



**Патрісія К. Кубов (Patricia K. Kubow) —**

професор з міжнародної та порівняльної освіти кафедри освітнього лідерства та досліджень політики і курикулуму та навчання в Університеті Індіана Блумінгтон. Також вона є директором Центру міжнародної освіти, розвитку та досліджень (Center for International Education, Development and Research (CIEDR)) при педагогічному факультеті (School of Education) університету.

Її наукові дослідження сфокусовано на порівняльних конструктах навчання демократії та громадянської освіти у Суб-Сахарній Африці та на Близькому Сході. Вона нагороджена почесними відзнаками за наукові дослідження Американською асоціацією у галузі освітніх досліджень та Асоціацією вчителів-педагогів США. За свою міжнародну діяльність вона отримала національне визнання з боку Президента США, Білого Дому та Національної агенції з міжнародного розвитку.

**Пол Фоссум (Paul R. Fossum)** отримав диплом бакалавра гуманітарних наук (BA) в Університеті Монтана, диплом магістра гуманітарних наук (MA) у Бостонському університеті, захистив дисертацію доктора філософії (PhD) в Університеті Міннесота, Департаменті освітньої політики та адміністрування, акцентуючи дослідницьку увагу на аспектах соціально-філософських засад, порівняльної педагогіки та вищої освіти. Після завершення докторської роботи та діяльності після її захисту в Інституті з інтеграції громад зосередив свою роботу на системних змінах в інклюзивних школах, та пізніше на інституційних контактах та міждисциплінарних дослідженнях в Університеті штату Мічиган.

В Університеті Мічиган-Дірборн професор Пол Фоссум обіймає посади тимчасового декана, заступника декана, координатора програм з підготовки магістрів з викладання гуманітарних наук у Коледжі освіти, охорони здоров'я і соціальних служб. Він був співкерівником грантового проекту Департаменту з освіти США на суму \$ 1.800.000, що був спрямований на поліпшення здатностей вчителів початкової та середньої освіти використовувати навчальні технології. Його діяльність в університеті також охоплює роботу у кількох додаткових комітетах як у кампусі Дірборн, так і в центральному кампусі університету в Анн-Арбор (Мічиган).

Доктор Пол Фоссум є автором низки праць з порівняльної педагогіки / міжнародної освіти, управління у сфері освіти та вищої освіти. Його праці друкувалися багатьма мовами та у багатьох країнах світу. Доктор Пол Фоссум також досліджує та публікує праці з проблеми потенціалу та обмежень навчальних технологій у класі.



УДК 37.013.74

## COMPARATIVE EDUCATION IN THE USA<sup>1</sup>

The article is devoted to the establishment and development of comparative education in the United States. In this paper the history of comparative education is highlighted in detail as a separate scientific field. This work explores the place of comparative education in American educational science and identifies current trends of its development. The arti-

<sup>1</sup> Передруковано з :

*Comparative Education at Universities World Wide*. Third Expanded Edition (2013). Wolhuter Charl, Popov Nikolay, Leutwyler Bruno, Skubic Ermenc Klara (Eds.). With an introductory chapter by Erwin H. Epstein. - Sofia: Bulgarian Comparative Education Society (BCES) & Ljubljana University Press, Faculty of Arts. - pp. 183-192.

cle also discusses the most important comparative education texts, curricular sources and instructional emphases about its place in the world of science.

Educators worldwide face similar challenges in helping policy makers understand the interactions among societal aims and globalizing factors that influence formal schooling's purposes. In the United States, education has moved in a problem-focused and solution-driven direction due to an accountability movement that demands the measurement of educational outcomes through standardized test assessments.

Classic analysis of Comparative Education depicts the field's progress in terms of its different historical stages of development. The first stage has been called "the period of travelers' tales" where people's interest in the unknown led to exploration around the world. Comparative educators in the 20th century were concerned with identifying the forces shaping foreign educational systems and used quantitative methods to explain the factors impacting formal education and society and to establish cause-effect patterns of influence. The third stage of Comparative Education is characterized as one of international cooperation, peace, and understanding.

Comparative Education as a subject area can be found in some schools and colleges of education throughout the United States. The Council of Learned Societies in Education has identified Comparative Education as a major academic approach that helps to define foundations of education.

**Keywords:** comparative education, history of comparative education, American education, contemporary directions in comparative education, the USA.

