

Comparative Education in Greater China: contexts, characteristics, contrasts and contributions

MARK BRAY & GUI QIN [1]

ABSTRACT *Greater China is an umbrella term used to cover Mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macau. This article reviews the evolution of comparative education in these four societies, noting major forces which have shaped the field. The article observes and comments on similarities and differences within the four societies. It has been prepared as a response to the millennial special issue of the journal, and notes some lessons and contributions from the field in Greater China to the global field of comparative education.*

This article, following receipt of an invitation from the Co-editors of the millennial special number of *Comparative Education* (Crossley & Jarvis, 2000a), is a response to some of the themes in that special issue and a presentation of perspectives from a particular part of the world. We begin by applauding the Co-editors for assembling a very valuable and insightful collection of articles. The Co-editors indicated (Crossley & Jarvis, 2000b, p. 262) that the special issue was conceived as a set of presentations, by the journal's Editorial Board, on the way that the Board Members viewed the field at this point in history. Because the Board Members are all based in the UK—although all have great international experience and expertise—the millennial special issue may be described as a set of perspectives from one particular part of the world. It therefore seems entirely appropriate that this set of responses should have been commissioned from people in other parts of the world, so that this follow-up special number may be seen as complementing the first.

The geographical focus of this article is on Greater China. This term has come into increasingly common use (see e.g. Shambaugh, 1995 and Taylor, 1996) as an umbrella descriptor of Mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macau [2]. All four societies are linked in their political histories, and have common linguistic and cultural characteristics. In terms of population, Mainland China is by far the greatest entity: Mainland China has 1200 million people, whereas Taiwan has 22 million, Hong Kong has 7 million, and Macau has less than half a million. Bearing these proportions in mind, the article devotes the greatest attention to Mainland China. However, commentary is not balanced in precise mathematical proportions, as to have done so would have obstructed some of the purposes of the article. Among these purposes is to highlight the ways in which the field of comparative education has developed differently in the four societies, thereby permitting a sort of 'comparison of comparisons'. The article also comments on the contributions that scholars in the four societies have made and may continue to make to the global field.

Correspondence to: Mark Bray, Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China. E-mail: mbray@hku.hk

When we began preparation of this paper, we observed the alliteration in the titles of two contributions to the millennial special issue. Crossley and Jarvis used three Cs in the subtitle to their introductory article: ‘continuity, challenge and change’ (Crossley & Jarvis, 2000b); and Angela Little’s subtitle was ‘context, content, comparison and contributors’ (Little, 2000). Together that makes seven Cs. Our subtitle adds two more—characteristics and contrasts—and makes a slight variation on two others. But to some extent, all these Cs will be evident in our article as we note the ways in which comparative education in Greater China resembles and differs from the field in other parts of the world.

At the outset, we also noted a need to delimit the parameters of focus. Like other parts of the world (see e.g. Loxley, 1994), Greater China has many actors in the field of comparative education. Producers of comparative education include academics in universities and similar institutions, and practitioners in international agencies and government bodies. Many of these people are also consumers of comparative education. Other consumers, who are less likely to be producers, include teachers, students and parents. However, relatively few of these people and organisations identify with the field, and even fewer routinely read either the journal in which this article has been published or its counterparts. Thus, this article is chiefly concerned with people who identify themselves with the field of comparative education. Most of them are scholars in universities and research institutes; but, as elsewhere, not all scholars who undertake comparative analyses of education identify with the field specifically known as comparative education, and not all of the people who do identify with the field are based in universities and research institutes.

Contexts

The importance of context has been almost universally stressed by comparative educationists. In the millennial special issue, it was highlighted by Crossley (2000), who emphasised that ‘the strong tradition of context sensitivity within our field deserves greatest recognition’ (p. 323). Similarly, Grant (2000) stressed the importance of ‘understanding the background conditions’ (p. 310). Cowen (2000, p. 333) went further to highlight the impact of context on the nature of the field in different parts of the world. He argued that because of differing contexts, there is in fact no single or unified comparative education. Rather, he argued, there are multiple comparative educations. Other scholars, and to some extent even Cowen himself, would note the forces of globalisation and the work of such bodies as the World Council of Comparative Education Societies (WCCES), which acts as a forum for comparative education scholars in different parts of the world and which does therefore to some extent form a global field. Nevertheless, the force of Cowen’s observation will become evident in the present article.

In Greater China, as elsewhere, the most important elements of context include political, linguistic, cultural, economic and geographical factors. Each of these elements will here be noted in turn.

The political histories of the four components of Greater China have shown significant differences despite some linkages. China as a whole has a history of several thousand years and many dynasties, during which the boundaries altered but a sense of national identity was a common thread. In Mainland China, the last imperial dynasty came to an end in 1911 with the revolution led by Sun Yat Sen and the Nationalist Party. In turn, this nationalist regime was replaced by a People’s Republic in 1949 under the leadership of Mao Zedong and the Chinese Communist Party. For the first decade, developments were strongly influenced by the Soviet Union. Mao died in 1976, and subsequent years brought a softening of the communist approach. Deng Xiaoping, who became the paramount leader in 1978, was responsible for China’s open-door policy, which gradually increased interaction between

China and other countries. In 1992, Deng introduced the notion of a 'socialist market economy'. China remains a socialist state, but has been increasingly shaped by market forces.

Taiwan was separated from the mainland by Japanese colonialism in 1895. In 1945, Taiwan was reunited with the mainland; but the two entities again parted company in 1949 when the nationalist government in Mainland China was defeated by the communist forces and fled to Taiwan. Since that time, the two jurisdictions have operated separately in legal, economic, educational and most other matters. However, both in Taiwan and in Mainland China, Taiwan is still widely seen as part of a single country which has been divided only temporarily.

Hong Kong also has a colonial history, under the UK. Hong Kong Island became a British colony in 1842; the Kowloon Peninsula came under British administration in 1860, and the New Territories were added in 1898. Sovereignty of the whole territory of Hong Kong reverted to China in 1997. However, the territory retains its own education system and has other elements of autonomy as a Special Administrative Region.

