pedocs
Open Access Erziehungswissenschaften

DIPF

Yang, Shen-Keng

# Universalization or localization? Issues of knowledge legitimation in comaprative education

*Tertium comparationis 4 (1998) 1, S. 1-9*

urn:nbn:de:0111-opus-28811

Erstveröffentlichung bei:

WAXMANN VERLAG GMBH
Münster · New York · München · Berlin

*http://www.waxmann.com*

## Nutzungsbedingungen

pedocs gewährt ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Die Nutzung stellt keine Übertragung des Eigentumsrechts an diesem Dokument dar und gilt vorbehaltlich der folgenden Einschränkungen: Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit dem Gebrauch von pedocs und der Verwendung dieses Dokuments
erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

**Kontakt:**

peDOCS
Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung (DIPF)
Informationszentrum (IZ) Bildung
Schloßstr. 29, D-60486 Frankfurt am Main
eMail: pedocs@dipf.de
Internet: www.pedocs.de

*Tertium Comparationis*
*Journal für Internationale Bildungsforschung*
*Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 1-9, 1998*
*Copyright © 1998 Waxmann Verlag GmbH*
*Printed in Germany. All rights reserved*

# Universalization or Localization? Issues of Knowledge Legitimation in Comparative Education

*Shen-Keng Yang*

*National Taiwan Normal University*

*Abstract*

The endeavor to unite the universal and the accidental in both, the physical and the social world into one theoretical framework – the idea of such a unity can be found already in the Chinese concept of Tao – dates back in the modern culture to the Enlightenment. Such a unified knowledge came to be understood as a potential tool of forecasting and controlling societal progress. All through the positivistic 19th century, comparativists followed Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris, who thought educational comparison should become an exact science whose outcomes could be used anywhere and transplanted to any place. It was Michael Sadler who as the first comparative educationalist strictly refused the idea of cultural and institutional borrowing. Under his influence comparative education focused on the variations unique to the single countries and to the factors underlying these variations. Even the later emerging functionalist method remained in the tradition of a „one-dimensional logic", which, as Marcuse alleged, was inseparably connected with the rationale of domination of nature and society. It is only the postmodern sight, which – without giving up the humanistic ideas of modernity which originated in Western modernization – opens possibilities to enter a cross cultural dialogue and to accept multiple theoretical realities.

## 1 Introduction

In his *„Der Aufbau der geschichtlichen Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften"* Dilthey (1914: 99) claims that the task of comparative methods in human sciences is the chance to overcome limits set by one's own range of experience and „to rise to truths of greater universality". By adopting comparative method and psychological foundation the emerging new special sciences are, according to Dilthey (1923: 144), acquiring the character of general theories. The criteria of generality and parsimony imply, as Przeworski and Teune (1970: 22) argue, that „the same theories must be evaluated in different systemic settings and that social science theories can gain confirmation only if theories formulated in terms of the common factors constitute the point of departure for comparative research". In

comparative education, a theoretical framework not to be taken for granted is, as Epstein (1992: 47) maintains, the requisite for doing genuine comparison.

The formulation of universal theoretical framework to distinct *universalia* from *accidentia* both in physical and social world can be traced to the legacy of the Enlightenment. For the philosophers of the Enlightenment the whole world is nothing but a mechanical mathematical structure. Thus the events of the world can be explained, predicted and even controlled by a universal law. Cartesian *mathesis universalis* and Leibnitzian *characteristica universalica* represent the scientific ideal in the Enlightenment.

The rise of modern social sciences began, as Hollinger (1994: 3) observes, with the need to understand modernization following the Enlightenment ideals for transforming society. Prediction and control of social development were called for the transformation of society. Universally valid knowledge for prediction was required within the context of social modernization.

Within the larger context of social modernization resulted from the Enlightenment there arose a need to establish rational educational science. Immanuel Kant and E. C. Trapp were two prominent representatives of the trend towards exact and precise educational science that, analogously to physical sciences, could offer universally valid knowledge of education.

In the context of Enlightenment scientific ideal, Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris, generally considered the father of comparative education, claimed that the ultimate aim of comparative studies of education indifferent countries was „to deduce true principles and determine rules so that education be transformation into an almost positive science". As a train of cultural modernization, contemporary positivism in comparative education has also been attempting to formulate universal nomological laws to explain and predict educational development without taking into account of the cultural peculiarities.