**Introduction.** Educators worldwide face similar challenges in helping students, communities, and policy makers understand the interactions among societal aims, personal aspirations, and globalizing factors that influence formal schooling's purposes. In the United States, education has moved in a problem-focused and solution-driven direction due to an accountability movement that demands the measurement of educational outcomes through standardized test assessments. A lack of genuine dialogue between educators and external stakeholders has contributed to a culture of compliance in the U.S. where teachers, and increasingly professors, are challenged to develop critical aims amidst accountability policies and legislative mandates such as the No Child Left Behind Act. Education accountability reforms have defined the American public's view of education since at least the 1980s, and schools have come under increasing scrutiny to justify that the things they teach are relevant to social needs. It is within this turbulent and dynamic educational climate that Comparative Education is positioned.

Comparative Education is generally defined as the cross-national, cross-cultural study of education. Comparative research often involves "a study of responses in other societies to problems that appear very [much] like the ones" experienced in one's "own educational system" [30, p. 2]. The ability to inquire comparatively is increasingly important for citizens in pluralistic environments because it enables them to suspend their judgments of unfamiliar people, places, and systems so as to understand and learn from those similarities and differences. Comparison – a study of how things are alike or different by giving attention to certain aspects through the copresence of the other [14, pp. 311–322] – can help people analyze their home cultures and systems with a better understanding of how social and cultural factors impact schooling and society.

As we argued in *Comparative Education: Exploring Issues in International Context* [24], Comparative Education helps educators, students, policy makers, and community members consider the kind of formal education that is appropriate for the kind of society desired and well-suited to the society that exists. Comparative Education has an important role to play, therefore, in helping educators to ask enduring social questions and to consider the kinds of relationships to be nurtured between schools and their respective communities. Because Comparative Education is not solely an academic exercise but has practical usefulness in reforming schooling [15, pp. 3–29], it is crucial that increased attention be given to Comparative Education in primary, secondary, and post-secondary settings in the U.S. This is especially important in light of evidence revealing a vast international knowledge gap between American students and their counterparts in other nations in relation to basic understanding of world geography, world history, and cultural diversity. Greater attention to Comparative Education in the U.S. could stimulate people’s curiosity of other nations, cultures, and social systems and, in turn, enable Americans to examine different cultures and values at a time when accountability and standards-based reform threatens to make educators more parochial in focus. For educators, the benefit is the realization that educators worldwide wrestle with similar issues impacting formal schooling and can gain insights from the global community of education professionals. Comparative Education’s practical value is that it can help educators decide what issues are of primary importance and facilitate their efforts to increase students’ cultural knowledge and classroom experiences [15, pp. 3–29].

### **History of Comparative Education as a Field**

Because Comparative Education draws from a host of disciplines such as political science, sociology, and anthropology in its examination of educational issues and phenomena, the skill of comparative perspective taking can play a central role in nurturing the critical aims of schooling. Comparative Education encourages educators to use multiple disciplines in posing questions that inform understanding of education and its influencing factors. Adherence to a single discipline and its specific analytical methods would limit understanding that can be gained from a host of disciplines. Thus, education is the unifying factor in Comparative Education, and the disciplines “come within the purview of Comparative Education only insofar as they are relevant to education and schools” [5].

Classic analysis of Comparative Education depicts the field’s progress in terms of its different historical stages of development. The first stage has been called “the period of travelers’ tales” where people’s interest in the unknown led to exploration around the world [28]. People observed social patterns and cultural communities to familiarize themselves with sociocultural practices in other locations. During the 19th century, a second stage of Comparative Education emerged called the period of educational borrowing [17, 18]. Educators themselves traveled to different countries to observe and describe foreign education systems in terms of organizational structure and methods to delineate what practices and approaches might be useful in their own schools and classrooms. The difficulty with their descriptions was that they were often based on personal impressions and judgments of the societal values they encountered. The well-known pioneer of the American common school movement, Horace Mann, visited a number of countries, including Germany (then Prussia), England, Scotland, Ireland, France, and Holland. Of particular interest to Mann was the Prussian system of education, which he felt might help to improve American education [30]. Although Mann provided descriptions of the techniques

and approaches encountered in each of the Prussian schools he observed [19], he provided “limited discussion of cultural contexts in which attractive ideas or practices had developed and into which they would be transplanted” [30].

