An example of the accelerating impact of learning systems is the difference between beginning musicians who take many days to learn a quite simple piece of traditional folk music together, and advanced musicians who are able to play the piece almost immediately and will, furthermore, be able to engage in shared improvisations on its melodic and harmonic structures, both readily and skillfully adapting the music in keeping with contemporary tastes and conditions. So too complex global systems of interdependence are not only extending, but also steadily and responsively altering both how and why we engage in social, economic, political and cultural activity.

Conversely, however, especially in the case of social and cultural systems – like education – where the stress on adaptive creativity is in tension with the valorization of conserving existing structures and traditions, the complex relational and historical embeddedness of values can have a potentially decelerating or *braking* effect. That is, commitments to certain values, if strong enough, can retard the development of capacities for responsive ingenuity – capacities that accelerating globalization at contemporary scales and depths makes practically necessary for the continued significance and, eventually, continued survival of these very commitments and values. The realities of complex global interdependence, although they foreground values and processes of valuation as qualifiers of the direction and depths of change, also pose particular challenges to the persistence of fixed values or systems of valorization.

Importantly, although complex systems are capable, through the dynamics of recursion and reiteration, of altering the temporality of both environing and envired systems, accelerating or retarding the pace of change, these dynamics also bring about spatial – that is, structural or organizational – alterations. As briefly noted above, the historical trajec-

tory of complex system development is deeply liable to significant spatial diffusions of potentials for making significant differences. That is, such systems are prone to generating increasingly pluralized geographies of innovation – extremely wide distributions of both sites-for and sources-of significant change.

A useful analogy can be drawn between such geographies and the reiterative structure of holographs, wherein the same images or relational patterns are present at all points and at all scales within the holograph as a whole but with varying degrees of resolution. But while the geography of innovative potential has with complex global interdependence come to be structured in an increasingly holographic fashion, it is a “live” geography in which changes originating at even the smallest scale are capable of propagating throughout the system as a whole to reconfigure its overall pattern of relational dynamics.

Second, as systems (be they social, economic, political, cultural, or technological) cross the set of thresholds distinguishing the merely complicated from the truly complex, affecting their behavior or development is increasingly difficult, as long as the domains of facts and values are segregated. Instead such systems can be effectively engaged by those seeking to better orient their dynamics only on the basis of keen awareness of the reciprocal implication of facts and values and hence the final inseparability of means and ends. In the context of complex change, means and ends constitute interpenetrating aspects of a total situation. Trying to reach desirable ends by means that evidence contrary values will eventually only amplify the indeterminacies and challenges associated with maintaining and arriving at those same ends. The solutions of problems will, in short, end up fueling problem production.

In the context of complex realities leadership involves fostering continuously self-correcting trajectories of innovation, as well as an increasingly refined coordination of both means/strategies and meanings/interests. As captured by the term, coordination, this involves a continuous harmonizing of actions and values – the realization of graceful accord through shared orderings of relational dynamics. Leaders play singularly important roles in reaching such accord but the non-linear dynamics of complex change prohibit seeing leadership activity as determinative in the strict sense of bringing about prescribed outcomes. Shared orderings of relational dynamics emerge most surely, perhaps, in the context of skilled leadership, but ultimately they are ‘authored’ by all who participate in and are affected by those dynamics. In a world of complex inter-

dependencies, leadership implies significant humility.

As just stated, the aims and character of leadership in a complex world have rather positive, almost nurturing, aura. But leadership also involves critically attending to the value-laden nature of all practices, techniques, and institutional structures – cultivating a keenly evaluative stance with respect to all existing means in terms of both their explicit and implicit ordering of ends. The introduction or wider deployment of technologies within a given domain must be assessed, for example, not primarily in terms of the (carefully engineered) utility of the tools associated with them but rather in terms of the summative effects of these technologies on all affected patterns of relationship and purpose, both within and outside of the immediate domain of their deployment.

Finally, because complex realities are *novogenous* or innovation generating, exercising leadership becomes inseparable from both broadening and deepening attunement-to and critical engagement-with the challenges of coordinated value change. In short, leadership cannot be exercised effectively on the basis of fixed principles and aims, but only in ever maturing appreciation of the liabilities of responding to complex situational dynamics from *any* fixed position. As both global and local dynamics become increasingly complex and recursive, dogmatic and ideologically framed responses become intensifying liabilities. Effective leadership comes to center on the task of coordinating skillfully improvised and continuously revised relationships directed at the consolidation of meaningfully shared values in the context of ever-changing realities.

At the same time, it must be realized that complex realities imply limits (or at least horizons) to coordinative leadership. Although it is the task of leaders to foster and sustain the building of innovative capacity, this can only be done on the basis of existing resources and interdependencies. That is, leaders must do the work of building capacities for responding effectively to unanticipated, often globally originated, changes from within locally obtaining present conditions and institutions. The readiness for responding to imperatives for paradigmatic (and not merely incremental or reformative) change must be generated and fostered on the basis of locally viable and sustainable values and patterns of relationality.

In sum, as the issues and processes addressed by contemporary leaders become increasingly complex and subject to the implications of scale, the possibility of simple factual solutions decreases. Indeed, beyond a certain threshold, the concepts of ‘problem’ and ‘solution’ themselves become effectively unproductive and/or irrelevant. This is so because

these issues and processes resist appraisal from any singular point of view from which it would be possible to fix clearly the horizons of relevance within which a 'problem' might be 'solved.' In the absence of clear and abiding boundary conditions that define – that is, temporally and spatially limit – the issues and processes to be addressed, there can be neither 'problems' nor 'solutions.' Because the problematic processes being addressed are recursively historical, any proposed 'solutions' for them necessarily prove incomplete: things cannot be fixed once and for all.

As I indicated in Chapter Four of this volume, we are entering an era in which problem solving gives way to predicament resolution. While problems can be seen as strictly factual in nature – the appearance of impediments to arriving at ends we intend to keep pursuing – predicaments are always to some degree moral, expressing the presence of competing and at times conflicting needs, interests, priorities and values. Most fundamentally, they announce the presence of impediments or blockages to pursuing our existing ends and interests – an incompatibility among our own values that demands a shift in the pattern of our own commitments and not simply a factual revision of our circumstances. Predicaments defy solution: successfully responding to them involves enriched clarity and commitment.

For example, contemporary notions of the good life have come to include valorizations of personal freedom and pleasure-seeking that are in significant tension with the valorization of stable, life-long monogamy – a tension that can only be resolved by altering the meanings we attribute to 'the good life,' 'marriage,' 'personal freedom,' and their interrelatedness. Likewise, conflicts between the values of economic development and environmental conservation or between nationally biased or globally sensitive history education can only be resolved by articulating commitments that have equivalent practical traction across the entire field of tensions involved. In an era when the need for predicament resolution begins overshadowing the demands for problem solutions, leadership concerns shift decisively toward the *meaning* or *direction* of interdependencies – local, national, regional and global; both within and among distinct sectors and domains of human endeavor.

Consider, for example, the exercise of leadership in the domain of bringing about practically effective accord on environmental quality and conservation. There is no significant dispute about the importance of environmental quality for human development personally, nationally, or globally. Outside of certain national capitals where corporate lobbies

and/or crony capitalism effectively set policy agendas, there is widespread agreement about the need to reorder the sets of priorities that have led to present-day scales of environmental disruption and degradation. Real disputes and leadership challenges arise only when it comes to arriving global consensus on the *meaning* of a 'good environment' or 'sustainable development' and establishing robust commitments to appropriately re-configure local, national, regional, and global interdependencies among economic, political, social, cultural, and technological activity.

The shift from an era dominated by problems to one of predicaments marks, then, a 'tipping point' in the meaning of leadership – a profound shift away from the practical restriction of concern to purely factual or material consequences toward an increasingly open and recursive engagement with issues of meaning and the improvisation/emergence of domain and sector-crossing values. In effective leadership, narrowly pragmatic considerations regarding what will work to bring about a predetermined and desired state-of-affairs must increasingly yield to considerations of what will promote both clarity about and meaningful commitments to common values and appropriate hierarchies of common goods. Contemporary leadership, thus, inevitably turns on capacities for clearly discerning the processes of valuation that obtain in a given situation and resolutely negotiating therein, sustainably and robustly shared currents of meaning making.

Leadership as Virtuosity in Diverse Community Building

Earlier, I stated that there are two sets of central considerations that must play into the process of discerning and opening passages to globally sustaining common good: scale, and processes of valuation. Considerations of the role of scale have led to noting leadership imperatives to take the historical nature of interdependence into fuller account and to appreciate its implications for a shift from problem-solving to predicament resolution. This has led, in turn, to discerning the deepening importance of values, value change, and articulations of shared meaning in responsive engagement with the direction and texture of interdependence, across scales spanning the local to the global. Especially in an era of predicament-resolution, leadership comes to pivot on both sensitivities and sensibilities for addressing issues of relational quality and transformation, not just within, but also across particular sectors and societies.

Contemporary leaders are faced with continuously and rapidly

shifting confluences of conditions that are conducive to unpredictable, but often profoundly significant alterations of situational dynamics. Under such circumstances, *responding effectively in the absence of clear precedents* emerges as a central issue – both a concern and a result – of effective leadership. That is, leadership comes to pivot on skills for resolutely coordinative improvisation or establishing meaningfully shared trajectories of innovation.

There can be no formula or fixed approach to establishing and sustaining such trajectories of coordinated and coordinative innovation. Rather, doing so requires cultivating and actively exercising what might be called moral genius or virtuosity in creatively extending and deepening shared practices of community. Given the pluralizing effects of contemporary patterns and scales of globalization, this requires eschewing an ethic of (at best) tolerant co-existence, whether constructed along the lines of postmodern relativist inclusionism or reductively fundamentalist exclusionism. Twenty-first century realities (e.g., the imminent crisis of human-induced global climate instability, or continued production of poverty as a function of market-driven economic growth that widens, rather than redresses, inequities in the distribution of global wealth) place us in need of a global ethic focused, not on maximizing utility, promoting specific personal virtues, or realizing an exception-less moral universality, but rather on sustainably alloying differing senses of what constitutes the good life – an ethic in which interdependence and relational quality are the basic units or categories of analysis. Without a reliable roadmap, leaders are faced with the task of harmonizing often dramatically plural interests with respect to the *meaning* of interdependence; and they must be capable of doing so without overwriting the *significant* differences constitutive of that very plurality.

It is my own conviction that *diversity*, understood as an index of the quality and depth of systematically sustained contributions to shared welfare, offers much as a value consonant with the task of consolidating an aptly robust global ethics of interdependence – an ethic that charts a recursion-rich middle way between relativisms that (often quite militantly) insist on the preservation of moral or ethical *variety* and universalisms that (often quite ethnocentrically) insist on the achievement of moral or ethical *unity*. Unlike such values as justice, which are more thickly expressed locally than they are globally, diversity has the distinctive characteristic of being thicker globally than it is locally. It is a value that not only gains in both critical and practical traction as it is scaled up;

it is also one that has progressive relevance throughout the public sphere, across the full spectrum of practices and institutions, from the social and economic to the political and cultural. Most importantly, perhaps, diversity demonstrates a relationally embodied valorization of distinctive differences – the *appreciation* or increased value/valuing of differences that make possible the making of a meaningful difference. Enhancing diversity means enhancing both capacities-for and commitments-to consolidating and coordinating situational enrichment through sustained contributory reciprocity.

In contrast with a conception of leadership as a capacity for managing variable means of achieving fixed ends or pre-ordained outcomes, leadership in a world of truly complex interdependence connotes superlative resolution with respect to realizing the emergence of self-sustaining ecologies of recursively innovative contributions to equitably shared welfare. Although practical genius and charisma will undoubtedly continue to be important in daily expressions of leadership, the ultimate success of contemporary leadership now increasingly depends on the kind diversity-enhancing improvisational virtuosity that makes possible the building of scale-, sector-, and society-spanning communities oriented toward ‘holographically’ pluralizing both local and global geographies of distinctive contributions to resolutely shared common good.

Education as a Force for Revising the Meaning of Global Interdependence

What does all this mean for education? What are the distinctive challenges and potentials for enhancing diversity, both through and in education? How are the means and meaning of education and educational leadership affected by the global transition from an era of problem solution to one of predicament resolution? Can globally dominant approaches to education (see John Hawkins’s Chapter Five of this volume) be reformed or revised to meet the needs of learners in a complex world of accelerating change, or have these approaches already crossed the thresholds of their own utility to begin producing ever more apparent ironic consequences – populations in need of ever more instruction? Granted that thoroughgoing educational change is needed, what (if anything) can be done by educational leaders to foster its emergence?

Given the complexion of contemporary realities, although such

questions can be perhaps unanimously affirmed as relevant and important, there can be no effective 'one-size-fits-all' answers to them. Educational responses to the challenges and opportunities posed by these realities cannot be out-sourced or mass-produced. To be successful, they must emerge in our midst as expressions of efforts to distinctively alloy local resources and traditions of relational virtuosity with the sensibilities and sensitivities needed for equitably revising the meaning of our expanding and deepening global interdependence. Such responses cannot be prescribed.

Nevertheless, it is possible usefully to reflect on what kinds of responses to contemporary imperatives for educational change *cannot* prove successful and what this tells us about the nature of the leadership tasks and opportunities before us. To this end, I would like to briefly examine three widely noted problems with globally standard approaches to education.

First, it has become apparent, especially in the most highly developed societies, where formal education is well institutionalized, that changes in school curricula and instructional content cannot match the pace of knowledge generation and shifting market needs. Students are today learning what will, when they enter the workforce, amount to yesterday's (effectively obsolete) lessons. Second, formal educational systems seem ill equipped, both in terms of content and structure, to foster the development of the kinds of creative or innovative skills and expertise demanded in an ever-changing society. Finally, educational institutions – globally, long bereft of explicit engagement with moral or values discourse – are ill-prepared and often ill-inclined to begin addressing the values gaps and erosion of social cohesion that are opening up in all societies being newly penetrated by the market values of competition, convenience, control, and choice, and the challenging and, at times, corrosive effect of global integration on traditional institutions and cultures of authority.

Standard responses to these sites of educational stress have tended to be piecemeal. Educational leaders have not tended to treat these shortfalls of contemporary education as complexly interrelated aspects of a globally emerging imperative for fundamental educational change, but have instead remained wedded to strategies of reforming existing educational structures and practices. Yet, if such educational stresses express the effects of changes in the scale and direction of global interdependencies affecting local social, economic, political and cultural realities, then leadership responses which are ill-attuned to global interdependence and

the distinctive character of complexity-generated convergence and emergence are liable to produce significant unintended (and perhaps quite ironic) consequences. Strategies for educational change that are not guided by global insights into complex interdependence will be at significant ontological odds with locally emerging but globally informed change dynamics and insensitive to local resources for exercising guidance with respect to those very dynamics.

Consider, for example, the common approach of responding to evidence of the social erosion of moral/ethical sensitivities and sensibilities by instituting values education programs aimed at delivering curricular content on such topics as moral conduct, citizenship and critical thinking. Such, typically free-standing, curricula are intended to directly fill the 'values gap' by pouring some currently approved and (at least theoretically) apt content into it. Yet, in the context of a complexly interdependent and increasingly pluralistic world, any programs of this sort that endorse and inculcate particular *fixed* values and virtues are liable to inhibit precisely the kind of responsive moral virtuosity commanded by contemporary realities. This is true even of most critical thinking curricula that are built around a single set of strategic values – in effect, a single logic of evaluation. The skills needed for skillfully negotiating robustly shared values and norms, in the context of continuously and unpredictably dynamic interdependencies that are characterized by complex *predicaments* are *not* the same as those needed to solve particular sets of normative *problems* from within an accepted moral or critical framework.

Similarly, there are now many educational reforms aimed at addressing the 'creativity gap' opening up especially in market intensive societies, where standard curricula and educational strategies seem to be delivering diminishing returns in terms of what might be called inventive capital. The global discourse on creativity and innovation is, however, now very heavily fraught with market compatible emphases on competitive excellence, personal choice and individual self-expression. It is a discourse curiously out of kilter with the realities of complex interdependence that commend coordinative genius, social intelligence and the joint improvisation of new kinds and qualities of relationships – creativity as a distinctive quality of interrelatedness, rather than a property of distinct individuals. Creativity of the sort now so widely endorsed is at odds with closing the values gap and – as many multinational corporate human resources experts are now realizing – even with gaining an edge in the competition over globally ever more saturated consumer markets. The

creativity needed for problematizing the familiar – a key component in the maximization of market reach and density – is not the same as the creativity needed to maximally coordinate contributions to shared, even corporate, welfare. Much less so is it the kind of creativity needed to skillfully and sustainably resolve the predicaments that emerge as economic, political, social and cultural realities become, not only interdependent, but also interpenetrating.

Finally, consider the leading edge of educational responses to the manifest inability of educational systems centered on delivering standardized curricula to keep abreast of changes in market needs and knowledge production. In some ways, this inability marks a distinct amplification of a traditional tension, within education, between conservation and creativity. This problematic tension has become, however, particularly acute in the contemporary context, in large part because of the temporal and spatial compressions attending present day scales and scopes of globalization. These compressions bring about conditions in which it is not just a particular standard curriculum and its relative weighting of emphases on conserving cultural and epistemic traditions and on fostering the critical acumen needed to substantially revise or replace them that is being distressed. Rather it is the very paradigm of education delivered via standard curricula of predetermined courses and contents that are being subjected to disruptive (and likely disintegrating) pressures.

A widely endorsed response among educational leaders has been to open formal education fully to market forces, abandoning the notion of fixed curricula in favor of a 'knowledge marketplace' in which consumers ultimately direct production and (at least ideally) are able to acquire desired educational commodities on demand. This response, as appealing as it is in many ways, is simply to capitulate to the values driving market operations, with the result that the field of education would rapidly begin evincing the very same disparities in the distribution of benefit that we now witness in the dynamics of global trade and business. The commodification of education would lead, not to the equitable distribution of capabilities for both generating and acquiring knowledge, but rather to the institutionalization of yet another class of the global poor – those destined to consume only the most inexpensive and lowest quality educational commodities. As a means to practical knowledge modeling schools on markets would be tragic enough. But it promises to be a much greater tragedy if critical acumen and the capacity for negotiating shared meaning in a world of rapidly changing and interdependent value environ-

ments are also commodified. The means of instruction open to the educationally poor would, in effect, compromise their relative capacity for making a meaningful difference in their own lives. Education would prove, for the global majority, to be relatively – and hence relationally – impoverishing.

It is a signal effect of the complexity of contemporary patterns of global integration that the primary drivers for change *within* a given sector or domain come increasingly to lie *outside* it. Likewise, solving problems arising within a given sector in terms of its own values are liable to incur considerable costs in other sectors. That is, problems within sectors more and more often amount to local expressions of global predicaments arising among sectors or spheres of valuation. These phenomena are particularly evident in the case of education, where the force of external – for example, economic, political and religious – drivers for educational change have long been openly acknowledged. Yet, it is an implication of complex interdependence that these same patterns of global integration must also position education to serve as a driver for change in other sectors and domains. In general terms, growing interdependence and interpenetration are conducive to pluralizing the geography of both sites-for and sources-of contributory innovation. The rapid, often decentralizing, growth of the education sector can be seen as evidence of its consolidating prominence and potential for influence within this geography.

In order to realize the potential of education to help initiate and sustain a turning of social, economic, political and cultural interdependence in an equitable and mutually enriching direction, it is crucial that educational leaders refrain from seeing emerging shortfalls within education as local problems. At the same time, they should actively develop and demonstrate skills for addressing these shortfalls as evidence of global predicaments reflecting conflicts among values and interests, playing out over a wide range of scales and domains in ways that presently compromise contributory diversity. A primary task of contemporary educational leadership is to demonstrate and enhance capacities for appreciating (both sympathetically understanding and adding value to) differences, incorporating them into the means and meaning of resolutely coordinated and coordinative educational change.

Leading for diversity, nowhere perhaps more acutely than in the context of education, requires working readily with others who differ significantly. It entails working on ground that is evidently common, but not yet fully shared, to jointly articulate mutually strengthening ways of

appreciating or adding value to situations that are resolutely experienced as *ours*, thereby enhancing the value of being situated where and as we are. This means going well beyond learning about others and merely tolerating their differences, to learning from and, eventually, along with them in pursuit of actively improvised, shared aims and interests.

The patterns of complexly interdependent convergence and emergence that now attend globalization processes are opening a wealth of opportunities for both institutionalizing global production monocultures and intensifying global inequity. But they are also opening similarly rich opportunities for realizing equity and diversity engendering ecologies of commitment and contribution. The direction or meaning of global interdependence remains open. The accelerating pace of change characteristic of 21st century realities can be seen as a major challenge to effective educational leadership. But it can just as well be seen as evidence of the continuous emergence of potentials for changing the ways in which things are changing – evidence that our situation, no matter how obviously and at times tragically troubled, is by no means intractable.

10

The Changing Role of Leadership (or A Changing Leadership for a Changing World)

Victor ORDONEZ

It is a paradox of globalization that, as the world becomes more interconnected, groups that come together – physically or virtually – are becoming more heterogeneous rather than more homogeneous. Common elements of globalization, such as language use and technological communication systems, are indeed becoming more universal, but the various individuals drawn together by these vehicles increasingly represent diversity rather than uniformity.

On the negative side, the heightened awareness of difference can lead to polarization, to a retreat from the surge towards greater interdependence and collaboration. In its extreme form, it may lead to a narrow chauvinism or a desperate stance to preserve local identities and cultures at the expense of rejecting – sometimes with violence – all that is not perceived as one's own. On the positive side, a healthy diversity can lead to a mutual respect and understanding of differences, and the potential for growth, harmony, and learning that can come from rich interaction.

It is in the context of this setting that the role of leadership can and must evolve. Management and leadership are often studied, discussed, and practiced in the context of a relatively homogenous work-force and a static organizational setup. Hence the focus on managing people, time, and other resources towards clearly identified and fixed goals, in the most efficient manner possible. Priority attention implicitly shifts from the individuals being managed to the goals and targets to be achieved.

But today's leaders are ever more frequently called upon to lead a team or a group of individuals with manifestly diverse backgrounds,

motivations, cultural and ethnic roots, and capabilities. This is true not only in international organizations, multinational corporations and large bureaucracies; it is also true, given rapidly changing migration patterns, in smaller and informal groups. Thus, the simple first step of communicating goals and laying out strategies takes on a complexity that derives from the fact that team members come from sometimes radically different starting points.

There is a second dimension in the environment of today's fast changing world that impacts upon leadership. The goals and targets towards which leaders guide their groups are themselves changing with the environment. Leaders therefore no longer have the assurance and credibility of being able to state clearly defined destinations for the rest of the group, if fast changing circumstances compel a regular re-articulation and adjustment of the desired goals. In many instances, old problems cannot be solved by old solutions. New solutions, indeed entirely new strategies for understanding and addressing problems, are required. The best that leaders can do is to illuminate paths oriented generally toward desired outcomes, rather than to pinpoint final destinations.

What then are the practical implications for leaders in the context of these realities? How do they deal with an increasingly heterogeneous group and increasingly flexible work objectives?

Leadership and Diverse Individuals

The first and most obvious area in which leaders need to re-orient their thinking and behavior is the area of what is traditionally called human resource management. Leaders are of course more than managers. The latter accomplish their ends by manipulating and 'managing' resources, human, financial, and technical; the former, in addition to performing the above, whether efficiently or poorly, add the human dimension of inspiring commitment, drive, and energy into a group-driven effort. How that is achieved in an increasingly diversified group marks the effectiveness of today's leader.

In the first place, the leader can no longer assume that the premises and convictions that motivate him or her are automatically also present in the rest of his group. It may be that some group members with similar backgrounds and experiences to those of the leader will automatically identify with and take on the same commitments and resolve as the leader. But it is increasingly probable that there will be others in the group who

do not share the premises or experiences upon which commitments to the leader's goals are built. And yet because they are part of the same group or team with the same final objectives or purpose, they need to be brought in as true contributors to the team. It is then the leader's task to recognize this and to draw out from individual team member's backgrounds and contexts those elements that can be used to forge common purpose and common commitment.

To do this, it is not necessary to impose uniformity or a standard way of looking at things. Common elements can be found in a community of diversity, without sacrificing previously held beliefs or approaches. The leader himself/herself is not required to be a chameleon, without his or her own world view, adjusting without a point of reference to every world view represented by the group. But he or she does have the responsibility to work with the world views of others in his groups, not to proselytize or change them, but to find within them common and compatible elements that can be built upon and expanded to provide the motivational foundations on which common dedication and commitment to the group's work can be built. What should emerge is an amalgamation of compatible premises relevant to different viewpoints, coalesced or juxtaposed to serve as the basis for the group's vision and actual work. This is of course done in a variety of ways, depending upon context, but invariably transpires through group interaction and processing.

An example from inter-faith dialogue

Griffith University in Australia recently hosted an inter-faith dialogue on fostering peace. Peace as an overall objective was immediately hailed as universally desirable, regardless of religious or denominational background. As discussions became more specific to areas and situations where peace was absent, it became clear that the faith roots for the common ethical desire for peace were different and that the resultant behaviors expressing these faith roots, sometimes called ritual, were also different. What eventually emerged from the discussion was recognition of three components or dimensions of an individual's faith or religion.

The first dimension is the world-view or life-understanding of the individual. In many cases, this is revelatory; that is, it marks acceptance of an understanding of a divine being and an after-life as communicated through a prophet or divine intervention (e.g., for adherents of Judaism, Christianity, or Islam). In other cases, it is an understanding of the world and life which is the accumulation of the collected wisdom of the ages,

often articulated by a revered embodiment of that wisdom, as in the case of Confucianism or Taoism. In any case, everyone has a world-view, even the agnostic, whose world-view and explanation of life is fashioned by what he/she accepts and derives from science.

The second dimension is the ethical dimension, the moral code of conduct that flows from this world-view. Whereas the sources of world-views of different religions (and non-religions) vary, as well as their resultant explanations, the moral implications of most of these views come close, fortunately, to being universal. Thus, for example, Hindu respect for life comes from the pantheistic view that we are all one and all part of God; for Confucians, it comes from the golden rule of not doing unto others what you would not have them do unto you; for Christians, it derives from the belief that everyone is the son or daughter of God, in the context of a moral code with strict after-life consequences; for the agnostic it may follow from the recognition of human security as a necessary component of the social fabric. Thus, though the motivations and foundations are different, values such as respect for life, honesty, and peace, can be universally recognized enough to outline a common human ethical code, as has arguably been the case with the United Nations' ratification of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The third dimension is that of ritual or patterns of social engagement, expressive of culturally embedded beliefs and systems of values. Unlike the first two dimensions, ritual conduct varies greatly, not only between belief systems, but also with a given belief system over time and in different locales. Rituals express and enact context-specific affiliations crucial in establishing shared convictions and group identities and thus often serve as means of differentiation or distinction, as in the case of the kerchiefs worn by Boy Scouts, the flag ceremonies conducted by patriotic groups, or the standard practices invoked globally at Rotary lunches.