Macau has a longer colonial history, having come under Portuguese administration in 1557. Macau was principally important in the Portuguese Empire as a trading post. However, Macau declined in significance after the colonisation of Hong Kong, which had a superior port, and for an extended period Macau was neglected as a backwater in the Portuguese Empire. This pattern changed in the 1980s, when Macau achieved striking economic growth. In 1999 Macau was reunited with Mainland China along similar lines to Hong Kong, and is also a Special Administrative Region.

The different political histories have left legacies in the sphere of languages, which are themselves linked to cultures. Chinese is spoken in all four jurisdictions, albeit with different dialects; and all parts of Greater China share a heritage of Confucianism. Yet despite these commonalities, academic cultures have been modified by a range of external influences. In Hong Kong, English is an official language alongside Chinese, and is a major vehicle for academic discourse. In Macau, Portuguese is an official language alongside Chinese, but is not such a strong vehicle for academic discourse. Indeed, in the academic domain as well as in many other parts of life, English rather than Portuguese is Macau's most popular second language. Taiwan retains some connections with Japan, but in the academic world has also been influenced by the English-speaking world and particularly the USA. In Mainland China, Russian was the dominant foreign language during the initial years of the People's Republic. However, the importance of Russian diminished after a political break between China and Russia in 1960, and Russian has now been largely replaced by English. These foreign-language connections have a significant impact on the field of comparative education, for they influence the types of materials to which scholars have access and the ways in which their intellectual approaches are shaped.

Turning to economics, the four component parts of Greater China display striking diversity. In 1999, the per capita gross domestic product (GDP) in Mainland China was estimated at US\$820 (Asian Development Bank, 2000). By contrast, that in Taiwan was estimated at US\$12,880, while the Hong Kong figure was US\$23,100. Macau's per capita GDP was between that of Taiwan and Hong Kong, standing at an estimated US\$14,100 (Macau, 2000). The disparities in economic levels have influenced the scale of university enrolments and research capacity, and have shaped comparative education as well as other fields of enquiry.

The last major contextual factor is one of geography. Mainland China is a vast country, with an area of 9,600,000 square kilometres. By contrast, Taiwan has 34,500 square kilometres, Hong Kong has 1100, and Macau has just 24. Improved communication systems have reduced the impact of remoteness, but to some extent, particularly at the bottom of the

scale, small size has made the inhabitants naturally externally oriented. This has had an impact on the field of comparative education as well as on other domains.

Characteristics

This section of the paper, bearing these contextual factors in mind, describes the characteristics of the field in each of the four parts of Greater China. It adopts a historical approach which considers, largely in a chronological manner, the nature and volume of scholarly analysis and the roles and activities of professional societies and key institutions.

Comparative Education in Mainland China

The fact that the history of civilisation in China is much longer than that in most other parts of the world has arguably given China a longer history of comparative education. Thus, examples of 'borrowing' and 'lending' in education can be found in the Han Dynasty (206 BC to 220 AD) and the Tang Dynasty (618–906 AD). Examples include the influence of Indian Buddhism on education in China, and of Chinese philosophies on Japanese and Korean education. Such influences have been discussed in the first of the three volumes in the *Short History of Comparative Studies of Chinese and Foreign Education* (Zhang & Wang, 1997) [3].

However, scholarly studies of education systems from a comparative perspective only began in the nineteenth century. After China's 1840 defeat by Western forces in the first opium war, society was gradually challenged in all dimensions by a desire to learn from other countries about ways to restore the state of independence, unity, prosperity and stability which China was perceived to have had previously (Bastid, 1987). Education was considered to be a major instrument to achieve this goal. Li (1983, p. 13) indicates that Xue Fucheng wrote a diary in 1849 which discussed in detail the education systems of four countries in which he had served as a diplomatic envoy. A government-sponsored report on the European, American and Japanese education systems was completed in 1883 by an American missionary, and systematic studies of foreign education included *New Schools in Seven Countries* (1870) and the four-volume *Lectures in Teacher Education* (1901) which introduced the education systems of Germany, France, the USA and the UK (Li, 1983, p. 14).

The field gathered further momentum during the first half of the twentieth century. In 1901 a journal was launched with the title *Education in the World* [4]. The year 1917 brought Yu's *Comparative Study of National Education in Germany, France, Britain and the USA* (Yu, 1917) and in 1929 came Zhuang's *Comparative Study of Education Systems in Foreign Countries* (Zhuang, 1929). In the 1930s, books with the words comparative education in their titles included Chang (1930, 1932), Chen (1933), Chen & Liu (1934), Zhong (1936) and Luo (1939); and comparative education was established as a formal course at Beijing Normal University and Zhongshan University. However, further developments were restricted by events following the 1937 Japanese invasion of China and by World War II.

In the early years of the People's Republic, which was founded in 1949, comparative education as a field of study was abolished. As explained by Chen (1992), the new regime considered the field to be 'a bourgeois pseudoscience that worshipped and had blind faith in things foreign' (p. 5). Because official policies at that time were closely guided by the Soviet Union, much of the education system, and especially the university sector, was restructured along Soviet lines (Cleverley, 1991, pp. 127–135; Hayhoe, 1999, p. 77). Policies were governed by ideological motives, which permitted little questioning of the value of Soviet models and excluded from consideration the educational models of other countries.

The 1960 diplomatic break with the Soviet Union brought a sharp change in direction. In 1964 the Ministry of Education set up a Division of Foreign Higher Education Information Materials at Peking University, a Division of Foreign Educational Technology at Qinghua University, and a Division of Foreign Education Research at Beijing Normal University. However, these divisions were abruptly terminated by the Cultural Revolution, which broke out in 1966. All studies of foreign practices were abolished because they were considered to have a close relationship with Western capitalism and Soviet revisionism.

