

the Global North for approval of policies imposed upon them. Since the MDBs would be fully represented in the Financing Compact, grants and loans would be more conditional than ever before. To its credit, the Report envisages a differential allocation of funds, so that low-income countries would receive two-thirds of the financing, lower-middle income countries one-fourth, and upper-middle income countries one tenth by 2030.

What is missing in the Report.—A comprehensive conceptual framework of the role of education in national development would have to include adult education. Today, under the race toward the “knowledge society,” the education of marginalized adults—the most excluded of all social groups—remains absent from the international political discourse, for there is no mention of adult education or out-of-school children. For raising funds, the Report envisages increasing taxation at national levels, but there is no serious reference to the increasing need for global taxation, especially with regard to speculative transactions. Much faith is being placed on the positive role of education entrepreneurs, yet no discussion is brought to light regarding the well-documented negative effects of privatization on vulnerable urban and rural groups, likely to include many women.

Positive aspects of the Report are its enormous attention to the importance of education and the concomitant argument to mobilize more funds toward it. Also welcomed is its call for long-term funding, something that would be greatly appreciated by participant member states. The defining feature of this Report is its recommendation to transform the financing architecture characterizing public education. Its four “transformations” are far from perfect and will bring new problems of their own. While the proposed solutions, especially the increased financial support for education that should generate a more adequate physical infrastructure, might serve to shake public education in less industrialized countries out of its current untenable stagnation and social inclusion is always a desirable goal, I am not certain that a new educational world—dominated by standardized testing, increased privatization, a continuous disregard for the poverty of teachers, and conformity with solutions imposed by a financial cartel—is the new reality many developing countries would like to inhabit.

NELLY P. STROMQUIST

University of Maryland—College Park

Teaching Comparative Education: Trends and Issues Informing Practice edited by Patricia K. Kubow and Allison H. Blosser. Oxford: Symposium Books Ltd., 2016. 212 pp. \$72.00. ISBN 978-1-873927-82-3.

Regular readers of the *Comparative Education Review* will recognize within the journal and broader academic society a strong devotion to comparative and international education (CIE) but limited examination of its teaching. Indeed, scholars and educators alike lament the decreasing attention to CIE within undergraduate and post-graduate programs as well as the increasing encroachment and, dare I say, co-opting of CIE by noncomparativists who borrow concepts and policies with little regard for contextual differences and realities. Yet while many scholars of CIE conduct research

on processes related to teaching, learning, and pedagogy, more broadly, we rarely situate ourselves as pedagogues within CIE. Given the constitutive roles CIE educators play in shaping the field and the concomitant questions posed and addressed by our research, it is surprising that few texts have explored in-depth the teaching of CIE.

Teaching Comparative Education contributes to filling this gap by exploring the ways in which CIE is conceptualized, institutionalized, and enacted in undergraduate and postgraduate classrooms. The text features chapters by many prominent scholars and engages with both historical and contemporary debates within CIE, which include, among others: how (and if) CIE is bounded, which units of analysis are privileged in related coursework (e.g., nation-state vs. transnational organizations/movements), and the differing roles of CIE for future teachers as compared to academicians or practitioners. Several chapters also include situational analyses or case studies—for example, of Germany, Singapore, the United States, and the United Kingdom—to ground the authors' conceptual orientations in specific national or institutional contexts.

The book begins with an introduction by the editors, Patricia Kubow and Allison Blosser, who articulate the value of CIE, particularly within teacher education, and encourage increased scholarly attention to the teaching of CIE. The remaining body of the text is divided into three overarching sections, though readers will note considerable overlap in areas of concern across the macro organization of the text. The first part of the text explores the “ideological and conceptual landscape of CIE” (9). Robert Arno and Barry Bull's chapter, the first of this larger section, begins by reinforcing the inseparability of descriptive and normative aspects of comparative education. Further, it highlights philosophical and moral frameworks that may be beneficial for students of CIE as they evaluate case studies of educational policy and practice. Perhaps most helpful for CIE educators is the list of questions to consider in selecting a case, which includes lines of questioning pertaining to how the case connects to a specific issue, what units and levels of analysis are most appropriate, and how the contextual realities interact with the case itself. Michael Crossley's chapter follows and maintains a strong emphasis on CIE in the United Kingdom. He examines the histories and transformations of the British Association for International and Comparative Education as well as internationally focused programs at the University of Bristol as case studies, positing that the balance between theoretical and methodological aspects of CIE, on the one hand, and applied work, on the other, is often in flux, though both are ultimately necessary for CIE to advance itself as a field. Continuing the theme of advancing CIE, long-time historian of the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) Erwin Epstein raises questions in chapter 3 about how the naming of CIE contributes to confusion and a lack of clarity concerning its very constitution. Indeed, his point is perhaps validated through the *Teaching Comparative Education* text itself, in which authors opt to use a variety of titles for the field(s), including “comparative education,” “comparative educations,” and “comparative and international education.” In the final chapter of this section, Kubow and Blosser build on the previously discussed need for advocacy and articulation of CIE by outlining its relevance for preservice teachers in the United States. They contend that multicultural education, despite sharing with CIE epistemological lenses and social justice orientations, is inadequate by itself in developing preservice teachers' abilities to examine critically the “complex intersection of historical, socio-political, economic, philosophical and cultural factors” (79) that influence education systems at home and abroad.