However, as the process of Western modernization has expanded to take in virtually the whole world in the last few decades, postmodernism became more and more important in response to the restrictions of modernity logic. The universal law of educational development is often criticized for its Eurocentrism, logocentrism and totalization of meta-narrative, which negates the identities created within the experience of multiple narratives and „border" crossings. Varieties of forms of knowledge, specifically localized knowledge, are emphasized in postmodern education.

Confronted with the tensions of modern homogenization and postmodern heterogenization, how is comparison between different educational systems in various countries possible? What is the legitimation basis of knowledge in comparative education? This paper turns attention to these issues from historical and international perspectives.

## 2 Legitimation of Comparative Knowledge in Positivism Tradition

At the very beginning of his *Metaphysics* Aristotle states, „All men by nature desire to know" (Aristotle, Metaphysics, A 980a). It seems that all the men are born to have the natural tendency to search for knowledge. Comparison as universal mental activity of humankind leads, as Schriewer (1988: 32) claims, to the acquisition of knowledge, specifically the knowledge of relations.

In order to establish the knowledge of relation commensurable principles are essential. Concerning the commensurable principle for identifying similarities and differences

between things, already early in the third century B. C. Chinese philosopher Han Fei Tzu (ca. 280–233 B. C.) had the following discussions:

> „Tao is that by which all things become what there are. It is what with which all principles are commensurable. Principles are patterns (wen) according to which all things come into being, and Tao is the cause of their being. Therefore it is said that Tao puts things in order (Li). Things have their respective principles and cannot interfere with each other, therefore principles are controlling factors in things. Everything has its own principle different from that of others, and Tao is commensurate with all of them [as one]" (Han Fei Tzu, chap. I: Interpretations of Tao).

The search for a unified law (or so-called Tao in *Han Fei Tzu*) to be commensurate with varieties of things was the scientific ideal in the age of Enlightenment. The comparative method was thought out by the philosophers of Enlightenment as means to reach rigorous scientific knowledge and to accelerate progress. As an heir of Enlightenment, Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris, evidently influenced by his contemporary comparative anatomist, G. Cuvier, adopted comparative method to perfect education science: „Researches on comparative anatomy have advanced the science of anatomy. In the same way the researches on comparative education must furnish new means of perfecting the science of education." (Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris 1816–1817, Fraser trans. 1963: 41)

By the application of comparative method, Jullien intended education to become an exact science based on positive and well-established principles. Once the principles of educational development are well-established, transposition of education from one country to another country for purpose of improvement is possible. As a matter of fact, many educational comparativists in the nineteenth century, e.g. Victor Cousin, Horace Mann, Matthew Arnold, had the common conviction that the transplanting and domestication of educational system with little modification was the suitable way to improve one's own education, for general principles of education might be common to all nations and general laws of education must be made applicable to different countries (Noah & Eckstein 1969: 14–33).

Michael Sadler was the first educational comparativist who firmly repudiated the idea of direct cultural and institutional borrowing from other countries. In his famous Guildford lecture, Sadler uttered his famous dictum that the „things outside schools matter even more than the things inside the schools, and govern and interpret the things inside" (cit. in Jones 1969: 50). Sadler's major theoretical contribution to comparative education is, as Noah and Eckstein (1969: 46) observe, „the axiom that schools of a society must be studied in of society." Thus universally valid knowledge deduced from comparison was denied by Sadler as unfounded, for „all good education and true education is an expression of national life and character" (ibid.)

Under the influence of Sadler, most of the comparative education works in the first half of the twentieth century were, as Bereday (1964: 8) observes, „concerned with the social causes behind the pedagogical scene." The prominent scholars in comparative education, e.g. Kandel, Hans, Schneider, Mallison, etc. elaborated on various aspects of the Sadlerian approach. Through comprehensive analysis of the interaction of educational and social phenomena, they tried to seek their explanations of the formation and the development of educational system in each country. They represented, as Noah and Eckstein (1969: 56–57) maintain, forces and factors approach with special emphasis on the explanation of the variations in education from country to country.