Thus, in the example of the multi-faith discussion on peace, it became apparent that the common ground was in the second dimension and that achieving consensus did not require of individuals any sacrifice or compromise in the first or third dimensions. Areas of discussion revolved mostly around the interpretation of how the third dimension plays out differently in different historical and cultural contexts.

To return to the implications for leadership, the leader of a multi-faith coalition for peace in this instance would be required to work with individuals whose first and third dimensions differ both from one another's and from those of the leader. Leadership rests, in such cases, on

being able to locate, among the distinctively differing resources available within the world-views and value systems of individual team members, those that can be coherently and sustainably composed to consolidate common purposes and drive shared efforts. In doing so, while the leader should be open to differences among world-views, he or she need not compromise his/her own basic world-view to guide effectively the group as a whole.

An example in an educational setting

When a university is faced with rapidly growing enrolments and demands for greater service that are not matched by currently available resources, its leader must face his/her governing board and draw out a policy strategy that best meets this situation. The board members could well come from a variety of world-views, resulting in different approaches to the predicament at hand. The neo-liberals who favor less government intervention will appeal for cost recovery by tuition increases or corporate activities. The more socialistically inclined will insist on the basic responsibility of the state and demand that this responsibility translate into bigger budget allocations. Even recruitment policies for managing expanded enrolment will be addressed from different premises. Those concerned with academic standards and market competitiveness will argue for scholarships and admission of the most talented; those concerned with a growing rich-poor divide and equity of access will insist on financial assistance on the basis of need rather than academic scores. The leader in this case would bring into focus the common predicament and the common goal of how the university can best serve, and then draw from the board members and their starting premises elements that would lead to an agreed strategy to reach a goal that everyone can support.

Transforming situations versus transforming people

In the end, whereas management works toward the transformation of situations using people, knowledge, and other resources, leadership works towards the transformation of people, empowering them to work together toward the consequent desired changes and transformations of situations. And as people in various groups become more and more heterogeneous, how one deals with this diversity becomes of paramount importance.

Today's work-forces often have diversities in gender, generation, ethnic and cultural background, religion, economic and social status, and skill levels. The traditional manager would look upon this diversity as

something to be 'managed' or controlled, and would strive to deal with the differences in such a way as to minimize how they interfere with the common tasks ahead. Tomorrow's leaders will not just tolerate such diversity; they will actively celebrate it. They will draw upon the unique potentials that each person has for contributing to the furthering of common interests, harnessing the diverse strengths of each, and maximizing the possibilities of a pluralist perspective centered on common purposes and shared commitments. They will, in effect, mold a new, synthetic 'third culture' for the tasks ahead, building upon the differing capacities of the work-force and coordinating their unique contributions.

Consider, for instance, age diversity. In a traditional pyramidal corporate structure, there is a tendency for the leader or manager to rely more on the experience and maturity of the older members of the work-force, encouraging the younger ones to learn from them in an apprentice mode. But the young, especially in the face of new predicaments, have contributions of their own to make. Contemporary leaders will, by contrast, be inclined to find ways to maximize and balance the energy, creativity, and teamwork of the younger members with the prudence, realism, and accumulated experiential wisdom of the older ones.

This might involve a leader assigning a priority project to a junior member of the staff instead of more senior members who normally would expect the assignment. On the one hand, the decision may draw resentment from the older staff and overwhelm the younger staff member with responsibilities for which he/she is not ready. Done indiscriminately, it may even lead to divisiveness, pitting the old guard against the favored young newcomers, instead of harmony. But on the other hand, if done in the context of team decision making, it could bring forth rather quickly the young member's potential and, if he/she operates in constant communication and with the guidance of the older staff members, it could generate teamwork across generations, a sense of patronage and shared ownership of project success among everyone involved, and foster the emergence of creative, multiple perspectives and alternatives as the project develops and adjusts to changing circumstances.

Thus the traditional 'command and control' approach to leadership needs to give way to the more consultative and facilitating 'team-driven' form of leadership. Focus shifts, within the context of a given objective, from pushing individuals to a given task, to shaping a task to best suit the collective potential of the individuals concerned. This implies much more reliance on open-ended communication with, rather than instruction from,

the leader. It also implies greater communication among the members of the group, and greater responsibility for the leader to see that the atmosphere for such lateral communication is engendered so that necessary synergies can take place. What emerges is a much flatter organization than the traditional corporate pyramid – an organization in which communication links play far greater roles than the status of the various boxes in the hierarchy.

Flatter, communication-rich organizational patterns and leadership appropriate to them are particularly needed in educational contexts that have traditionally been rigidly hierarchical in structure and are now being subjected to deepening imperatives for fundamental reform to meet the needs of the future. Even on a primary school level, for example, perspectives of administrators, teachers, and community leaders regarding the school's basic orientation need to change dramatically or be linked in distinctively new ways as the composition of the student body becomes increasingly heterogeneous. Interesting studies on this in various settings illustrate how the reality of multi-cultural communities has now really begun to have an impact on the perspectives of those who run the schools that serve them.

Leadership and New Communication Modalities

The new and different ways in which a leader deals with and maximizes human resources are also mirrored in the new and different ways the leader deals with and manages information and knowledge. The traditional attribute of a leader as predominantly having the information, knowledge or wisdom to lead the group needs to change in an information-saturated age. Knowledge used to be one of the elements that vested leaders with natural authority and legitimacy. But as corporations and enterprises are becoming increasingly transparent, and as relevant knowledge becomes more accessible not only from within the organization but also from a multitude of technologically-assisted sources, the leader no longer holds knowledge exclusively. Moreover, given the increasingly complex sets of predicaments and tasks that present themselves, the leader himself/herself may not have clear knowledge of final destinations or strategies, as I mentioned earlier, and may well have to rely on the collective reflection and experience of the group to fashion an articulated vision and strategy for the tasks ahead.

Academics researching corporate management have recently put

much more emphasis on the communication flows within corporations rather than the hierarchical structures that their tables of organization represent. There is a growing body of evidence that official superior-subordinate interactions, formal corporate planning sessions, and board meetings are not central factors in well-tuned corporate functioning (Cross and Parker 2004). Rather, it is informal flows of communication that determine, with greater accuracy, the effectiveness, strategic forward thinking, and rapidity of response to changing environments that corporations display. An entire sub-discipline, now called social network analysis, has researched this phenomenon and documented case studies and created simulation models to measure the impact of social networking. Among the most innovative is the work of Karen Stephenson (2005), formerly Professor at UCLA's School of Management and now President of NetForm International, who expands the concept and does prescriptive as well as analytical work with corporations using frameworks like the quantum theory of trust. According to this theory, high levels of trust in informal corporate communications between given individuals trigger not only improved communication, but also greater creativity, teamwork, and eventually a capacity for increased productivity.

Reform versus reorganization

On a personal note, my experience in a variety of private, governmental and international organizations has enabled me to witness or navigate a number of reform or reorganization efforts. Often the impetus is from the top, either because of a new CEO or Minister, or even because of a change of regime or government. Over time, I came to distinguish, within organizations, a set of distinct dimensions comparable to those of a living organism: an anatomical (or structural) dimension; a physiological (or process) dimension; and a pathological (or health/sickness) dimension.

The common tendency in many reform efforts was to focus on reorganization, on the anatomical: an attempt to change the structure of the organization or the ministry, for example, by merging departments, adding new bureaus, eliminating minor offices, and so on. Quite often, however, the problem addressed was not anatomical in nature, but physiological; the problems could have been addressed by simplifying procedures, setting up regular communication links, without changing structures. It was as if the new 'doctors' were ready to submit their 'patient' organizations to radical surgeries when simple medication to improve circulation or digestion would have sufficed. Of course if the

problem were analogous to a case of gangrene, then organizational leaders might correctly prescribe such anatomically radical measures as 'amputating' or severely down-sizing a given department or office.

In other cases, reform efforts used anatomical (reorganization) or physiological (streamlining) measures when the problem addressed was pathological. If there was a bottleneck caused by specific personal inefficiency or corruption blocking smooth operations, the solution should have been to identify the sickness in the organization, and to cure it, by replacing the problematic person/s and finding a better alternative.

All this is to illustrate how today's leader needs to pay attention to his group's 'physiology,' or to the dynamics of social network analysis, as academics call it. Interestingly this is more than just finding out which sub-groups gravitate together and who talks more to whom. The observant leader will discern that individuals tend to talk to different people for different reasons. Stephenson (2005) points out that a person would talk to one officemate regarding normal work operations, but to another colleague for social contacts and activities outside the workplace, and yet a third for new ideas and innovations at work. There may well be a fourth colleague, more like a mentor, when the individual needs further information or career guidance, and yet another person for general wisdom and learning both about work and about life problems in general. The leader may, or may not, be one of these colleagues, but it is easy to see how the leader's knowledge of the networks of individual group members might be valuable and at times indispensable. Such networks help him/her formulate the most effective task forces; they help him in advocacy campaigns when he/she has a new task or project that requires the commitment and enthusiasm of all; they help in formulating approaches for soothing personal frictions that arise, and so on.

Leadership through Uncharted Waters

Today's fast changing world demands a constant supply of new ways of addressing persistent predicaments, new situations, and goals or desired outcomes never before thought possible. This means leaders working to achieve better futures or worthwhile outcomes must constantly rely on creative and new insights and innovations, and can no longer rely on what may have worked so well in the past. This also means that new insights can no longer be exclusively sought or expected from leaders.

An analogy from the teaching profession

The teacher was once viewed as the oasis of knowledge, or at least the map owner for the oasis, to which he/she would lead students out of the desert of ignorance. Today, students find themselves surrounded by an ocean of information and knowledge and the teacher finds himself/herself in the same boat. Teachers do not act as sources of knowledge, but as facilitators and guides to make sense of the plethora of knowledge available, how to digest and correlate it, what to absorb and what not to absorb, and how to process it to arrive at new knowledge.

And, if today's teacher forgets this, students are quick to remind him/her, as they too have the Internet and other means of access to the teacher's sources and can hone in on very specific topics in depth. Taken to the extreme in a market driven system, even grading systems become problematic, as students may conceive of their programs of study and their teachers as mere vehicles or means, for which they have paid good money, to get a degree.

Of course, it would be simplistic ever to reduce the teacher or professor to a mere process facilitator. There remains his/her own personal competence, accumulated knowledge, and experience as assets upon which his/her authority and classroom leadership must be built. But under contemporary circumstances, the effectiveness of teaching is strongly linked to capacities for keenly playing facilitating and processing roles.

In similar fashion, the leader, as captain of the ship, must continue to guide and navigate it. Leaders need to enlist the commitment and cooperation of the crew, even as they learn from them many things about how best to oversee operations on the ship and chart their course as they move forward with common purpose, in a desired general direction, but without any precisely pinpointed destination or clearly demarcated route for getting there. Considerable improvisation becomes the order of the day as such factors as changes in weather and circumstances, as well as new knowledge and more refined interests, evolve and develop.

New paradigms for the corporate world

Today's corporate world is in the throes of redefining its goals and directions. Nowhere, perhaps, is this more evident than in corporations in developing economies. The traditional perspective on development tended to take one of two approaches: the community organization prototype, or the entrepreneurial or business development prototype.

The community organization prototype is characterized by initial

impetus from an NGO or external philanthropist, but with full community participation eventually, premised on the valid fact that sustainability and relevance depend on internal acceptance and ownership. Often however, the process of development by this means proves to be too long and limited, as local capacities take time to mature. Eventually, external inputs and experts dwindle and move on, rarely creating the major impact required for true development.

The entrepreneurial or business development prototype is typically initiated by an entrepreneurial investor or a benign imperialist, and developing countries are now dotted with human settlements that have been improved and transformed and which depend on the continued viability of a large manufacturing, milling, forestry, mining or even military establishment that has been located therein. Here, outside resources are poured in, long-term commitments are made and the transformation in enclaves of progress is fast. However, there is often no attempt at real community development. The local population is valued merely as a physical labor pool or as a consumer market. More significantly, revenues and benefits from growth do not remain in the community but are siphoned off to external stockholders. In fact, whereas economic indicators may show remarkable progress, a marked deterioration in the quality of life often occurs over time with this approach to development, along with social problems and unrest.

Corporate leaders are now seeing a need to bridge the gap between these models. Imperatives are being recognized for reorienting their energies, their experiences, and the rigorous activity of successful big business, away from single product, linear enterprises, toward more global and systemic development aims affecting society as a whole. For many, it has become clear that this involves a paradigm shift in business development strategy and operation.

A recent corporate experiment has attempted such a refocusing – incorporating a concern for integrated human settlements development as its primary corporate objective, and using a wide range of product lines as means to this end. There is a fundamental difference between a resource development policy dictated as part of a total development goal and that dictated by merely seeking raw materials, even if both are operating ultimately for profit. For example, a logging company that comes into an area for the sole purpose of cutting the commercial timber to service a foreign market will have an operating strategy that is quite different from that of a development company, whose objective is to develop

viable human settlements within a forest environment. The logging company's job is finished when the logs have been converted into revenues. For the development company, the revenues from timber sales are part of the total process of development that also includes providing capital to develop local infrastructure, enhance employment, recreation and educational opportunities, and promote improved livelihoods for the population of the region (while implicitly creating more business opportunities for the development company). In each case, development projects are organized for profit. In one, gains come solely from marketing timber; in the other, gains derive from the overall effects of producing a permanently viable community and developing the total resources of the region.

Effecting such a change in a corporate paradigm is not a simple or easy matter. It requires the advent of a new and different kind of corporate leadership, capable of moving into uncharted waters in pursuit of a difficult, yet necessary and exciting new vision – a leadership that is as concerned with qualitative measures of success as it is with more traditional quantitative ones.

The need for new education paradigms

But perhaps more so than in the corporate or any other sector in society – transportation, communication, banking, entertainment, health, etc. – it is the education sector that most clearly requires leaders capable of navigating uncharted waters. Other sectors mentioned have responded, sometimes by sheer necessity of survival or competition, to the changing demands of society and have transformed the very shapes and fundamentals of how they work. ATMs, cell phones, cable TV, virtual health clinics, e-mail – all unheard of or unimaginable two decades ago – are merely some indicators. On the other hand, schools and universities have remained virtually unchanged and operate much as they did twenty, thirty or more years ago, with possibly a few more computers. Perhaps the slow pace of educational change can be explained as a function of the sheer size, stability, and centuries-old prestige and deference given to this sector, as well as its conservative role in transmitting the insights of prior generations. Yet educational institutions are not meant to be just the custodians of the past; they are supposed to be the forerunners of the future, responsible for the formation of future generations. Tensions between these roles have never been more acute than at present, and are steadily intensifying.

True, there is no lack of attempts to reform educational systems. The proliferation of programs to develop professional education managers

has produced a generation of competent educators. But their reform efforts have been largely focused on improving existing practices, on efficiency rather than on effectiveness, and on modifying or improving the existing dominant paradigm (as described by John Hawkins in Chapter Five of this volume) rather than generating truly novel educational aims and approaches. Thus, for example, curriculum reform focuses on how to improve and sequence the teaching of specific subject matter blocks, rather than on questioning whether to teach that subject at all or replace it with new learning content. Another example is proposing to expand access to an existing educational system, without questioning whether the system itself is designed to reach and effectively enhance the lives of the presently unreached. Reforms in university education look to alternative financing regimes and equitable cost recovery mechanisms, without questioning whether expansion ultimately leads first to emphasis on credentialing rather than competence, and then to the eventual devaluation of such credentials – a result entirely compatible with corporate interests in the education sector.

An analogy from paradigmatic shifts in transportation and written communication may be helpful. The need for faster transportation over longer distances was not met by building better and better cars, but by finally inventing the airplane. Similarly, producing and editing written documents was not creatively enhanced by simply improving the typewriter, but by developing computer-mediated word processing. The time has come for educational leaders to stop trying to improve the education ‘automobile’ or ‘typewriter’ and invent instead educational equivalents of the airplane, or the submarine, or the bicycle – whatever best meets the educational needs of those living in today’s locally distinctive and yet globally fast-changing environments.

And only by being open to, and constantly on the lookout for, innovative possibilities, which actually exist in often unrecognized places (see the examples described by Joseph Farrell in his Chapter Eight in this volume), can the educational leader move into the uncharted waters of a future system of education that truly meets the fast changing needs of the learning community that his/her team must address. In the face of rigid and traditional bureaucracies, the leader and the team must both be convinced that a paradigmatic change has become necessary and also share a daring yet realistically achievable vision capable of generating the momentum and eventually the commitment for true change.

Leadership and Vision

The authority of leadership traditionally derives from many sources. In societies where longevity is a real feat, advanced age in itself qualifies village elders with a measure of authority, clothing them in an aura of those who should be listened to and heeded. More organized communities eventually evolved some form of leadership selection, by feats of prowess or skill, by competition among rivals, or by acclamation or some form of voting. In this case, community acceptance was the source of authority of the leader. In more recent times, industrial societies have institutionalized authority structures and, especially in the corporate sector where much research has been undertaken in leadership, pecking orders were effectively sanctified and upheld in elaborate organizational charts specifying many hierarchical levels. Authority came to be vested in a specific leader simply because he/she occupied a particular place in an organization – the President, the Director, the Chief, or even the Supervisor. Here, authority is less directly personal than positional. With the dawning of the so-called information age, and in the decades preceding it, a new kind of authority emerged: the authority of the expert, regardless of where that person is situated in (or even entirely outside of) a given organizational chart – the authority of knowing what others do not.

But again, authority and leadership are not congruent ideas. The authority deriving from age, group acceptance, a hierarchical position, or from knowledge may be enough to ensure compliance in a ‘command and control’ environment, but it does not automatically lead to the committed and inspired group work ethic characteristic of a team headed by a true leader.

Perhaps the single most telling source of authority of a true leader is a sense of vision and a commitment to that vision. Probably nothing is more contagious than this in a work setting. Needless to say the vision has to be one that is well chosen and articulated. A vision that is vague and Utopian, no matter with how much eloquence and enthusiasm it is conveyed to others, will not necessarily inspire action if the desired goal is hardly measurable or unreachable. On the other hand, if the vision is a mere articulation of a standard work target (such as a sales goal, or a more satisfactory customer rating, or a higher enrolment number), it may not serve to inspire. Too many managers have reduced their vision in this way and fail to take the opportunity to see beyond such standard targets and inspire their teams with the underlying rationale and vision that ultimately support and give meaning to them.

The most effective leaders on the world stage now stand out as having dedicated their lives to large and yet clearly identifiable visions, which have inspired and motivated thousands of others over several decades and changed the world in specific ways. Dozens of examples come to mind, but mention might be made of Jacques Cousteau and Fidel Castro as two very clearly dedicated and distinctly controversial contemporary leaders.

In addition to dedication to a clear vision, leaders must be capable of powerfully communicating that vision. Of course in major cases, communication often becomes automatic and obvious in the very dedication and commitment of a leader's entire lifetime to a cause. In smaller cases, where the project leader has a specific vision for a limited time, it is important that his/her vision and the accompanying commitment and enthusiasm for that vision be explicitly passed on and shared with the entire group. Again, the work ethic and example displayed by the leader is the most effective tool, but explicit mechanisms such as planning/strategy sessions, having team members explain the project vision to outside groups, media releases, and so on, are good tools to share the excitement of the vision.

Vision versus ambition

Passionate leadership is not always driven by vision. Ambition releases the same drive, energy, and dedication. But that is where the similarity between vision and ambition ends. The leader with ambition is motivated by selfish ends, whether for self or family or political party. The leader with vision is motivated by largely selfless ends, by ends for the greater good of the organization or society at large. And the long-term impacts of the two types of leadership are diametrically opposed. The litmus test is the choice between what is good for the leader versus what is good for the larger group. The concept of servant leadership, first made part of leadership discourse within religious and sectarian settings and in writings from influential people, such as Rick Warren (2002) of *Purpose Driven Life*, is now gaining credence and currency in secular management and leadership training programs. It has taken on an effectiveness dimension as well as an ethical dimension.

Leadership and charisma

It is a matter of continuous debate whether charisma is inborn or can be developed. And yet it is probably the single most obvious characteristic

that one notices when one meets a true leader. It is often a magnetic personality, an affable charm, or a stunning even if not very pleasant presence. The person walks in the room, and eyes and attention automatically gravitate to that person. Leadership programs, charm schools, and courses on effective speaking abound, in an effort to provide at least the trappings of charisma for certain managers and leaders, and they may succeed to a limited extent. But they often succeed in providing the acquired external techniques for better first impressions, rather than imbuing the person with that intangible quality called charisma.

It is the fate of many a successful project or even successful organization that there is a meltdown at the end of the term of the previous (often the founding) charismatic leader. The more thoughtful leaders often anticipate this and take on, at an early stage, a protégé with potential and hopefully some charisma that they painstakingly nurture through a long process of deputy apprenticeship. The eventual transition of leadership, then, does not result in too much of a letdown. In other cases, the leader tries to transfer his/her enthusiasm and charisma, not to another individual, but to the entire organization, or at least to a critical mass of the organization's leadership and managerial corps.

A Few Case Studies from the Education Sector

Here, I would like to describe three different cases from the world of education that exemplify the distinctive qualities of leadership that are emerging in response to contemporary realities. These cases are presented to encapsulate and synthesize many of the concepts discussed above.

China

The first case is that of a reform project in Jilin, China. The education leaders of the province, Chen Mo Kai and Zhang Yin, sensed a need for a dramatically improved basic education system for the 11,000 schools in the province. Curricula were traditionally Beijing-centric: there was little focus on rural production, health or nutrition, and students registered low achievement scores. Projects were designed and external assistance was sought by Chen and Zhang, but because of their insistence that the project was not to be uni-dimensional (only for books, for classrooms, or teacher training) but had to be comprehensive, the limited outside funding they secured was enough to work on and effectively transform only 12 schools in six counties. The project was started in these 12 schools and

was both thorough and effective, involving the local communities and investing them with the prestige of being specially chosen, internationally recognized 'pilot reform' schools.

Curricula were overhauled – ginseng production, bicycle repair, health and nutrition classes were introduced; community resource people were brought in; and, a sense of enthusiasm was instilled. Attendance and achievement scores rose dramatically, communities flourished, and the reputation of these pilot schools spread throughout the system. After a few years, a province-wide effort culminating in a conference was held to expand the project to 146 carefully selected schools in 46 counties. There was a plan to spread the project to all 11,000 schools eventually, but prudence and a realism from years of experience with the project eventually led to a slower expansion strategy. Over the years, however, the fruits of the project continued to multiply, and hundreds more schools have been incorporated.

The leadership traits so evident in Chen and Zhang included their clarity of mission and their unswerving dedication to it. It was the good, if rare, fortune of Jilin province to have a leadership team that was not replaced or transferred for decades, providing much needed sustainability and continuity. This is increasingly rare in educational systems, where frequent changes of leadership often do not give innovative approaches the needed continuity, as new leaders come up with different priorities. Another leadership trait, and a basic one, is the soundness of their vision, of the idea of an education more relevant to the needs of the community and an approach to achieve this vision through a comprehensive integrated overhaul of curriculum, materials, teacher re-training, and community support. However, the crucial factor was their ability to share their vision and in effect transfer ownership of that vision to the communities they served. Within traditional Chinese culture, the phenomenon of social networking is strikingly obvious: contacts with village elders, production farmers, and all levels of society were as much a part of Chen's workday as was his administrative paperwork. Another big part of their success was their subtle ability to create a hunger to be part of a winning effort, to be identified as part of a success story. Understanding the rhythm and pace of reform and expansion was also crucial: some projects stay forever happily at a small-scale pilot level; others move too swiftly to expand before prerequisite dimensions of sustainability are ensured.

India

A second case study in educational leadership is the example of urban girls' camps in Rajasthan, India. Leadership of an active educational NGO in the area, Lok Jumbish, passed to Anil Bordia, who had just retired as Secretary of Education of India. Bordia was concerned about the high illiteracy rates among young girls in his home state and the large number of them who had never been inside a classroom. Working with a new paradigm, he organized girls' learning camps in Jodhpur, Jaipur and a few key cities, using his team in Lok Jumbish to convince parents of those out-of-school girls who were not already orphans to allow the girls to come to borrowed houses in groups of 50 to 100, with a core of volunteers and teachers, to live and learn together for a period of six months. The guardians and teachers, some Lok Jumbish staff members, some teachers, some mothers with spare time (who sometimes brought their infant children to live in the camps with them) set up informal classes by aptitude and inclination rather than by age, organized meals and recreation, and were available as learning resource persons 24 hours a day. Results after six months were remarkable: after only six months of this form of education, pre-adolescents with aptitude had no difficulty transferring to the public school system at the fifth grade level. Somehow, this innovative paradigm effectively made possible the fitting of five years of schooling into six months. Families saw the value of education and many sent their daughters to more formal schooling. Girls' camps started to multiply in other cities of the province. Lok Jumbish continued to provide logistics and training, constantly refining the paradigm on the basis of lessons learned from past experience.

Always, there was the inspirational source of the project in the person of Bordia, its leader. His energy and dedication, dynamic and forever seeking improvements, so uncharacteristic of someone his age, were obvious to everyone. In his case, aware of the need for continuity and succession, he had worked to develop a worthy successor and to transfer his commitment to the girl's camp project to all the area managers of Lok Jumbish. Because girls' camps were 'uncharted waters,' Mr. Bordia had to deal with government education bureaucracies and local government officials (fortunately aided by his previous job title), and also with suspicious parents, reluctant girls, and the volunteers and teachers for whom sharing his vision was essential. In doing so, it was obviously not sufficient to use his authority as Lok Jumbish head and to limit his work and communication channels to the organization officers and staff. It was in

fact through listening to his staff – members of which had many years of experience, anecdotes, and contact with out-of-school girls – that he pulled together the components that became the vision of the girls' camp. By learning from and then co-shaping the vision with his Lok Jumbish staff, they quickly grew enthusiastic and recognized the vision as theirs as well as his.

UNESCO

A third and final example is the case of UNESCO E-9 or Nine High Population Countries project. Although this case risks being a little too personal, as I was the coordinator of the effort, it also affords a number of valuable lessons in multi-cultural leadership.

At the time that I was given the responsibility for coordinating the world-wide movement for Education For All as UNESCO director, I was initially overwhelmed by the contrast between the giant mandate (900 million illiterates world-wide, 100 million out-of-school children) and the miniscule amount of resources and budget (fewer than 50 people at headquarters, aided admittedly by field staff, and a budget less than that of a small US university) for the task. A bit of reflection and strategic thinking on the part of my team and myself eventually led to the conclusion that almost three quarters of the world's illiterates reside in nine high population countries: China, India, Bangladesh, Nigeria, Mexico, Brazil, Pakistan, Egypt, and Indonesia. If UNESCO and its allies could make significant progress in these nine countries, a real impact could be made.

