Comparative education is as old as the custom of visiting countries other than one’s own.

Fraser and Brickman

A brief history

‘Comparative education’ as a term has a long history, though the use of comparison in texts that make some reference to education (broadly understood) can be traced back many centuries before the term began to be employed. Some authors regard the Histories of Herodotus as the earliest text in which education is implicitly considered beyond the boundaries of the writer’s own state (though Herodotus goes into very little detail: he records, briefly, that in Persia ‘the period of a boy’s education is between the ages of five and twenty, and they are taught three things only: to ride, to use the bow, and to speak the truth’); others take Xenophon’s Cyropaedia, with its comparisons of training for citizenship in Greece and Persia, as the earliest source in which education is specifically mentioned in a comparative context, though much of what is said about Persia has been seen as utopian fiction.

We might argue that the dissemination – since the early modern period – of significant educational texts outside of the countries in which they were written contributed to the widespread comparison of educational ideas and therefore had an intrinsically comparative role. Rousseau’s Émile (1762) would be a case in point, as might Locke’s earlier work, Some Thoughts Concerning Education (1693). But it is in the early years of the nineteenth century that we can see the beginnings of a deliberate and
systematic attempt to compare educational provision ‘elsewhere’ with that ‘at home’. Increased travel opportunities and international communication – which had been interrupted in Europe by the Napoleonic wars – brought educational issues to the attention of commentators of all kinds who were interested in travelling to other countries and reporting in detail on what they observed.

Noah and Eckstein postulate five stages in the development of comparative education which, they argue, are not ‘discrete in time’:

1. travellers’ tales
2. travellers with a specific educational focus; learning through example; improving circumstances at home
3. understanding of other nations; detailed accumulation of information; educational exchange
4. study of ‘national character’ and its deterministic role in shaping national systems of education
5. quantitative research; explanation of educational phenomena.

Another way of looking at the phases of development in comparative inquiry in education, which complements Noah and Eckstein’s approach, is to describe a sequential chain of emphases beginning at certain broadly defined historical points and continuing alongside the already existing emphases, while modifying them in various ways. This is attempted in Figure 3.

This chain of development begins with a limitation on the part of observers to description. It then moves to a period, from around the 1830s for the most part (though there are some earlier examples), when the investigation of foreign systems of education began to have an identifiable political purpose – to inform the national debate with both positive and negative examples of experience in other countries and to try to identify ideas and practices that might be imported or ‘borrowed’. This general political purpose was strengthened when the collection of statistical information became more sophisticated: as the nineteenth century progressed, there was increasing effort to quantify and record, so that political arguments could be supported or attacked on the basis of ‘hard’ evidence. Much statistical information could in turn be used in analyses of socio-economic factors, and so our fourth phase introduces efforts to understand social phenomena and their relation to economic conditions. Much of the more significant early work of comparativists belongs to this tradition. More recently there has been a focus on international surveys of educational outcomes, most
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notably manifest in large-scale comparisons of educational achievement. And at the same time there has been a tendency to look at education within an investigation of globalizing trends, where we find significant analyses of the tensions between global pressures for education to converge, and divergent local cultural and resource realities. Currently there are various theorists working in a generally postmodern context and developing new analytical approaches to the notion of comparison in education. We see each new phase as existing together with earlier traditions, so that the task of comparison becomes ever more sophisticated and diverse in approach. Each of our phases (‘emphases’) does not replace what has preceded it.

The first of Noah and Eckstein’s five stages (recall that these stages are not ‘discrete in time’) – the ‘description’ phase in our Figure 3 – comprises the time when travellers brought back tales of what they had observed. These tales formed ‘the most primitive […] observations’, originating in curiosity and emphasizing the exotic so as to produce stark contrast with the norm at home: ‘Only the rare observer could extract systematic conclusions with explanatory value from a mass of indiscriminately reported impressions’. The travellers who fall into Noah and Eckstein’s first stage were visiting other countries out of cultural and general intellectual curiosity, and they constitute a very large group, writing with varying degrees of sophistication and providing sometimes rich descriptions of a wide range of aspects of
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Figure 3  Historical emphases in comparative analysis
education. They belong to a tradition which continues today, and it is a
tradition which should not be glibly dismissed as having been superseded
by later approaches.