Among the proponents of social explanations in comparative education, Hans was the first who was aware of the importance of functionalism in educational research. In his „Functionalism in Comparative Education“ (1964), Hans demanded functional analysis instead of statistical study in comparative education. Functionalism in comparative education is meant by Hans (1964: 94) „the comparison of functions of educational institutions as they were historically evolved in each country.“ This kind of understanding of functionalism is, as Welch (1991: 509) argues, somewhat misconceived. Hans partly confused functionalist analysis with the historical mode of research: „Comparative Education by evaluating seemingly identical functions should compare also the historical past, which is a part of the present“ (Hans 1964: 97).

Unlike the historical approach, functionalism focuses, as Anderson (1961: 4) indicates, „upon patterns comprising abstracted social systems, exploring relationships of essentially undated and often timeless nature.“ From functionalist perspective, schools as integrative agencies are, as Kazamias and Schwartz (1977: 163) argue, „expected to perform functions to maintain social equilibrium: they are expected to adapt constantly to other systems.“ The legitimation of comparative knowledge is thus based on if the result of comparative study can be efficiently put into improving education for producing people to fit the already-determined social needs. The issue of the intermingling of historical and social construction of educational knowledge with social power relationship is almost completely neglected.

Functionalists contented themselves with only the aplication of contemporary social science concepts and research techniques to deal with the functional relationship between society and education. Positivists in comparative education proceeded further to formulate „laws“ to explain and predict educational trends. The culminating point of comparative education is, according to Bereday (1964: 25), to be concerned with the overall impact of education upon society in a world perspective. The final stage of this discipline is thus concerned with the formulation of „laws“ or „typologies“ that permit an international understanding and a definition of the complex interrelation of the schools and the people they serve.

The development of a systemic, controlled, empirical and critical methodology is specifically emphasized by Noah and Eckstein (1969: 122) in their *„Toward a Science of Comparative Education“* (1969). Quantification and hypothesis testing are thought to be most important to build a rigorous Science of Comparative Education. Describing scientific approach of Noah and Eckstein as methodologism, Barber (1972: 424–436) comments: „it presumes that reliability, precision, and certitude can be attained by the dutiful application of specific methods and techniques-irrespective of the nature of the subject under study.“

Rigorous quantitative hypothesis testing is also emphasized by Psacharopoulos (1990) in his study of the relationship of comparative education and educational planning. Unsatisfied with the long, non-quantitative accounts of the educational system of a single country, Psacharopoulos (1990: 380) advocates that the goal of linking comparative education research with educational policy and planning can only be achieved through „conceptualization, methodological design, statistical sampling, rigorous data analysis, and hypothesis testing“.

Irrespective of functionalism or positivism in comparative education, they use the natural sciences as ideal models of educational research. As Horkheimer (1972: 190) puts it: „The sciences of man and society have attempted to follow the lead of the natural

sciences with their great successes." Educational knowledge is thus legitimated through rigorous scientific research design analogously to that of natural sciences. Educational knowledge is thought to be universally valid, not bound to any specific time and social context. Models of cause-effect are transformed to those of means-ends. Practice is narrowed to technical know-how.

This kind of supposedly universal educational knowledge is the product of western rationalistic logic. On the one hand it is criticized by critical theory as scientism ideology detached from real social process. On the other hand, the legitimation of the scientific knowledge is also strongly doubted by postmodernist for its risking the danger of falling into totalianism and neglecting the indigenous knowledge.

## 3 Legitimation Crisis or Delegitimation of Knowledge in Comparative Education

The establishment of universal nomological law in comparative education to predict and explain the educational development is, as indicated above, rooted in the rationalistic logic since Enlightenment. Formal logic provides the model of thinking. Methodological rigor, empirical evidence and exact test of hypothetical causal relation are deemed to be paramount important in acquiring universal scientific knowledge.

However, formal logic, as one-dimensional reduction logic, constitutes, according to Marcuse (1967: 152), elements of domination structure, including substantial detachment of thinking from its object, conflicts between phenomenon and essence, tensions between „Is" and „ought". Formal logic together with highly abstracted and mathematicized scientific thinking produce a kind of rational enterprise of science, which makes it possible to raise the standard of human life. However, the rational scientific enterprise brings about also a schema of thinking and behavior, which justifies the destructive potential in the scientific enterprise itself. Scientific rationality combined with domination makes it impossible to fully develop humanity.