With the enthusiastic support of the UNESCO Director General, the charismatic Federico Mayor, my team and I started dialogue with the education ministers of the nine countries to fashion the E-9 project. It soon became apparent that the ministers were as dedicated as we were to the cause of basic education and literacy, but had problems securing the needed quantum leaps in resources and attention from their parliaments and national budgets, who were besieged with similar budgetary appeals from health, trade, transportation, military and other sectors. The only hope for dramatic change had to come from a level above ministers. Communicating this to Mayor led to the beginning of his active participation and close collaboration with the project, which then shifted its focus from ministers to governmental heads of state, for which the UNESCO Director General's participation became necessary.

What followed were state visits to the presidents and prime ministers of these nine countries, verifying their realization that basic education

for all was the surest way to development for their countries (a surprisingly easy task) and inviting them to a summit of heads a year later to launch commitments for achieving significant breakthroughs toward this end. Prime Minister Narasimha Rao of India, whose country hosted the world's largest number of illiterates, and who himself had already been personally in negotiation with his parliament for a dramatic five-year plan to increase resources for education, eagerly offered to host the summit in New Delhi.

In the year that ensued, ministers reported back that their presidents and parliaments had launched many new plans and initiatives so that they might have substantive progress to report at the summit. On our side, it became immensely helpful to take on as full partners the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). Even the World Bank, balking at the idea of favoring nine countries over so many others, such as the rightfully deserving but smaller ones in Africa, eventually saw the potential and the growing momentum of E-9 and came on board to support the initiative.

By the time the preparatory documents and pledges for the summit came in and the meeting occurred, dramatic budgetary increases for basic education had been implemented or were pledged for the future in six or seven of these countries, as their presidents and prime ministers proudly proclaimed to the world. Out of a total of 82 million additional school places needed to accommodate the out-of-school children in these countries, resources were put in place for an additional 52 million school places.

Fortunately, over the years, even as presidents and education ministers have rotated in and out within these countries, the E-9 initiative continues. At the ministerial level, the networking and communications exchange on specific problems and opportunities of large systems remained useful. Every year, one of the nine countries, on a rotation basis, invites the other eight to a conference on specific issues pertinent to them. Brazil recently hosted the annual meeting in Recife to address the issue of relevance and quality in large basic education systems. Credit for this continuity must be given to the foresight in having created within UNESCO a small follow-up task-force mandated to ensure continuing communication links among countries and with the secretariat via newsletters and other means – another effective leadership mechanism.

Lessons of leadership came to me in great numbers and with great force during this experience. It would never have succeeded, first of all,

without the full commitment and co-ownership of this vision, first of all by Federico Mayor, the UNESCO Director General, and eventually by the heads of the partner agencies. Without these, access to heads of government and in turn inspiring them with the possibilities of a vision of an educated citizenry would have been impossible. But sharing this vision, laterally and downward, was just as important. UNESCO Basic Education staff had to buy into the initiative of 'favoring' the nine countries chosen, had to focus their experience on those nine, and had to be willing to help shape a strategy for the nine on the basis of their experience and knowledge in their specific fields of expertise: pre-school education, nutrition and feeding programs, teacher training, instructional material development, indigenous low-cost school building, adult literacy, etc. They had to give concrete shape and strategy to the overall vision, and be at the ready for assistance should any of the nine countries seek it in their field of expertise.

Also interesting was the amount of time and energy involved working with the nine very different country ministries and the partner agencies. Needless to say, not all countries had the same level of commitment and enthusiasm, and even those that did seemed to participate for somewhat different, sometimes educational, sometimes political, sometimes personal motives. Even agency participation was driven by different motivations: UNDP needed a visible education component in their country programs; UNICEF was naturally concerned about children, not just education but child labor, nutrition, child rights, and so on; UNFPA was a committed partner due to the realization that an educated mother tends to have fewer children than an illiterate one (a country study typical of several others has documented that the illiterate mother has an average of 6.5 childbirths, while a mother with 4 years' education or more has an average of 2.3 childbirths). In forging coordinated inter-agency advocacy and strategies in the nine countries, and in hammering out documents and declarations for the summit, I spent almost as much time in the corporate headquarters of partners in Washington and New York as I did at my Paris base and on the country visits. What emerged were a communication pattern, a social network, and a quantum theory of trust that would have made an ideal study for Karen Stephenson.

In hindsight, a shortcoming of the social/professional network that emerged was a lack of adequate networking within the organization to which I belonged. I became more familiar and in more frequent contact with the basic education experts in the World Bank in Washington and in

UNICEF and UNDP in New York than with my own colleagues in higher education, or in HIV/AIDS education, or culture, in my own building, sometimes on my own floor in Paris. Building networks with colleagues in fields other than basic education at that time would have been invaluable. For example, only now are conferences being held to crystallize and bring to fruition the untapped potential of greater collaboration between the higher and basic education sectors in areas like teacher training, the advances in neurosciences as they have the potential to improve the learning process, re-channeling university research to basic education needs, and so on. Similarly, the links with culture for a responsive education system, and the need to institutionalize HIV/AIDS education in all basic education systems are, only in recent years, getting the attention they deserve.

Bold initiatives are often met with initial skepticism and resistance, especially from those who do not feel personally involved. Sectors within UNESCO outside the basic education sector were naturally curious about the E-9 project and yet remained uninvolved in the initial stages. Effective networking with these sectors even before project identification and start up would have been helpful. As a director, I had the opportunity to meet my peers at regular directorate meetings, learning about their priorities and concerns, sharing with them my own, and between meetings forming a few valuable contacts and indeed friendships. At the other end of the spectrum, my membership on the UNESCO basketball team, composed of both professional and non-professional staff, created linkages and cemented friendships at different levels of the organization. The annual UN agency games, a sort of mini-Olympics, meant long train or car rides to different cities to compete with other agencies, creating occasions for me to bond with colleagues in different sectors at different levels. And it also developed contacts and friendships with those from other agencies against whom we competed; contacts that on more than one occasion proved so helpful.

Over the course of my involvement with the E-9 project, I received considerable feedback on the relationship between leadership style and project success, and came to see that the recognized authority which allowed me to carry out the project was not derived from personal charisma, charm, or even the authority of knowledge. My background prior to UNESCO was not in basic education and, though I tried to be a fast learner, I was always tapping into the experience and knowledge of the experts around me. I am told that the respect and authority I was even-

tually accorded in connection with the E-9 project came from my being able to form collaborative working teams from groups as diverse as ministry staff from countries of vastly different cultures and even levels of competence, and from hard-boiled, articulate and sometimes jaded UN professionals from different agencies, who were welded together by a common vision and passionate enthusiasm for the E-9 project, even through the difficult strategy and drafting sessions. And, of course, I made no effort to hide my own enthusiasm and passionate commitment to E-9 and its enormous multiplier potential. That enthusiasm and fervor has apparently endured, and turns out to have been infectious for everyone I worked with in my staff, in partner agencies, and in various country settings. It represented a significant shift in the way UNESCO normally worked, but it was anchored on an ambitious and yet realistic vision that I did my best to spread.

Leadership and the Future

As the world gallops into a rapidly changing future, leaders in general, and educational leaders in particular, will be called upon not just to keep up with these changes, but indeed to channel and compose them. Leadership must take on new forms, new roles and new modes of operation in an increasingly diversified world of heterogeneous yet closely interacting individuals in various work or social groups. We live now in an era where evolving new paradigms and venturing into uncharted waters will become frequent, and indeed ever more imperative.

Initial reflections on leadership and management for the future do not make this immediately apparent. Schools of management have courses on the management of change, of futuristic scenario building, or conflict negotiation. But at root, the dominant management paradigm remains the same. If there is a task or a project, whether it is a standard one or an innovative one, or even one focused on moving into uncharted waters, the leader must be able to marshal the resources needed to accomplish the task. Leaders must manage the people (whether homogeneous or heterogeneous), control budgets and financial resources with the greatest efficiency, organize tasks and groups within specific timeframes and schedules to get objectives accomplished on time, and eventually deliver the product or service or solve the problem – all within budget, within deadlines, and with a minimum of difficulty and conflict.

But leadership, indeed management, in educational settings needs

now more than ever to look beyond improving means to re-articulating existing ends. As earlier mentioned, there is growing evidence that education structures, as they currently exist, have largely outlived the environments for which they were originally developed, and leaders in this sector must look beyond budgets, faculty unions, facilities expansion and maintenance, textbook production, and so on. They must constantly search for new ways and new paradigms to meet the learning needs of students facing uncharted futures.

Management and strategic planning skills must be part of the tool kit of every leader. But leaders of the future can and must be more than managers. They must be able to optimize the potential inherent in the realities of diversity rather than just tolerating or dealing with it. They must cooperatively build visions and strategies rather than just handing them down. They must be prepared to suggest new and different directions as circumstances and changes in the workplace and in the larger environment call for them. Finally, they must be leaders who recognize that their ultimate mandate is the development of their people rather than the achievement of their work objectives, which then follows as a logical consequence.

References

- Cross, R.L. & Parker, A. (2005): *The Hidden Power of Social Networks: Understanding How Work Really Gets Done in Organizations*, Boston: Harvard Business School Publication.
- Stephenson, K. (2005): *Quantum Theory of Trust: The Secret of Mapping and Managing Human Relationships*, Zurich: Pearson Education.
- Warren, Rick. (2002): *The Purpose Driven Life: What on Earth am I Here For?*, Grand Rapids, MI; Zondervan.

*Interconnections Within and Without
The Double Duty of
Creative Educational Leadership*

WANG Hongyu

The central argument of this chapter is that experiencing meaningful interconnections of an *inward* nature is essential to leading *outward* into today's complexly interdependent world for the purpose of bringing about creative educational change. Furthermore, I argue that global transformation and self transformation need to go hand-in-hand. Some aspects of Chinese philosophy, including Confucianism and Daoism, can offer useful inspiration for how to respond to complex patterns of relationships both internally and externally. Both the Confucian ethics of personal cultivation and the Daoist aesthetics and cosmology of independent personhood situate those engaging them in explicitly dynamic patterns of social, emotional, spiritual, and cosmic interconnections. Such traditions, I maintain, can usefully inform contemporary efforts to initiate and sustain creative educational change.

I will first examine Confucian and Daoist notions of personhood and leadership, and then elaborate upon views of the relationship between interconnectivity and creativity that are substantially associated with these aspects of Chinese philosophy. Next, I will discuss the contemporary significance of personal cultivation in the context of present day patterns of globalization (see Deane Neubauer's Chapter One for an overview of the dynamics of globalization), including the implications of personal cultivation for education in 21st century China and for global educational leadership. The chapter concludes with a call for an inter-space of educational leadership in which creativity can flow from inter-

connections within and without.

Personal Cultivation as the Heart of Leadership

Personal cultivation occupies an important position in much of Chinese philosophy. Though Confucianism and Daoism are quite distinct traditions, both emphasize the importance of personal cultivation as a way of life and as the basis of effective leadership. This is evident in Laozi's claim that: "Cultivated in the person, its *de* is true; cultivated in the family, its *de* is rich; cultivated in the village, its *de* lasts; cultivated in the nation, its *de* is abundant; cultivated in the world, its *de* is universal" (*Laozi [Dao De Jing]*, Chapter 54). *De*, sometimes translated as "virtues" (but different from the Confucian moral virtues), is the situated and particular expression of *Dao* (literally, 'way,' 'path,' 'method,' or 'understanding') in actual being.¹ Laozi's personal cultivation aims at achieving *Dao* and extending such cultivation from the person to the family, the village, the nation, and the world.

Although Laozi's notion of *Dao* is cosmic rather than moral, his sequence of cultivation is echoed in *The Great Learning*, one of the Confucian classics:

When things are studied, knowledge is achieved. When knowledge is achieved, then one reaches sincerity of thought. When one reaches sincerity of thought, the integrity of heart comes. With the integrity of heart, the person can be cultivated. When the person is cultivated, the family life can be regulated. When the family life is regulated, the nation can be rightly governed. When the nation is rightly governed, the whole world can be made peaceful. From the emperor down to the common people, all must consider the cultivation of the person as the root of all. It cannot be that, when the root is neglected, what springs from it will be well-ordered. (*The Great Learning*, 1)

The parallel regarding personal cultivation between *Laozi* and *The Great Learning* is clear. Since Confucianism speaks more often about personal cultivation and the concrete means of practicing it, the concentric linking of person, family, nation, and world is usually regarded as a Confucian concern, yet it was Laozi who first articulated such a relationship. Likewise, while "sagacity within and kingliness without" is usually regarded as the essential teaching of *The Great Learning*, the phrase first appears in the *Zhuangzi*. Confucians and Daoists share commitments to personal cultiva-

tion as essential for both individual fulfillment and societal development.

Importantly, even though ancient China was an elitist society, personal cultivation was an ideal for everybody to pursue and practice. It seems to me that the Confucian vision that everyone is capable of personal cultivation is given complementary practical force by the Daoist advocacy of *wuwei*. *Wuwei* literally means 'non-action,' but in Daoist contexts connotes action that is non-instrumental without forcing and thus, free of constraint. It is the mode of conduct by means of which the sage follows common people's hearts. I will return to this later.

Without establishing interconnections within a person through *ren* (variously translated as 'love,' 'benevolence,' 'humane-ness' and 'authoritative personhood') in Confucian practice or *Dao* in Daoist practice, it is not possible to undertake successfully the role of leadership and to build apt interconnections in the outer world. Moreover, personal cultivation is a process facilitated by interactions among the internal and the external worlds. Possibilities for change and transformation are based upon interconnection because one thing can become another thing only if they are connected. Laozi is a master in demonstrating how one state of affairs can be changed into its opposite as an expression of the movement or dynamic patterning of *Dao*. If we remember that the historical period in which both Confucius and Laozi lived was one full of turbulence, the link between personal transformation and societal reform that they were keen to establish has much significance for understanding and responding within our own, analogously turbulent, age in which new and more equitable interconnections need to be made.

The Confucian Tradition of Personhood and Leadership

In ancient times, men learned for the sake of the self (*The Analects*, 14.24).

The heuristic value of learning for the sake of the self can perhaps be understood as an injunction for self-cultivation ... [which] enacts the Confucian concern that to know oneself internally is the precondition for doing things right in the external world (Tu 1985, p.56).

For Confucius, a gentleman² cultivates himself in order to conduct rituals properly and to enable peace for others and, indeed, for all under heaven (*tian*) (*The Analects*, 14.42). First, personal cultivation is fundamental, without which nothing else can be firmly built. To know and practice rituals that are the products of ancient civilization is made possible by

education. Confucius holds an optimistic view of human nature and believes in the potential for all men to become gentlemen around whom there can be formed sustained moral communities. Confucianism is substantially concerned with how to bring out the best in humanity. The interconnections between morality, politics, and education are features of Chinese holism and are demonstrated clearly in Confucian thought (e.g., Tu 1986; Hall & Ames 1999).

Second, an individual is always a 'person-in-community.' As individuals, we relate with others and these relationships are integral to the process of personal cultivation. The Confucian golden rule is: "What you do not want done to yourself, do not do to others" (*The Analects*, 15.24); or, more positively stated: "the gentleman wishing to be established himself, seeks to establish others; wishing to be enlarged himself, seeks also to enlarge others" (*The Analects*, 6.30). In other words, the self cannot engage in personal cultivation as an isolated entity; rather, what makes personal cultivation possible is a relational view of the self.

Third, the ultimate purpose of personal cultivation is to make the whole world harmonious and to bring peace to everybody. Here is where sagacity and kingliness coincide. Personal cultivation is not independent from the governing of the world and one cannot talk about leadership without talking about personal cultivation.

The Confucian framework of personal cultivation involves an extension from the self to the other, from the internal to the external, and from the near to the far. How can we achieve such an extension? Confucius advocates the *Dao* or *Way of ren*. *Ren*, as I indicated above, is translated as love, humane-ness, reciprocity, benevolence, perfect virtue, and so on. Actually, Confucius defines it differently depending on the circumstances, audience, and time, and so it is an embodied and contextualized notion rather than a universal concept. But what is clear is that the Confucian *Way* is different from the Daoist *Dao* in that the Confucian emphasis on *ren* accords the *Way* a strong moral connotation. (Even though the same written character is rendered here as *Way* and *Dao*, I prefer to use the term *Way* to indicate the Confucian *Dao* so that the differences between Confucianism and Daoism can be more clearly shown.) For Confucius, *ren* is not confined by rationality; it has important emotional and ethical dimensions and underlies apt ritual practice, good leadership, and the golden rule in the 'self and other' relationship.

The concept and practice of *ren* is also an extensive process. Confucius regards a loving filial relationship as the basis of *ren*, which requires

the individual to extend familial feelings to others in the world. Through the resonance of empathy and sympathy that such feelings invoke in the individuals he is able to achieve and sustain reciprocity between the self and the other. Without internal cultivation, one is less likely to reach empathetic understanding of others or to provide a persuasive exemplar; one is also less likely to evoke positive reactions from others. Confucius believes in helping people to change by touching their hearts rather than rewarding or punishing them. This ability to touch and transform the other comes, he claims, from the internal power of the self. He therefore emphasizes the priority of self-integrity in leaders over instilling integrity in others. One's own integrity and empathy are crucial in stimulating those of others and to evoking resonant responses from those whom one would lead.

The Great Learning outlines the steps of personal cultivation in detail. These include serious study of things, sincerity of thought, integrity of heart, and the extension of personal integrity to the world. We can see that knowledge plays an important role in this process and that knowledge is closely bound with the moral pursuit of sincerity and integrity. The integration, rather than the separation, of intellect and feelings is clearly stated. Therefore, personal cultivation involves the growth of the whole person, including intellectual, emotional, moral, and spiritual development. Furthermore, it aims at not only fulfilling oneself but also fulfilling or maximizing the relational potential of things, others, and ultimately the world. In Confucian self-cultivation, a unity of self and cosmos is postulated, effected through moral conduct and qualitatively developed through appropriate relationships. Thus, the individual and society become integrated as means and end for each other.

What is still more interesting is that *The Great Learning* presents a complex layered holistic process in which the encircling relationship is two-directional, flowing between the lower/smaller and the higher/larger scale. A cycle of personal cultivation is completed here, not only by step-by-step extension from near to far, but also by the accomplishment of a lower layer under a higher layer. This is a way of thinking with great potential for building webs of interconnection and guiding relational refinement. Such a web does not mean the loss of the individual person within layers of relationship. There is an inherent element of independence that upholds a gentleman's internal sense of *ren* and his commitment to practicing it even when external circumstances are not conducive to it. Both Confucius (*The Analects*, 6.17; 7.16) and Mencius (*Mencius*, 6.2) ad-

vocate cultivating a strong sense of moral mission despite poverty, hardship, and adversity.

Even though Confucianism has historically demonstrated serious liabilities,³ here I focus only on showing what the Confucian theory of personal cultivation and its inherent connection with leadership might offer regarding our contemporary considerations of global interconnectedness and education. Confucian views on personhood and leadership are inseparable from education; indeed, Confucius and many other Confucian masters were teachers whose theories were integral to their notions and practice of educating as leading. I will address educational leadership in the contemporary context later.

The Daoist Tradition of Personhood and Leadership

A sage leads by *wuwei*; educates without words. (Laozi)

In Laozi's viewpoint, following the way of nature includes respect, concern and affection for every individual and every living thing. Supporting the nature of thousands of things means not only taking care of the development of the whole, but also provides a good environment and space for every grass and wood, every family and village, and every nation and state. This is the basis and condition for natural and holistic harmony. (Liu Xiaogan 2005, p.43)

To refer to the Daoist self as 'independent personhood' is paradoxical as such independence must be in harmonious relationship with *Dao*. In other words, a person's independence can never be absolute or complete. It is in the flow of *Dao*, rather than through the exercise of personal autonomy, that one can achieve freedom. This Daoist understanding of freedom, I want to suggest, is a crucial element in the vision of Chinese holism.

Similar to the Confucian emphasis on personal cultivation, Daoism also has a strong tradition of personhood. According to Sun Yikai, Lu Jianhua, and Liu Mufang (2004), Laozi focuses more on societal change and governing the world, while Zhuangzi is more concerned with inner transformation and spiritual freedom; Laozi emphasizes how to embody *Dao* personally, while Zhuangzi emphasizes the role of individual agency. But both of these seminal thinkers explicitly link self-cultivation with maintaining *Dao*. Together their thoughts form a dynamic whole in articulating the early Daoist tradition of personhood and leadership.

In contrast with Confucianism, Daoism does not rest content with

received traditions of morality and ritual. Instead, Daoism challenges all conventional notions regarding strength, achievement, and knowledge. For Laozi, only after *Dao* is lost, do *ren*, righteousness, ritual, intellect, and trustworthiness become important. He does not necessarily negate the importance of *ren*, but rather insists that what is more essential is *Dao*, which cannot be achieved without going beyond *ren*. Zhuangzi (*Zhuangzi*, Chapters 1, 2, 6) is well known for ridiculing the Confucian virtues. For both Laozi and Zhuangzi, in order to get in touch with the creative rhythms of *Dao*, one needs to go beyond internal and external constraints. Only through *Dao* can one understand the self or the world as it is and smooth out the path between the person and the universe.

To understand the Daoist notion of personal cultivation and leadership, we need to refer to Laozi's dialectical views about humans, nature, change, and the universe. He states: "reversal is the movement of *Dao*; softness is the usage of *Dao*" (*Laozi*, Chapter 40). Here, "reversal" has three layers of meaning. First, everything has its opposite and opposites enable each other. Strength is opposite to softness but softness enables strength. Second, things always change in the direction of what they (at present) are not. What is empty, therefore, will be filled; what is unfortunate will become fortunate. Third, things return to the source of life (sometimes *reversal* is translated as *return*). This return to the way of nature is inherent in the evolution of everything. The *Laozi* is full of teachings about opposites and their mutual transformation of each other. From such a perspective, Laozi advocates holding on to softness as the means to maintaining power because strength will give way to the built-in vulnerability in hardness. The dynamics of knowing the masculine/*yang* but keeping the feminine/*yin* are essential to the movement of *Dao*. The *Tai-ji* symbol illustrates well not only the interplay between *yin* and *yang*, but also the fact that *yang* is inherent within *yin* and *yin* within *yang*. Such a dynamic view of *yin/yang* interaction values, rather than eliminates, tension because it is in tension that there lies the possibility for transformation. Therefore, the Daoist notion of harmony incorporates difference, opposition and multiplicity.

Now, it comes as no surprise that Laozi advocates *wuwei* (*Laozi*, Chapters 2, 3, 37, 43, 57, 63) for governing the self and the world. A term difficult to translate, *wuwei* literally means, as I intimated earlier, 'non-action,' but it does not mean doing nothing. *Wuwei* in *Laozi* is usually coupled with its opposite, *wubuwei*, which means being free to do anything. Therefore, *wuwei* is not a passive state (as it is sometimes inter-

preted), but signals the dynamic presence of unlimited possibilities for accomplishing freedom of action. *Wuwei* comes from *Dao*: “*Dao* holds on to *wuwei*; yet through it everything is done. If dukes and kings could keep it, everything would transform itself” (*Laozi*, Chapter 37). In other words, *wuwei* is an essential quality of *Dao*. *Dao* in its formlessness gives birth to the universe but does not occupy it; *Dao* nurtures the universe but does not dominate it. Just as *Dao* is generative but not possessive, *wuwei* leads to the transformation of everything but does not force any change. The position of *wuwei* advocates self-organization, while going against any imposition. Thus, *wuwei* does not mean withdrawal; it means following the way of nature to act without forcing.

By following the way of nature without forcing, *wuwei* does not connote abiding in passive stillness, but rather opening paths for fluidity that lead to change. *Dao* is not only an ideal, but also a moving force (Allan 1997). It is in movement that the transformation of all participants happens. Without a will or a predetermined purpose, Laozi’s *Dao* is recursive, circuitous and sustainable, and *wuwei* sustains its dancing through quietude (*wu* in ancient Chinese inscriptions depicts dancing; the pronunciations of *wu* and dance are the same). Here we have the dialectic of quietude and motion in which change happens through returning to the original source. Like water gathering its power in flowing downhill, *wuwei* keeps the position of the lower to accumulate strength.

Keeping the position of the lower to accumulate strength, *wuwei* values non-competition and softness. Laozi links the yielding with vitality in life and links the hard with stiffness in death, illustrating the power of softness. The soft prevails over the strong due to its changeability, adaptability, and sustainability. Holding on to the soft does not mean excluding the hard because they are mutually dependent upon each other. The newborn baby, who is supple but full of possibilities and energy, is Laozi’s oft-used metaphor to symbolize the vital strength of the soft. *Yin*/feminine/softness often appears together with *yang*/masculine/hardness to enable flexibility and sustain life. Daoism differs from Confucianism in emphasizing more the power of *yin* to realize harmony.

Distinctively, Daoist *wuwei* starts with what common people want: “The sage does not have a selfish heart; he considers the heart of the people as his heart” (*Laozi*, Chapter 49). As I discussed earlier, the Confucian golden rules extend from self to other, which may lead to imposing one’s principles and ideals upon others unintentionally. In Laozi’s *wuwei*, the sage does not attempt to control the common people but considers

what the people like and where their hearts lie. The leader does not impose, but rather allows the common people a space of their own to actively engage in personal cultivation and public affairs. To a certain degree, Laozi's *wuwei* counters the Confucian liability of conflating the self and the world. In short, the sage as good leader understands the importance of *wuwei*: "I adopt *wuwei*, yet the people transform themselves; I love quietude, yet the people correct themselves; I do not interfere, yet the people enrich themselves; I do not desire, yet the people return to the state of nature" (Laozi, Chapter 57). To be able to lead by *wuwei*, leaders' personal cultivation involves learning the posture of quietude, modesty, non-possession, non-competition and tolerance, with nourishment of life as a fundamental purpose.

Interconnections, Holism, and Creativity: A Reflection

As we have seen, classical Confucianism and Daoism overlap in their concerns about personal cultivation and leadership, but their approaches diverge in many respects. To simplify the differences between them, personal cultivation intends to achieve *ren* in classical Confucianism while it intends to unite with *Dao* in Daoism. Confucian emphases on *ren*, righteousness, ritual, and intellect are precisely what Daoism attempts to dissolve in order to get in touch with *Dao*. Confucianism is more affirmative of principle, while Daoism is more flexible in situational negotiation. Confucianism advocates active engagement with politics, while Daoism advocates withdrawal from utilitarian gains. Confucian personal cultivation follows a humanist path, while Daoist personal cultivation follows a naturalist path. Confucianism insists on the essential link between internal sagacity and external kingliness, while Daoism emphasizes internal spiritual cultivation and values "the mode of the hermit" among the crowd.

These differences, however, complement each other. Many traditional Chinese intellectuals have incorporated both without much difficulty. Because both Confucius and Laozi assumed the underlying cosmology and ontology of the *Book of Change*, their distinct philosophies usually form a dynamic whole that expresses the relational basis for the Chinese self, society, and politics. In ancient government practices, these philosophies were often jointly embodied (Mou 2001).