One of the earliest of such travellers in the nineteenth century was
John Quincy Adams (1767–1848), who wrote an account, published in
1804, devoted to his travels in Silesia in 1800–1. Adams was then the US
Minister Plenipotentiary in Berlin. Himself the son of a president, he
became the sixth US president in 1825. In a letter from Berlin of March
1801, Adams writes favourably of the educational policies of Frederick
the Great; he argues that it was due to ‘the zeal with which he pursued the
purpose of spreading useful knowledge among all classes of his subjects’
that, compared to the USA, ‘probably, no country in Europe could so
strongly contest our pre-eminence in [elementary education] as Germany’.6
He highlights the training of teachers and covers various other details of
educational provision in Silesia, and he initiates – with this attention to
educational issues – a long process of serious examination of education in
Prussia that was to exercise the minds of policy-makers in the USA, Great
Britain, and France throughout the century.7

While Adams was representative of an intelligent and well-informed
approach to educational questions, others who wrote travellers’ tales
reported on the more eye-catching aspects of what they had observed, or
warned against any attempt to learn from foreign experience. Here is an
arrogant warning from 1818, at the time the Continent was opening up to
travellers again following the defeat of Napoleon:

Let the traveller remember that he is called not to import the principles or
habits of foreign nations into his own, but to export to those less favoured
countries the principles and practices he has learned at home.8

The following is an example of a trivial observation expounded upon for
effect; it is included in an account of travels in Westphalia in 1797:

The Germans bring up their children with great tenderness, but in a manner
to prevent the effects of effeminacy, or the ordinary ailments proceeding
therefrom. I have seen the sons and daughters of gentlemen run through the
dew of the morning without shoes, stockings, or any under garments, but
shirts and shifts […] . About noon, when there seems the less real necessity to
wrap up, they begin to put on, just in the proportion as other children throw
off; but they all look as healthy as if they were educated in the way of England.9

And we can see almost its mirror image in observations recorded earlier by
Carl Philipp Moritz during his travels in England in 1782:
English boys remain true to nature until a certain age. What a contrast when I think of our six-year-old, pimpled, pampered Berlin boys, with great hair-nets and all the paraphernalia of an adult, even to being dressed in lace-trimmed coats, and compare these with the English boys in the flower of youth – lithe, red-cheeked, with open-breasted shirts, hair cut and curling naturally. Here in England it is unusual to meet a blotchy-faced boy or young man, or one with deformed features and disproportionate limbs. Were it so in Berlin a really handsome man would not be so conspicuous.  

These are typical early examples of travellers’ tales which remain at the level of superficiality. They are subjective snapshots of observed phenomena, singled out for their bizarre or exotic character and with no serious implications for the transfer of notions and practices. Although they belong in Noah and Eckstein’s first stage and our wholly descriptive first phase, we can still find examples today – particularly in the popular press – of sensational reporting of the perceived character of educational practice ‘elsewhere’. Perhaps the most notorious example is the spurious story, reported ad nauseam, of the French minister of education looking at his watch and saying that at this exact time all French pupils are on page so-and-so of a particular textbook in whatever subject. The exaggeration here serves simply, of course, to illustrate the centralized nature of education in France. Here, for a change, is an example along the same lines from Hungary:

If one says ‘So-and-so’s son is in the fifth class of the Gymnasium’, a Hungarian at once knows that the boy in question is about fourteen to fifteen years of age, […] and that at present he is encouraged to appreciate the beauties of Ovid and the lighter verse of Heine and Goethe.  

The early travellers who wrote so engagingly on their impressions of educational provision have left a rich source of description intended for the consumption of a wide popular readership. They were able at least to identify some of the themes – for example, the nature of the state’s role in education and associated issues such as compulsory attendance and religious education – which would be the subject of more organized systematic inquiry by specialist observers as the century progressed.

Stage two of Noah and Eckstein’s developmental division of comparative education – which overlaps with the first – introduces the notion of what can be learnt and assimilated from foreign systems, in effect what can be ‘borrowed’. This is essentially a political objective, and so we see this stage as the beginning of a phase of political analysis (Figure 3) of the situation
‘elsewhere’, with the aim of informing policy ‘at home’. Notions of policy borrowing remain a significant theme in the work of comparativists today. We might cite here observations by Frances Trollope, a prolific and popular commentator on other countries (and mother of the novelist Anthony Trollope), who visited Germany in 1833 and reported enthusiastically on her perceptions of education in Prussia. She is remembered in particular for the indignant reaction her opinionated account of the United States, *Domestic Manners of the Americans* (1832), received. As far as her account of Germany is concerned, Trollope is representative of a bridging point between simple description and arguments in the direction of learning lessons from the foreign example.