Comparative educators in the 20th century were concerned with identifying the forces shaping foreign educational systems and used quantitative methods to explain the factors impacting formal education and society and to establish cause-effect patterns of influence [28]. However, Michael Sadler argued that an educational system was “not readily detachable but...intricately connected with the society that supports it” [5]. This led to concerns about the limitations of educational borrowing and often resulted in a reluctance to study nations outside the West due to the assumption that historically similar backgrounds and cultures could be more easily controlled and quantified. Many comparative educators restricted their investigations to studies in Western nations of school achievement, educational standards, and teacher qualifications. Throughout the century, comparative educators took the view that wholesale adoption of education from one country to another was shortsighted and that one must consider observed practices and interpretations of those practices strictly in light of the differing social, political, economic, and cultural contexts in which they occur.

The third stage of Comparative Education is characterized as one of international cooperation, peace, and understanding [4]. Comparative Education’s goal is to improve the quality of citizens’ lives through the sharing of educational knowledge, structures, and pedagogy with the aim of expanding educational provision and educational quality worldwide. However, the extent to which cross-cultural sharing has been mutual and reciprocal between countries is debatable. Colonial legacies and homogenizing tendencies of Westernization in schooling worldwide suggest that education may be more a reflection of the policies and practices of developed nations than opportunities for self-realization and self-determination in developing country contexts. Certainly curiosity about the unfamiliar and unknown, the quest for best educational practices, and the need for international cooperation are all motivations driving the field of Comparative Education today.

Although such classifications (e.g., traveler’s tales, educational borrowing, and international cooperation) may delineate different eras in the field’s development, these stages often occur simultaneously [24]. Moreover, there may be other ways to characterize Comparative Education’s progress historically or to describe the field in less historical terms. For instance, Arnove (2001) stressed Comparative Education’s co-existing dimensions (i.e., the theoretical/analytical, the ameliorative, and the international/global). These kinds of classifications, however, may be perceived as linear and bounded and may therefore unnecessarily constrain comparative educators in seeking new understandings of the field’s progression and potential. Moreover, the work of comparing education is not restricted to scholars who align themselves with the field’s primary professional community, namely the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES). Although scholars most closely associated with the field have readily critiqued the limitations of transporting educational practices across cultures, in reality pursuit of precisely this kind of borrowing is demonstrated in projects such as the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), which provides data on student achievement in these subject areas. However, by extension, this has generated ranking of American education in relation to education systems elsewhere. Achievement findings like TIMSS are then promulgated through federally supported avenues (e.g., the U.S. Department of Education’s National

Center for Education Statistics), reflecting a centralized impetus toward accountability, and also legitimizing such findings and implicating the need for local and state responsiveness as a national priority. In light of the competitiveness demonstrated by this use of international comparison, it is reasonable to argue that “international cooperation and understanding” is more a vision of the way things ought to be than it is an established stage. Educational comparison in the U.S. is articulated in terms of international economic competitiveness and as a measure of economic standing relative to that of other nations. Comparative perspective taking [24] is an end for which the field of Comparative Education is uniquely suited and that is supportive of mutual cross-cultural learning. Yet, the most persistent and visible contemporary use of educational comparison in the U.S. is competitive rather than reciprocal in nature.

### **Comparative Education’s Place in American Education**

Comparative Education as a subject area can be found in some schools and colleges of education throughout the United States. The Council of Learned Societies in Education [11] has identified Comparative Education as a major academic approach that helps to define foundations of education. Thus, many programs and courses in Comparative Education are often housed within educational foundation units or departments at American universities. The objective of Comparative Education, like other courses in the foundations (e.g., philosophy of education, history of education, and sociology of education), is to help students to critically examine educational policies and practices and to develop “an awareness of education and schooling in light of their complex relations to the enviroing culture” [11]. Comparative Education, however, is often missing as a course requirement in many education degree programs in American higher education institutions. Without this option, it is unlikely that instructors in the other foundations courses will incorporate cross-national, cross-cultural dimensions in their curricula. This stance is supported by evidence that when international perspectives are found in general foundations texts, they are often relegated to one chapter or drawn upon intermittently, “leaving the comparative perspective undefined and unintegrated as a conceptual tool for interpreting educational assumptions and practices” [24]. American comparativists such as Isaac Kandel and Robert Ulich were attentive to the foundations of education and concerned with “the social causes behind the pedagogical scene” [5, pp. 7–8]. Thus, the systematic analysis of broader social and cultural factors and policy aspects that Comparative Education provides is generally missing from undergraduate teacher certification programs. When Comparative Education is found in graduate schools or colleges of education in the U.S., it may not be required but offered instead as one of several options in the foundations of education.