Together, Confucianism and Daoism have contributed to the Chinese tradition of holism's emphasizing interpersonal harmony and the interconnection between human and universe. Such a holism upholds a

sense of personal cultivation situated in a circle of layered relationships, whether they are social or cosmic. Creativity, according to this interconnected worldview, is creative transformation, which recursively returns to *Way* or *Dao*. The notion of creativity as a singular act by God or as a rupturing break from the old is privileged in Western thought, but Confucian and Daoist concerns with relationships lead to a conception of newness as born from co-creative and co-emergent processes. Singularity or rupture in creativity implies a certain sense of violence as it separates what is new from the context of its emergence. A notion of co-creation has a potential for softening such a tendency. In Chinese holism, one is always with *Way* or *Dao* rather than mastering or controlling it, and creativity emerges from the interdependence between person and world.

Dao or *Way* is not a rigid standard externally imposed, but permeates humans, nature, society, the cosmos, and the interactions among them. For Laozi, *Dao* is in perpetual movement and beyond definition; for Zhuangzi, *Dao* expresses a certain degree of emptiness and powerful openness to change. The fluidity of *Dao* is stronger than any force. Creative activities aligned with *Dao* benefit not only the person but also the whole network of which the person is a part. In this sense, Daoist creativity is ecological, leading to the formation of a balanced, interconnected whole. The Confucian *Way* emphasizes personal agency in promoting *ren* and imbues creative processes with humanistic concerns. Confucius says: "It is the human being who is able to extend the Way; it is not the Way that is able to extend the human being" (*The Analects*, 15.29). Here, the active and creative role of humanity in not only keeping with the *Way*, but also transforming and broadening it, is made clear. Human participation in *Dao* or *Way*, rather than blind obedience to predetermined truth, is the key to unity between the universe and humanity, and to a co-creative sense of newness. As Tu Wei-ming (1985) points out, the Chinese cosmos is spontaneous, self-generative and emergent. This viewpoint is compatible with contemporary systems theory in which the self-organization of a system comes from generative interaction among local parts. Chinese holism is rooted in a notion of transformative creativity through both personal cultivation and relationships that is of particular relevance in today's interconnected world.

A note of caution, however, is important here. Even though the Daoist *yin/yang* interactive view is dynamic and allows space for tensions and opposites, by and large, Chinese holism focuses more on continuity, rather than on discontinuous newness. The relational emphasis of Chi-

nese holism shadows differences among the nature of the social world, the nature of the human, and the nature of nature, and does not fully address the issues related to fragmentation. Without consideration of these differences, it is difficult to establish a social system that benefits from and promotes individual creativity. History has shown that neither Confucianism nor Daoism provided a sufficient mechanism to regulate political systems when they went wrong. In short, Chinese holism has costs that must be acknowledged if it is to be useful in sustaining both interconnections and creativity in personal cultivation and societal reform.

With these reflections in mind, we can now ask what the framework of interconnection and the conceptual resources provided by classical Chinese thought can offer contemporary educational leadership. It is worth pointing out, though, that classical Chinese thought did not make any really distinctive separation among education, politics, ethics, and aesthetics. Educational wisdom is an organic part of Confucian and Taoist thought. What Confucianism and Taoism discussed philosophically and politically was simultaneously educational, and this chapter intends to present such connections as a whole, rather than treating educational issues as applications of philosophical principles. Nevertheless, we face new educational situations in our era that ask for new specific and creative responses, so I turn now to highlighting some contemporary issues related to educational leadership.

The Challenges of Globalization for Chinese Education

Globalization has dramatically influenced many aspects of contemporary life. Dynamic and complex global interdependence has become a reality, which is reflected both in a capacity for transcending space limitations to expand/contract the planet, and in an imperative to manage planetary crises at a global level. Even though we witness strong homogenizing tendencies, multiplicity and heterogeneity are also emerging, especially in cultural realms, contributing to tensions between the global and the local.

Since China joined the World Trade Organization (WTO), the concept of education has been substantially re-defined and marketization has become a driving force. (Ma Wan-hua has considered these issues in some depth in Chapter Six of this volume.) Chinese educational leaders face the challenges of educational globalization while also seeking to preserve Chinese traditions. They seek new possibilities alternate to both narrow-minded ethnocentrism and complete Westernization. In the light of

such conditions, do Confucian and Daoist traditions of leadership and personhood have any relevance to contemporary educational concerns?

Some Chinese scholars (Wang 2002; Ye 2004; Li & Xing 2004) suggest that constructing a new sense of personhood is the ultimate challenge of globalization for Chinese education. The relationship between self and culture is a perennial undercurrent permeating Chinese intellectual and social history, and is not absent in today's reform efforts. Considering the last century's penetrating criticism of Confucianism and Daoism, and recent appeals to Chinese traditions (in some cases) to serve the needs of conservative politics, it is not surprising that the call for creative personhood by some contemporary critical scholars is a call for transforming, rather than preserving, both personal and cultural identity. But the central concern with interconnections through personal cultivation remains intact.

Globalization implies increasing degrees of homogeneity, while indigenization is associated with heterogeneity and multiplicity. However, the global and the local are not separate entities, but are intertwined processes in a complex network. Wang Xiao (2002) argues that educational indigenization does not mean returning to traditional cultural roots, but means reconstructing traditions and creating new personal and cultural identities that respond to the impact of globalization. He sharply criticizes Chinese humanism for its suppression of individual creativity, responsible subjectivity and emotional expression. At the same time, he also questions that aspect of Western rationality that promotes possessive individualism. He proposes that the mission of contemporary Chinese education should center on personal transformation, and infuse the humanistic tradition with a scientific spirit to reach a new integration that transcends both Chinese humanism and Western scientism. Scientific pursuit without excessive scientism and individual subjectivity without excessive individualism are the double goals for contemporary Chinese educational leadership.

Learning from Western science has been a concern in Chinese education for more than a century. But the force of sweeping global markets with their profound cultural influences is relatively new. In the 1980s, one focus in the heated debates about the role of the market in education was the relationship between the market and personhood. Since the market brings competition, individualism, and materialistic pursuit, it conflicts with traditional Chinese cultural values that are oriented around collectivism and morality. It poses fundamental challenges to personal and cultural identity as a double-edged sword. On the one hand, the market

promotes the culturally repressed value of individuality and transforms the traditional society; on the other hand, the market threatens to submerge indigenous values and erode ethical commitments to the community. In the 21st century, such conflicts are intensified by global markets and their impact on Chinese education, including on its structure, purpose, administration, content, and methods. However, because of the gap between increasing educational needs and the limited access provided by public education, educational leaders intend to use marketization and privatization as ways to expand educational resources, diversify educational institutions, and provide a regulative mechanism to mediate between what is produced by education and what is needed in the society. In this sense, marketization is being pushed by both internal needs and external forces.

However, in contrast with societies with relatively mature market economies, in a society like China's, where the market economy is still in its formative stages, significant challenges and risks attend the introduction of market mechanisms into the field of education, the nature of which differs substantially from institutions and processes in the economic domain. In developed Western countries, where the rate of privatization of education has increased, there has been strong criticism of associated trends in which utilitarian political and economic intentions have replaced existential educational concerns. Markets do not of course function in a power vacuum; and the operation of the market in China does not follow a strictly internal logic.⁴ Too often markets dramatically increase the gap between rich and poor, and impede the process of educational democratization.

Both science and the market constitute forces beyond the reach of classical Confucianism and Daoism. It is also true that classical Chinese thought does not provide much fertile soil in which to plant the seeds of scientific and market development. These aspects of life give new meanings to the ideal of interconnections within and without. Information technology and global migration could be said to have expanded the potential of personal cultivation for ordinary people; on the other hand, science, the market, technology, and their interaction with humanity also lead to fragmentation, the loss of cultural roots, identity crises, the dominance of instrumental thinking, and the intensification of educational inequality. In such contexts, the fundamental issues of what it means to live one's life alone and together on a shared planet cannot be addressed

adequately without reformulating the notions of personhood, relationality, and leadership.

First of all, as today's world is simultaneously fragmented and interconnected, the Chinese tradition of interconnections through personal cultivation addresses essential questions about the human condition, and can be re-affirmed with much benefit. Cultivating interconnection within the self requires acknowledging the coexistence of differences, parallel to weaving interconnections across differences in the external world. To reach a balance within the self between heterogeneous forces is the basis of building bridges in the external world between seemingly disconnected forces. The Daoist emphasis on *yin/yang* interaction values the role of difference in creating a dynamic harmony. The interplay between *yin* and *yang* within a person is a microcosm of cosmic interdependence and its generative tensions. A Daoist state of "tranquility in disturbance" is especially helpful for thinking about how to live with generative tension co-creatively across the global, the local, and the personal.

Given such an affirmation, educational leaders should be encouraged to acknowledge further the complexity of contemporary interdependence and to bring into focus those aspects of human life largely neglected by Confucianism and Daoism, such as the legal system, cultural pluralism, science, and political democracy. Only on the basis of such a comprehensive appreciation of the relational complexion of contemporary society will the creative potential of interconnections within and without be effectively actualized. For example, the Daoist advocacy of leadership as *wuwei* is in line with contemporary efforts to decentralize control for the purposes of promoting educational innovation and democratization. At the same time, decentralization raises questions of how to institutionalize and legally define and defend educational structures conducive to greater educational equality and equity in China.

In making use of the resources of Confucian and Daoist traditions of personal cultivation and leadership, educators should actively engage what is problematic in the classical traditions. The merits of Chinese holism, in the contemporary setting, depend upon incorporating within it a heightened understanding and appreciation of differences among the self, the other and the world. It is in this way that the full complexity of interactions between and within micro- and macro-systems can be inflected in ways conducive to the emergence of a new sense of interconnectedness – an interconnectedness that promotes co-creativity and creativity of both the part and the whole. The suppression of individual creativity and the

underdevelopment of science and technology as the result of the traditional holism cannot be dealt with without transforming the foundations of Chinese philosophy and culture. The conflation of morality and politics also requires separating different mechanisms for different realms of social life. The re-conceptualization of harmony needs to consider the roles of polyphony and alterity. Ironically, in a world where global and local interdependence has become more prominent, Chinese education faces the challenge of cultivating a necessary sense of separation, but this is essential for rejuvenating and fully realizing the potential of interconnections within and without.

Based upon theoretical and empirical studies of educational reform at Chinese schools, Ye Lan (2004) and her colleagues propose a holistic transformative mode of educational leadership in the 21st century. Acknowledging the double-edged impact of globalization, she suggests that educational reform is an interconnected process that not only involves the internal and external relationships of schools in everyday educational practice, but also concerns the agency of personal cultivation. She argues for shifting the subject of leadership from central control to local schools and ultimately to each person's active pursuit of individuality, creativity, and subjectivity. Interestingly, Goodson (2001) also argues for a model of educational change in which the internal, the external, and the personal are interlinked and integrated. He emphasizes the centrality of internal/personal concerns and of teachers' work to initiate sustainable change. Such an echo turns our attention to Western educational leadership.

The Double Duty of Educational Leadership for Transformative Change

Globalization has specific reference to fairly recent developments that may in turn be acting to form a new kind of imaginable understanding within human consciousness. (Smith 2003, p.35)

In my world of education, the notion of 'educational leader' is a redundancy, repeating the same thing twice, for 'to educate' itself means, in the original sense, to lead out (*ex-ducere*). To lead is to lead others out, from where they now are to possibilities not yet. (Aoki 2005, p.350)

Due to the relative separation of politics and religion/morality that is a

major legacy of the modern West, personal cultivation and leadership are not as intimately linked as they are in the Chinese tradition. The associated modern duality of the public and private spheres, in contrast to the Confucian tradition, also leads to a separation, if not segregation, of personal transformation and social transformation. The current imposition on schools of market-driven change and the standards movement at once exemplifies and intensifies such separations. Global citizenship is commonly discussed or treated more or less as an added-on objective, outcome, or attribute, and inherent connections between the personal and the social/global are seldom stressed. Indeed, the separation between interconnections within and interconnections without makes it easy to blame others for one's own crisis. In fact, to the degree that leadership at the school level means building a professional community within the internal environment and responding to the external environment of assessment, markets, and civic capacity, those participating in educational change cannot work towards increasing the quality of interconnections with the external world without working simultaneously to enhance those occurring within the self. The strong tradition of emphasizing the singular in the modern West has often led to failures in understanding the impact of networks on the singular.

Historical studies of educational leadership (Goldring & Greenfield 2002; Sackney & Mitchell 2002) in the USA show that prescriptive managerial approaches and behavioral sciences dominated much of the field in the last century. Only in the last few decades have new perspectives emerged to challenge the dominant approaches. Many efforts aim at bringing different sets of assumptions and different ways of thinking into educational leadership, sometimes learning from the traditions of minority groups and of other cultures. However, such efforts are marginalized by current educational reforms based on standardization, accountability, assessment, and learning outcomes that, in the USA, echo and reinforce structural, bureaucratic, and behavioral approaches. These reforms, although claiming to be new, draw substantially on the ideology of industrial management and thus serve to submerge personhood into a system of control, competition, and compliance. This is antithetical to the purpose of education that holds personal cultivation at heart.

With the contemporary scale and scope of globalization, critical questions have been raised regarding traditional structural-functionalist leadership models that focus on individual leaders' capacities for exerting influence to achieve organizational goals. Newly developing approaches

tend to take multiple domains and multiple levels of leadership into consideration, emphasizing the role of relationships and interconnections rather than the individual nature of leadership. However, these new approaches often fail to capture the holistic dynamics of complex, multiple layered interconnections. While the new models suggest relationships among the personal, the interpersonal, and the organizational, they seldom explore how these different layers of relationships form a dynamic network. The personal dimension and the interpersonal dimension are often separated as if they were independent variables. As a result, efforts to re-configure leader formation still reveal deep roots in behaviorism and scientism. Some combination of competencies in knowledge, skills, and attributes is typically assumed to be essential in selecting and producing desirable leaders, and the challenge in leadership training is to identify the 'right' attributes and competencies and to assist prospective leaders in obtaining them. Global competency is now typically added to the list of leadership traits, but I doubt if such an aggregative approach to understanding the dynamics of leadership will result in truly transformative and creative leadership. Needed, instead, are broader perspectives, dynamic approaches, and holistic thinking in order to understand the complexities of interconnection and change from the most personal level to the global.

The Chinese tradition of integrating the personal, the interpersonal, and the communal/organizational is not an atomistic adding-up of parts to make a whole, but an effort to realize an interactive whole. The process of personal cultivation does not separate self, other, and community but indicates that one dimension does not exist without other dimensions and that all are intertwined. To transform educational leadership theory and practice, we need not abandon analytical thinking and in-depth understanding of parts; however, we need to understand that patterns of higher-level interconnections are produced through the dynamic interplay between and among aspects of educational leadership theory and practice, including the contexts in which these are situated.

The modern Western leadership tradition of legal regulation and scientific management has worked well to establish systems, structures, and procedures to administer schools and school districts. With such systematic strength retained, an apt renewal of modern, Western management traditions can be undertaken through wedding them with Confucian leadership traditions which advocate reciprocity between empathy and sympathy to weave a web of relationality and interconnectedness.

Positive emotional resonance in the Confucian holistic process of personal cultivation promotes harmonious relationships and directs the collective towards a shared goal. Confucian emphases on the role of *ren*, on persuasion rather than law, on relationality rather than regulation, and on feelings rather than rationality can be used in a complementary way to attune educational visions and long-term transformation with what the collective desires.

The decentralization movement resulting from both market mechanisms and democratic initiatives in the USA is geared towards a distributed approach to leadership. The enabling vision of every member becoming a leader in the educational community can be seen as echoing Laozi's *wuwei*, but these two visions are not, in fact, the same. They can, however, effectively be seen as forming an interactive relationship. The Daoist *wuwei* is based on a fluid worldview that does not occupy or dominate, while the Western notion of democracy is based on the equality of individual rights, supported by the market, which can hardly be non-possessive. Such a notion of decentralization cannot always deal effectively with the perceived conflicts between individual interests and the communal welfare. The Chinese tradition of personal cultivation flows beyond any fixed boundary of individuality since it acknowledges the essential interconnections of and among self, other, community, and cosmos. Therefore, the purpose of interconnections within and without is not for others *per se*, but is mutually beneficial for both self and the other, as the self is always embedded in the network of humanity and ecology. However, the Chinese tradition of interconnections within and without, does not handle well the issue of separation and the institutionalization of *wuwei* or *ren*. It becomes clear that only when both individuality and relationality become the double locus of educational leadership can the potential of both democracy and *wuwei* be realized.

There are already movements in connecting personhood and the global in a mutually transformative way. One example is a recent internationalization of curriculum studies (Pinar, 2003a, 2003b, 2004) that attempts to counteract the ethnocentric, narcissistic tendency of the educational field in the United States through re-formulating the notion of identity to understand the self as relational, historical, and political. "A genuine democratization of one's interiorized elements," (Pinar 2004, p.38) to build bridges within oneself is the basis for building interconnections among the plural (and at times fragmenting) dynamics of the world without. Without probing the depths of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity,

the search for unity at the global level may lead to compliance and false universalism. Mobilizing the social and destabilizing the self cannot be fully separated; neither can they be fully integrated. The generative tension of difference can be seen as “a bridging of two worlds by a bridge, which is not a bridge” (Aoki 2005). Realizing such an ever-shifting movement between self-transformation and global transformation is an essential task of educational leadership in a global society.

Although there is a sense in which the term ‘educational leadership’ is redundant (Aoki 2005), Murphy (2002) argues that, in fact, “the practice of educational leadership has [had] very little to do with either education or leadership” (p.70). Over the past century, given the dominance of bureaucracy and industrial/corporate ideology, educational leadership and administration have seldom considered how to educate or how to lead. To face the challenges of internationalizing and globalizing networks in a new century, we need to return to the root meanings of educational leadership in its doubling call for leading both others and self out to new possibilities. Such a double meaning echoes the Chinese tradition of creativity, enabled by co-creation, in which the birth of the new is generated from a dynamic interaction between and among self, other, and the world. In this sense, what is claimed as ‘new’ in current standards-based reform initiatives in the USA are largely parochial reactions to external and internal pressures for change, rather than truly co-creative acts of sustaining transformative change.

Educational leadership faces a double difficulty: concerns with the world without cannot be addressed without attention to the inner world, but the relationship between the inner and the outer is not a causal, sequential one. By seeing the dynamics of self-generative change – rather than linear and incremental change – as moving simultaneously across different scales, it is possible to see that the complex interplay of the inner and the outer forms a fluid network of intersecting currents within and among distinct relational layers or domains. What is new does not come from any single element within the network, but from creative interfusions taking place among multiple elements. The double duty of educational leaders is to work from within themselves *and* to lead others to work from within, not by imposition, but by guiding them to get in touch with their own creative resources.

An 'Inter'-Space for Contemporary Educational Leadership

We can see from the above that the same tradition may have different meanings in different contexts, so there is no one solution to the issues at hand. Because we have different traditions and our starting points are not the same, what we need is an 'inter'-space in which we reach out for difference in order to enrich the self (Wang 2004). An inter-space does not privilege one particular set of assumptions and frameworks, but encourages continuous transformative change through interacting with what is different to one's own theory and practice. While Chinese education needs to critically reflect upon its own traditions and learn from the West, Western education needs to transform itself through being open to alternative ways of thinking and leading in other traditions. Chinese education and Western education should take different things from Confucianism and Taoism for creating new modalities of leadership in contemporary society. Difference in such an inter-space is respected, rather than eliminated, and becomes instrumental to linking the local and the global, interdependence and independence, multiplicity and unity, and to bringing disparate elements into equitable relationships.

Since the West occupies a privileged position in globalization, many countries have been trying to learn from Western approaches under native contexts. Hallinger and Kantamara (2000) report three successful stories of Thai schools that implemented participatory school-based management, information technology, and school improvement planning. Their successes rested on combining traditional Thai leadership with Western styles of decentralization. Such a blending is difficult to achieve in hierarchical societies because cultural traditions emphasize respect for authority. Leaders at these three schools use traditional group orientation, teamwork, and the celebratory spirit in the workplace, but infuse it with efforts to create a new style of leadership. When necessary, they resort to the pressure of external authority to implement new programs in addition to creating a supportive environment. They walk a fine line between challenging the culture of compliance and maintaining traditional values. These examples demonstrate the importance of creating an inter-space that supports interaction between different forces to generate new approaches. The birth of the new, in such cases, is not embedded in a tearing apart from the old, but is immanent in renewing networks.

The work of Hallinger and Kantamara is indicative of recent emphases on cross-cultural approaches and indigenous knowledge bases as an effect of globalization dynamics on educational leadership. This trend

of adopting cross-cultural perspectives has the potential to destabilize ethnocentric viewpoints and transform hierarchical West/East power relationships. However, the usage of Western 'lenses' is sometimes privileged even when these studies are undertaken in Asia and by Asians. Such studies reinforce the efficacy of individualism and masculinity and fail to understand the subtle agency exercised by Asian educators in their negotiation of effective change within top-down structures of educational authority and within profoundly relational cultures. I would like particularly to contest the notion that Asian countries lack indigenous literature on educational leadership and change (Hallinger & Kantamara 2000). The problem is not that the indigenous knowledge base is missing but that such a base is no longer valued in today's world. As a result, in many Asian countries the issue is not simply to revive such traditions, but to adapt them to contemporary needs. Such adaptation requires an opening to other horizons but not fusing with them. Only by doing so is cultural transformation, rather than negation, possible. The centering of the West in globalization is not without danger for Western countries because self-closure blocks the fluidity of creativity in the long run. Opening to Eastern horizons is essential to realizing new potentials. In approaching each other, we must acknowledge that one should not consume the other, fully reduce the other into the same, or surrender itself to the other. Rather, the site of difference is generative for both self and other as long as dynamic interplay between differences is sustained.

An inter-space does not merely refer to inter-cultural or inter-national space. The terminology of East and West is especially problematic since East and West have had a long history of intermingling and mutually influencing each other. Here, I use it as a way to indicate, but not essentialize, cultural difference. An inter-space also refers to negotiating within intra-cultural differences – such as gender and ethnicity – to open up alternative possibilities. There are emerging literatures introducing, for instance, Native American indigenous traditions or feminist analyses into educational leadership. An inter-space can also refer to one's relationship with the self to allow the emergence of polyphonic voices. Difference and generative tension are essential to producing transformative change and making the creativity and co-creativity of an inter-space possible.

An inter-space values conflict and dissonance as potentially constructive. This openness to difference, which is not confined by any tradition yet at the same time inclusive of and playing with the multiple, is precisely what we need for forming a complex, dynamic, and equitable

network of relationship and creativity. An inter-space supports meaningful interconnections both within the self and across the globe. New patterns of educational leadership situated in such a space express a fluidity of movement beyond any predetermined procedures, at once extending the *Way* or *Dao* of teaching/learning while forming new educational channels. The double duty of creative educational leadership is to cultivate interconnections within and without, in order to 'lead out' (*educare*) to possibilities yet to come. Defying the quest for certainty, emergent visions will not become stagnant themselves, but will flow continuously onward and outward in realization of yet other patterns of co-creative relationship. Such a leading out does not fully break with old networks, but rather orients transformations of the interconnected web towards forms of co-creative expression that support creative individuality. Working from within and towards the world, educational leadership has the potential to enable both self-transformation and global transformation.

References

- The Analects* (1992): In *The four books* (Yang Bojun's translation into modern Chinese; Liu Chongde and Luo Zhiye's editing of James Legge's translation in the 19th century). Changsha: Hunan Publishing House.
- Allan, S. (1997): *The way of water and sprouts of virtue*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Ames, R.T. & Rosemont, H. (1998): *The Analects of Confucius: A Philosophical Translation*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Aoki, T.T. (2005): *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki* (William F. Pinar & Rita L. Irwin (eds.) Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- The doctrine of the mean* (1992). In *The four books* (Yang Bojun's translation into modern Chinese; Liu Chongde and Luo Zhiye's editing of James Legge's translation in the 19th century). Changsha: Hunan Publishing House.
- Goldring, E. & Greenfield, W. (2002): 'Understanding the evolving concept of leadership in education', in Murphy, J. (ed.) *The educational leadership challenge*, pp.1-19. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goodson, Ivor F. (2001). Social histories of educational change. *Journal of Educational Change*, Vol.2, No.1, pp.45-63.
- The great learning* (1992). In *The four books* (Yang Bojun's translation into modern Chinese; Liu Chongde and Luo Zhiye's editing of James Legge's translation in the 19th century). Changsha: Hunan Publishing House.
- Hall, D.L. & Ames, R.T. (1999): *The Democracy of the Dead: Dewey, Confucius and the Hope for Democracy in China*. Peru, IL: Open Court Press.
- Hallinger, P. & Kantamara, P. (2000): 'Educational change in Thailand: Opening a

- window onto leadership as cultural process.' *School leadership & Management*, Vol.20, No.2, pp.189-205.
- Hanson, E. (2005): 'Guanxi: China's Common Currency.' *The Journal for Convergence*, Vol.6, No.4. Retrieved September 22, 2006 from <http://www.axius.co.za/axius/Publications/Convergence/CurrentJFC.jsp>
- Laozi (1994) (Chen Guying's translation into modern Chinese; Fu Huisheng's editing of Arthur Waley's English translation in 1934). Changsha: Hunan Press.
- Li, W. & Xing, Y. (2004). *WTO rushi beijing xia zhongguo jiaoyu wenti yanjiu* [Studies on Chinese education at the frontier under the context of joining WTO]. Taiyuan, China: Shanxi Educational Press.
- Liu, X. (2005): 'Laozi zhi renwen ziran lungang.' *Zhongguo zhexue* [Chinese Philosophy], No.2, 37-45.
- Mencius (1992). In *The four books* (Yang Bojun's translation into modern Chinese; Liu Chongde and Luo Zhiye's editing of James Legge's translation in the 19th century). Changsha: Hunan Publishing House.
- Mou, Z. (2001): *Ruxue jiazhi de xin tansou* [New understandings about the value of Confucianism]. Jinan: Qilu Press.
- Murphy, J. (2002): 'Reculturating the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints', in Murphy, J. (ed.) *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century*, pp.65-82. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Pinar, W.F. (2003a): 'Introduction' in Trueit, D., Doll, W.E., Wang, H. & Pinar, W.F. (eds.) *The internationalization of curriculum studies*, pp.1-13. New York: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W.F. (ed.) (2003b): *International handbook of curriculum research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pinar, W.F. (2004): *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sackney, L. & Mitchell, C. (2002): 'Postmodern expressions of educational leadership'. In Leithwood, K. & Hallinger, P. (eds.) *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, pp.881-914. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Smith, D.G. (2003): 'Curriculum and teaching facing globalization', in Pinar, W.F. (ed.) *International handbook of curriculum research*, pp.35-51. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sun, Y., Lu, J. & Liu, M. (2004): *Daojia yu zhongguo zhexue* [Daoism and Chinese philosophy]. Beijing: People's Press.
- Tu, W. (1985): *Confucian thought: Selfhood as creative transformation*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Wang, H. (2004): *The call from the stranger on a journey home: Curriculum in a third space*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Wang, X. (2002): *Quanjihua yu zhongguo jiaoyu* [Globalization and Chinese education]. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- Ye, L. (2004): *Quanjihua xinxihua beijing xia de zhongguo jichu jiaoyu gaige yanjiu*

baogaoji [Studies on Chinese educational reform in the context of globalization and information society]. Shanghai: East China Normal University Press.
Zhuangzi (1990) (Zhang Yuliang ed.). Xian: Sanqin Press.