In this little village, as in every other part of the kingdom of Prussia, the education of the people is the business of the state. So deeply are the benevolent and philosophical lawgivers of this enlightened country impressed with the belief that the only sure method of rendering a people preeminently great and happy, is to spread the light of true knowledge among them, that the government leaves not the duty of providing instruction for the children of the land to the unthinking caprice of their ignorant parents; but provides for them teachers and books; selected with a degree of vigilant circumspection which would do honour to the affection and judgment of the tenderest father. Nor is this all:- not only are the means of instruction thus amply and admirably provided, but the children of the people are not permitted to absent themselves from school on any plea except that of sickness, which must be authenticated by the certificate of a physician.12

Trollope then contrasts this impression with educational provision in England:

And how is this all-important business transacted with us? In some places, a teacher is appointed by the clergyman, who would regulate his parish school with the same anxious care which he exercises in the government of his own family. In others, some vain and canting Lady Bountiful has the power of nomination, – and selects a person who shall look sharply after the uniform, and take care that the children show themselves off well, upon all public occasions.

In one village, a staunch constitutional Tory shall exert his utmost influence that the little people about him may be brought up to fear God and honour the king. He may watchfully see them led to the venerated church of their fathers, and teach them to look up, with equal love and respect, to the institutions of their country.

In the very next, perhaps, a furious demagogue may insist that every
lesson shall inculcate the indefeasible right to rebel. And, if the poor rogues be taught any religion at all, it may be with the understanding that each and every of them, when they are big enough, will have as good a right to be paid for preaching as the parson of the parish.

What can that whole be, which is formed of such discordant elements? And would it not be better for our rulers even to enforce such a mode of instruction as might give a chance of something like a common national feeling among the people of England, instead of letting them be blown about with every wind of doctrine, as they are at present?  

Fanny Trollope was typical of a number of writers who commented on education alongside other aspects of the society of countries they visited as intelligent observers. Later in the century, for example, the French philosopher Hippolyte Taine recorded his impression of education in England, making contrasts with provision in France. He spent time at Eton and Harrow (from which generalizations should not have been possible) and at the University of Oxford. Here is his view of the character-forming aspects of the teaching he observed:

All the boys I saw in their class-rooms, in the fields and streets, have a ‘healthy and active air’. Obviously, at least in my view, they are both more childish and more manly than our own boys: more childish in that they are fonder of games and less disposed to overstep the limits of their age, more manly in that they are more capable of decision and action and self-government. Whereas the French schoolboy, especially the boarders in our colleges, is bored, soured, fined-down, precocious, far too precocious. He is in a cage and his imagination ferments. In all these respects, and in what concerns the formation of character, English education is better; It is better preparation for the world and it turns out more wholesome spirits.

At the same time as European and American comparativists were looking to other countries to understand their education systems, and to seek examples of education policy and practice to be ‘borrowed’, a related, but distinctly different, process was happening in parts of the world colonized by European powers. The perspectives of the time – which now appear distinctly ethnocentric and indeed racist – moved educationists to look for ways to provide what they deemed to be appropriate education for the ‘natives’ of these regions. Classic and illustrative examples of this process are found in the reports of the Phelps-Stokes Educational Commissions to West, South and Equatorial Africa and East Africa in the early 1920s. These commissions had the following descriptive and meliorist purposes:
To inquire as to the educational work being done at present in each of the areas to be studied.

To investigate the educational needs of the people in the light of the religious, social, hygienic and economic conditions.

To ascertain to what extent these needs are being met.

To assist in the formulation of plans designed to meet the educational needs of the Native races.