The accountability movement, and the attendant market demands to produce a steady supply of teachers, has resulted in teacher preparation curriculum that is limited in duration and scope and that is increasingly shaped by externally imposed standards and characterized by measurable teacher “competencies.” Within such a curriculum, there is little room for educators to consider who benefits from formal education and whose knowledge and culture are valued and not valued in schools. Because Comparative Education is marginalized, if not entirely excluded from the curriculum, teacher preparation students have limited opportunity to consider schooling’s underlying assumptions and to reflect on the gaps between stated educational objectives and actual educational outcomes [24]. Moreover, cross-cultural perspectives and international understanding take on greater urgency in the increasingly global world in which teachers operate. Howard

Gardner [16, p. 250] has contended that global issues such as ecological balance, energy conservation, poverty reduction, disease prevention, and anti-terrorism “all require input from the syntheses of various forms of disciplinary knowledge and methods”. The task for educators is to foster students’ global awareness and international competence through the development of skills in multidisciplinary analysis. The “multi-disciplinary origins and nature” of the Comparative Education field “position it well for further advancement in a future in which the socio-cultural analysis of global trends and developments will require concerted attention” [12, pp. 319–332]. As Gerald Gutek [17, 18] has reminded, two functions of teachers’ work include fostering students’ identity as American citizens and as members of a global society – students, in short, who recognize the possibilities for human development and who address the challenges to human survival that transcend national boundaries. Whether the U.S. government and education policy makers will make Comparative Education a priority of American education reform efforts and insist on its inclusion in schools and universities is still to be acknowledged and realized.

### **Contemporary Directions in Comparative Education**

George Bereday [5], considered the father of Comparative Education in the U.S., argued that Comparative Education’s “intellectual purpose” was “to search for lessons that can be deduced from the variations in educational practice in different societies”. Comparative inquiry not only enhances one’s understanding of other nations and cultures but also helps one to know oneself. For Bereday, “It is self-knowledge born of the awareness of others that is the finest lesson comparative education can afford”. By the late 1970s, a number of comparative educators were influenced by the work of Michael Apple [1] who examined the internal workings of American schools and discussed how curriculum, pedagogy, and other schooling processes served to maintain social inequities and even hide the particular economic and political interests of the dominant culture. The educational excellence and education accountability movement that started in the 1980s drew greater attention to the study of educational expansion and reform efforts in different nations with some attention given to educational opportunities and lack of opportunities afforded learners around the globe. Thus, socioeconomic, ethnic group, and school-society concerns were studied by comparative educators [22, pp. 505–533]. Comparative studies of nation-states, social movements, educational centralization and decentralization, and conceptions of equity continue to receive attention from scholars in the field [2, pp. 477–503].

Presidential remarks offered during annual meetings of the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) – the established North American professional organization of comparativists – provide a window into the contemporary status and direction of the field. An overview from the past decade highlights a few recurring emphases, including the primacy of the comparativist’s role as researcher, the field’s dedication to global justice and equity, and the tension between the local (particular) and the global (general). First, presidential addresses have clearly tended to appeal to the comparativist’s identity as researcher at the relative exclusion of the comparativist’s instructional role. Thus, university faculty, whose work is judged within the institution in terms of knowledge discovery, dominates the professional organization’s membership. Emphasis on the researcher role of the CIES membership is mirrored by the nature of CIES conferences themselves, given their focus almost exclusively on the findings emanating from research studies or methodological concerns related to the research process. The external public, however, views teaching rather than research as the hallmark of higher education.

The second common thread, regarding organizational commitment to global justice and equity, is reflected, for example, in the presidential remarks of Carlos Torres [31] who exhorted comparativists to develop theories and perspectives that might help lessen or eliminate social difference and inequity. Robert Arnove [2] encouraged the comparative education community to harness insights and specialized perspectives in order, for instance, to positively influence the use of information technology to ensure the inclusion of “views from ‘the margins’ and grassroots initiatives that challenge existing power structures” (p. 481). Heidi Ross, addressing the CIES in 2002, encouraged the membership to consider relational theory as a means for gaining better understanding of “the space between us” (p. 407), thus enabling us to address and undo “the ease with which we dehumanize each other” (p. 411). To the extent that democratic processes are a corrective to social injustices, Noel McGinn [27, p. 342] reminded the CIES membership of the lessons that international democratization efforts might offer to the American domestic context, given diminishing participation in democratic processes such as elections and the general spirit of distrust observed in the U.S. toward “all forms of collective action”. And, Karen Biraimah [6, p. 432] noted that societal transformation is dependent on comparative educators returning their research interests to the classroom setting because “dependence on quantitative/economic assessment measures may limit a true understanding of schooling, equity, and appropriate educational outcomes”.