The foreign studies institutes were permitted to recommence work in 1973, but they did so with considerable caution. Mao's death in 1976 and the subsequent fall of the Gang of Four, who had sought to take the reins of power, brought a new climate. Deng Xiaoping's open-door policy contributed to a renaissance of comparative education because the field was seen as an instrument to help China to catch up with more advanced countries. In 1979 a Programme of Foreign Education was established for postgraduate students at Beijing Normal University, and a Programme of Education in Western Europe and North America was established at East China Normal University, Shanghai. In 1984, Beijing Normal University and East China Normal University were permitted to enrol doctoral students in comparative education, and shortly afterwards they were joined by Hangzhou University. While by the standards of other countries the operations were very limited, the events were of considerable importance. By 1989 the country had four institutes and 20 programmes of comparative education (Chen, 1994, p. 233).

Accompanying these developments was the formation in 1979 of the Chinese Comparative Education Society (CCES). The CCES was affiliated to the Chinese Education Society, and, like other affiliates (Chen, 1992, pp. 121–122), was expected:

- to engage in studying theoretical and practical problems of educational sciences under the guidance of Marxism–Leninism and Mao Zedong thought;
- to unite its members nation-wide, to undertake educational research, and to facilitate educational reforms; and
- to render service to implement comprehensively the educational policy formulated by the Chinese Communist Party, to improve the quality of education, to build up the socialist educational sciences system which is peculiar to China, and to realise the socialist modernisation.

At the outset the CCES had fewer than 100 members; but by 1985 the membership had grown to 340, and in 2001 it reached about 500 [5]. The CCES organised periodic conferences which in the 1990s settled down to a biennial pattern. In 1984 the CCES was admitted to the WCCES, and in 1987 the CCES President, Gu Mingyuan, was elected WCCES Vice-President.

Further indicators of the growing strength of the field included the foundation of specialist journals (Table I). In 1965, a bulletin for internal circulation entitled *Foreign Education Conditions* was launched at Beijing Normal University [6]. The bulletin was suspended at the time of the 1966 Cultural Revolution, but distribution resumed in 1973. In 1980 the bulletin became an open publication as a recognised journal. A second publication entitled *Journal of Foreign Education Studies* was launched in 1972 by East China Normal University. Two more journals were launched in 1979, and five journals were launched in the 1980s [7].

Initially, the principal focus of these journals was on foreign rather than comparative education. Up to 1991, the journal *Foreign Education*, published by the China National Institute for Educational Research, had been the official journal of the CCES. In 1991 the CCES Executive Committee decided that the Beijing Normal University publication should

TABLE I. Journals in Mainland China related to comparative education

| Title | Publisher | Started | Issues per year | | Circulation | |
|---|---|---------|-----------------|------|-------------------|------|
| | | | 1990 | 2001 | 1990 | 2001 |
| <i>Foreign Education Conditions/ Comparative Education Review^a</i> | Beijing Normal University | 1965 | 6 | 12 | 10,000 | 5600 |
| <i>Journal of Foreign Education Studies/ Global Education^b</i> | East China Normal University | 1972 | 6 | 12 | 8000 | 6000 |
| <i>Foreign Education</i> | China National Institute for Educational Research | 1979 | 6 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 |
| <i>Higher Education Abroad/ International Higher Education^c</i> | Xiamen University | 1979 | 4 | 4 | 1000 | 1000 |
| <i>Foreign Education Reference Materials/ Chinese and Foreign Education^d</i> | Fujian Normal University | 1980 | 4 | 4 | 4000 | 2500 |
| <i>World Education Digest</i> | South China Normal University | 1981 | 6 ^e | 0 | 4000 ^e | 0 |
| <i>Secondary and Primary Education Abroad</i> | Shanghai Teachers' University | 1982 | 4 | 6 | 15,000 | 8500 |
| <i>Studies of Foreign Education</i> | North East Normal University | 1983 | 6 | 6 | 3000 | 4400 |
| <i>World Education Information</i> | Ministry of Education | 1987 | 12 | 12 | 2600 | 3500 |

^a The journal was renamed in 1992.

^b The journal was renamed in 2001.

^c The journal was renamed in 2000.

^d The journal was renamed in 1991.

^e This figure refers to 1988. The journal ceased publication in 1989.

Sources: Chen (1992, p. 250); publishers of the journals.

become the society's official journal. In 1992 the Beijing Normal University journal was renamed *Comparative Education Review*, and the China National Institute for Educational Research journal ceased publication. Significantly, the circulation of the Beijing Normal University journal immediately dropped from 10,000 to 5000; and since *Foreign Education* had ceased publication, the volume of output in this domain decreased markedly. The fall in circulation of the Beijing Normal University journal reflected the lower interest in the academic field of comparative education compared with the more factual foreign education. However, by 2001 the journal's circulation had risen again to 5600, and in that year the publisher doubled the number of annual issues from six to 12.

Also significant at this period of history was that the East China Normal University *Journal of Foreign Education Studies* was renamed *Global Education*, and the Xiamen University journal *Higher Education Abroad* was renamed *International Higher Education*. This indicated a further shift of emphasis away from foreign education. In 2001 the publishers of the East China Normal University journal, like their counterparts at Beijing Normal University, doubled the number of annual issues from six to 12.

Book publications provided a further indicator of development. Despite the growth of the field during the 1970s, only in 1982 was the first post-1949 textbook published (Wang *et al.*, 1982). It was followed 5 years later by Cheng (1987) and then Wu & Yang (1989).

Nevertheless, despite this growth and diversification the field continued to suffer from various shortcomings. Addressing the sixth CCES meeting in 1990, Gu noted three major problems [8]. The first was that comparative education scholars had not worked hard enough to facilitate China's development. Gu declared:

If we say that in the past most educators in China had only a superficial understanding of education in foreign countries, then the same can be said today except that now comparative education researchers do not understand the situation in China well. Nowadays, researchers are immersing themselves in information about education in other countries, and pay little attention either to what is happening in their home country or to what China really needs (Gu, 2001, p. 230).