To make available the full results of this study.\textsuperscript{15}

In the wake of the First World War, the commissions saw these aims as both altruistic and self-interested:

... everything possible should be done to remove possible causes of serious friction or danger even in a continent so 'remote' from the great political capitals of the world as Africa. As long as any portion of it, or of any other continent, suffers because of disease or superstition or prejudice or ignorance, the elements are at hand out of which a conflagration, which might later gain world proportions, may be fanned into a flame.\textsuperscript{16}

The areas deemed suitable for the educational development of the 'Negro masses' were character development, health and hygiene, agriculture and gardening, industrial skill, home economics, and 'healthful recreations', along with the 'three Rs' – reading, writing, and arithmetic. While there was a recognition that the type of education needed in Africa might be different from that needed in more 'civilized' nations, this verdict was guided not so much by an understanding of the context as by a low opinion of the capacities of Africans, a desire to bring what was perceived as the best of European and American culture to a selected elite, and the power of colonizers to impose policies on the colonies. Shaped by the attitudes of the time, the descriptions and recommendations of the Phelps-Stokes reports, while not commissioned or produced by colonizing nations, were influential in shaping colonial education policy.

But the notion of borrowing was gradually questioned as educational systems came to be regarded as interwoven in the fabric of their society. As we have seen, the person who did most to establish this principle in comparative education was Michael Sadler, who headed the Office of Special Inquiries and Reports in London from 1895 to 1903. Sadler oversaw an impressive effort at examining educational issues in other countries, with the intention of informing discussion in England. The poet and man of letters Matthew Arnold, an earlier official – he was an inspector of schools – who had played a significant role in bringing
foreign practice in education to the attention of British policy-makers, had made it clear how he saw the notion of ‘borrowing’: ‘I hope with time to convince people;’ he wrote in 1868, ‘that I do not care the least for importing this or that foreign machinery, whether it be French or German, but only for getting certain English deficiencies supplied.’

And the Oxford academic Mark Pattison, who served with Arnold as an assistant commissioner for the Newcastle Commission on the state of popular education in England (1858), recorded a similar view: ‘Much rather is every one who has any information on foreign systems to give, called upon to come forward with it, not as precedent to be followed, but as material for deliberation.’

Methods of data collection improved throughout the century, and informed observers had at their disposal a growing body of information which could be used to inform discussion based on comparison. And increasing numbers of influential people had spent time travelling or studying abroad.

Though he made little impact in his own day, an early investigator who has had lasting significance for comparativists is Marc-Antoine Jullien, whose *Esquisse d’un Ouvrage sur l’Éducation Comparée (Plan for a Work on Comparative Education)* appeared in 1816–17. Jullien is often regarded as the father of comparative education, principally because he used the term in his famous work and because he proposed a systematic empirical investigation, by means of a questionnaire, to facilitate comparison of educational provision between nations:

Series of questions on each branch of education and instruction, drawn up in advance and classified under uniform headings, would be given to intellectual and active men of sound judgment, of known moral conduct, who would search for solutions in public and private educational institutions, which they would have the mission of visiting and observing on different points.

Jullien’s questionnaire is a remarkably thorough document, anticipating the kind of investigations which only became common much later. It was conceived as six series of questions, covering ‘primary and common education’, ‘secondary and classical education’, ‘higher and scientific education’, ‘normal education’, ‘education of girls’ and ‘education as it is related to legislation and social institutions’. In the event, only the first two series appeared in Jullien’s *Esquisse*. There is a note to the effect that the remaining four series ‘will be published immediately’, but they have not
been discovered. Here is a sample of the questions included in the first series:

31. What is the number of students in the primary schools in the commune or in the district?
32. What is the proportion of the total number of these students to that of the population of the commune or of the district?
33. Approximately how many students are grouped under a single director or teacher?
34. At which age are children admitted to the primary schools?
35. Are children of both sexes admitted to the same school, and until what age?
36. Do children undergo, at the time of their entrance to primary school, and during the course of their studies, examinations adapted to produce an appreciation of their faculties and the progress of their instruction? How do these examinations take place?
37. Is care taken to separate the children of the same school into several classes or sections, and according to what basis is this division determined?
38. Are arrangements made among the [children] which allow them to mutually help and teach one another?
39. How much time is spent with an ordinary child to make him familiar with reading, writing, and mathematics?
40. At what age approximately do children leave primary school?20

Questions of such detail were to be asked later in the century in the course of various surveys undertaken in England in connection with the work of official committees charged with reporting on the state of educational provision in the country21 and we shall return to them in Chapter 5. Jullien’s questions remained theoretical, however, and so we have no systematically collected comparative data on the complex topics he wished to see addressed for the second decade of the nineteenth century.