Endnotes

- ¹ A philosophical and philological discussion of Dao and related terms in the early lexicon of classical Chinese thought can be found in Ames and Rosemont (1998, pp.45-65).
- ² The issue regarding whether or not Confucian personal cultivation includes women is controversial. For more details, see Wang (2004). Here I use the masculine pronoun on purpose to indicate the gender biases of Confucianism.
- ³ Confucianism is liable to conflating the self and the world due to the extensive relationships that a person establishes both internally and externally. Differences and individuality usually end up being submerged within relationships, especially when leadership does not practice the Way of ren. Although the ideal of Confucian personal integrity can be seen as compatible with democratic governance (Hall & Ames, 1999), the cultural phenomenon of Confucianism has historically led to patterns of moralized governance that are incapable of providing adequate critical regulation of the political system.
- ⁴ A notable difference between Chinese market operations and those prevalent elsewhere is the prominence of informal, hierarchic loyalty relationships or *guanxi*. See, for example, Hanson 2005.

Unraveling Leadership 'Relational Humility' and the Search for Ignorance

Vrinda DALMIYA

The Project

This chapter is concerned with a paradox, a promise and their contentious inter-relationship. The paradox is generated by the functioning of global capitalism. Even as fast flows of information, capital, goods, and people across national boundaries usher in an 'epoch of borderlessness,' various systems of exclusion that regulate differential access to wellbeing get solidified. Thus, the compression of geographical space is accompanied by a concurrent widening of economic distances between the rich and poor. The promise is that education can be a corrective to such imbalance. This anthology's project is based in part on the belief that educational institutions can contribute to sustainable and equitable change and interdependence. The general hope is that self-critical education makes self-critical citizens capable of thinking creatively about democratic practices and social justice.

However, the restructured 'corporate academy' of today is no longer a public space characterized by the entirely free exchange of ideas. Learning has become linked to the creation of profit: research is driven by privatized industry, knowledge is commodified, students are consumers and teachers become producers of marketable knowledge and intellectual property. The re-configuring of academic space in accordance with the ideology of the market raises the same issues of invisible boundaries and differential access within the academy as those raised by material practices of free trade in a globalized space. Thus, academic institutions are neither outside of nor untainted by the forces they are supposed to rein in;

more often than not, they are sites of the very inequities that they are meant to eliminate. The relation between the initial paradox and the initial promise consequently becomes contentious.

Can educational institutions, in spite of this complicity, still nurture oppositional discourses that are sensitive to the injustices of poverty? To explore this question, this chapter looks to the 'relational turn' in feminist scholarship. Feminist theories, in their attempt to cast key concepts – of self, autonomy, agency and equality – in terms of necessary and even involuntary interconnections, typically pay attention to both the oppressive and the emancipatory dimensions of a relational ontology. The world we live in instantiates just such a networked space. Thus, referring to this body of feminist thought could assist us in understanding the inequities that result from global relationships and in pointing towards conceptual resources within these relational contexts that might serve as a corrective to the imbalances.

Equality is, of course, a two or multi-placed predicate – a comparative judgment of the situation of some people in relation to others. But a stress on mere differences in wealth (such as might be measured by inter-governmental organizations) misses the nature and complexity of the inequalities generated in a globalized world. The imbalance "is as much about issues of powerlessness, loss of dignity and respect, and exclusion from one's community and meaningful participation in it as it is about having less wealth" (Koggel 2002, p.260). Looking at *who* are adversely affected, as the feminists urge us to do – locating their gender, race, class and caste positions – makes visible the interlocking of multiple oppressions. Questions of structure and power that are elided when inequities are cast merely as issues of distribution/redistribution of income thus come to the fore and our grasp of the problem becomes more sophisticated. Moreover, feminist scholars of education have also turned their attention to empowering relationships that are still possible within modern day pedagogical contexts. Some have explicitly explored whether structural changes within schools and universities might become springboards for producing citizens with the political will to stem the ravages of globalization. Their attempts to link the classroom to a more equitable world thus seem to be in broad agreement with the general promise with which we began.

I intend to show in this chapter how a feminist analysis not only rethinks the aims of education but also re-conceptualizes the processes of crafting educational policy to realize those aims. To anticipate the argu-

ment, the changes made in the nature and content of education rebound self-reflexively on what it is to 'lead' educational policy towards those changes. Thus, re-imagining education implies re-configuring the nexus of power required to implement those changes. I will argue that if educational institutions are capable of producing responsible and responsive citizens, then to that extent we need to unravel established notions of leadership and policy making. Changes within education go hand in hand with changes on the meta-level regarding what is required to create and keep those structures in place.

I begin with the work of two contemporary scholars – Nel Noddings, who is a philosopher of education working within the framework of care ethics, and Chandra Talpade Mohanty, who writes as a post-colonial South Asian feminist of color, teaching in the American academy. Noddings and Mohanty identify very different *kinds* of relations within the academy to generate robust political interventions for justice. What Noddings theorizes can be called 'inter-subjectivity,' while Mohanty focuses on 'inter-historicity.' I first flesh out the difference between these two conceptions of empowering relations, but then attempt to synthesize their insights in the notion of what I call 'relational humility.' Education, when structured around the cultivation of such relational humility, becomes the search for ignorance. The attention then shifts from the power and constructions of knowledge to understanding when and how ascriptions of ignorance can be enabling. We look into the political role of *acknowledged ignorance* in disrupting the forces that silence dissidence and marginalize differences both within the academy and outside.

Noddings' inter-subjectivity and Mohanty's inter-historicity are both, I argue, enabled by self-ascriptions of ignorance, stemming from the cultivation of relational humility. However, the key concept of relational humility emerges only through a tripartite conversation that includes the meaning and methodology of education reflected in the stories of the *Mahābhārata*. Perhaps the conceptual resources thrown up by such a theoretical inter-relationality that disrupts the invisible but firm boundary between contemporary feminist thought and Classical Indian thought can provide guidelines to remodel both education and the very process of remodeling it. Only when the traditional divide between 'leaders' and 'led' – both in education and in the world at large – is deconstructed, can we begin to see the unraveling of systems of global privilege.

Noddings and 'Caring-For'

Noddings conceives of education as a series of "encounters" (Noddings 2002, p.283) and invokes the framework of care ethics to formulate social policy. Caring (as a moral orientation) has its origins in the home and in the domestic domain of women's gendered experiences. Educational reform is part of the public domain of policy. Thus "starting at home" is an important reversal of the traditional source of foundational ideas of progress.

According to Noddings, the fundamental ethical notion is a "natural" caring that arises spontaneously, without deliberation. This face-to-face, dyadic and intensely personal relation between two people – the one-caring/carer/caregiver on the one hand, and the cared-for on the other – she calls "caring-for." Analyzing this relation phenomenologically from the 'inside,' Noddings (1984) says:

When I look at and think about how I am when I care, I realize that there is invariably this displacement of interest from my own reality to the reality of the other (p.14).

Apprehending the other's reality, feeling what he feels as nearly as possible, is the essential part of caring from the view of the one-caring (p.16).

Thus, a receptive and affectively induced engrossment in the cared-for's reality is the beginning of caring. This underlies a grasp of another's expressed and inferred needs without which no ethical response is possible. The next step is motivational displacement – a redirection of the carer's energy towards the projects of the cared-for. This enables the caregiver to work towards enhancing the cared-for's good. Besides trying to satisfy needs, the primary motivation of the care-giver here is to avoid harm to the cared-for. But then Noddings goes on to add a crucial third condition of reciprocity. For caring-for to be successful, the one who is being cared-for must respond to and acknowledge the efforts of the one who is the caregiver. Note that this is not a *caring-for* the caregiver (by the cared-for) and may in fact range from enthusiastic acceptance to total rejection of her. The point here simply underscores that caring implies that the carer must be cognizant of the effect of her caring on the cared-for and give the latter a voice in shaping the relationship. The reciprocity requirement should not mislead us into a contractual model of 'I care for you only if you care for me.' Caring has to be a relation but every recognized relation need not be symmetrical. A shared control or asymmetric reciprocity helps block

some pathologies of care and is crucial for Noddings' argument that caring is not a *virtue* but a *relation*. But before we come to that issue, the immediate challenge is to see how such an unabashedly and intensely intimate encounter can speak (i) to issues of justice generally and (ii) to the restructuring of educational policy in particular.

Regarding the global issues of justice, Noddings attempts to mediate the care/justice debate in her more recent work by emphasizing a second notion of 'caring-about' which is "emotionally derived" (Noddings 2002, p.24) from caring-for. Caring-about is a sense of outrage at unfulfilled needs of distant others that is expressed in public and impersonal acts of intervention – for example, of charity, of organizing, of voting. Though these efforts may themselves remain quite faceless, they are geared to enable face-to-face caring-for by others at the local level. Personal caring-for still remains ethically primary in two ways: the fact that I have been so cared-for generates in me the "sense of justice" (Noddings 2002, p.23) that motivates me to rearrange social conditions so that *others* can care-for those whom *I* cannot meet personally. And it is these local, personal relations (enabled by my impersonal efforts) that ultimately address the needs of people. In this way, attention to the mechanisms within the inner circle of care can enable avoiding harm in the public sphere as well.

The educational policy reform that suggests itself within this framework is quite radical and contentious from a liberal point of view. According to Noddings, we should educate for home life and promote curriculum changes that shift attention away from algebra and geometry, and test scores, towards developing young adults capable of establishing better homes. Training both boys and girls to be better caregivers and homemakers thus becomes the aim of education.¹

I will not go into the details of Noddings' plans for realistically implementing this change in the school syllabus (she does not propose simply adding on a course like 'Home Economics'); and neither will I address how she meets the obvious criticisms of her vision of educational reform. But what should be emphasized here is that educational success is not defined in terms of preparation for higher education, preparation for a work life, or preparation for economic success. Rather, the goal is to make transformations that tend to produce people morally sensitive to harm. Students need education for caring "for themselves, their families, and *their enlightenment as citizens*" (Noddings 2002, p.298, emphasis added).

With the last statement, Noddings makes the connection between changes within the classroom and changes in the world outside. The link

between home life and citizenship lies in the association between caring-for and caring-about indicated above. Impersonal caring-*about* is associated with the duties of citizenship and enables personal and local caring-*for*. Such caring-*for*, in turn, amounts to direct interventions ensuring that harm is avoided. But, as Noddings emphasizes, caring-*about* or the will to avoid public harm emerges from relations and memories of being personally cared-*for* and being caring oneself. Thus the political will to address the wrongs of globalization could well come from individuals schooled in this way for private caring-*for* or home-life. As Noddings says:

Dare we teach for private life? I think we must. A caring society will be sure that all its people have at least adequate housing, material resources, and medical care. Beyond satisfying basic legitimate needs, it must ask how it can best encourage the kind of encounters that will support the development of competent, caring, fully alive, and interesting people." (2002, p.299)

Mohanty and 'Feminist Solidarity'

Chandra Talpade Mohanty emphasizes that the classroom is not merely a site for the transmission of information but the locale where knowledges, and thereby identities, are constructed, colonized, and contested. Globalization impacts on the academy by demanding that education, in order to remain relevant, provide students with global competency. But this imperative for multicultural exposure, coming as it does from the business world, "actually facilitates the re-colonization of communities marginalized on the basis of class and racialized gender" (Mohanty 2003, p.178). Mohanty spells out how this happens and suggests a strategy for resistance by looking at the politics behind different types of Women's Studies curricula (in colleges and universities in the USA) in their bid to teach about cultural difference. These observations are generalizable to curricula in other disciplines also attempting to internationalize their own courses.

Mohanty points to three possible models – the Feminist-as-Tourist model, the Feminist-as-Explorer model and the Feminist Solidarity model. According to the first, courses about the Other are added to the syllabus even while the Euro-American context sets the normative standards. According to the second (made prominent by Area Studies), specialized and distant 'areas' are introduced on their own terms. But both these models plot 'difference' as simple plurality, with little attention to the historical

and often oppositional relationships between the various cultural spaces. As a counterpoint, the Feminist Solidarity model is structured around the connections and disconnections between the lives of women around the world. The emphasis here is not on just the intersections of race, class, gender, nation and sexuality *within* a group, “but on mutuality and complication, which suggests attentiveness to the interweaving of the histories of (these) communities” (Mohanty 2003, p.242). This approach makes visible relations of power – of colonialism and racism – and the consequent policing of women in different ways in local sites *because* of wider global restructuring. Thus, the understanding of a particular culture is in terms of historical and politico-economic systems that involve others as well. It is an understanding of the local that illuminates the universal/global and vice versa. If unblinkered research brings out historical causal links between the economic liberation of a certain community or class of women and the economic and social enslavement of another community and group, then the Feminist Solidarity model of education entails that such causal connections be actively acknowledged and that even some feminist ideologies be subjected to criticism. The solidarity perspective therefore requires:

understanding the historical and experiential specificities and differences of women’s lives as well as the historical and experiential connections between women from different national, racial, and cultural communities. Thus it suggests organizing syllabi around social and economic processes and histories of various communities of women in particular substantive areas like sex work, militarization, environmental justice, the prison/industrial complex, human rights, and looking for points of contact and connections well as disjunctures.” (Mohanty 2003, pp.242-43)

There are two points that should be emphasized here: First, the ‘add-and-stir’ strategy of the Feminist-as-Tourist model and the ‘separate-but-equal’ perspective of the Feminist-as-Explorer model both construct difference as simple diversity. This encourages a kind of relativism where otherness can become a static consumable commodity that need not imply any real engagement. The Feminist Solidarity model, on the other hand, understands difference *relationally*, as a product of processes in which we are all co-implicated: difference is not kept distant and wholly ‘outside.’ Second, Mohanty is emphatic that such solidarity is not a romantic sisterhood. It is rather a self-reflexive and comparative praxis that is both “a

political as well as an ethical goal" (Mohanty 2003, p.3) of multicultural studies. Recognizing how global processes reconstruct women's bodies and labor and how struggles against these configurations take shape at the local level is a self-conscious strategy of making visible both the workings of oppressive power and the potential for cross-border alliances for resistance.

I will not go into the details of the administrative changes within the academy that follow from such pedagogical changes.¹ Suffice it to say that struggles for meaning – the meaning of 'difference' included – are struggles for power and representation. Thus, discourses about difference, about the way others are known – and thereby constructed – have always been implicated in strategies of rule. Thus, seemingly micro-level contestations over syllabi – about what gets taught and how – can become an important site for recovering alternative knowledges and identities hitherto colonized by the dominant narrative. The Feminist Solidarity model, therefore, has the potential to generate a 'pedagogy of dissent' and to become a radical process of de-colonizing the mind.

The more important (and more obvious) points for our purposes are the connection between such pedagogies and the rectification of imbalances created by globalization. Mohanty is quite explicit here:

My own political project involves trying to connect educational discourse to questions of social justice and the creation of citizens who are able to conceive of a democracy which is not the same as the 'free market.' ... After all, the politics of commodification allows the cooption of most dissenting voices in this age of multiculturalism.... Revolutionary pedagogy needs to lead to a consciousness of injustice, self-reflection on the routines and habits of education in the creation of an 'educated citizen,' and action to transform one's social space in a collective setting. (2003, p.205)

The upshot of this is clear. A (*re*)-educated citizen is one whose mind has been decolonized. She is cognizant of the *intertwined histories* of various marginalized communities and hence sensitive to the power that tends to naturalize the ideologies representative of those at the center. One of the foundational principles of contemporary society is capitalism. Pedagogies of dissent that reject the commodification of the very idea of difference and look to a knowledge base rooted at the margins become resources for resisting the master narrative of commodity-culture or the ideologies of the center. Alternative narratives to capitalism are more

likely to emerge from the margins where its oppressiveness is most immediately and directly experienced. It should be remembered that a Feminist Solidarity model of teaching points not only to the intertwining of oppressions, but to those of *resistances* as well. Thus, solidarity with anti-globalization movements world-wide can create oppositional discourses of anti-capitalism which can destabilize the false universalizing and normalizing strategies emanating from the center that claim to speak for all humanity. Thus Mohanty says:

feminist pedagogy ... should also envision the possibility of activism and struggle outside the academy. Political education through feminist pedagogy should teach active citizenship in such struggles for justice. (2003, p.243).

Kinds of Relations: Inter-Subjectivity or Inter-Historicity?

It should now be evident that the relations within the academy that Noddings and Mohanty identify as springboards for good citizenship are widely different. For Noddings, 'good' education is nurtured by face-to-face, phenomenologically thick interactions, the purpose of which is ultimately to make the student attentive to just such relations in her own life. The personal interactions of caring ground an ethical ideal, which in turn serves as the source of a moral 'I must.' The latter motivates us to both care-for and to care-about (distant) others, which, as spelled out later in this chapter, underlie interventions for justice.

Mohanty is explicitly critical of such a-historical inter-subjectivity that draws on a "phenomenological humanism" (Mohanty 2003, p.267). Attention to personal relationships of the kind that Noddings supports leads us away from questions of collective accountability and responsibility. Systemic power is made invisible when oppositions are reduced to a matter of individual attitudes. For Mohanty, the 'personal' should not be understood psychologically and individualistically, but as deeply constituted by knowledge of history and collective memory. When two individuals come in contact, they bring with them entire histories of oppression and privilege. By merely concentrating on fine-tuning attitudinal and individualized connections (as Noddings does), we fail to make visible social configurations that constitute identity, gloss over our own co-implication in those constructions, and elide the historical conflicts associated with our locations.

For Mohanty, then, an educational space must "pivot the center."

Knowledge (including knowledge about difference) must first be decolonized and course content must reflect the standpoint of those on the margins. Educating for a just society requires making students sensitive to relations of power – at the local and global levels, and in their interactions. Consequently, the will to recognize and rectify injustices is formed through a grasp of the intersections of histories and a consequent sensitivity to anti-capitalist political resistance across cultural/national borders. A self-reflective relational praxis of solidarity is the foundation of good citizenship in a globalized world.

In spite of this stark contrast, can the insights of these two scholars be synthesized into a more comprehensive account of educating the self? Does Noddings' interpersonal caring really need to disregard a historicized consciousness? And does Mohanty's de-colonization of identity through immersion in power-infused historical processes rule out the dynamics of power at the inter-personal level? Is the difference between the two theorists merely one of emphasis?

A close reading suggests that the two positions could complement each other. To the extent that Noddings talks of a-historical subjects interacting in a-political space, her account needs to be thickened. After all, it is easy to manipulate intimacy for the ends of profit-making. But the crucial introduction of the 'politics of location' need not transcend or make irrelevant the power dynamics of personal encounters. Historicized subjects remain psychological subjects, even though they are not *merely* so. In Mohanty's discussion of the limitations of "prejudice reduction workshops," (2003, p.208) she makes clear that while such strategies lend themselves to business-as-usual by translating structural relations into problems of individual attitudes that avoid broad based political action, still,

these workshops can indeed be useful in addressing deep-seated psychological attitudes and thus creating a context of change. [T]he danger resides in *remaining* at the level of personal support and evaluation (Mohanty 2003, p.209, emphasis added).

Mohanty is right in pointing out the danger of "remaining" at the personal, atomistic level. But to go beyond it does not mean to leave it behind completely. Noddings' work shows the relevance of such an inter-subjective level of functioning, even for political agendas.

However, can we think of a closer intertwining of the two theories? Does inter-subjectivity (in Noddings' phenomenological sense) play any role in the formation of solidarity (in Mohanty's sense), and vice versa? To

work through this question and mediate the debate between inter-subjectivity and inter-relationality fully, I find it useful to introduce into the dialogue a third voice about the goals of education – one coming from the distant (and non-globalized) past – of the ancient Indian epic, the *Mahābhārata*. The latter speaks directly neither of inter-relationality nor of inter-subjectivity but of a notion of *subjectivity* that could underlie both. This, I contend, might serve as the bridge between the insights of Noddings and Mohanty.

The *Mahābhārata* and ‘Relational Humility’

The *Mahābhārata* is said to be an accretive text reflecting ongoing debates about social and ethical issues of the times. Thus it is hard to identify it with one consistent message because what we find in it are often equally cogent representations of different sides of an issue. The master narrative is a complicated tale of the two wings of the Kuru clan – the Pāndavas and the Kauravas. But embedded in this frame are countless plots and subplots that attempt to capture the richness and the many particularities of human life. As an *itihāsa* (narrative or history), the *Mahābhārata* gives us, through these stories, a glimpse of how abstract ethical principles often generate dilemmas and conundrums in actual life. The anecdotes that are relevant for our purpose here involve the ‘defeat’ in intellectual debate of established male sages by ‘ordinary’ people positioned much lower in the gender-class-caste hierarchy. The particular story I analyze here centers on the dialogues between the sage Kauśika and a housewife and a (low caste) butcher/hunter.² Since the stories included in the *Mahābhārata* are meant to be read as parables reflecting the tensions and messiness of ‘our’ lived realities, I take the liberty of extracting from them a message about education and pedagogy relevant to this paper.

The learned seer Kauśika once lost his temper when a hapless bird disturbed his meditation by defecating on his head. Incensed by this rude interruption, Kauśika unleashed his supernatural powers on the unsuspecting bird and caused it to drop dead. But almost immediately, he turned self-reflective and was dismayed by his own vengeance. Realizing the ineffectiveness of his much-famed scholarship to prevent even this small but totally unnecessary act of aggression and harm, Kauśika decided that he had to re-educate himself. With begging bowl in hand, he went on a quest for instructors and was informed of a particular housewife who could be an appropriate teacher.

Arriving at her doorstep, Kauśika found her busy with household chores and had to wait. Interpreting this as disrespect, Kauśika stormed:

What is the meaning of this? You told me to wait, fair woman, and delayed me without dismissing me! ... You make your husband superior! While living by the householder's Law you belittled the Brahmin!³

The reprimanded woman was contrite but firm in her response:

I do not belittle the Brahmins, they are equal to Gods.... Now do excuse me for this transgression, blameless sage. The Law that I must obey one husband is pleasing to me.... I must obey my Law by him without discrimination, best of Brahmins. Just look at the result of my (service) to him: through it I know that you irately burned a female heron; but ire, good Brahmin, is the enemy that lives in a man's body, and the Gods know him for a Brahmin who abandons both ire and folly.

She continued:

Many a time the Law has been seen as subtle, great Brahmin, and you too are aware of the Law devoted to study, and pious: yet sir, I do not think you know the Law really. A hunter who lives in Mithila, one obedient to his father and mother, true-spoken, in command of his senses, shall explain the Laws to you. Good luck to thee, go there if you please.

The story continues with Kauśika seeking out the hunter. This humble, low-caste person, whose only claims to fame were his expertise in killing, skinning and chopping animal carcasses – the practice of his trade – and a track record of living by conventional moral rules, becomes Kauśika's teacher/guru. In the unlikely location of a slaughter house, and in the forced company of a hunter, Kauśika the sage learns "the Law."

What ideas for curriculum change can we derive from this narrative? Kauśika was uncontroversially a master theoretician and had studied the Laws. But why, then, did he have to be re-educated and what were the lacunae filled in by the 'ordinary housewife' and the hunter? An obvious answer, of course, is that Kauśika lacked practical wisdom in spite of his scholarship. The housewife and the hunter were virtuous and, unlike Kauśika, were skilled in *living* by the Law. Thus, it could be argued that, according to the *Mahābhārata*, the goal of education is the inculcation of

virtues that enable us to lead a good life. These embody the conventional wisdom of the time. Note the housewife's pronouncement, "the Gods know him for a Brahmin who abandons both ire and folly," and her claim that "the Law that I must obey one husband is pleasing to me." Note also that the hunter is recommended as one who is "obedient to his father and mother" and is "true-spoken." The straightforward suggestion that emerges here is that a truly educated person must have a certain *character* or entrenched dispositions to act in certain (conventional) ways. Intellectual progress is mapped on to moral progress, right views on to right habits.

However, there is another message lurking in the structure of the narrative which is much more interesting. The manner in which Kauśika is instructed is itself instructive. We have here a person full of the importance of his own status (as a scholar and Brahmin) but who is *made to learn* from two figures positioned clearly at the margins of society. Thus, what Kauśika loses in the process is the pride of social privilege. In order to learn from his new gurus, he must first recognize not only that he does *not* know, but also that *they do*. The precondition of his becoming 'educated' presupposes an ability to recognize those at the periphery as being the loci of knowledge important for him. This recognition I would like to call 'relational humility.' According to the narrative, the content of education should include the inculcation of this particular virtue in the student.

Of course, to articulate the key notion of relational humility, we need to compare and contrast it to other related moral concepts like modesty, *mere* humility, and absence of pride. We also need to see its interplay with closely related epistemic states, like recognition of fallibility and self-ascription of ignorance. According to Julia Driver (1989), an epistemic dimension is crucial for the moral virtue of modesty/humility, which she calls a "virtue of ignorance."⁴ Thus a modest person is one who is either ignorant of or has a false belief about her self-worth. Though I am in sympathy with Driver's general tenor of embracing ignorance as a virtue (under some circumstances, of course), I think that the implied link between humility and ignorance suggested by her 'Underestimation Model' is rather too simplistic. Relational humility incorporates ignorance in a more indirect but a more politically robust manner.

An alternative analysis of humility states it to consist in a realistic self-knowledge rather than a cultivated under-estimation or false belief about one's achievements. This is the Non-Overestimation Model, according to which a humble agent is aware of her accomplishments but does not exaggerate or overestimate their worth. Humility as unexagger-

ated critical self-assessment comes closer to my idea of relational humility. This epistemic state is grounded in a basic commitment to egalitarianism that urges one to keep one's own achievements in perspective. According to Norvin Richards (1988), who advocates this view, the restraint engenders behavioral modifications that enable deference to others, in spite of a grasp of our own worth. The heart of relational humility consists in such 'other regard,' in spite of, and in fact because of, a realistic 'self-regard.' We will have occasion shortly to go into the details of what might motivate this attitude, but let us see how this gets played out in the tale about Kauśika.