Finally, in the CIES presidential addresses reviewed, a third strand concerns the tensions within the field about the purpose of comparative research. The identification of comparable educational situations, structures, approaches, and results are often pitted against an overriding interest in the particular, local, and unique contexts of education. As Arnove [2, p. 478] argued in his own retrospective of CIES commentaries and contributions, “calls have come from comparativists working within different and at times competing paradigms” to urge both “improvements in large-scale quantitative cross-national studies ... [and] refinements in smaller scale qualitative case studies”. And, Arnove noted the efforts of Bray and Thomas [7] to include the individual, classroom, and school contexts as units for geographical/location analyses. In general, however, the recent tilt of the research published by members of the comparative education community in the U.S. has been toward the local side of this debate. This tilt has long-standing historical antecedent in U.S. government-supported area studies programs [20]. However, American school curriculum and the Comparative Education field as a whole have largely neglected attention to ecological perspectives that would enable the identification of patterns that engage (connect) or disengage (destroy) human possibilities [23]. Although indigenous perspectives often link the personal and sacred to the environment, Victor Kobayashi [23] has argued that cultures may fall apart due to ignorance of local ecosystems. Comparative educators, therefore, should consider the biological universe to inform studies of education and society. To encourage attention to the global side, William Cummings [13, p. 413] challenged members of the society to “Compare, compare, compare!”, and, Ruth Hayhoe [21, p. 423], in her presidential address a year later, asserted the need for “metanarratives” that might provide coherent frameworks for understanding multiple observed phenomena.

### **Comparative Education Texts, Curricular Sources, and Instructional Emphases**

In the past several years, a number of books have become available for use in comparative education courses. In *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local* (1999 and 2003), Arnove and Torres and their contributing authors illuminate local, national, and regional responses to “the workings of a global economy and the increasing

interconnectedness of societies” [23], which raise common problems for schools, societies, and educators around the world. To pursue better understanding of the interaction between global and local tendencies and the often-contradictory nature of this interaction, the selected essays generally undertake broad aspects such as women’s education, educational control, and centralization and decentralization of school governance, which are explored in terms of a particular region or country.

Other recent texts include pedagogical features more typical of a textbook format. Among these, both *Education in a Global Society: A Comparative Perspective* [25] and *Schooling Around the World: Debates, Challenges, and Practices* [26], are similar to Arnove and Torres’ book to the extent that they consist of chapters contributed by many authors. These books are also comparable in that each chapter tends to focus on a single national context. Each chapter in *Schooling Around the World* seeks to bring to the fore a particular contemporary educational challenge within a single country (e.g., shifting policy within the changing post-Soviet Russian Federation and capitalization and economic competitiveness in China). Gutek, author of *American Education in a Global Society* (1993 and 2006), maintains a similar single-country focus, but, similar to the Mazurek, Winzer, and Marjorek [26] compilation, tends to center attention upon the systems and structures of the selected countries rather than upon a specific trend or issue. In a separate segment of his book, Gutek dedicates considerable additional attention to international education and globalization as a contemporary phenomenon, and he provides particular contextualization in terms of the American perspective.

Our own textbook, *Comparative Education: Exploring Issues in International Context* [24], combines some of the attributes mentioned above. Like Mazurek and Winzer [25] and Arnove and Torres [4], we undertake contemporary concerns such as globalization. In addition, however, we explore educational issues that are, we argue, fundamental wherever formal education is undertaken, such as achieving educational access and opportunity and clarifying the multiple and often contradictory purposes of schooling. Each of the major chapters of the Kubow and Fossum text draws two countries into simultaneous focus, providing treatment that is more overtly comparative in nature and thus distinguishing this text from the other recent books discussed.