Second, Gu observed that much comparative education research lacked theoretical depth:

Many factual descriptions of education in foreign countries are too superficial. The researchers have not been able to retrieve patterns or laws from the comparative analysis [which] ... are necessary for the assimilation and application of overseas experience (p. 231).

Third, Gu argued that scholars had paid insufficient attention to the construction of the field:

In the past decade, quite a number of textbooks on comparative education have been published, but these works cannot break away from the set conventions in the 1950s and 1960s in either methodology or contents. These textbooks can only be used as introductory materials for newcomers to comparative education. They can reflect neither the new developments of comparative education as a sub-discipline in educational science nor the unique characteristics of comparative education in China (p. 231).

Other critics echoed these points and noted limitations in the range of countries and topics on which comparative education scholars focused. Chen (1994, p. 242) observed that among the 760 articles in *Foreign Education* between 1979 and 1989, 58.8% focused on six countries, namely the Soviet Union, the USA, Japan, the UK, West Germany and France; and a similar emphasis was evident in authored and translated books. Concerning topics, particular focus was given to higher education. In the four journals which Chen surveyed, this was the focus

of 21.8% of articles; and again a similar focus was evident in the books. Chen remarked that these emphases reflected views on the countries from which China could learn useful lessons and awareness of the importance of higher education to China's goals of modernisation. Additional factors concerned the background of the researchers, many of whom were based in universities and who were therefore familiar with the operational context, and the availability of information. Chen explained (1994, p. 237) that the limited opportunities for comparative education researchers to go abroad meant that their main sources were second-hand materials, many of which were obtained through exchange programmes with foreign institutions. Comparative educationists commonly chose their topics according to the information available, and the relative availability of materials on higher education therefore contributed to a dominance of this focus.

During the 1990s, however, the field continued to develop dramatically. The new books became too numerous to be listed here, but included specialised works on methodology (e.g. Xue, 1993), adult education (e.g. Bi & Si, 1995), early childhood education (e.g. Huo, 1995), teacher education (e.g. Su *et al.*, 1990; Chen, 1997), higher education (e.g. Yang & Han, 1997), educational traditions (e.g. Gui, 1996), financing (e.g. Zhang, 1997) and laws (e.g. Hao & Li, 1997). At the same time, as China opened up, increasing numbers of scholars were able to collaborate with international bodies such as UNESCO and the World Bank, and with bilateral agencies of various kinds. This collaboration broadened horizons, and permitted at least some scholars to focus on less developed countries in Asia (see e.g. Wang *et al.*, 1997 and Wu *et al.*, 2000). These scholars were few in number, and Africa and Latin America remained largely over the horizon. However, the field did show at least some broadening of geographical scope as well as deepening of analysis. New initiatives included the launch in 2001 of a Centre of International and Comparative Education at Central China University of Science and Technology (Shen, 2001), and a master's degree in comparative education at Shanghai Teachers' University (M. Zhang, 2001, personal communication).

Comparative Education in Taiwan

Comparative education in Taiwan has followed a different path from its counterpart in Mainland China. During Taiwan's period as a Japanese colony, the territory was in some respects a borrower of educational models from Japan (Tsurumi, 1984). The immediate post-colonial period, in the 1940s and 1950s, was unsettled and not conducive to academic development. However, Taiwan's subsequent economic prosperity assisted comparative education by supporting expansion of the university sector and promoting external linkages.

Like Mainland China, Taiwan has a comparative education society which is a member of the WCCES. It was established in 1974, 5 years earlier than its counterpart in Mainland China, and joined the WCCES in 1990. It is known in English as the Chinese Comparative Education Society–Taipei (CCES-T). The main purpose of the society, according to its constitution (CCES-T, 2001), is 'to study current education in the important countries, to achieve international education and academic cooperation, and to promote education at home'. In 2001 the society had 320 members (Y. Chung, 2001, personal communication). This number is especially remarkable when Taiwan's population of 22 million is considered; Mainland China's CCES had twice that number, but for a population of 1200 million.

The CCES-T has also been very active. In 1982 it launched a newsletter which in 1997 evolved into a full *Journal of Comparative Education*. For most of the two decades from 1982, three issues of the newsletter/journal were published [9]; and in 2001, 500 copies of each issue of the journal were printed (Y. Chung, 2001, personal communication). In addition, the CCES-T usually held at least one conference each year. Table II shows the publications

TABLE II. Chinese Comparative Education Society–Taipai (CCES-T) conferences and publications, 1975–2000

| Year | Title | Publisher |
|------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1975 | Comparative Education | Teachers' Friend Journal |
| 1976 | Education Reform Trends in the World | Kindergarten Education Press |
| 1977 | Higher Education Reform Trends in the World | Kindergarten Education Press |
| 1979 | Secondary School Education Reform Trends in the World | Kindergarten Education Press |
| 1980 | Primary Education Reform Trends in the World | Kindergarten Education Press |
| 1981 | Teacher Education Reform Trends in the World | Kindergarten Education Press |
| 1982 | Technological Career Higher Education Reform Trends in the World | Kindergarten Education Press |
| 1983 | University Entrance System Reform Trends in the World | Kindergarten Education Press |
| 1984 | School System Reform Trends in the World | Hua Xin Press |
| 1984 | School System Reform Policies and Prospects | Wen Jing Press |
| 1985 | Comparative Studies of Educational Administration | Taiwan Bookstore Press |
| 1986 | Educational Reform Trends and Prospects | Taiwan Bookstore Press |
| 1987 | Comparative Studies of Preschool Education | Taiwan Bookstore Press |
| 1988 | Lifelong Education | Taiwan Bookstore Press |
| 1989 | Comparative Studies of Textbooks | Taiwan Bookstore Press |
| 1990 | Comparison of Primary and Middle School Curricula | Normal University Bookstore Press |
| 1991 | International and Comparative Teacher Education | Normal University Bookstore Press |
| 1992 | Comparison of Education in Mainland China and Taiwan | Normal University Bookstore Press |
| 1993 | Educational Reform towards the 21st Century | Normal University Bookstore Press |
| 1994 | Cultural Tradition and Modernisation of Education | Normal University Bookstore Press |
| 1995 | Education: Tradition, Modernity and Post-modernity | Normal University Bookstore Press |
| 1995 | Educational Reform Prospects | Normal University Bookstore Press |
| 1996 | Educational Reform: From Tradition to Post-modernity | Normal University Bookstore Press |
| 1997 | Equality of Educational Opportunity during the Processes of Social Change | Yang-Chih Book Co. |
| 1998 | Lifelong Education for All | Yang-Chih Book Co. |
| 1998 | The Forum of Young Scholars between Taiwan Strait | Yang-Chih Book Co. |
| 1998 | Educational Research and Educational Policies: An International Comparison | Yang-Chih Book Co. |
| 1999 | The New Era Education: Challenges and Responses | Yang-Chih Book Co. |
| 2000 | In-service Teacher Education: A Comparative Perspective | Yang-Chih Book Co. |
| 2000 | Comparative Education Theory and Practice | Taiwan Bookstore Press |