Kauśika initially turns self-reflective and is aware of the limitations of his own learning. No matter how much his scholarship and propositional knowledge is undermined by the narrative, it is important to remember that they are never denied. In fact, what we see is a realistic assessment of the limits of this knowledge. The following features are important here:

- (i) Kauśika's self-assessment leads to an acknowledgment of what he knows along with an acknowledgment of his own ignorance.
- (ii) Note, however, that this admission (of ignorance) does not result in a skepticism or a defeatist or cynical acceptance of unavoidable error.
- (iii) It is not skepticism because it spurs him on to further epistemic effort and a search for 'true knowledge.'
- (iv) Furthermore, this quest is not a self-reflexive, individualistic or Cartesian self-correction. Kauśika realizes that he has to be *taught* – and in the story, he learns the Law from (improbable) Others.
- (v) Kauśika's education is not complete until he acknowledges that they (the improbable others) know what he does not. Thus, the initial acknowledgement of ignorance is not the admission of a universal human fallibility.

This self-ascription of ignorance along with other-ascription of important knowledge is the complex virtue of relational humility. The more we realize what we know, the more we are aware of how much more we do not, but need to know, and, along with this, comes a realization that there are others who do know what we do not. Relational humility should not be confused with either diffidence or inferiority. Rather, it can ground

an active intellectual and social engagement with others. As in Kant, so in Kauśika, awareness of the limits of theoretical/empirical knowledge does not amount to knowledge-denying 'illusionism.'

According to the *Mahābhārata* narrative then, education involves the restructuring of consciousness and the making of persons with certain character traits – specifically with the disposition to treat one's own understanding as incomplete and to consider radical others as possible repositories of knowledge. It might be fair to say that this goal fits in well with the Ultimate ideal of *mokṣa* or liberation in the Classical Indian ethos. After all, relational humility strikes at the root of pride and is the first step towards shattering one's ego, which is the ethical brunt of *mokṣa*.

But to the extent that this is true, the educational ideal of the *Mahābhārata* seems all the more remote from the problem of this chapter. Kauśika's story shows the need to distribute epistemic power through all rungs of society. But there is no evidence that Kauśika uses this to address the social injustices and imbalances of economic power of his times. In fact, as noted before, the protagonists in the story all talk of very conventional moral norms that tend to keep the *status quo* intact. Moreover, it is hard to show how a virtue like relational humility that works towards *mokṣa* can be relevant for political projects like those of Noddings and Mohanty. The latter are immersed in attempts to intervene in socio-economic power structures; Kauśika is immersed in attempts to transcend those structures altogether in order to reach some Higher Power. Can a character trait involved in the latter be harnessed to serve the purposes of the former?

Subjectivity, Inter-Subjectivity and Inter-Historicity

This section is concerned with the space for individual self-cultivation (of the kind spoken of in the *Mahābhārata*) in the political visions of Noddings and Mohanty. Noddings and Mohanty both pay heed to different kinds of *relations* within the academy. In contrast, the *Mahābhārata's* stress on character building and on the inculcation of specific dispositions focuses on the *individual*, and may thus seem to be at odds with the feminist relational turn.

Now it could be argued that the realizability of any theory of justice depends on a specific emotional profile, which political theorists generally take for granted. Thus Rawls' (1971) theory of justice depends on dispositions like respect for justice, indignation about unjust officials, an

adequate sense of self-esteem, absence of contempt for those who are different, and absence of resentment if one's property is re-distributed according to the difference principle⁶ – at least in a significant subset of the population. In the light of this, interventions in our psychological repertoires might be necessary to actualize certain political blueprints. The *Mahābhārata's* emphasis on character formation, therefore, could be shown to be politically relevant in bridging the gap between theory and practice.

But this establishes only a general compatibility between emotional/psychological culture and structural adjustments of power-knowledge relations. We still need to ask whether the particular character formation emphasized by the *Mahābhārata* (one which aids the overcoming of ego for a spiritual quest) is necessary for the kind of political relationships envisaged by Noddings and Mohanty. Furthermore, the virtue of relational humility, derived, as it is, from the cultural milieu of Classical India, is supported by institutional formations to which we might not want to return. The critique of globalization does not amount to a romantic valorization of a golden Vedic Age.

The philosophical point here is that if we are willing to concede (as I think we must) that our psychic dispositions can be both obstacles and opportunities for political transformation, then delving into the inner contours of subjectivity is a move to deepen political theory and not necessarily to get away from it. From this point of view, the question is whether the psychic economy underlying the politics of Noddings and Mohanty draws on emotional resources that are already commonplace in the culture or whether we need some interventions on this level too in order to actualize their visions. More specifically, do the relational structures of 'caring-for' and 'feminist solidarity' depend in any way on the virtue of relational humility? Alternatively, the issue is whether the specific institutional changes envisaged by Noddings and Mohanty can sustain relational humility or whether we need to go back to the institutions of the times of the *Mahābhārata* in order to access the virtue that it talks of.

On the face of it, Noddings' apparently a-political, dyadic intersubjectivity should be naturally hospitable to subjective virtues. But incorporating relational humility in her educational project turns out to be surprisingly circuitous. Noddings explicitly distinguishes between caring-as-virtue from caring-as-relation and shows how the former can undermine good education. She is wary of "virtuous figures from parents to prophets," (Noddings 2002, p.21) who, in spite of their sincerity, cannot connect with the recipients of care and blame all failures on recalcitrant

learners. Caring, according to her, is not a moral excellence but an attribute of relations. Thus, Noddings seems to apprehend a slide into paternalism if we concentrate on caring as a character trait in the *Mahābhārata's* sense. In Noddings' system, a mode of "shared control" (2002, p.14) – where the relation is crafted partly by the responses of the Other – is an important feature of caring-for. It is feared that focusing on the possession of a *virtue* or character trait in the carer will erase the important contributions to the relation made by the cared-for.

While this is a genuine worry, it is hard to see how caring-for as a relation can avoid relying on something like the virtue of relational humility. In fact, Noddings' objection seems more appropriate for virtues of *mere* humility. Simple engrossment and motivational displacement are not sufficient for caring. However, even requiring that recipients of care respond to efforts of the carer does not, by itself, ensure shared control. These responses must be listened to and taken seriously. Unless the caregiver is open to giving up some control, the cared-for will not be able to 'share' it. And this is facilitated by the disposition for relational humility.

Furthermore, the ethical imperative to care-for – the 'I must' – stems from nourishing the 'ethical ideal'. But this is an ideal of *character*: remembering ourselves being cared-for and being caring ourselves is remembering being a certain way. Noddings admits here that "the genuine ethical commitment to 'maintain oneself as caring' gives rise to the development and exercise of virtues, but these must be assessed in the context of caring situations" (1984, p.96). Now, the virtue of relational humility sustains the ability to enter into caring relations and to maintain oneself as one-caring. Consequently, it is essential for Noddings' ethical ideal. Of course, since relational humility is a character trait, it does involve a turning inwards. But given the nature of this disposition, such an inward turn is what enables us to turn outwards. Thus, in this context, the dichotomy between self-cultivation and the cultivation of relationship does not hold. Relationally humble agents, alone, can enter into caring relationships, which are ones in which they must necessarily relinquish control.

The awareness of complicated historical narratives of oppression and resistance that is the foundation of Mohanty's political education seems even further removed from the *Mahābhārata's* agenda of self-cultivation. Of course, if historicizing the personal is read as an important corrective to and not a complete erasure of inter-subjectivity (in Noddings' sense), then, to the extent that the latter is sustained by relational humility, Mohanty's inter-historicity and praxis of solidarity are also

consistent with the incorporation of relational humility. As we have shown earlier, Mohanty is not against questions of transforming consciousness and exploring the psychic dimensions of de-colonization. Note the following from her *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures* (Alexander & Mohanty 1997):

[W]e have come to learn that the emotional terror produced by attempts to divest oneself of power and privilege and in the struggle for self-determination needs to be scrutinized very seriously. The challenge lies in an ethical commitment to work to transform terror into engagement based on empathy and a vision of justice for everyone. (p.xlii)

Relational humility, which is the disposition to authorize others as knowing while giving up the claim to know oneself, is a trait that might help in this transformation of “emotional terror” to engagement. Willfully and joyfully giving up control is not a disposition that is prevalent or valued in contemporary society. And if Mohanty’s political vision needs to rely on it, then an engagement with an ethos in which such traits were thought to be necessary for flourishing would be in order.

The model of a politicized agent is thus three-tiered, leading to a three-pronged re-construction of agency as the goal of education – the inculcation of inter-subjectivity and inter-historicity *and* the inculcation of virtues that make these possible. Education for justice needs to educate on all three levels. The place of ignorance in this vision of education is interesting. Knowledge-seeking is generally fuelled by an awareness that ‘I do not know,’ and the cognitive enterprise begins with this acknowledgement of ignorance. But ignorance works in a more complicated manner when education is built around the virtue of relational humility. I am supposed to dwell on what I *do* know (a realistic assessment of my accomplishments). But the deeper the knowledge of my epistemic achievements, the more starkly the contours of my *failures* to know stand out. However, a relational humility is not simply the Socratic admission of the wise man who claims that he does not know. Educating for relational humility actively uses that acknowledged self-ignorance to ascribe knowledge to others. Thus, it is a search for self-ignorance through self-knowledge that enables a distribution of cognitive power. Such an education is wedded necessarily to a social epistemology and a conception of both knowing and non-knowing as a collective enterprise. When the goal of education is relational humility, a search for ignorance is a process of

empowering others.

A disturbing objection now surfaces. Is it possible to borrow the psychic resources of Kauśika without bringing in tow the social/material conditions that nurtured that character? Remember that Kauśika 'learnt' the lesson of relational humility within a very conventional and hierarchical, caste-ridden society which he, in all probability, did nothing to overturn even after he had been educated. How then will the educational philosophy of the *Mahābhārata* help in creating citizens motivated to *transform* society?

My claim is that a deeply historicized consciousness of the kind that Mohanty speaks of is needed to nurture a feminist virtue of relational humility. Thus, not only does relational humility underlie political interventions for justice, but we also need certain kinds of political processes to be in place in order to sustain that virtue itself. To argue for this, let us return for a moment to the Non-Overestimation Model of humility. According to it, a humble agent is one who realistically recognizes her worth but also keeps it in perspective. A.T. Nuyen (1998) elaborates this stance as being one of taking into account and acknowledging all the circumstances that have made the achievement possible. In an interesting move, he links this to the idea of proportionality or equity. Thus, just as the unique circumstances of a crime can mitigate the punishment considered to be just, the unique circumstances of accomplishments too can mitigate the *reward/approbation* that they rightfully merit. As a result, justice requires that we ensure proportionality in our own judgments of self-worth. For Nuyen, a humble person is realistic in judging her accomplishments by actively examining and giving credit to the contribution of the circumstances surrounding the achievement. This is because

[i]nvariably, the particular circumstances will show that one has a great deal to be modest about. Invariably the examination of the particular circumstances will have a deflationary effect on one's accomplishment. (Nuyen 1998, p.196)

Nuyen, however, leaves the explanation of this 'invariability' rather vague, and this is where Mohanty's politics of location can be useful. Since subjects are embedded in history, agency is determined at least in part by the privileges and limitations of the location. A *realistic* self-estimation must therefore take into account structural features, which are enabling or disabling. But such self-reflexivity also brings an awareness of our complicity (Mohanty's co-implication) in the processes that have

'located' – and hence enabled/disabled/differently-abled – others. After all, "who we are, how we act, what we think, and what stories we tell become more intelligible within an epistemological framework that begins by recognizing existing hegemonic histories" (Mohanty 2003, p.195). The politics of knowledge and voice implies that understanding our own location in society entails recognizing the social configurations that privilege our speaking position. This goes hand in hand with recognizing that the same configurations that privilege us silence others. Consequently, an awareness of our privileges may be seen as a move to put our accomplishments in perspective. And this is concomitant with an awareness and authorization of voices different from our own. A *politically grounded* humility results naturally in a 'relational' humility that acknowledges the privileges that contribute to our success. In this way, Mohanty's feminist praxis of actively recovering oppositional histories of domination and struggle can be the material conditions that sustain the virtue of relational humility.

Let us return to Kauśika in the light of the above analysis. In my reading, the moral of the *Mahābhārata* tale is that education should aim at inculcating the virtue of relational humility. But Kauśika, even after 'learning' this virtue, does not go on to make adjustments in the social hierarchies of his times (at least we are not told if he does so).⁷ So, clearly, the virtue of relational humility by itself does not necessarily lead to social change or justice. What political theorists need to pay attention to are the complex interactions between emotional dispositions, political institutions, and the socio-economic structures in which the latter are embedded. Thus we are not speaking of 'virtues' or character-types in the abstract, but as they are sustained by material processes. Alternative institutional structures can sustain particular psychic configurations: loyalty, for example, can be nurtured by fiercely hegemonic configurations of religious fundamentalism or by nationalism, and economic satisfaction can often blunt political discontent. Thus, once it is recognized that certain dispositions are needed for social justice, what we need to look to are the structural configurations that can keep them in place. Our psychic economies both contribute to and are sustained by material practices. Attention to one in exclusion of the other is not enough. In the light of this, the *Mahābhārata* can be read as opening up a conceptual space by highlighting a disposition that is lacking in our times. To capitalize on that space, Mohanty's analysis of praxis is needed to fill in and fertilize the seeds of social transformation that lie embedded in that psychic reconfiguration. Kauśika's relational humility needs to be supported by the praxis of

feminist solidarity in order for it to induce progressive change.

Unraveling Leadership *with* Relational Humility?

Our discussion so far has concentrated on what policy-makers should aim for in progressive educational reform. The goal of education, I have argued, is the crafting of political agency involving three layers – subjective dispositions, inter-subjective skills of caring-for, and an inter-historical grasp of particular social locations. This is a far cry from educational accountability conceived in the narrow terms of bridging achievement gaps between students of different ethnic and class backgrounds. In fact, it is recognized that the “discourse of accountability, standards, and quality is safe language that eschews more controversial confrontations about race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and systemic inequities” (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy 2005, p.202) and ends up constructing justice in narrow market-based terms. I have argued instead that if education is to aim at more robustly transformed and transformative subjects, what is needed is consciousness of oppositional locations of gendered and raced bodies both inside and outside the classroom. Such consciousness and the self-reflective praxis of recovering alternatives to systemic oppressions are motivated by the virtue of relational humility, which enables us to negotiate power both at the inter-personal and social levels.

The question raised in this final section is whether this idea of what leaders should be aiming at – the *content* of educational reform – affects the *style* of leadership or the *form* in which the reform is initiated. Does the vision of what we want education to instill in young people rebound on questions of how we need to train educational leaders themselves? Should educating leaders and policy makers about education be continuous with and follow the same pattern as educating others? We can, for example, initiate a policy reform, the goal of which is to train students to be high-scoring mathematicians, without requiring that policy makers themselves be trained mathematicians. But is it consistent to educate for relational humility without requiring that leaders who initiate and oversee that reform exemplify (or be trained in) that virtue themselves? If the answer is ‘no’ (as I shall be arguing), then non-quantitative parameters would have to be used to assess educational leaders. Leadership training will need to engage with structures of agency rather than aiming merely to develop specific management techniques and discrete problem solving skills.

Incorporating relational humility among the goals of education is

self-reflexive. Classrooms and curricula geared to nurturing this disposition require that those who are responsible for such re-structuring also have this virtue. This amounts to claiming that policy makers actively acknowledge their own ignorance and epistemic limitations while deferring to the expertise of those they are attempting to regulate. Anything short of this would disrupt the realization of the initial goal. The logical mechanism of advocating isolated and un-humble teachers of relational humility would be akin to an operational self-refutation. For example, it is a self-repudiation to say "I am not talking" – because there is an opposition between the propositional content presented (I am not talking) and the manner in which it is presented (my 'saying' it). Similarly, there is an operational self-refutation in requiring, in an authoritarian or prideful manner (i.e., without relational humility), that our teachers and students be relationally humble. The opposition can be brought out in two different ways according to whether the virtue is operative at the level of inter-subjectivity or that of inter-historicity.

According to our reading of Noddings, relational humility figures in enabling inter-subjective relations of caring-for. However, the imperative to establish such relations comes from the 'ethical ideal' which encompasses memories of both our being caring and being cared for. Now, if educational reform requires *teachers* to establish such relations in the classroom, then part of the imperative for this – the 'I must' – must come from *their* memories of being cared for. In the context of educational organizations, this means that teachers must have been cared for by policy makers, the leaders of the reform. Consequently, the kind of shared control that is envisaged as transformative in classrooms cannot be in place unless it is also in place between policy-makers/administrators and teachers. The latter provides the ethical impetus for the former. Thus, educational leaders must be relationally humble in order for classrooms to be so.

According to our reading of Mohanty, relational humility enables reclaiming of oppositional knowledges from marginal locations. The praxis of solidarity encouraged in the classroom and through curriculum change is a route to understanding the co-implication of the privileges of the center with the oppressions at the periphery. Solidarity is the self-conscious and self-reflective practice of making these conceptual links. Solidarity for *resistance* amounts to constructing a counter-narrative based on varied and multiple local resistances in order to negate the hegemony of the center. Now, if this is the case, a successful classroom is about learning to see the invisible workings of power and learning to resist.

Consequently, the very success of this project will lie in a process whereby students and teachers will be aware of and actually resist hegemonic power structures. However, the inculcation of a political sensibility, if successful, is not domain specific. Thus, an authoritarian imposition of reform for feminist solidarity is incoherent. It should also be remembered that relational humility is not conceived here as a humanistic virtue, but needs to be sustained by the kind of political praxis that Mohanty discusses. Thus, the kind of virtue that is aimed at by educational reform presupposes a structural organization where the center and the margins are always in conversation. It is impossible to sustain relational virtue in shamelessly hierarchical systems – whether or not they are educational institutions.

To summarize: Leaders are guides. But ‘guiding’ others towards a goal can be done in many ways: (a) by telling that (theoretical analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of the aim), (b) by telling how (articulating recipes and manuals of a praxis for implementing that goal), (c) by telling to (issuing of imperatives either by moral urging or commands), (d) by exemplifying the goals oneself (displaying or ‘showing’ what is aimed at by serving as an exemplar), and finally, (e) by non-didactically starting an ‘epistemic contagion.’ Probably, aspects of all of the above need to be in place for leadership to work: (a), (b) and (c) are extensively practiced and discussed – and to some extent, we even find an analysis of (d). But the strategy of leading through (e) above, is what has been argued for in this paper.

Though leading by initiating an ‘epistemic contagion’ comes close to the ‘exemplar’ mode of leadership, it is important to keep (d) and (e) apart. The significance of Noddings’ insistence on caring as a relation lies in its critique of exemplars as drivers of change. The focus on *being a certain way* in order to lead – i.e., leading by virtue of embodying certain character traits – shifts attention to *self-making* rather than to the needs of the population the ‘leader’ is trying to serve. The speech act here is “Look at me; be like me!” Now, the strategy indicated in (e) also requires character-building. However, the crucial difference is that the subjective traits that are inculcated are those that initiate certain intellectual habits of analysis, dialogue, discussion and epistemic deference. These traits do not ‘command’ emulation in the same way that a virtuous exemplar does. Rather, being around and with people who are relationally humble in the specific sense is to be around people who see, appreciate and are willing to act on their understanding of the connections of privilege and oppression. Being

in such a community nurtures those same traits in us. Perhaps the difference between (d) and (e) is best expressed by pointing out that an exemplar leads by exemplifying the change that she seeks to bring about but the self-exemplification of the goal comes with an imperative that others follow. In the model suggested here, the leader also exemplifies the change that is sought in others. But, this 'being a certain way' is not accompanied by a command that others become 'like' her. In fact, the leader looks to *others* for ideas and is even ready to be 'led' by them. But in exemplifying this stance, she happens to build a community of trust and co-operation wherein others, too, become like her. The change now is brought about, as it were, by a 'contagion.' Others spontaneously 'catch' or 'pick up' what the leader exudes, even though the leader herself is not focused on *making* them be like her. We are reminded here of Nodding's inter-personal dynamic of caring-for, the memory of which serves as the ethical ideal that motivates others to be caring in turn.

Consciousness of social power makes knowledge-seeking a deeply collective and power-infused enterprise. Along with an understanding of how oppressive systems work, strategies for reform must also emerge from experiences at the margins. The systems of gender/race/class not only position students differentially within the classroom (which students – of particular ethnicities, for example – perform better on standardized tests) and construct who gets to teach whom (the race/class/ gender constitution of the professoriate and their ranks) but also seep into determining who gets into administration and academic entrepreneurship and who does not. A deep praxis of solidarity, therefore, must take into account the function of power at all levels of educational institutions (and in fact, even in the interactions between educational institutions and the state). Consequently, solidarity for resistance and reform must be constituted by experiences from the margins at multiple levels of educational organizing. Leadership initiatives must therefore be crafted out of the local resistances of some students (against the dominant culture of the peer group and teachers), some teachers (against the demand to teach for an unjust status quo), and some administrators (against the state imperative to commodify education).

What this amounts to is really a deconstruction of the traditional concept of leadership and a step towards what might be a 'relational turn' in the conceptualizing of leadership and policy-making itself. We must all be ready to be led – which, of course, is possible if we are all relationally humble. "Our minds," according to Mohanty (2003, p.45), "must be as

ready to move as capital is, to trace its paths and to imagine alternative destinations." This intellectual mobility encompasses a rethinking of notions of authority, accountability and the very role and nature of leading itself. An understanding that the concept of leadership itself is historically constructed suggests that the need of the times might be "problematizing leadership as a key concept in educational administration and policy – redefining it and even rejecting it – for perhaps the focus upon leadership is itself the biggest barrier to (gender) equality" (Blackmore 1999, p.222). Until she is ready to jettison the language of leadership, a relationally humble teacher of teachers would have to lead the search for ignorance, neither from the proud head nor from the diffident hind of the community, but perhaps right from the messy middle.

References

- Alcoff, L. & Dalmiya, V. (1993): 'Are 'Old Wives' Tales' Justified?', in Alcoff, L. & Potter, E. (eds.), *Feminist Epistemologies*, London: Routledge.
- Alexander, M.J. & Mohanty, C.T. (1997): *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*, New York: Routledge.
- Ben-Ze'ev, A. (1993): 'The Virtue of Modesty'. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol.30, No.3, pp.235-246.
- Blackmore, J. (1999): *Troubling Women*, Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Cambron-McCabe, N. & McCarthy, M. (2005): 'Educating School Leaders for Social Justice'. *Educational Policy*, Vol.19, No.1, pp.201-222.
- Driver, Julia L. 'The Virtues of Ignorance'. *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol.86, No.7, pp. 373-384.
- James, S. (2003): 'Passion and Politics', in Hatzimoysis, A.(ed.), *Philosophy and the Emotions.*, London: Cambridge University Press.
- Koggel, C. (2002): 'Equality Analysis in a Global Context: A Relational Approach', in Brennan S. (ed.), *Feminist Moral Philosophy*, Calgary: Canadian Journal of Philosophy.
- Mohanty, C.T. (2003): *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Noddings, N. (1984): *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Noddings, N. (1999): 'Care, Justice and Equity', in Katz, M.S. Noddings, N. & Strike, K.A. (eds.), *Justice and Caring: The Search for Common Ground in Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Noddings, N. (2002): *Starting at Home: Caring and Social Policy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nuyen, A.T. (1998): 'Just Modesty', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol.35, No.1,

pp.101-109.

Rawls, J. (1971): *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University.

Richards, N. (1988): 'Is Humility a Virtue?', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No.3, pp.253-259.

Statman, D. (1992): 'Modesty, Pride and Realistic Self-Assessment', *The Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol.42, No.169, pp.420-438.

van Buitenen, J.A.B. (1975), *The Mahābhārata* (trans & ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Endnotes

¹ "Education is not just preparation for economic life and citizenship (But) even as preparation it encompasses far more than getting a well-paid job. Ideally, it is preparation for caring – for family life, child-raising, neighborliness, aesthetic appreciation, moral sensitivity, environmental wisdom, religious or spiritual intelligence, and a host of other aspects of a full life" Noddings (1999, p.14).

² For example, Mohanty criticizes "prejudice reduction workshops" for upper to middle level administrators in educational institutions as strategies of merely "managing" difference in order to help business as usual with the academy. By framing historical contestations of power as individual prejudice and psychological conflict, these strategies avoid any real engagement with difference of the kind that is urged by the solidarity model.

³ In our co-authored paper (Alcoff & Dalmiya 1993), Linda Alcoff and I used this story to talk about the importance of non-propositional forms of 'knowing how.' Here I attempt to take the analysis further by reading the narrative in the light of virtue theory. Its significance for a virtue epistemology and the relation of the latter to the validation of forms of knowing how is only hinted at in this chapter.

⁴ Translations are those of van Buitenen (1975).

⁵ For the sake of simplicity, I will not go into the differences (if any) between the states of modesty and humility. Though some (Statman 1992) agree with their identification, others (Ben-Ze'ev 1993) have made it a point to keep them distinct.

⁶ For a discussion of these issues, see James (2003).

⁷ Nuyen also leaves open the possibility that supremacists and chauvinists might be modest about some specific achievement, but are not humble overall because they refuse to examine closely all the relevant factors and circumstances governing human life.

Conclusion

Changing Education

Peter D. HERSHOCK, Mark MASON & John N. HAWKINS

As we indicated in the introduction, in the three sections of this book the different chapter authors responded to the following questions:

- Section I: What are the consequences of globalization for education?
- Section II: How are some states and alternative providers of education challenging (or not challenging) the prevailing educational paradigm in their responses to the processes of globalization?
- Section III: Given a world of complex global interdependence, what are the challenges for the leadership of change in education?

The first section of the book addressed the context of globalization and the importance of paradigmatic educational change. The chapters in this section described the realities of contemporary patterns of global interdependence and explored some of the consequences of globalization for education, especially with regard to the aims and purposes of education, educational diversity, ethics and education in multicultural societies, issues of poverty and equity in education, and the implications of complex interdependence for educational change.

The chapters in the second section provided some empirically grounded perspectives on educational realities and change in Asia and more widely afield. While the challenges arising from these realities are opening spaces for potentially paradigmatic shifts in the meaning and practice of education, two of the cases considered – that of China and Singapore – underline the almost intractable dominance of the prevailing educational paradigm: almost, but not entirely, because the cases reported from Colombia, Bangladesh and Egypt indicate promising alternative

approaches that appear to challenge quite substantially the dominant paradigm.

The third section of the book synthesized the more conceptual considerations of global dynamics undertaken in Part I and the empirically grounded 'grassroots' realities and practices informing Part II to derive insights into the nature of leadership that might articulate and nurture paradigmatic change in education. While each of the chapters in Part III aimed at drawing globally relevant conclusions about how to foster apt leadership in the context of rapid change and complex interdependence, the particularities of Asian cultural resources for leadership innovation were given special consideration. Two authors in particular explored the relevance of Asia Pacific traditions of leadership in contemporary global context. Authors noted that, as agents of systemic and complex change, educational leaders need to be apprised of the increasing importance of norms and values in change, some suggesting that this implies the deepening relevance of local and regional cultural traditions in initiating and sustaining change. Educational leaders need to be exposed to more than just those topics in educational management theory that enhance individuals' abilities to lead and manage effectively and efficiently. They need to explore topics that are drawn from moral philosophy and political philosophy, from social theory, from history and economics. These latter topics may provide the wherewithal to consolidate leadership commitments to educations that have among their priorities deepening mutual respect among both persons and communities; expanding and refining felt responsibilities to each other and to our planetary ecology for the consequences of our actions; and the full development of all, beginning with securing the human, social, civil and political rights of all, irrespective of race, gender and class. In other words, it is the ethics (in the broadest sense of the term) of leadership that is most important in the preparation of educational leaders.