Two significant early investigators of foreign systems of education, who lead us into Noah and Eckstein’s third stage and our phase of systematic (including statistical) data collection, were the Frenchman Victor Cousin (1792–1867) and the American Horace Mann (1796–1859). They both produced influential texts based on thorough knowledge of what was happening in education in Germany and elsewhere.22

Cousin’s book Rapport sur l’état de l’Instruction Publique dans quelques pays de l’Allemagne (Report on the State of Public Education in Some Parts of Germany) appeared in 1833 and was published in English translation in
the following year. It was to be frequently cited in contemporary and later writing in England and the USA, and it counts as one of the most influential texts in the context of the discussion of educational provision and the role of the state in the early nineteenth century. In his Digest of Cousin’s Report, J. Orville Taylor, Professor of Popular Education at New York University, enthused over the ‘lively interest’ it had sparked in France and England, and argued that ‘from the results of this great experiment in giving the whole people that kind and degree of instruction which they need, some of the most useful and practical lessons may be obtained.’

Cousin’s report focused on primary instruction, not unnaturally so at a time when the main topic of debate was how best to establish national systems of elementary education. The year 1833 saw the first financial support to educational provision on the part of the state in England, when Parliament voted £20,000 for the building of schools. This sum was reckoned to be about one-twentieth of the Prussian Government’s annual expenditure on education, the equivalent to half the yearly cost of maintaining the King’s stables …

And in America, Horace Mann’s Report on an Educational Tour in Germany, and Parts of Great Britain and Ireland, originating in 1844, was also very influential:

The heart of [Mann’s] Report contained the message that the United States had fallen behind the Prussians in education, and in order to catch up and move ahead, it was now mandatory to create a truly professional corps of teachers, produce a systematic curriculum, and develop a more centralized and efficient supervision of the schools. The Prussians offered a model in practicality and efficiency which his own countrymen would be well advised to follow.

The work of Cousin and Mann was built upon by those who produced some of the great official reports on education in Great Britain later in the century, in which the foreign example – and especially that of Prussia – figured prominently, and in which statistical evidence was systematically presented.

Noah and Eckstein’s fourth stage – what we call ‘socio-economic evidence/understanding’ – involves analysis of what has been termed ‘national character’ and its influence on the shaping of institutions. Historical understanding was essential here to arrive at an appreciation of the ‘factors’ which had contributed to education systems being as they were and which helped with understanding of the socio-economic dimension of education. Prominent among those who represented this kind of approach were Isaac
Kandel, Vernon Mallinson, and Joseph Lauwerys, all of whom can still be read with profit today.\textsuperscript{27}

With the fifth stage postulated by Noah and Eckstein, our stage of outcomes analysis and globalized context, we see the emphasis shift to detailed ‘scientific’ analysis of educational phenomena with the declared aim to provide explanation and therefore to point towards ways of improving performance. Developments in social science research generally helped to put comparative inquiry in education on a more secure basis, and in particular the work of the IEA (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement) and the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) has led in recent years to the accumulation of huge amounts of data which enable us to describe educational provision internationally and to identify practice which might account for high levels of measured performance. There is currently much international interest in the education system of Finland, given that country’s demonstrably high performance in the first two rounds of the OECD’s PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) survey.\textsuperscript{28}

Not predicted by Noah and Eckstein’s five stages is a contemporary movement which draws on postmodern perspectives in comparative education research. Postmodernism offers critiques of the ‘grand narratives’ that dominate what is accepted as knowledge, which consist mainly of white, male and western points of view, and therefore are seen to serve white, male and western interests. Instead, it favours a pluralistic view, which acknowledges and celebrates that individuals and groups of individuals have equally valid but different perspectives, and an equal right to constitute knowledge. Coulby and Jones\textsuperscript{29} have noted three particular strands of postmodern critique: feminist, culturalist, and class.