The second section of *Teaching Comparative Education* explores the “Aims and Purposes of Comparative and International Education” (9). This section begins with a more empirically based chapter by Karen Biraimah exploring the nexus of teacher education, study abroad, and CIE. Her chapter highlights how study abroad courses can facilitate rich discussions of educational approaches and systems while still fitting among the constraints of increasingly packed teacher education programs. Reflections from Irving Epstein in the following chapter reinforce the value of comparison within undergraduate programs and, specifically, standards-obsessed teacher education. He suggests that liberal inquiry through comparative education in undergraduate programs can help future teachers consider carefully their actions through the tools of “reasoning, curiosity, reflection, and empathy” (129). In the final chapter of this section, Maria Manzon examines comparative educations in the plural, and the philosophical orientations that elucidate various purposes of CIE. She then grounds the discussion in the Singaporean context through interviews with academics and ultimately suggests that CIE is “extramural” in the sense that it is “invisible in teacher education” (142) but present in implicit forms in research and policy borrowing as well as the institutional structures within which CIE scholars operate, which often seek “best practices” from other institutions and international settings.

Though addressed intermittently in previous chapters, the third section focuses specifically on contemporary sociocultural and political issues related to the teaching of CIE. Noah Sobe’s chapter first outlines approaches to teaching comparative education before encouraging CIE educators and students to move beyond static, globally or nationally bound analytical frames. He implores CIE educators to teach “with the nation-state” and maintain a more concerted emphasis on context and the ways in which “national imaginaries come to operate as social facts” (158) as well as “against the nation-state” by questioning scalar assumptions of global dimensions and their powers. The local and global also feature prominently in chapter 9, wherein Carlos Alberto Torres emphasizes the necessity of global citizenship education to advance human rights and engender a more just global society. He suggests an orientation among educational researchers toward more critical and postcolonial approaches, lest quasi-positivistic research agendas deemed more scientific lead the world nearer to an unsustainable future. The final chapter of this section, by Marcelo Parreira do Amaral and Sabine Hornberg, reviews the place of CIE in Germany and how recent trends, including obsessions with large-scale comparative data, increasingly frame the teaching of comparative education in higher education institutions. The authors draw on their own teaching experiences to provide specific accounts of how they enacted the CIE curriculum within a constrained context that continues to devalue CIE in spite of positive student responses to the courses themselves. The text then concludes with an afterword and personal reflection by Oxford Studies in Comparative Education series editor, David Phillips.

Like any early conceptual work, *Teaching Comparative Education* covers a wide area of relatively uncharted territory. It raises a wealth of questions relevant to how CIE is taught and shaped by educators, influenced by researchers, and positioned in institutional contexts. Future research on the teaching of comparative education will likely draw heavily on this work, as scholars continue to consider the framing of CIE and, perhaps more importantly, its impact on students across all levels. Overall the book makes a significant contribution to the field and is bound by the authors’ col-

lective appreciation for CIE as well as their belief in its potential power to transform the thinking of future teachers, scholars, and practitioners as they aim to advance educational processes.

MATTHEW A. M. THOMAS

University of Sydney

The Critical Global Educator: Global Citizenship Education as Sustainable Development by Maureen Ellis. New York: Routledge, 2016. 246 pp. \$163.00 (cloth). ISBN 978-1-138-88780-0.

In the field of international education, frequent debates occur regarding the intersecting topics of globalization, sustainable development, and the type of citizenship education necessitated by these issues. Maureen Ellis enters these debates with her critical and theory-dense book: *The Critical Global Educator: Global Citizenship Education as Sustainable Development*. Ellis argues that global citizenship education needs to be reframed as sustainable development because the current neoliberal, passive, and instrumentalist education models are engendering the values and mind-sets that perpetuate the sociocultural, economic, and most notably environmental injustices the world is witnessing today. Thus, Ellis calls for “global citizenship education as sustainable development (GCESD)” (ix), an education that takes a transdisciplinary view of the world and is deeply rooted in critical realism. She believes this approach can help to mold educators to have the “passion, disciplinary expertise, and legitimacy” (ix) to create the sustainable structures necessary to address the urgent issues facing the globe.

As a critical theorist, Ellis argues for the necessity of shifting global citizenship education to focus on critical democratic pedagogies that support emancipatory politics as a means of sustainable development. In the first chapter she provides her biographical journey detailing how her personal and professional experiences, including as a teacher, curriculum designer, and consultant, led her inductively to understand the theories that framed her research including critical realism, critical social theory, critical discourse, and critical linguistics. In chapter 2, these theories frame her analysis of the current policies in global education that espouse a citizenship centered around techno-scientific discourses, consumption norms, and neoliberal skills and knowledge, all of which she skillfully argues have continued the colonization of minds, the degradation of democracy, and the destruction of the environment. However, she notes that globalization has also opened up opportunities to face these challenges through the creation of discourses around social justice, human rights, and sustainable development.

In chapter 3, Ellis argues that GCESD, rooted in critical theory and transdisciplinary approaches, can provide an education that addresses the challenges and embraces the opportunities of globalization. She shows how GCESD can enable a critique of the dominant policies that have led to these challenges while empowering learners with transformative perspectives and experiences that are possible in a global education. She builds this argument through an extensive review of the existing literature, weaving together different “philosophical traits, sociocultural critique, and emancipatory praxis” (79) to argue for the critical mind-sets and theoretical