Apart from a focus on the values and ethics that underlie educational aims and purposes, what is it that educational leaders committed to change should be paying attention to? As the authors in this book have shown, the issues are many and complex, but four stand out as worth highlighting (again, in some cases). First, John Hattie (1999) has identified through massive meta-analyses the factors that enhance school learning most effectively. They have primarily to do with the teacher: feedback to learners; the setting of learning goals; and the quality and quantity of teacher instruction. If education is at least partly about enhancing learn-

ing most effectively, a key leadership issue is developing teacher education programs that teach teachers the skills to do just this. Second, Martin Carnoy's (1975) (and others') research points still to the general importance of socio-economic status as a predictor of educational achievement, while Robert LeVine's (2003) research points to the particular importance of educating girls in any attempt to improve the socio-economic status of the least well off. Better educated women have lower fertility rates; infant mortality rates among babies born to better educated women are lower. Increasing the access of girls to education, and their retention in the system is, thus, a second key issue for educational leaders. Finally, HIV/AIDS has become in many societies one of the single greatest threats to the well-being of the least well off and to any attempts to enhance the quality of their lives. In other societies, substance abuse plays a similarly corrosive role. In each of these cases, and many others that might be mentioned, we witness a troubling and tragic relationship with risk that is inseparable from prevailing material conditions and the competitions among norms and values informing them. A third issue related to educational change is how best to sublimate the energies of risk-taking into creative innovation, where creativity implies not just novelty, but contributory significance.

Speaking of these three issues as if they were independent foci for educational leadership is, however, misleading. Because change in complex systems such as those emerging with deepening global interdependence is liable to occur in a non-linear fashion, the assumptions of theories of linear causation and change are increasingly likely to prove limiting and potentially counterproductive. A fourth issue of importance to educational leaders is that educational change of the depth and extent that might reasonably be termed 'paradigmatic' is unlikely to occur in a linear fashion or on the basis of centralized initiatives. Rather, change of this sort is more likely to emerge through the realization and sustained enhancement of educational diversity in response to the dynamics of 21st century globalizations.

It is our intention in this concluding chapter to open up for further consideration some questions that arise from these and other issues considered in the book thus far. We start by emphasizing that education takes place at a highly charged nexus of relationships among social, economic, political, technological and cultural forces and institutions. Indeed, it is not an exaggeration to say that education distinctively links and qualitatively shapes the private and public spheres. In language less indebted to the history of Western political and legal discourse, education is a pro-

gressive wedding of the personal and the societal, the imagined and the documented, the natural and the made. The vision of education that inspired the coining of the term, 'university,' has become a practical reality. The scope of education is, finally, the entire complex and reflexive scope of being human. At the same time, education has come to be seen as a specific institutional complex within the social sector that has the responsibility and the potential to solve all manner of other social problems; a kind of panacea for society's various ills.

For all this, education is not 'all things for all people.' For governments seeking to spur economic growth or to hone and maintain a competitive edge, education is a strategic investment. For peoples seeking to sustain a sense of shared identities and ideals, education is a means for both transmitting and adaptively transforming tradition. For increasing numbers of school administrators, education is a standardized and quantifiable result of apt instruction. For those who make up the 45% of the global population living on less than two dollars a day, education offers a ladder – however short, lopsided and rickety – for ascent into a life of increased opportunity and at least the hope of a less impoverished and more dignified life. And, for many children across vast tracts of the globe, education is inseparable from the experience of being schooled: a right, but also a rite of passage that is not so much a means to some aspired end as a tunnel at the end of which flickers light of fervently desired escape. Education is the proverbial elephant that appears variously to those who are in touch with and touched by it.

Yet, if the workshops and seminars that led to envisioning and compiling this collection of essays are at all a reliable index of global realities, the great variability in the meaning of education can be collapsed into at least one shared conviction: that education should make a difference. Education should enhance our ways of being human together. It should, but in fact it does not; or at least, it does not make enough of a difference, or the kinds of differences that are being sought through it. Education, as we have come to practice it, is coming up short.

The preceding twelve chapters offer some perspectives on why this is so and on what might be done to redress our educational shortfalls with the complex interdependencies and resources at hand. Necessarily, even with this restriction of the scope of perspectives to those arising in the context of the Asia Pacific experience, the several voices gathered here are at best a representative sampling. Indeed, one of the anticipated merits of such a collection featuring authors from different cultural, professional

and disciplinary backgrounds is to bring attention to the 'gaps' between their individual efforts to understand and creatively address the globally experienced need for paradigm-challenging educational innovation. The purpose of this concluding chapter is not, therefore, to provide a summary of the chapters' findings and conclusions. Rather, what follows is an attempt to reflect on both common and uncommon threads linking the perspectives on education afforded by the preceding twelve chapters, with an eye to discerning areas for future exploration.

A key thread among those that, more or less explicitly, weave together the various chapters included in this volume is the need to grapple with the reality that many of the primary drivers for educational change do not lie within the education sector itself. It has long been recognized that educational change or reform rarely comes from within the educational sector. It is variously driven, for good or for ill, by social forces and factors outside the educational enterprise, including political policy-makers, the business sector, community interest groups, and even national security lobbyists.

One implication of this is that the context for evaluating educational performance and innovation also increasingly encompasses domains and stakeholders lying outside of formal educational structures. The merits of specific educational innovations and of sustained educational practices are no longer a matter of internal review undertaken in the light of values that remain relatively constant and that are held with considerable unanimity. This presents particular challenges to professional educators who find their work – not only in terms of its actual effects, but also its intended aims – being subject to review by individuals and groups without formal expertise in education and often lacking any sustained commitments to engagement with educational practice.

In part, this is a legacy of the modern merger of educational and national aims – the institutionalization of education as a primary means to the end of national progress and the increasingly refined articulation of national identity. This merger placed education squarely in the public sphere, and in doing so, contributed to a fading association of education with personal self-cultivation and a concomitant highlighting of direct links between education and economic, social and political performance and power. But it also brought a radical alteration of the scale of educational activity. Education pursued as a function of personal passion gradually yielded to compulsory and institutionally mediated mass, public education. This transformation occurred with insufficient analysis

of or questioning about its facility to really 'educate' the individual.

The modern conception of education as a public good intimately linked to national identity and progress can be seen as a necessary precursor to the contemporary ideal of globally realized 'education for all.' Yet, it also constitutes a key factor in the empirically varied, but globally common contemporary experience of education being in crisis. To the degree that the interests of any given nation-state and the topography of the public sphere within it might have been and remained simple, the positioning of education in the public sphere need not have resulted in the emergence of debilitating tensions in the evaluation of educational performance and change. History, however, took a rather different course.

Among the major – and somewhat ironic – effects of market-enabled and market-enabling modernization have been increased specialization, the consolidation of profoundly variegated geographies of socio-political and economic space, and deepening patterns of inequity both within and among societies. The public sphere is decidedly not uniform in terms of its structures or quality. Indeed, as has been well described by many authors in this volume, among the most compellingly visible realities of the 21st century is the steady demise of relatively closed and homogenous societies. Mounting global interdependence, while grounded on the cumulative integration of institutions and practices world-wide, is not bringing about global homogenization in other sectors, but rather its opposite – an expanding awareness of and emphasis upon difference. Among the signal characteristics of postmodernity is that societies are becoming ever more complexly articulated and pluralist.

The effects on education, one of the very few sectors headed toward homogeneity, of this tendency toward complex plurality are profound. As has become evident – most forcefully perhaps in the debates surrounding the degree to which multiculturalism should be acknowledged as an educational value or ideal and pursued as a curricular reality – assessing the meaning or aims of education has itself come to be a truly complex task in which plural values and histories must be accommodated. Simply stated, there is no single perspective from which educational performance and innovation might be authoritatively evaluated, and no prospect of such a universal (and difference-eliding) perspective emerging. Yet, educational policy-makers in such diverse settings as Nebraska and Katmandu are actively seeking just such universal assessment instruments and criteria for evaluation and accreditation.

Neither, however, is there any already existing harmony among the

varied perspectives bearing upon education. Indeed, because of the dual responsibility of education systems both to conserve and to extend cultural and intellectual traditions, evaluating education implies significant recursion – an increasingly rigorous self-evaluation. Yet, in complexly plural societies this implies that, rather than being placed in competition, different values and perspectives need to be actively and equitably coordinated (though not necessarily homogenized).

Education is apparently positioned within societies across the globe to serve as a key site for concretely working out the meaning of conserving and yet harmonizing differences – a site, in other words, for operationalizing a robust concept of diversity. It should also be recognized that the complex realities of postmodern states and their interrelationships are conducive to the conservation of diversity only as long as certain boundaries are not crossed, boundaries that significantly challenge the thrust toward harmonization. This raises issues about the continued, politically charged alliance of education with such modern values as universality, autonomy and equality. As an educational value, diversity would seem to be substantially at odds with the promotion of global or ‘universal’ standards – any ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach to education. But diversity is just as decisively at odds with seeing equal access to educational choices – the market-mediated exercise of autonomy as educational consumers – as a suitable substitute (whatever its status in reality) for the educationally sustained enhancement of equity, both within and among societies. Indeed, it is the rhetoric and quest for equity that best defines the paradoxes of mass education today. The complexity of this term is often lost in the discussion of how education can best serve the dual interests of promoting national development and social justice. Equal opportunity of education is now widely accepted as national policy, but, as has been noted by others, there is probably no greater inequality than the ‘equal opportunity’ of unequals. Issues of educational access, survival in school, comparability of school experience, post-school outcomes, and a variety of other factors all determine how well ‘school’ mediates the equity issue.

In sum, the complicated – if not complex – nature of evaluating contemporary educational performance and practice can be seen as a disturbing outcome of global processes that have been systematically reconfiguring the public sphere. Yet, it also promises opportunities for education to affect the dynamics and orientation of this ongoing reconfiguration of social, economic, political and cultural space.

As a specific focus for further examining the means and meaning of

education in the context of such contemporary realities as increasing global interdependence, accelerating change, and the emergence of increasingly complex and plural societies, there is much to recommend the tensions between conceiving and treating education as a public good, and as a commodity intended for ultimately individual or private consumption. As globalization has proceeded, one universally recognized effect has been the gradual withdrawal of the state from the education sector. This is most recognizable at the tertiary level. Higher education throughout the world is in a state of flux as it seeks to respond to the many challenges posed by increased global interdependence and rapid economic and social change. Within the Asia Pacific region, these challenges map very differently onto societies evolving on the basis of quite distinct cultural traditions and historical experiences – some countries in rapid development with expanding populations, some with declining birthrates and advanced economies, and yet others with stagnant or declining economies and growing populations. Voices calling for higher education reform are heard throughout the region. But in reflection of the many differences just noted, these calls are focused distinctively around the needs for either increased or rationalized higher education capacity, the need to accomplish this while generating quality that will meet international standards, and the hope of realizing both of these outcomes while addressing growing problems of equity.

Policy debates over higher education reform often propose greater freedom for private sector initiatives, and, indeed, in many societies (e.g., India, China, Korea, the Philippines), the growth of private sector institutions of higher education is as remarkable as it is uncontrolled. Opening higher education to private sector initiatives and adopting various market-centered approaches problematizes the historic role of the state in providing higher education as a public good, and raises numerous questions about the state's 'proper' role in providing and assuring the production of public goods. At the core of the issue is the extent to which education, basic and higher, will be viewed as a public good to be provided largely by the state on behalf of the production of 'the public good,' or whether higher education is produced as a commodity to be acquired through market-based transactions. Issues of equity are central to these distinctions, especially in terms of how the state perceives and accepts its responsibility for higher education provision. Inasmuch as higher education is potentially one of the primary drivers of educational change, future research initiatives would do well to focus more deeply on such tensions

within this sector as we seek to understand the complex relationships illuminated in the essays featured in this volume.

A related, broad area for future research is centered on issues of difference in education and on the kind of difference that education is intended to make for persons, for communities, and for the wider networks of relationships within which they are sustained.

On one hand, historical linkages among the processes of nation-building, economic development and the institutionalization of mass, public education have led to an understanding of education as a process valued on largely instrumental, material grounds: 'getting an education' is important because it makes a difference in capabilities and choices related to 'making a living.' However, as is increasingly true in India and other developing countries where economic growth is running well ahead of employment generation, 'getting an education' is for many starting to seem like a waste of time (and money). A college degree does not guarantee skilled employment; a high school diploma does not guarantee work in the formal sector.

On the other hand, historically accelerating rates and scales of globalization processes, especially over the last half century, have led to an understanding of education as having valuable contributions to make in realizing functionally pluralist societies: 'becoming educated' is important because it makes a difference in capacities for and commitments to 'living together well.' Thus, UNESCO's International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (1996) included among its "four pillars" of effective education "learning to live together" and "learning to be" – education as the culturally and locally situated cultivation of persons-in-community. Globally, this has most often led to implementations of values-focused educational efforts to enhance citizenship dynamics, the prospects of participatory democracy, and peace. But more broadly, it has raised issues of the meaning of educating whole persons for whole lives. In the context of a world in which it is apparently no longer possible to rest content with promoting the tolerance of difference within and among societies, profound questions emerge regarding how to encourage and enable the appreciation of difference as the basis for mutual contribution.

Perhaps the most general way of characterizing the task of research and leadership is that of clarifying the conditions for realizing a sustained gestalt shift, from seeing contemporary realities as bringing about the conditions for ongoing educational crisis, to seeing these same realities as opening up opportunities for educational creativity. There is of course

considerable danger in appealing to a term like creativity as a focus for research and leadership. Creativity appeared as a value in its current sense only around the middle of the 19th century as a result of historically unique conditions in Western Europe (Mason, 2003). Many cultures lack any closely parallel term. Nevertheless, one would be hard-pressed to find any culture or society in which there was no recognition of the value of relationally significant novelty. If systems of global interdependence, within which educational policy and practice need to be realized and to which they must respond, are truly complex, then creativity, in the sense of responsive virtuosity, should be 'mainstreamed' in both educational conduct and content. To the extent that it is, education at all levels becomes less a matter of transferring knowledge than one of generative knowing: education as adventure. For that to occur we are likely to need an approach to 'education' vastly different from that which dominates educational systems today.

Before we conclude, a note of caution: paradigm shift is not a phrase that should be used lightly. Thomas Kuhn's (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* popularized the phrase as a description of changes as momentous as the shift from a Ptolemaic, geocentric cosmology to the heliocentric cosmology developed by Copernicus, Kepler and Galileo. A paradigm shift refers in this sense to a radical (in the original sense of this term as well, from the Latin, *radis*, meaning root) and fundamental dislocation that forces a change in the very categories that we use to perceive, organize and understand our world. The phrase has, however, become so popular that it has lost much of its potency. There will be those who are skeptical of calls for new paradigms not only because of the popular abuse of the term today, but because we've had the benefit of some pretty good minds being applied to the field of education for quite a long time now. Why haven't we yet seen these new paradigms emerge? In response we might remind skeptics that when the possibility of humans in flight was still a dream at the turn of the twentieth century, to have expected somebody born then to accept that there would be a man on the moon within her lifetime of 70 years *was actually a realistic expectation*. So skepticism should be tempered with the humility of anyone scanning the future. We hope to have convinced readers that there is a new paradigm of education and educational leadership whose first glimmerings we are just beginning to see, whose emergence is consequent on the rapidly increased rates of globalization characteristic of just the last couple of decades. It's therefore no wonder that these glimmerings have not been seen

before, and that they carry still the aura of the speculative.

Certainly there are innovative and promising responses to the situation in which we find ourselves currently that have been articulated, most notably perhaps by the Delors Report of 1996 (UNESCO International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, *Learning: the Treasure Within*), to which we referred earlier. While the Delors Report has articulated the vision, the devil is in the implementation, rather than in the proverbial detail. Difficulties in the development and implementation of radically new policies are probably an indication of the power of the prevailing dispensation's inertial momentum. It's probably not a vision of a new paradigm that we lack, but the fact that the force of markets, the influence of vested interests – particularly of the wealthy and powerful – are indeed factors to be reckoned with. Poverty and injustice are going to be addressed by wealthy and powerful societies only when their consequences affect them. Fortunately, in an increasingly globalized world it gets ever more difficult for richer societies to isolate themselves from the consequences of such massive inequities as we see today, and we have grounds for optimism in this. September 11th 2001 was an expression of a lot of things, surely not least the frustration of some citizens of some US-supported Middle East dictatorships. The scourge of HIV/AIDS in the developing world is at last being given attention by the developed world, possibly because of the potential of the disease to contribute to the incidence of failed states and the problems they have been shown to bring, not least the seemingly endless queue of refugees knocking at the door of Fortress Europe, and the haven that failed states offer to groups like al-Qaeda. Climate change due to global warming is also, at last, being given attention, possibly because its consequences could include the flooding of lower Manhattan, central London and much of Shanghai, and not just the disappearance of Vanuatu and the annihilation of large parts of Bangladesh.

We return in conclusion to some of the aims we expressed in the Introduction. If Neubauer, Rizvi, Mason, and Hershock have succeeded in establishing the context and imperatives for paradigmatic change in education in an increasingly globalized world; if Hawkins, Ma, Tan, and Farrell have succeeded in illustrating the dominant educational paradigm historically and empirically in Asia and more broadly afield in their consideration of case studies of educational change in response to the pressures of globalization and of potentially new educational paradigms; and if Hershock, Ordonez, Wang, and Dalmiya have succeeded in bringing

new perspectives to bear on the challenges of educational leadership in the context of an increasingly globalized world; then this volume will be pertinent to changing education by contributing these perspectives on leadership, innovation and development in a globalizing Asia Pacific.

References

- Carnoy, M. (ed.) (1975): *Schooling in a Corporate Society: The Political Economy of Education in America*. New York: David McKay.
- Delors, J., International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (1996): *Learning: the Treasure Within*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Hattie, J. (1999): *Influences on Student Learning. Inaugural Lecture*. University of Auckland.
- Kuhn, T. (1962): *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- LeVine, R. (2003): *Childhood Socialization: Comparative Studies of Parenting, Learning and Educational Change*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre.
- Mason, J.H. (2003): *The Value of Creativity: The Origins and Emergence of a Modern Belief*. London: Ashgate Press.

Notes on the Authors

Vrinda DALMIYA is Associate Professor in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Hawaii, Manoa. She has also taught at Montana State University, the University of Washington and the Indian Institute of Technology in Delhi, India. Her research interests lie in the theory of knowledge, environmental philosophy and feminist philosophy. Her work has been published in journals that include *Hypatia*, *Environmental Ethics*, *Sophia*, the *Journal of Indian Council of Philosophical Research*, *The Philosophical Quarterly* and the *Journal of Social Philosophy*, and in several anthologies. In 2000 she co-directed a Summer Institute on "Religions, Philosophies and Culture in India: Contestations and Negotiations," sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities. She is currently working to extend the insights of feminist care ethics to the theory of knowledge and to initiate a dialogue between analytic virtue epistemology and what she refers to as a 'care based' epistemology. From 1999 to 2002 she served on the American Philosophical Association Committee on the Status of Asian/Asian American Philosophers and Philosophies. *Correspondence:* Philosophy Department, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii 96848, USA. E-mail: vrinda@hawaii.edu.

Joseph P. FARRELL is Professor Emeritus of Comparative and International Education in the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto, where he has served since 1968. He has served as Chair of the Department of Educational Planning, and as Founding Director (now co-Director) of the Comparative, International and Development Education Centre (CIDEC) and of the Collaborative Graduate Program in Comparative, International and Development Education. He is a specialist in the fields of comparative and international education, planning for social development, comparative teacher development, educational policy studies, and evaluation of educational reform projects. He has published eight books and well over 150 scholarly articles, technical reports and essays on these topics, in English and in Spanish. Since the early 1990s he has focused his research attention on analyzing a large international set of radically alternative forms of primary and junior secondary education in developing countries

that are dramatically improving learning results, in some cases on a very large scale, among highly marginalized young people. His chapter in this book is based on that research. He has received from the Comparative and International Education Society awards for Outstanding Scholarship and Outstanding Leadership, and was recently designated an Honorary Fellow of that Society. *Correspondence*: Comparative, International and Development Education Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6, Canada. E-mail: jfarrell@oise.utoronto.ca.

John N. HAWKINS is a Professor in the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles. He is Director of the Center for International and Development Education at UCLA, where he served for twelve years as Dean of International Studies. His research focuses on education and development, and specifically on higher education reform, in the Asian region. He is the author of 15 books and over 60 articles on educational development in Asia. His most recent works include: *Education and Intergroup Relations*; *Education and Social Change in the People's Republic of China*; *Transnational Competence: Rethinking the US-Japan Educational Relationship*; *Development or Deterioration: Work in Rural Asia*; and *Values Education for Dynamic Societies*. *Correspondence*: Center for International and Development Education, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, Box 951521, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90095, USA. E-mail: hawkins@gseis.ucla.edu.

Peter D. HERSHOCK is an Educational Specialist and Coordinator of the Asian Studies Development Program at the East-West Center in Honolulu, Hawaii. He is trained in both Western and Asian philosophy, with a specialization in Buddhist philosophy. His primary responsibilities center on designing and implementing university and college faculty development programs related to teaching about Asia. His research and writing focus both on historical dimensions of Buddhist thought and practice, and on their relevance to addressing such contemporary issues as technology and development, education, human rights, and the role of values in cultural and social change. His books include: *Liberating Intimacy: Enlightenment and Social Virtuosity in Ch'an Buddhism*; *Reinventing the Wheel: A Buddhist Response to the Information Age*; *Technology and Cultural Values on the Edge of the Third Millennium*; *Ch'an Buddhism*; and

Buddhism in the Public Sphere: Reorienting Global Interdependence.
 Correspondence: Education Program, East-West Center, 1601 East-West Road, Honolulu, Hawaii 96848, USA. E-mail: hershocp@eastwestcenter.org.

MA Wan-hua received her PhD at Cornell in 1997. She is a full Professor in the Graduate School of Education, Peking University. Her research interests focus on vocational education, and on higher education reforms and development in China. Her work has been supported by UNDP, Ford Foundation, and UNESCO. She is currently a Fulbright New Century Scholar directing a project, "Global Research Universities: models and characteristics." She has written several books and articles on higher education reform. Her most recent publication, *From Berkeley to Beida and Tsinghua: the development and governance of public research universities in the USA and China* (2004), has won three awards, from the Association of Education, the Association of Higher Education in China, and from Peking University. Correspondence: Department of Education and Human Development, Graduate School of Education, Beijing University, Beijing 10087, China. E-mail: hma@pku.edu.cn.

Mark MASON is Associate Professor in Philosophy and Educational Studies in the Faculty of Education at the University of Hong Kong, where he is also Director of the Comparative Education Research Centre (CERC). With research interests in philosophy, educational studies, comparative education and educational development, he is Regional Editor (Asia & The Pacific) of the *International Journal of Educational Development*, Editor of the *CERC Studies in Comparative Education Series* (co-published by Springer), an Editorial Board member of *Ethics and Education*, and President of the Comparative Education Society of Hong Kong. Prior to his appointment at the University of Hong Kong, he lectured in the School of Education at the University of Cape Town. Sections of his chapter in this volume are based on his keynote address to UNESCO's recent conference on intercultural education. Correspondence: Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China. E-mail: mmason@hku.hk.

Deane NEUBAUER (Ph.D, Yale, 1965), is Professor Emeritus in the Department of Political Science at the University of Hawaii, Manoa (UHM), Senior Research Fellow of the Globalization Research Center at UHM, and Senior Advisor to the Education 2020 Program of the East-West Center. Educated at the University of California,

Riverside and at Yale University, he has also taught at the University of California (Berkeley and Irvine), at Waikato University in New Zealand, and at the University of Sydney. His research interests lie in health policy, political economy and globalization. His work explores globalization phenomena as a major vector of social change throughout the world. He served as the founding Dean of the College of Social Sciences at UHM (1980-88). In 1999 he founded the Globalization Research Center at UHM, and subsequently the Globalization Research Network, a collaboration of four US universities. He served as Chancellor of UHM from 2001 to 2002, and as Vice President for Academic Affairs for the University of Hawaii System from 2001 to 2004. *Correspondence:* 3454 Oahu Ave, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822, USA. E-mail: deanen@hawaii.edu.

Victor ORDONEZ joined the East-West Center as Senior Education Fellow in 2002. Prior to that he was with UNESCO, first as Director of the Basic Education Division in the Paris headquarters, from which he coordinated the global inter-agency campaign on Education For All, and afterwards as Director of its largest field office, the Principal Office for Asia and the Pacific. He has served at various times in different government and educational institutions in the Philippines: as Deputy Minister/Undersecretary of the Department of Education, Culture and Sports; as Chair or Vice-Chair of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform; as a member of the Board of Higher Education, and of the National Commission for Culture and the Arts; and at various state colleges and universities. His work in the academe includes being Dean of the Graduate Schools of Business and Education of De La Salle University, Acting President of Maryknoll College, and Professor or Visiting Lecturer at the University of California, Los Angeles, at the University of Hawaii, and at other institutions. He has seven academic degrees, including a PhD in Oriental Philosophy, and has done further work at the Asian Institute of Management, the Harvard Business School, and the University of Wisconsin. *Correspondence:* Education Program, East-West Center, 1601 East-West Road, Honolulu, Hawaii 96848, USA; and 1998 Kalachuchi Street, Dasmarias Village, Makati City, Philippines. E-mail: v_ordonez@hotmail.com.

Fazal RIZVI has been a Professor in the Department of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Illinois since 2001, having previously held academic and senior administrative appointments at a number of universities in Australia, including as Pro Vice-Chancellor

(International) at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology. From 1993 to 2000 he edited *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, and in 1996 was the President of the Australian Association for Research in Education. His recent books include *Globalization, the OECD and Education Policy Making* (Pergamon, 2001), and *Education Policy and the Politics of Change* (Routledge, 1996). He is currently researching issues of identity, culture and transnational education. At the University of Illinois he directs the Global Studies in Education Program (gse.ed.uiuc.edu). He is an international panel member for Education on the United Kingdom's 2008 Research Assessment Exercise. *Correspondence*: Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Illinois, 1310 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820, USA. E-mail: frizvi@uiuc.edu.