Source: Yang (1996, p. 205) and Chung (2001, personal communication).

which resulted from the conferences between 1975 and 2000. The broad evolution in themes, while not absolutely consistent, is instructive: from focus on levels of education, to topics, and then conceptual approaches. One of the books published in 2000 (CCES-T, 2000) brought together the work of scholars from Taiwan and Mainland China, and was thus a significant step in collaboration within Greater China.

Over the decades, three universities have made major contributions to the CCES-T, especially in editing and publication of the newsletter. They are the National Taiwan Normal University, National Cheng-Chi University, and National Kaohsiung Normal University. In 1995 a Graduate Institute of Comparative Education—the first of its type—was established at the newly created National Chi-Nan University. In contrast to the Normal Universities, which have mainly focused on industrialised countries, this institute has focused on both industrialised and less developed Asian countries, and aims to develop distinctive Taiwanese characteristics in comparative education research. The institute launched a master's degree programme in 1995 and a doctorate in 1998. A similar institute has been planned for National Taipei University [10].

To identify the nature of the field in Taiwan, Lee (1999) assessed developments in the time periods 1945–1974, 1974–1995, and 1995–1998. For the first period, he analysed 1495 journal articles which had been written by Taiwanese scholars and could be classified as comparative education. He found (p. 436) that the articles mainly presented area studies (82.6%), followed by special subject studies (17.1%), and a few theoretical studies (0.3%). Most articles focused on industrialised countries, particularly the USA, UK, Japan and, to a lesser extent, Russia, Germany and France (Lee, 1999, p. 441). One underlying factor was that many scholars had received their graduate education in the USA or Japan. For the second period, Lee analysed 1429 articles. He found a similar dominance of area studies, with many articles simply describing foreign education experiences. The USA was even more dominant as the country of focus. For the third period, Lee analysed 306 articles. Again he found a dominance of area studies, but noted considerable growth in theoretical studies, a deepening of comparative analyses, and a broadening of the geographical foci of research. Mainland China had displaced the USA as the dominant focus of the research (Lee, 1999, pp. 459–460). This reflected a shift in Taiwan's political climate, which had removed many of the barriers to Mainland China. Similar findings were presented in Lo's (1999) detailed analysis not only of journals but also of books.

Yang (1996, pp. 199–200) has documented the steady flow of Taiwanese textbooks in comparative education since the 1960s. They included five books by Lei Guoding: *Comparative Education Systems* (1967), *Comparative University Education* (1968), *Comparative Vocational and Technology Education* (1974), *Comparative National Education* (1978), and *Comparative Education Principles* (1979). Yang Guoci wrote *Comparative Education Methodology* (1975), Wang Jiatong produced *Introduction to Comparative Education* (1979), and Lin Qingjiang edited *Comparative Education* (1983). Later books include Yang Siwei & Shen Shanshan (1996), Yang Shenkeng (1998), Wang Rujer (1999), and Shen Shanshan (2000).

Comparative Education in Hong Kong

Hong Kong's characteristics are different again from both the mainland and Taiwan. As in Taiwan, economic prosperity has permitted high tertiary enrolment rates, well-resourced universities, and considerable external travel for scholars and researchers. Hong Kong is even more international than Taiwan, reflected in its rank in 1997 as the world's seventh-largest trading entity, with the world's busiest container port and busiest airport in terms of the volume of cargo handled (Hong Kong, 1998, p. 42). Although 98% of the population is of

Chinese ethnicity, most families have members who are resident outside the territory. In the past, the majority of such family members were in Mainland China; but recent years have brought increased movement from Hong Kong to other parts of the world, and therefore strengthening of contacts particularly with such countries as Australia, Canada and the USA.

Small size has supported the development of comparative education by encouraging Hong Kong scholars to be outward looking. While the volume of research on Hong Kong has grown impressively during the last few decades, it would be inconceivable for any serious study to be based only on local literature. As such, the small size of the territory to some extent forces all researchers to be comparativists, although they may not all apply that label to themselves.

According to Sweeting (1999, p. 8), scholarly work in fields at least contiguous with comparative education was being conducted at the University of Hong Kong in the 1920s. The earliest university course in Hong Kong that could be regarded as a form of comparative education was launched in 1939 within the programme of the postgraduate diploma in education at the University of Hong Kong. As in other parts of the region, subsequent academic development was disrupted by World War II; but the course was restored in 1951. More vigorous activity developed in the 1980s, when modules were launched at the masters' level at the University of Hong Kong and the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

The Comparative Education Society of Hong Kong (CESHK) was founded in 1989, and 3 years later became a member of the WCCES. In 2001, the CESHK had 80 members. While this might not seem a huge number, like the Taiwanese society it is impressive in proportion to the size of the total population. The objectives of the CESHK set out in its constitution (CESHK, 2001) were:

- to promote the study of comparative education in Hong Kong;
- to disseminate ideas and information, through seminars and publications and other means, on recent developments, in Hong Kong and abroad, of comparative education scholarship; and
- to liaise with other scholarly associations of comparative education and of other areas of educational research, in Hong Kong and abroad.