Following Marcuse's critique of modern scientific and technological rationality, Habermas (1969) reconstructs Weber's concept of rationalization to explicate the double functions of science and technology: production and ideology. According to Habermas (ibid: 64), Weber's concept of rationalization in the evolution of modern society has two significant meanings: on the one hand it signifies the wide extension of the scope of appealing to the criteria of rational decision in social life. On the other hand the continuous industrialization of social labor makes the criteria of instrumental action penetrate into every sphere of social life. Consequently instrumental action overcomes social practice based on communicative action.

Moreover, from perspective of social evolution Habermas argues that the legitimation of political domination in civilized traditional society through mythology, religion and metaphysics has been lost in highly rationalized modern society. Instrumental action based on accountability determines, instead, the legitimation. The criteria of achievement in the society offer the legitimate status of purposeful-rational action. The ideology of fair interchange corresponds exactly with this type of action. Since domination facilitates the formation of the conditions for just exchanges, it is thus legitimated. In post-capitalistic society, this relationship of domination begins to fall into crisis. State can no longer assure the fairness of exchanges. Therefore, the state seeks to maintain its authority of control by

direct interference into the exchange relations. In the process of interference, the state can no longer use traditional myths and world-views to legitimate its governance. It must constantly search for new sources of legitimation. The most important sources of legitimation in post-capitalistic society are science and technology. The logic of scientific and technological progress determines the development of social institution and economic growth. Thus the state often adopts science and technology as means of legitimating its decision-making process.

From comparative education perspective, Weiler (1983) explored the role of knowledge based on scientific research in the legitimation of educational decision-making. For Weiler (1983: 269), the notion of „reforms as experiments" is the application of the classical paradigm of scientific methodology to the realities of public policy. It raises the prospect of being able to judge, „with scientific conviction and credibility, that one social program was 'better' than another, that advocates of a given policy were 'right' and its opponents 'wrong'". Weiler refers to the introduction of comprehensive schooling models in Sweden, and, later, into the Federal Republic of Germany as exemplifying the form of using scientific experimentation as a means of compensatory legitimation.

The extension of science and technology and associated purposive-rational systems of actions have, according to Habermas (1969), yielded a net increase in forms of social control. Science and technology become background ideology (Hintergrundideologie) which penetrates tacitly into the consciousness of populace. Science and technology develop as another kind of mythos and become the tool of legitimating public policy in a „black box" process. Authentic personal autonomy and social solidarity can not be reached. The truly rational process of decision-making should be carried out through domination-free communication. Thus the consensus reached by practical and theoretical discourses in an ideal speech situation becomes the legitimation basis of public decision-making and valid knowledge.

The principle of consensus elaborated by Habermas as a criterion of validation is criticized by Lyotard (1984: 60) as inadequate, for this conception is based on validity of the narrative of emancipation. As one of grand narratives of modernity, the narrative of emancipation has lost its credibility. The practice of modern sciences is justified, as Lyotard (1984: 31–32) argues, by two philosophical principles: the attainment of universal knowledge and the attainment of universal freedom. Science as form of knowledge has been thought to be superior on account of its avowed ability to meet the needs of these principles, that is, freedom from ignorance and prejudice. However, these metanarratives have lost their credibility. Science in postmodern society plays only its own game, „it is incapable of legitimating the other language games" (Lyotard 1984: 40).

Parallel to the delegitimation tendency of scientific knowledge, the decline of the status of the intellectuals represents another prominent feature of postmodernism. Traditionally, intellectuals possessed the privileged status of providing authoritative solutions to questions of cognitive truth, moral judgment and aesthetic taste (Bauman 1987: 219). The essential idea of the pluralistic stance of postmodernism is, as Harvey (1990: 48) puts it, „that all groups have right to speak for themselves, in their own voice and have that voice accepted as authentic and legitimate." The intellectuals have lost their prerogative to legitimate the authority of knowledge.