Erwin Epstein and his graduate students at Loyola University of Chicago have conducted an ongoing study (i.e., Comparative and International Education Course Archive Project or CIECAP) of the position of the field of Comparative Education in the United States. Their work suggests that the curricular materials chiefly employed in the classrooms of comparativists are eclectic in nature, diverse in focus, and abundant in number. As such, a textbook is rarely an anchoring feature of the curriculum, even in introductory classes where textbook use might be most expected. Among books mentioned here, Arnove and Torres’ text is in widest use, but articles from a vast array of authors tend to comprise course readings, sometimes complementing a selected textbook but more often than not substituting for a course textbook. One CIECAP [9, 10] analysis lists nearly 2,000 sources in use by well over 500 authors and authorship teams. The number of journals from which classroom materials are drawn totals over 65 [9, 10], although the journals most regularly used as curricular sources include the three English-language journals strictly dedicated to comparative education, namely *Comparative Education Review*, *Compare*, and *Comparative Education*.

Like the curricular materials used, the topics emphasized in comparative education classes further reflect the diversity of instructors’ interests, research emphases, and areas of geographic, thematic, or methodological expertise. Coverage of theory and international

development tend to be prominent in course syllabi. Gender and women's issues are chosen as a thematic focus in over half of the introductory comparative education classes, while globalization and the organization of schools and national education systems continue to receive substantial attention [9, 10].

**Conclusion.** Comparative perspective taking on educational issues enables people to recognize that fundamental challenges transcend national boundaries and that every country, in addressing these challenges, wrestles with the contradictions within and between its societal ideals and its educational realities. Presently, American students lack knowledge, information, and skills to effectively wrestle with philosophical questions and social issues. This is due, in large part, to the climate of surveillance that accompanies the accountability movement in the U.S. – an outlook that has shifted public attention toward, and held it upon, measurable outcomes as opposed to more philosophical and nuanced discussions. Comparativists are in a position to adopt a more prominent role in working with primary and secondary teachers on the integration of philosophical, sociological, political, and global dimensions in American classrooms and schools. To address this need, the professional organization, CIES, will need to encourage shifts in its members' roles from the present strictly researcher-centered identity to an identity that is more dual in character – one that acknowledges members' roles as instructors as well as researchers. This will require that comparativists rethink their future direction in light of this dual identity, pursuing and accommodating environments for sustained discussion about issues of instruction, teaching practice, and teaching roles, as well as continued research and knowledge discovery. Toward that end, comparative educators in the U.S. will need to clearly articulate the usefulness of the field at the grassroots level. Primary and secondary teachers need to know the potential that Comparative Education holds in their development as thoughtful education professionals. “As its final aim, Comparative Education hopes to relax national pride to permit events and voices from abroad to count in the continued reappraisal and re-examination of schools” in the U.S. and elsewhere [5, P-7].

### References

1. *Apple, M.* (1978): Ideology, reproduction, and educational reform. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.28, No.4, pp.550-562.
2. *Arnove, R. F.* (2001): Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) facing the twenty-first century: Challenges and contributions. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.45, No.4, pp.477-503.
3. *Arnove, R. F.* (2003): Introduction: Reframing comparative education. In *Arnove, R. F. & Torres, C. A.* (Eds.), *Comparative Education: The dialectic of the global and the local*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp.1-23.
4. *Arnove, R. F. & Torres, C. A.* (Eds.). (1999 & 2003): *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
5. *Bereday, G. Z. F.* (1964): *Comparative method in education*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
6. *Biraimah, K. L.* (2003): Transforming education, transforming ourselves: Contributions and lessons learned. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.47, No.4, pp.423-443.
7. *Bray, M. & Thomas, R. M.* (1995): Levels of comparison in educational studies: Different insights from different literatures and the value of multilevel analysis. *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol.65, No.3, pp.472-490.