In its early years the CESHK published periodic newsletters, and in 1998 these evolved into a more substantial bulletin. Four issues of the bulletin were published in the following 3 years, with the fourth having 24 pages and a print run of 1000 copies. Most of the content in these four issues was in English, although some was in Chinese. This contrasted with the official publications of the CCES and CCES-T, which were exclusively in Chinese [11]. Similarly, some books and journal articles have been written by Hong Kong's comparative education scholars in Chinese, but they have been a minority. This partly reflected the overall orientation of Hong Kong's higher education sector, and the fact that English-language publications have generally been considered to have greater prestige.

Parallel to the development of the CESHK has been the establishment and growth of two bodies specifically dedicated to comparative education within Hong Kong's universities. The Comparative Education Research Centre of the University of Hong Kong was formed in 1994, and has established an international presence through its books, newsletters, workshops and other activities [12]. At the City University of Hong Kong, a smaller Comparative Education Policy Research Unit was established in 1999 (Mok, 2001).

An analysis of the contribution of Hong Kong scholars to the literature in comparative education was provided in the Presidential Address at the CESHK's 10th anniversary (Bray, 1999). The address listed the 48 articles written by Hong Kong scholars since 1990 in the five journals which were widely considered to be the top English-language publications in the

field and in the Chinese-language journal with the largest circulation [13]. The address noted that the list was impressive in length, but also commented on imbalances.

Concerning the geographical focus of the articles, the imbalances noted were an instructive contrast to the imbalances noted by Gu's CCES 10th anniversary address, quoted above. While Gu had criticised mainland comparative education scholars for neglecting their home country, the same could not be said of Hong Kong scholars. Among the articles, the largest group (21 of 48) examined patterns in Hong Kong within the framework of wider literatures, and the second-largest group (11 of 48) primarily focused on Mainland China. A further two articles took Hong Kong in a pair of comparisons (the other in the pair being Macau in one article, and Guangzhou in the other); and two articles took Mainland China as one of a pair of comparisons (the other in the pair in both cases being Taiwan). Yet despite the importance of comparativists being aware of patterns in their home societies, from a disciplinary perspective, the fact that so many of the publications by Hong Kong scholars primarily focused on Hong Kong and China was not necessarily a strength. Most of the articles would come under the heading of area studies, and the comparative elements were rather limited. Moreover, few Hong Kong scholars reached beyond East Asia in their geographical foci.

Turning to subject focus, the dominant topics in the 48 articles were political change, curriculum, and economics and financing of education. The theme of political change reflected Hong Kong's particular circumstances as the territory moved towards and then passed its 1997 reversion of sovereignty from the UK to China. Hong Kong's political transition was very unlike that of most colonies at earlier points in history, and several scholars pointed out that these differences were worth examining comparatively in order to strengthen broader conceptual understanding (see e.g. Morris, 1992 and Bray & Lee 1997). Some of the analyses of curriculum also fitted within a political framework, although others had different orientations. The articles which focused on economics and financing reflected more the particular interests of the scholars who wrote them than the specific circumstances of Hong Kong.

Comparative Education in Macau

As mentioned at the beginning of this article, Macau's population is even smaller than that of Hong Kong. Macau's academic contributions to the field of comparative education have not been strong, and the territory is chiefly brought into this article for the sake of completeness within the framework of discussion on Greater China. However, the contrasts with other parts of Greater China are instructive, and facilitate understanding of the broader factors which shape the field.

Because Macau is even smaller than Hong Kong, its citizens have also had a strong external orientation. However, small size has also been a major constraint on the development of Macau's research capacity. Chiefly because of the limited population, Macau's first modern university was only established in 1981 [14]. It was called the University of East Asia, and, as its name suggests, sought to draw students from the whole region as well as Macau. This broad orientation did to some extent promote comparative perspectives, but as it was a private institution aiming chiefly to earn revenue through courses, the university emphasised teaching more than research (Mellor, 1988).

A Faculty of Education was established at the University of East Asia in 1987, and formed an important base for subsequent developments in the field. In 1988 the University of East Asia was purchased by the government; and in 1991 its name was changed to the University of Macau. In the expansion that followed, recruitment to the Faculty of Education

did include two scholars who were specialists in comparative education [15]. As it happens, both came from Beijing Normal University, and one worked in Macau as Dean of the faculty and the other as a lecturer. The University of Macau has also over the years employed various scholars from Hong Kong, some of whom contributed to a book which compared education in Macau and Hong Kong and which made methodological as well as other contributions to the field (Bray & Koo, 1999).

Yet while in Hong Kong small size was earlier described as in some respects a strength for the field of comparative education, that remark was made in the context of a higher education system which is much larger. Macau, being among the smallest of the small, has a much weaker centre of gravity and has not had a sufficient critical mass of scholars to permit formation of a specialist comparative education society comparable to the ones in Hong Kong, Taiwan or Mainland China. However, the fact that Macau is a prosperous society has facilitated an outward-looking orientation, and many Macau students have gone outside the territory for higher education (Bray, 2001). Indeed, in the years immediately preceding and following the turn of the millennium, several students from Macau were registered for higher degrees in comparative education in Mainland China, the UK and elsewhere. Thus, the field of comparative education may be expected to mature in Macau alongside other fields of enquiry.

Contrasts

Having described some major characteristics of comparative education in the four parts of Greater China, it is time to turn to contrasts with some other parts of the world, including those to which the millennial special issue of *Comparative Education* referred. This section begins with the purposes of comparative education. It then elaborates on the impact of historical ties between different countries, and remarks on aspects of identity in the field.