Jason TAN is a Singapore national. He completed his Masters in Education in education and national development at the University of Hong Kong, and his doctoral studies in comparative education at the State University of New York at Buffalo. He is currently Associate Professor in Policy and Leadership Studies at the National Institute of Education in Singapore. He is an editorial board member of several international journals, including *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *Journal of Studies in International Education* and *Globalisation, Societies and Education*. His most recent publications include *Globalization and Marketization of Education: A Comparative Analysis of Hong Kong and Singapore*, and *Shaping Singapore's Future: Thinking Schools, Learning Nation*. *Correspondence*: Policy & Leadership Studies, Building 2, National Institute of Education, 1 Nanyang Walk, Singapore 637616, Singapore. E-mail: etjtjan@nie.edu.sg.

WANG Hongyu is Assistant Professor in Curriculum Studies at Oklahoma State University. She received her PhD in Curriculum Theory from Louisiana State University, and publishes in both Chinese and in English. She is co-editor of *The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies* (Peter Lang, 2003); and author of *The Call from the Stranger on a Journey Home: Curriculum in a Third Space* (Peter Lang, 2004), which provides a critical analysis of the writings of Eastern and Western philosophers, principally Michel Foucault, Confucius, and Julia Kristeva. She has published articles in journals that include *Educational Theory*, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, *Journal of American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, and *Multicultural Education*. Translator of William E. Doll's book, *A Post-Modern Perspective on Curriculum*, she

has worked on introducing North American curriculum texts into the Chinese educational field. *Correspondence:* School of Teaching and Curriculum Leadership, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074, USA. E-mail: hongyu.wang@okstate.edu.

Index

A

Academy for Educational
Development, 208
Altbach, Philip, 52, 176
Analects, The, 275-7, 282
APEC, 64, 71, 77, 80-1
Appadurai, Arjun, 70-1
Asia Pacific, 1, 3-4, 12, 19, 26, 85, 95,
324, 326, 330, 334

B

Baden-Powell, Robert, 212-2
Bangladesh, 12, 17, 209-10, 215, 218,
267, 323, 333
Bauman, Zygmunt, 102
behavioral sciences, 288
Beniger, James, 121
Bernstein, Basil, 217
Blackmore, Jill, 30, 47, 321
Bologna Declaration, 64
Book of Change, 281
Bordia, Anil, 266
Bourdieu, Pierre, 7, 68
Buddhist thought, 118

C

care, *see ethics of*
Carnoy, Martin, 156-7, 325
Castoriadis, Cornelius, 69
causality
and complexity, 235
downward, 235
causation, linear, 19, 325

change(s)
dynamics, 1, 10, 244
in Asia, 323
theories, 140, 143
in school curricula, 243
character formation, 312
charter schools, 202
Chen, Mo Kai, 264-5
China, 14-5, 23, 42-5, 52, 54, 62, 79, 95,
98-9, 122, 137, 139, 154, 156, 159,
163-80, 189, 193, 230, 264, 267, 273,
275, 283, 285-6, 323, 330
higher education in, 14, 169-70, 172,
176, 179
Jilin province, 22, 170, 264-5
Chinese
classical Chinese thought, 283, 285
traditional Chinese cultural values,
284
philosophy, 23, 273-4, 287
citizenship education, 95, 110, 215-6
democratic, 215-6
programs, 95
in Singapore, 95
classification, strong, 217
classroom, 17-8, 25, 62, 146, 156, 159,
185, 206-7, 213, 218, 223, 258, 264,
266, 298, 301-2, 317-8, 320
collectivism, 284
Colombia, 16, 208, 210, 214-5, 221-2,
323
cognitive psychology, 16, 150, 200,
205
Community Schools Program of
UNICEF-Egypt, The, 17, 209, 220-1

complex
 change, 19, 96, 122-3, 127, 237, 324
 interdependence, 5, 9, 12-3, 19,
 93-4, 123-4, 131, 138, 229, 242,
 244, 246, 323-6, 326
 systems, 19, 122-3, 125, 133, 234-7,
 325

complexity theory, 11, 56, 101, 164

compression of
 geographical space, 297
 temporal magnitudes, 230

conflict, 3, 6, 23, 30, 41, 47, 62, 82, 121,
 124, 143-4, 185, 193, 239, 246, 271,
 284-5, 290, 293, 305, 322
 as a driving force for social change,
 143
 theory, 142-4, 155

Confucian ethics, 23 183, 273

Confucianism, 23, 252, 273-4, 276, 278,
 280-1, 283-6, 292, 296

continuous progress learning, 206,
 213, 215-6

Copernicus, 332

creative
 educational change, 23, 273
 innovation, 325

creativity, 23, 101, 168, 236, 244-5, 254,
 256, 273, 281-4, 286-7, 291, 293-4,
 325, 331-4

cross-age peer tutoring, 213

cross-cultural approaches, 292

Cuban, Larry, 12-3, 137-8, 141, 155,
 159, 201, 204-5

cultural
 borrowing, 200
 norms and values, 2
 pluralism, 286

curriculum
 discourse, 7
 reform, 261

D

Dao, 23, 274-6, 278-82, 294, 296

Daoism, 23, 273-4, 276, 278-81, 283-6

Daoist, 23, 273-6, 278-81, 283-6
 aesthetics, 23, 273
 tradition, 278, 284, 286

Darwin, Charles, 140

decentralization, 156-7, 164, 170, 286,
 290, 292

Delanty, Gerard, 95

Delors Report, 333

democratic
 equality, 83-5, 88
 governance and free markets, 5
 traditions, 8, 83, 89

de-regulation of education, 52

development
 in education, 1
 modernization theory, 142
 sustainable, 5, 9, 15, 93-4, 96-7, 154,
 180, 240, 259, 265, 280

Dewey, John, 67-8, 83, 110, 133, 146

diversity, 2, 4-5, 8-11, 15, 18, 21-2, 31,
 38, 72, 75, 77-8, 88, 93-5, 101-2, 107,
 111, 115, 120, 122, 126, 128-9, 131,
 144, 155, 180, 199, 217, 228, 241-2,
 246-7, 249, 251, 253-4, 256, 272, 303,
 323, 325, 329

Doll, William, 120

Driver, Julia, 309

Durkheim, Emile, 66

E

East Asian cultural sphere, 118

East-West Center, 3

Economic(s)
 Fundamentalism, 78
 free market, 5, 97, 140, 232, 304
 globalization, 38, 157, 164, 191
 space, 328
 systems, 31, 143

education
 access to schooling / education, 14,
 16-7, 83, 200, 202, 209, 215, 219
 aims and purposes, 323-6

- alternative education / schooling,
 - 154, 156, 199-223
 - alternative providers, 4, 235
 - alternative programs, 207, 209, 212, 218, 221-2
 - alternative systems, 49
 - arts education, 216
 - child-centred, 205
 - commodification of, 245
 - and competence, 10, 115
 - corporatization and marketization, 77
 - and curriculum, 10-1, 13, 110, 115, 121, 138, 146, 151
 - early childhood education, 51, 221
 - for girls, 325
 - higher education, 6, 14-5, 19, 43, 50-1, 53-4, 56, 62, 81, 148, 152, 157-8, 163-80, 185, 270, 301, 330
 - higher education in China, 14, 169-70, 172, 176, 179
 - for home life, 301
 - for justice, 314
 - life-long, 3
 - multiple educations, 2
 - policies and practices, 3
 - reframed according to market dynamics, 128
 - Education For All, 12, 17, 223, 267
 - goals, 22
 - educational
 - accountability, 25, 317
 - achievement, 12, 325
 - aims, 7-8, 63-89, 116, 122, 261, 324
 - change, 4-5, 9, 12, 14, 18, 23, 26, 93-4, 129-31, 143-4, 157-8, 163-4, 220, 242-3, 246, 260, 273, 287-8, 323, 325, 327, 330, 333
 - indigenization, 284
 - leaders, 19, 22, 25, 243, 245-6, 261, 271, 283, 285-7, 291, 317-8, 324-7
 - leadership, 4, 21, 23-6, 242, 246-7, 266, 273-94, 325, 332, 334
 - paradigm, 4, 7-8, 12, 14, 16, 26, 49, 57, 120, 128, 130, 138, 176, 180, 333
 - paradigm, dominant, 11-4, 16, 26, 120-1, 137-160, 180, 333
 - policy, 24, 64, 87, 142-3, 149, 152, 157, 192, 202, 298-9, 301, 332
 - policy formation and evaluation, 64
 - reform, 7, 10, 64, 77, 81, 85, 115, 142, 156, 159, 201, 244, 287-8, 300-1, 317-9
 - Egypt, 17, 139, 209, 211, 215, 267, 323
 - emergence, 13-4, 30, 33, 35, 63, 75, 78, 95, 101, 120, 123-4, 127, 138-9, 146, 180, 228-9, 240, 242, 244, 247, 254, 282, 286, 293, 328, 330, 332
 - emergent, 4, 6, 30, 35, 44, 233, 282, 294
 - equal opportunity, 85, 110, 329
 - equilibrium theory, 142, 144
 - equity, 2, 4-5, 9-11, 14, 35, 78, 84-5, 87, 93-4, 96-7, 100-1, 115, 128-9, 131, 174, 247, 253, 286, 315, 323, 329-2
 - Escuela Nueva* (New School), Colombia, 16, 208
 - ethics
 - care, 24, 118, 299-300
 - Confucian, 23, 183, 273
 - global, 241
 - of interdependence, 241
 - and multiculturalism, 94, 107, 110
 - European Union, 34
- F**
- feminist, 24-5, 293, 299, 303, 305, 311, 315-6
 - discourse, 118
 - scholarship, 298
 - solidarity, 302-5, 312, 317, 319
 - theories, 298
 - Feminist-as-Explorer model, 302-3
 - Feminist-as-Tourist model, 302-3

foreign direct investment (FDI), 32, 39, 60
 framing, strong, 217
 free market, *see also economics*
 Fullan, Michael, 204

G

Galileo, 332
 Giddens, Anthony, 36, 95
 global
 capitalism, 41, 297
 colonialism, 231
 competency, 289
 demographics, 49
 diversity, 5, 9, 93-4, 101, 107
 education, 110
 educational leadership, 23, 273
 educational policy networks, 64
 interconnectedness, 5, 278
 interconnectivity and
 interdependence, 8, 71, 75-6, 87
 interdependence, 2-5, 9-11, 18-21, 32, 34-5, 41, 93, 95-6, 101, 107, 115-7, 124, 128-9, 133, 227-47, 283, 292, 323, 325, 328, 330, 332
 investment, 231
 migration, 285
 networks, 63
 transformation, 23, 273, 291, 294
 globalization
 accelerated, 9, 93, 96, 176
 alternative form of, 8, 89
 characteristics of, 36, 165
 consequences of, 4, 8, 108, 176, 179, 323
 context of, 49, 156, 323
 of intellectual labor, 52
 homogenizing effect of, 2
 paradox of, 21, 48, 249
 processes, 14, 19-20, 45, 56, 100, 156, 164-5, 179, 228, 235, 247, 331
 globalism, 75, 110
 Goh, Chok Tong, 184, 188, 190

“Good Citizen” for primary schools, 183
Great Learning, The, 274, 277
 “grammar of schooling”, 12, 137, 202

H

Habitus, 7, 68
 Harvey, David, 10, 31, 35, 73, 118, 134
 Hattie, John, 324
 Held, David, 30, 74
 Hegel, 140
 heterogeneity / divergence, 19
 higher education
 change, 14, 163
 globalization and
 internationalization of, 176
 reform, 166, 170, 330
 Hirst, Paul, 65-6
 HIV/AIDS, 37, 40, 44, 62, 99, 109, 325, 333
 Education, 270
 proliferation of, 9, 94, 99, 108
 home-schooling, 202
 homogeneity / convergence, 19
 human capital theory, 77-8, 151
 human rights legislation, 231
 humanism, phenomenological, 305
 Huntington’s thesis, 99

I

Illich, Ivan, 128, 133, 153-5
 illiteracy among girls, 22
 income gap, increasing, 167
 India, 12, 39-40, 43, 52, 54, 79, 99, 139, 159, 189, 193, 213, 230, 266-8, 312, 330-2
 individualism, 61, 86, 156, 194, 284, 293
 inequity, 3, 5, 10, 96, 115-6, 120, 123, 128, 148, 167, 247, 328
 information and communications
 technology (ICT), 63, 78, 80, 85, 87-8, 97, 231

information technologies, emergent, 35

interdependence
 among societies, 13, 138
 global, 2-5, 9-11, 18-21, 32, 34-5, 41, 93, 95-6, 101, 107, 115-7, 124, 128-9, 133, 227, 236-7, 242-3, 247, 283, 323, 325, 328, 330, 332

intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), 71-2, 77, 83, 87, 298

International Forum on Education 2020 (IFE 2020), 3-4

internet, 35, 42, 47, 61, 153-4, 190, 199, 258

'invisible hand', 143, 232

J

Justice, 7, 9, 25, 65-6, 84, 88, 93-4, 96, 104-5, 110, 241, 297, 298-9, 301, 303-5, 311, 314-7, 329, 333
 theory of, 311

K

Kepler, 332

knowledge(s)
 condition, 65
 economy, 8, 39, 73, 78-80, 84-5, 193, 195
 indigenous, 118, 292-3

Korea, 12, 156, 173, 330

Kuhn, Thomas, 332

L

Labaree, David, 83

labor forces, 38, 121, 166

Laozi, 274-5, 278-82, 290

leadership
 coordinative, 238
 distributed approach to, 290
 deconstruction of the traditional concept of, 320

effective, 18, 227, 238, 240-1, 263, 268, 274

'exemplar' mode of, 319

implications for, 22, 235, 250, 252

and management, 271

responsible, 20, 235

role of, 21, 249-72, 275

style of, 292, 317

training, 173, 179, 263, 289, 317

traits, 265, 289

leading for diversity, 246

learning
 enhancement programs, 222
 factors that enhance, 324
 goals, setting of, 324
 needs of students, 22, 272
 support category, 216

legal system, 286

LeVine, Robert, 325

local-national-regional (LNR), 12, 138

local adaptations, 215, 217

M

Mahābhārata, 25, 299, 307-8, 311-3, 315-6

Maoist, 231

market
 delivered commodities, 125
 liberalism / liberalization, 52, 62, 116
 mechanisms, 7, 33, 64, 285, 290

marketization, 77, 125, 129, 133, 157, 194, 283, 285

Marx, 140
 Marxist theory, 143-4

Mayor, Federico, 267, 269

migration, 33, 36-7, 44, 70, 98, 167, 250, 285

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade, 24-5, 118, 299, 302-7, 311-2, 314-6, 318-20, 322

Montessori, Maria, 133, 212-3

Montessori schools, 212-3

moral
 philosophy, 324
 principles, 9, 94, 101, 103-4, 106-7,
 112
 morality, 102, 232, 276, 279, 284, 287
 motivational displacement, 300, 313
 multicultural
 countries, 15
 societies, 9, 94, 110, 323
 multiculturalism, 2, 9, 21, 93-112, 304,
 328
 principle of, 9, 94, 102, 104-7, 110
 multilateralism, 64

N

National Education (NE), 15, 183-9,
 192-5
 National Education policy, 15, 184
 national
 identity, 15, 183-4, 188, 327-30
 planning goals, 199
 policy, 329
 systems of formal education, 199
 Noddings, Nel, 24-5, 67, 118, 299-302,
 305-7, 311-3, 318-9, 322
 neo-liberal
 imaginary of globalization, 8, 72-4,
 80, 82-3, 87
 policy thinking, 7, 64
 neo-liberalism, 33, 50, 52, 54, 61, 73, 76,
 81
 new education(al) paradigms, 7, 14,
 26, 57, 130, 180, 260, 333
 'New Zealand experiment', 79
 Non-formal Primary Education
 Program of the Bangladesh Rural
 Advancement Committee (BRAC),
 The, 17, 209
 non-linear dynamics of complex
 change, 237
 Non-Overestimation Model of
 humility, 315

O

OECD, 64, 71-2, 77-80, 85-6, 147, 178

P

People's Action Party (PAP), 183,
 188-9, 193, 195
 personal cultivation, 23-4, 273-9,
 281-90, 296
 personhood, 23, 273, 275, 278, 284, 286,
 288, 290
 Peters, R.S., 65-6
 Philippines, the, 39, 330
 PISA, 64
 planetary
 ecology, 324
 monoculture, 228
 pluralism, 2, 227, 286
 political
 democracy, 51, 55, 286
 philosophy, 324
 post-industrial market operations, 119
 post-industrial production regimes, 3
 postmodernity
 characteristics, of 328
 postmodern
 fact and value, 19
 perspective, 102
 skepticism, 118
 poverty, 10-1, 36-7, 40, 61, 93, 96, 98,
 108-9, 115-32, 147-8, 167, 185, 241,
 278, 298, 323, 333
 predicament resolution, 11, 20, 124,
 127, 239-40, 242
 privatization, 34, 52, 61, 73, 87, 128,
 157, 159, 165, 167, 285
 of educational goods, 2
 policies, 7, 64
 problem solution, 11, 20, 124, 239, 242
 progressive educational reform, 317
 privatized industry, 297
 public
 education, 43, 52, 95, 141, 285, 327,
 331

good, 1-2, 4, 8, 51, 82-5, 89, 97, 127,
139, 143, 146, 174, 231, 328, 330

R

Rajasthan, 22, 266

Ramus, Peter, 121, 133

Rao, Narasimha, 268

recursion, 20, 234-6, 329

reform(s)

educational systems, 260

project in Jilin, 264

in university education, 261

initiatives, 201, 291

relational

maturation, 129-30

ontology, 10, 118, 120, 298

understanding, 116-7, 120

humility, 24-6, 297, 299, 307, 309-19

turn, 26, 298, 311, 320

ren, 275-7, 279, 281-2, 290, 296

Republic of Korea, *see* Korea

Rawls, John, 311

research, 17, 62, 72, 137, 144, 156, 159,

166, 171, 173-6, 204-5, 208, 218, 223,

262, 270, 297, 303, 325, 330-4

S

scale, 1, 5, 16-9, 29, 35, 38-9, 45, 75, 101,

122, 124, 126, 129, 131, 149, 156,

168-9, 207-8, 218-9, 223, 227, 229-30,

232-8, 240-1, 243, 245-7, 288, 291, 327,

331

school administrators, 326

schooling

formal, 80, 139, 147-51, 153-5, 158,

200-2, 205-6, 208-9, 216-8, 220,

222, 266

life-long, 128

science, 37, 48, 56, 80-1, 118, 121, 124,

166, 174, 180, 203, 252, 284-7

Scouting and Guiding, 212-3

Sen, Amartya, 10, 116, 150, 158-9

September 11th 2001, 15, 47, 53, 195,
333

services, 2, 8, 32, 34, 37, 39-40, 42, 44,
50, 60-1, 73-4, 79-80, 98-9, 109, 125-6,
128, 167, 171, 228, 231

Siegel, Harvey, 102-5

Singapore, 15, 40, 69, 79, 95, 183-95,
323

citizenship education, 95

Sizer, Theodore, 202-3

Smith, Adam, 139-40, 143, 146, 232

social

capital, 86

efficiency, 83-8

enterprise, 6, 29

imaginary, 7-8, 65, 68-72, 75-6, 81

mobility, 43, 51, 83-6, 166

network analysis, 256-7

theory, 69, 324

transformation, 14, 163, 288, 316

socio-cultural development theories,
141

socio-economic status, 325

socio-political, 15, 195, 227, 328

Soros, George, 78

Soviet, 55, 133, 169, 199, 231

state, declining role in policy

development, 74

strategic

investment, 32, 326

planning skills, 22, 272

substance abuse, 325

sustainability *see also* development

T

Taylor, Charles, 7, 24, 68-9, 110

teacher(s), 17-8, 51, 148, 150, 166, 185,

187, 192-3, 195, 201, 203, 206-7, 211,

215-9, 223, 255, 258, 264-6, 269-70,

278, 287, 297, 307-8, 318-21, 324-7

become producers of marketable

knowledge, 297

development, 17, 207-8

instruction, 324
 teacher: feedback to learners, 324
 teacher-centered, 215, 217
 TIMMS, 64
 Toulmin, Stephen, 121
 transcultural
 educational and philosophical
 ideals, 103, 105
 moral principle, 103
 normative reach, 9, 94, 101, 105-7,
 109
 transnational
 corporations (TNCs), 32, 97, 231
 economic relations, 63
 transnationalization, 95
 Tyack, David, 12-3, 137-8, 141, 155,
 159, 201, 205

U

UNESCO, 22, 37, 71, 86, 147, 152, 177,
 210, 212, 267, 268-71
 E-9 or Nine High Population
 Countries project, 267
 Education for All, 12, 267
 International Commission on
 Education for the Twenty-first
 Century, 331, 333
 United Nations Children's Fund
 (UNICEF), 17, 209, 268-70
 United Nations Development
 Programme (UNDP), 268-70
 United Nations Population Fund
 (UNFPA), 268-9
 Universal Declaration of Human
 Rights, 252
 urbanization, 9, 44, 98

V

value(s), 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 15, 18-21, 23, 30,
 32, 41-4, 47, 49, 55, 65-6, 73-5, 93-112,
 116-7, 121-4, 127-9, 140, 143, 145-6,
 152, 156, 165, 178, 180, 187, 210, 227,
 229, 234, 236-41, 243-6, 252, 279-81,
 284-6, 292-3, 324-7, 327-31
 and education, 42-3, 156, 244
 variety, *see diversity*
 virtue(s), 26, 74, 97-8, 139, 241, 244,
 274, 276, 279, 301, 309-19, 322
 virtuosity, 11, 115, 119-20, 124-31,
 240-4, 332

W

Wang, Xiao, 284
 Washington Consensus, 64
 Waters, Malcolm, 63, 95
 Whitehead, Alfred North, 65
 Williams, Raymond, 7, 68
 Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 7, 68
 World Bank, 34, 62, 64, 71, 77, 208, 222,
 268-9
 World Organization of the Scouting
 Movement, 212-3
 World Trade Organization (WTO), 34,
 172, 178, 283

Y

Ye, Lan, 287

Z

Zhang, Yin, 264

CERC Studies in Comparative Education

1. Mark Bray & W.O. Lee (eds.) (2001): *Education and Political Transition: Themes and Experiences in East Asia*. Second edition. ISBN 962-8093-84-3. 228pp. HK\$200/US\$32.
2. Mark Bray & W.O. Lee (eds.) (1997): *Education and Political Transition: Implications of Hong Kong's Change of Sovereignty*. ISBN 962-8093-90-8. 169pp. [Out of print]
3. Philip G. Altbach (1998): *Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University, and Development*. ISBN 962-8093-88-6. 312pp. HK\$180/US\$30.
4. Zhang Weiyuan (1998): *Young People and Careers: A Comparative Study of Careers Guidance in Hong Kong, Shanghai and Edinburgh*. ISBN 962-8093-89-4. 160pp. HK\$180/US\$30.
5. Harold Noah & Max A. Eckstein (1998): *Doing Comparative Education: Three Decades of Collaboration*. ISBN 962-8093-87-8. 356pp. HK\$250/US\$38.
6. T. Neville Postlethwaite (1999): *International Studies of Educational Achievement: Methodological Issues*. ISBN 962-8093-86-X. 86pp. HK\$100/US\$20.
7. Mark Bray & Ramsey Koo (eds.) (2004): *Education and Society in Hong Kong and Macao: Comparative Perspectives on Continuity and Change*. Second edition. ISBN 962-8093-34-7. 323pp. HK\$200/US\$32.
8. Thomas Clayton (2000): *Education and the Politics of Language: Hegemony and Pragmatism in Cambodia, 1979-1989*. ISBN 962-8093-83-5. 243pp. HK\$200/US\$32.
9. Gu Mingyuan (2001): *Education in China and Abroad: Perspectives from a Lifetime in Comparative Education*. ISBN 962-8093-70-3. 252pp. HK\$200/US\$32.
10. William K. Cummings, Maria Teresa Tatto & John Hawkins (eds.) (2001): *Values Education for Dynamic Societies: Individualism or Collectivism*. ISBN 962-8093-71-1. 312pp. HK\$200/US\$32.
11. Ruth Hayhoe & Julia Pan (eds.) (2001): *Knowledge Across Cultures: A Contribution to Dialogue Among Civilizations*. ISBN 962-8093-73-8. 391pp. HK\$250/US\$38.
12. Robert A. Levine (2003): *Childhood Socialization: Comparative Studies of Parenting, Learning and Educational Change*. ISBN 962-8093-61-4. 299pp. HK\$200/US\$32.
13. Mok Ka-Ho (ed.) (2003): *Centralization and Decentralization: Educational Reforms and Changing Governance in Chinese Societies*. ISBN 962-8093-58-4. 230pp. HK\$200/US\$32.
14. W.O. Lee, David L. Grossman, Kerry J. Kennedy & Gregory P. Fairbrother (eds.) (2004): *Citizenship Education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and Issues*. ISBN 962-8093-59-2. 313pp. HK\$200/US\$32.
15. Alan Rogers (2004): *Non-Formal Education: Flexible Schooling or Participatory Education?* ISBN 962-8093-30-4. 316pp. HK\$200/US\$32.
16. Peter Ninnes & Meeri Hellstén (eds.) (2005): *Internationalizing Higher Education: Critical Explorations of Pedagogy and Policy*. ISBN 962-8093-37-1. 231pp. HK\$200/US\$32.
17. Ruth Hayhoe (2006): *Portraits of Influential Chinese Educators*. ISBN 10: 962-8093-40-1; ISBN 13: 978-962-8093-40-3. 398pp. HK\$250/US\$38.
18. Aaron Benavot & Cecilia Braslavsky (eds.) (2006): *School Knowledge in Comparative and Historical Perspective: Changing Curricula in Primary and Secondary Education*. ISBN 10: 962-8093-52-5; ISBN 13: 978-962-8093-52-6. 315pp. HK\$200/US\$32.
19. Mark Bray, Bob Adamson & Mark Mason (eds.) (2007): *Comparative Education Research: Approaches and Methods*. ISBN 978-1-4020-6188-2. 444pp. HK\$250/US\$38.
20. Peter D. Hershock, Mark Mason & John N. Hawkins (eds.) (2008): *Changing Education: Leadership, Innovation and Development in a Globalizing Asia Pacific*. ISBN 978-1-4020-6582-8. 348pp. HK\$200/US\$32.
21. Vandra Masemann, Mark Bray & Maria Manzon (eds.) (2007): *Common Interests, Uncommon Goals: Histories of the World Council of Comparative Education Societies and its Members*. ISBN 13: 978-962-8093-10-6. HK\$250/US\$38.

Order through bookstores or from:

Comparative Education Research Centre
Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China.
Fax: (852) 2517 4737; E-mail: cerc@hkusub.hku.hk; Website: www.hku.hk/cerc

The list prices above are applicable for order from CERC, and include sea mail postage.
For air mail postage costs, please contact CERC.

No. 7 in the series and Nos. 13-15 are co-published with Kluwer Academic Publishers and the Comparative Education Research Centre of the University of Hong Kong. Books from No. 16 onwards are co-published with Springer. Springer publishes hardback versions.