8. CIECAP: Comparative and International Education Course Archive Project (2006a): Authors in CIECAP database. Retrieved September 22, 2006 from: <http://www.luc.edu/education/cce/ciecap/index.shtml>
9. CIECAP: Comparative and International Education Course Archive Project (2006b): Journals cited in comparative education course outlines. Retrieved September 22, 2006 from: <http://www.luc.edu/education/cce/ciecap/index.shtml>
10. CIECAP: Comparative and International Education Course Archive Project (2006c): Introductory Courses in comparative education: Topics cover. Retrieved September 22, 2006 from: <http://www.luc.edu/education/cce/ciecap/index.shtml>
11. Council of Learned Societies in Education. (1996): Standards for academic and professional instruction in foundations of education, educational studies, and educational policy studies. 2nd edition. San Francisco, CA: Caddo Gap Press.
12. *Crossley, M.* (2000): Bridging cultures and traditions in the reconceptualisation of comparative and international education. *Comparative Education*, Vol.36, No.3, pp.319-332.
13. *Cummings, W. K.* (1999): The institutions of education: Compare, compare, compare! *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.43, No.4, pp.413-437.
14. *Eckstein, M.* (1983): The comparative mind. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.27, No.3, pp.311—322.
15. *Epstein, E.* (1983): Currents left and right: Ideology in Comparative Education. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.27, No. 1, pp.3-29.
16. *Gardner, H.* (2004): How education changes: Considerations of history, science, and values. In Suarez-Orozco, M. M. & Qin-Hilliard, D. B. (Eds.), *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, pp.235-258.
17. *Gutek, G. L.* (1993): American education in a global society: Internationalizing teacher education. New York, NY: Longman.
18. *Gutek, G. L.* (2006): American education in a global society: International and comparative perspectives. 2nd edition. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
19. *Hans, N.* (1967): *Comparative Education: A study of educational factors and traditions*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
20. *Hawkins, J. N. & Rust, V. D.* (2001): Shifting perspectives on comparative research: A view from the USA. *Comparative Education*, Vol.37, No.4, pp.501-506.
21. *Hayhoe, R.* (2000): Redeeming modernity. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.44, No.4, pp.423-439.
22. *Kelly, G. P., Altbach, P. G. & Arnove, R. F.* (1982): Trends in Comparative Education: A critical analysis. In Altbach, P. G., Arnove, R. F. & G. P. Kelly (Eds.), *Comparative Education*. New York, NY: Macmillan, pp.505-533.
23. *Kobayashi, V.* (2007): Recursive patterns that engage and disengage: Comparative Education, research, and practice. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.51, No.3, pp.261-280.
24. *Kubow, P. K. & Fossum, P. R.* (2003 & 2007): *Comparative Education: Exploring issues in international context*. 1st and 2nd editions. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education/Merrill Prentice Hall.
25. *Mazurek, K. & Winzer, M. A.* (Eds.) (2006): *Schooling around the world: Debates, challenges, and practices*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon/Pearson Education.
26. *Mazurek, K., Winzer, M. A. & Majorek, C.* (Eds.) (2000): *Education in a global society: A comparative perspective*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon/Pearson Education.

27. *McGinn, N. F.* (1996): Education, democratization, and globalization: A challenge for Comparative Education. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.40, No. 4, pp. 341-357.
28. *Noah, H. J. & Eckstein, M. A.* (1998): *Doing Comparative Education: Three decades of collaboration.* Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
29. *Ross, H.* (2002): The space between us: The relevance of relational theories to comparative and international education. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.46, No. 4, pp. 407-432.
30. *Trethewey, A. R.* (1976): *Introducing Comparative Education.* Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
31. *Torres, C. A.* (1998): Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.42, No. 4, pp. 421-447.

*Патрисія К. Кубов, Пол Р. Фосум*  
**ПОРІВНЯЛЬНА ПЕДАГОГІКА В США**

Статтю присвячено питанню становлення та розвитку порівняльної педагогіки у Сполучених Штатах Америки; у роботі ґрунтовно висвітлено проблеми історії компаративної педагогіки як окремої наукової площини; досліджено місце порівняльної педагогіки в американській педагогічній науці; визначено сучасні напрями її розвитку; проаналізовано найважливіші наукові тексти та навчальні джерела, що стосуються порівняльної педагогіки та її місця у світовому науковому просторі.

**Ключові слова:** порівняльна педагогіка, історія порівняльної педагогіки, місце порівняльної педагогіки в американській освіті, США.

*Патрисія К. Кубов, Пол Р. Фосум*  
**СРАВНИТЕЛЬНАЯ ПЕДАГОГИКА В США**

Статья посвящена вопросу становления и развития сравнительной педагогики в Соединенных Штатах Америки. В работе детально освещены проблемы истории компаративной педагогики как отдельной научной области; исследовано место сравнительной педагогики в американской педагогической науке; определены современные направления ее развития; проанализированы важнейшие научные тексты и учебные источники, касающиеся сравнительной педагогики и ее места в мировом научном пространстве.

**Ключевые слова:** сравнительная педагогика, история сравнительной педагогики, место сравнительной педагогики в американском образовании, США.