Purposes of Comparative Education

One manifestation of the differences arising from context can be seen by contrasting conceptions of comparative education in Mainland China with those discussed by Little (2000) in the millennial special issue of *Comparative Education*. Presenting a view of identity boundaries among groups of scholars in the UK (or at least associated with the UK through willingness to publish in UK journals), Little contrasted the work of academics who identified with the field of comparative education on the one hand and development studies on the other. Little commenced with the work of Parkyn, who in the 1977 special issue of *Comparative Education* which was taken as a benchmark for the millennial special issue, had noted a distinction between the two fields but had stressed that they should be connected. Little observed that:

Parkyn was at pains to point out that the fundamental distinction between comparative education and development education was not one of geography. The distinction was one of purpose. The purpose of comparative education was understanding and analysis, the purpose of development education was action and change. Comparative education could and should be undertaken in the countries of the North and the South. Wherever it is practised, development education should rest on a foundation of comparative education (2000, p. 280).

Yet despite this perspective, in practice geographical foci as well as conceptual perceptions tended to separate the two camps. The development studies group were strongly influenced

by debates about modernisation and dependency, and tended to focus on the less developed countries of the Third World rather than on the industrialised countries of Europe and North America. Little pointed out that:

questions of method and country context distinguished the two literatures. Those who engaged most actively in the modernisation and dependency debates largely ignored the methodological debates in comparative education. Those who engaged most actively in the comparative methodological debates, drew their knowledge of educational context largely, though not exclusively, from the education systems of the North (2000, p. 289).

In China, by contrast, the two domains were not separated simply because, at least among dominant scholars, the principal purpose of comparative education was to contribute to national development. Thus, Gu, for example, expressed the view in 1986 (see Gu, 2001, p. 221) that the ultimate aim of comparative education 'is to promote educational development and reform in our own country [China]'; and as summarised by Chen (1992), the principles of comparative education:

should not deviate from the general guiding principles of the nation's construction which [in the words of Deng Xiaoping] are 'to integrate the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete realities of China, blaze a path of our own and build a socialism with Chinese characteristics' (p. 61).

Wu and Yang (1989) emphasised that Marxist universal truth demanded more emphasis than narrow empiricism; theory had to be integrated with China's specific practices; foreign experiences were to be used as a reference rather than being copied indiscriminately; and the orientation of socialism had to be maintained.

One irony was that although the UK scholars appeared superficially to espouse goals which matched those of their Chinese counterparts, they defined development studies rather differently. Particularly in the 1970s, the UK scholars, as noted by Little (2000, p. 287), were heavily influenced by the dependency school, which addressed the extent to which poor countries were dependent on rich countries and the mechanisms through which economic dependency was maintained. These ideas were developed from Marxist ideas on exploitation of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie and Lenin's writings on imperialism by such scholars as Frank (1971) and Galtung (1971). The Chinese scholars certainly shared the Marxist-Leninist principles; but while the dependency school encouraged UK scholars to study less developed countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, the Chinese scholars concentrated on the Soviet Union, the USA, Japan, the UK, West Germany and France. Their main goal in doing this was to understand how those countries had become industrialised and what lessons from their education systems could be learned for China.

Elaborating on the differences in approach, and noting the extent to which geographical foci differed in the various scholarly camps, Little (2000) stated that the pages of *Comparative Education* 'have attended disproportionately on educational issues in the countries of Europe, North America and, to a degree, Asia' (p. 281), but nevertheless found many articles which focused on less developed countries. Little classified the articles appearing in *Comparative Education* between 1977 and 1998. She found (p. 284) that among the articles which focused explicitly on a single country, 145 (58.5%) focused on 'developed' countries while 103 (41.5%) focused on 'developing' countries. Of the titles that indicated comparison across two countries, 42 (67.7%) were comparisons between two developed countries, 12 (19.3%) were comparisons between two developing countries, and the remaining eight (12.9%) compared developed and developing countries.

These findings may be contrasted with the work of Yung (1998), who analysed the contents of the 642 articles in the Beijing Normal University *Comparative Education Review* between 1987 and 1997. Yung found that 24.5% of the articles focused on countries in Asia (including China) [16], 19.8% on Europe, 18.5% on the USA and Canada, 9.6% on Russia, 1.4% on Australia, 1.2% on Africa, and 0.8% each on Latin America/the Caribbean and the Mediterranean/Middle East. The Asian focus was considerable, but Asia is of course a diverse continent. The strongest interest was in Japan, followed by other prosperous parts of the region including Hong Kong, South Korea and Singapore. Much less interest was shown in poorer parts of Asia.

Further insights on the reasons for differences between the orientations of comparative education scholars in China and the UK can be identified from comparison with Hong Kong and Taiwan. These societies also had ideological frameworks which shaped the types of studies undertaken. However, in part because the societies were much more prosperous than Mainland China, less pressure was placed on scholars to address immediate local/national issues of development. Scholars could thus devote more attention to conceptual, methodological and other work which did not necessarily have direct implications for policy and practice in education systems. Indeed, to a considerable extent abstract conceptual work was rewarded more strongly than applied work in the university systems of Hong Kong and Taiwan. This to some extent paralleled patterns in the UK: a major factor permitting UK scholars to focus on topics which might not appear to have direct and practical application to the national development of the UK itself was that the UK was prosperous enough to be able to afford academics who spread their intellectual horizons widely.

Historical Ties and Language

Additional factors behind the different emphases in comparative education in different parts of the world arose from historical links. Through its colonial past, the UK has had long links with a substantial group of less developed countries, especially in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, and the South Pacific. China, by contrast, has not had similar connections through a colonial past, and has fewer 'natural' connections with such parts of the world [17].