In conjunction with the pluralistic stance of postmodernism and incredulity towards the totalizing metanarratives, the superiority of western culture on a global scale and the

dominance of main-stream refined culture have been abandoned. Inappropriate theories, models and concepts derived from solely western experiences have been confronted with severe challenges. The boundaries between „majority“ and „minority“, and between „refined“ and „popular“ culture have broken. Postmodernism provides, as Rust (1991: 619) remarks, a sense of hope and legitimacy for those Others. The voice of the Others should be listened to carefully with understanding and appreciation.

In correspondence to postmodern incredulity towards metanarrative, pluralistic stance and „border-crossing“ cultural orientation, a universally valid knowledge in comparative education can not legitimate itself. As Masemann (1990a: 471) observes, „in the post-industrial era knowledge paradigms will change: new form of research in comparative education will blossom in new and theoretically fruitful directions.“

The new forms of research will be holistic, context dependent and integrative. Old forms of ways of knowing should be adapted to deal with the need for personalized, contexted knowledge. Moreover, indigenous knowledge forms in the areas of world that are not „successfully“ industrialized are once again seen as valid forms of knowledge. Education reform project based on western-oriented rationalistic logic should not, according to Masemann (1990b: 1848–1857), be imposed on the non-western world. Indigenous form of knowledge should be taken into serious accounts in implementing education reform.

For postmodernists, the claim that one way of knowledge is the only legitimate way, would, as Rust (1991: 616) argues, be rejected. The postmodernist's task would, according to Rust, be „to determine which approach to knowing is appropriate to specific interests and needs rather than argue some universal application and validity, which and ends up totalizing and confining in its ultimate effect.“ The universally valid knowledge is delegitimated by postmodern perspective. The validity of knowledge should be localized to meet the need of what Derrida (1978) conceptualized as *difference*.

## 4 Outlook

In order to avoid the simple data collection and description of foreign education, the establishment of *tertium comparationis* is, according to Röhrs (1995: 15), essential for the explanation in the framework of comparative educational science. The *tertium comparationis* is the third, through which the comparison of two educational fields in international room is possible. For Bereday (1964: 9–10), the *tertium comparationis* is the criterion upon which a valid comparison can be made and the hypothesis for which it is to be made.

Problems arise as postmodernists take stance of incredulity towards universal knowledge validity: How can a *tertium comparationis* be built? Should the education comparativist be „trapped“ into localized frameworks that disallow comparison?

Concerning the attitude towards modern homogenous universality and postmodern locality, one should bear in mind, as Heraclitus (Diels & Kranz 1956: 22, Herac. B51) says, „That which is contrary is actually in agreement to itself.“ Postmodernism is never antimodernism. Rather it radicalizes modernism with the common objective of emancipating humanity from inner and exterior domination and thus leading to the realization of authentic self. Thus the modern claim of universal validity does not exclude the respect for peculiarity. The modern universalizing tendencies associated with Western

culture should be subjected to reinterpretation and transformation in order to include the understanding, appreciation and even assimilation of the peculiarities of the Others in the globalizing process.

Similarly comparative education in the 1990ies is characterized by Paulston (1992) as arriving at a period of theoretical pluralism and heterogeneity. According to Paulston, comparative education and social sciences in the 1990ies consists of disputatious yet complementary knowledge that has come to recognize, tolerate and even appreciate the existence of multiple theoretical realities and perspectives. Incommensurable as they are, they open to each other the new insights and ways of seeing the world. Only with such a broadened vision, the Utopian aim, as depicted in Delors' Report (Delors et al. 1996: 51), of steering the world towards greater mutual understanding, a great sense of responsibility and solidarity, through acceptance of our spiritual and cultural differences, can be actualized.

*Note*

1. Paper prepared for presentation at 10th World Congress of World Council of Comparative Education Societies (WCCES): Cape Town, South Africa, 12-17 July, 1998.

*Bibliography*


Anderson, C.A. (1961). Methodology of Comparative Education. *International Review of Education, 7* , 1–23.

Barber, B.R. (1972). Science, Salience and Comparative Education: Some Reflections on Social Scientific Inquiry. *Comparative Education Review, 16* (3), 424–436.