It has been claimed that relative to other fields, comparative education ‘has been late in addressing issues of postmodernity’.\textsuperscript{30} Its increasing importance and redefining role is predicted by Gottlieb:

The ‘post-modern turn’ in comparative education, if and when it takes place, will most likely result in a [different] construction of knowledge. The destabilisation of the dominant modernist genres of discourse and the opening up of space for the actors’ voices and authority will introduce indigenous knowledge and new categories into the semantic universe of comparative education, through the typical interpretive underlying metaphors of culture as text, metaphor and game.\textsuperscript{31}

Within international comparative studies in poorer parts of the world,
post-colonial perspectives are sometimes associated with postmodernism because of their emphasis on a plurality of voices and a critical perspective on how the ‘other’ is construed in education and educational research. The dominant discourses of colonialism and neo-colonialism come under sharp critique and are offset by the diverse voices of those who have lived, and are living, under colonialism in all its forms.

One of the problems with many overarching theories, however, is that they tend on the one hand to be dogmatically embraced by their enthusiasts, and on the other to have only a limited life. There was a time, for example, when structuralism dominated and supposedly provided a key to understanding social phenomena that its proponents seemingly could not do without. Postmodernism – despite its semantic and conceptual problems as a term – has similarly dominated but slipped into decline as a guiding means of explaining and interpreting. The lesson here is that in a field of intellectual inquiry as diverse as comparative education there is no ‘one size fits all’ device with universal explanatory power. Instead the comparativist is better served by an appreciation of ways in which a variety of theoretical perspectives might be drawn upon to elucidate particular issues/problems/methodological approaches – essentially an eclectic approach not dissimilar from Edmund King’s embracing of the concept of ‘tools for the job’. Thus, if aspects of the work of Marx or Weber or Durkheim or Foucault (for instance) provide an illuminating perspective on a particular topic of inquiry, those theoretical features should of course be drawn upon with appropriate critical caution.

In observing the broad sweep of development in comparative education since its earliest origins, we can see that its progression has not been so much a series of discrete advances, each one replacing that which preceded it; instead there has been a slow accretion of layers of sophistication placed upon the early descriptive work so that we now have a multi-dimensional field of educational inquiry which, as we shall see in Chapter 5, draws on a wide range of expertise culled from other disciplines. We should make it clear that despite over-writing in terms of ‘stages’ or ‘phases’ or ‘emphases’ there is no implication that the later a stage, phase or emphasis begins, the more valuable it is regarded for the purposes of comparative inquiry. Long-established traditions have proved as rewarding as any of the latest nostrums.
Organizations and publications

A number of societies in various countries and regions have made and still make a strong contribution to the development of comparative and international studies in education. These societies bring comparativists from around the world to regular conferences at which the full spectrum of topics in comparative and international education is discussed. They include the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES), the oldest and largest, founded in 1956; the Comparative Education Society in Europe (CESE), founded in 1961; the British Association for International and Comparative Education (BAICE) founded under another name in 1979 and before that the British Section of CESE, and many others. Comparative education societies are brought together in the World Council of Comparative Education Societies (WCCES, founded in 1970) which holds a regular World Congress, hosted in the country of one of the associated societies.

There are well-established journals in which a continuing debate about the nature of comparative education can be traced. These include: the Comparative Education Review (CER), the journal of CIES; Compare, the BAICE journal, Comparative Education, an unaffiliated British publication; the International Review of Education, published by UNESCO; the International Journal of Educational Development (IJED); the German journal Tertium Comparationis; Current Issues in Comparative Education (CICE), an open-access online journal run from Teachers College, Columbia University; and a UK-based online journal, Research in Comparative and International Education (RCIE). In addition there are various book series of long standing, including the World Yearbook of Education, which each year comprises a thematic volume, Oxford Studies in Comparative Education, published twice a year, and the Hong Kong Comparative Education Research Centre’s Studies in Comparative Education.

Valuable sources of information include the International Encyclopedia of Education, edited by Torsten Husén and Neville Postlethwaite, and the various databases produced by UNESCO, the OECD, and EURYDICE, the EU information network.

The traditions of comparative studies in education are rich. Whatever discrete or overlapping stages we might identify in the development of the field, there is strength in the fact that each period of development has added incrementally to what had gone before, rather than wiping the slate clean.
following the latest new direction to be identified. There is a body of established literature produced by leading figures in comparative studies from the late nineteenth century onwards: some of the earlier texts (by Michael Sadler especially, but also by the scholars like Bereday, King and Holmes who did so much to set comparative education on a secure footing in the 1960s) deserve to be widely read today since they contain much wisdom about the nature of comparison and its methods. We shall return to methods in Chapters 6 and 7.
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