Bauman, Z. (1987) *Legislator and Interpreters on Modernity, Postmodernity, and Intellectual* . London: Cambridge University Press.

Bereday, G.Z.F. (1964). *Comparative Method in Education* . New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Delors, J. et al. (1996). *Learning: The Treasure Within. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the 21st Century* . Paris: UNESCO.

Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and Difference* (translated by A. Bass). London: Routledge.

Diels, H. & Kranz, W. (Hrsg.). (1956). *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (8. Aufl.). Berlin: Weidmann.

Dilthey, W. (1914). *Der Aufbau der geschichtlichen Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften*, vol. 7. Leipzig & Berlin: Teubner.

Dilthey, W. (1923). *Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften* (Wilhelm Diltheys Gesammelte Schriften, Bd. 1). Leipzig & Berlin: Teubner.

Epstein, E. (1992). Uses and Misuses of Comparative Research: How We Can Strengthen Our Field as We Move Toward the 21st Century. In José Luis García Garrido et. al. (Eds.), *Reformas E Innovaciones Educativas En El Umbral Del Siglo XXI: Una Perspectiva Comparada* . Madrid: UNED.

Fraser, S. (1963). *Jullien's Plan for Comparative Education 1816–1817 Teachers College* . Columbia University.

Habermas, J. (1969). Technik und Wissenschaft als Ideologie. In J. Habermas, *Technik und Wissenschaft als Ideologie* . Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Hans, N. (1964). Functionalism in Comparative Education. *International Review of Education, 10* (1), 94–105.

Harvey, D. (1990). *The Condition of Postmodernity* . Oxford: Blackwell.

Hollinger, R. (1994). *Postmodernism and the Social Sciences* . Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Horkheimer, M. (1972). *Critical Theory*. New York: Continuum.

Jones, Ph.E. (1969). *Comparative Education: Purpose and Method* . St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Kazamias, A.M. & Schwartz, K. (1977). Intellectual and Ideological Perspectives in Comparative Education: An Interpretation. *Comparative Education Review, 21* (2–3), 153–176.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge, transl. by Geoff Benning - ton and Brian Massumi* . Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Marcuse, H. (1967). *Der eindimensionale Mensch* . Neuwied: Luchterhand.

Masemann, V. (1990a). Ways of Knowing: Implication for Comparative Education. *Comparative Education Review, 34* (4), 465–473.

Masemann, V. (1990b). Educational Reform: Impact of Indigenous Forms of Knowledge. In Torsten Husén & T. Neville Postlethwaite (Eds.), *International Encyclo pedia of Education* , vol. 4, 2nd ed., (pp. 1848–1857). Oxford: Pergamon.

Noah, H.J. & Eckstein, M.A. (1969). *Toward a Science of Comparative Education* . London: Collier-Macmillan.

Paulston, R.G. (1992). *Comparative Education as an Intellectual Field. Mapping the Theoretical Landscape*. Paper presented at the 8th World Congress of Comparative Education, July 8–14, Prague, Czechoslovakia. [An abbreviated version was subsequently published in *Compare, 23* (2), 101–114].

Przeworski, A. & Teune, H. (1970). *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry* . Malabar Florida: Robert E. Krieger publishing Company.

Psacharopoulos, G. (1990). Comparative Education: From Theory to Practice, or Are You A:\Neo.* or B:*.ist? *Comparative Education Review, 34* (3), 369–380.

Röhrs, H. (1995). *Die Vergleichende und Internationale Erziehungswissenschaft* . Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag.

Rust, V. (1991). Postmodernism and its comparative education implications. *Comparative Education Review, 35* (4), 610–626.

Schriewer, J. (1988). The method of comparison and the need for externalization – Methodological criteria and sociological concepts. In J. Schriewer & B. Holmes (Eds.), *Theories and Methods in Comparative Education* . Frankfurt: Lang.

Weiler, H.N. (1983). Legalization, Expertise, and Participation: Strategies of Compensatory Legitimation in Educational Policy. *Comparative Education Review, 27* (2), 259–277.

Welch, A.R. (1991). Knowledge and Legitimation in Comparative Education. *Comparative Education Review, 35* (3), 508–531.