Moreover, Chinese scholars who are willing to reach out have to learn a foreign language. Many comparative education scholars over the decades have stressed the need for scholars to learn different languages (see e.g. Bereday, 1964, pp. 131–142 and Halls, 1990a, pp. 62–63). However, this tends to be stressed much less strongly in English-speaking communities than in other communities, simply because so much information is available in English. This fact creates biases, which are evident in the pages of *Comparative Education* as much as elsewhere. Little's (2000, p. 282) list of country foci of articles showed a much greater proportion of articles about countries in which English is an official language than about other countries. Although *Comparative Education* does publish articles from scholars based outside the UK as well as from within the UK, the fact that the journal is published only in English maintains the bias towards English-speaking countries.

Given that comparative education scholars in Greater China who wish to work from anything other than translated sources must learn a foreign language when working beyond the boundaries of Greater China itself, the next question for the scholars is which foreign language(s) to learn. As noted above, during the 1950s Russian was the dominant foreign language in Mainland China. Political tides have greatly reduced the interest in Russian, and the new generations are much more likely to give priority to English. Again, this creates a bias in the access to materials and in the types of society on which scholars are likely to focus. The fact that large parts of Africa use French places those parts even further beyond the horizon than the English-speaking parts of Africa; and the use of Spanish and Portuguese in Latin

America means that this continent is also less accessible to Chinese scholars whose primary foreign language is English.

The fact that English is the dominant second language in the other parts of Greater China maintains biases there too. Taiwan, to a greater extent than Hong Kong or Macau, retains links with Japan as a result of its colonial history and contemporary linkages; and Macau, through its colonial legacy, has links to the Portuguese-speaking world which are not found in Hong Kong or Taiwan [18]. However, these linkages have not had so great an impact on scholarly work in comparative education as the linkages within the English-speaking world.

Identity in Comparative Education

One major concern among at least some scholars concerns the identity of Chinese comparative education within the wider field. For example, in 1990 Gu wrote (see Gu, 2001) [19]:

Comparative education originated in the West, so the research on comparative education has always been Eurocentric. Although in recent years more and more scholars have become interested in the Third World, their research methodology has been predominantly Eurocentric in nature... Therefore the comparative education researchers shoulder a huge responsibility of constructing a comparative education discipline with Chinese characteristics (p. 242).

A few years earlier, Wu & Yang (1985) had asserted a need to develop uniquely Chinese textbooks for comparative education; and Yang Rui (1998) stressed the need for Chinese comparative education to 'improve its theoretical standard, strengthen its integration with Chinese educational actuality and communicate more with its international counterparts' in order to 'improve its teaching quality [and] build up its own characteristics' (p. 6).

The perception that comparative education originated in the West deserves some comment because, although it is a common view, it is questionable. Works such as Halls (1990b) and Zhang & Wang (1997) have shown multiple origins of the field in different parts of the world.

Expanding on this point, it might be appropriate to challenge the place ascribed to Jullien's (1817) *Esquisse et vues préliminaires d'un ouvrage sur l'éducation comparée*. In the millennial special issue of *Comparative Education*, this work was referred to by Cowen (2000, pp. 334–335). Rosselló (1943) described Jullien as 'the father of comparative education'—an appellation which many others have echoed (e.g. Epstein, 1992, p. 3; van Daele, 1993, p. 49; Leclercq, 1999). However, in China (and elsewhere) systematic comparative studies of education systems developed quite independently of Jullien's work. This paper has referred to various endeavours in the nineteenth century which gathered strength in the twentieth century. Even in the West it is questionable whether Jullien should really be considered the father of comparative education, as his manuscript was only 'discovered' over a hundred years later and then popularised by Rosselló and the International Bureau of Education. Thus, no reference was made to Jullien by such authors as Michael Sadler (see Higginson, 1979) or Isaac Kandel (1933). Moreover, even if Western scholars consider Jullien to be the father of their branch of comparative education, Chinese scholars should perhaps consider him only the father-in-law (or perhaps great-great-grandfather-in-law) rather than a direct ancestor.

Yet even if Chinese scholars were to give their own direct ancestors stronger recognition, the thrust of Gu's message would remain the exhortation to construct 'a comparative education discipline with Chinese characteristics' (2001, p. 242). The question then is what

such a discipline would be like. Gu's answer, writing in 1990, was that 'China is a socialist country guided by the thought of Karl Marx and Mao Zedong', and that 'their ideas have formed the methodological foundation of comparative education in China' (Gu, 2001, p. 242). A decade later, at the beginning of the new millennium, scholars in Mainland China were less enthusiastic to give the thought of Karl Marx and Mao Zedong so prominent a place. This was chiefly because of political shifts and the advent of the market economy with its very different implications.

Further, the other parts of Greater China had never stressed Marxism and Maoism to the same extent as in Mainland China—and indeed the governments in those parts of Greater China had actively discouraged such perspectives. Thus, the question of what a comparative education discipline with Chinese characteristics might look like in these parts of Greater China would have gained a very different response in the 1970s and 1980s. At the beginning of the new millennium, some scholars might declare that it is in any case an irrelevant question in an increasingly globalised world; but others might comment on the sorts of contributions which scholars in Greater China can make to the global arena, which will be remarked upon below.

Contributions

Despite the fragmentation of the field, which led Cowen (2000) to refer to comparative educations in the plural, there does exist a global community of comparative educationists who have strong interaction with each other and mutual influence. Comparative educationists in Greater China have already made some notable contributions to the global field, and it seems clear that they will make further contributions in the new millennium. The most striking of these contributions are in the volume and the orientation of comparative education research.

Beginning with the volume, it is useful to return to the statistics in Table I. With a circulation of 5600 copies in 2001, the CCES journal *Comparative Education Review*, which is published by Beijing Normal University, far exceeded the circulation of any comparable journal in the world. The nearest counterpart was the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) journal with the same English name, which was published in the USA and had a circulation below 2500 (Hawkins, 1999). *Comparative Education*, the journal in which this article is printed, had a circulation below that number; and the circulations of other comparative education journals were smaller still. To the explicitly comparative journal published by Beijing Normal University may be added the journals in foreign education and allied subjects which had even larger circulations; and to the publications in Mainland China may be added the CCES-T journal, which had a print run of 500 copies, and the CESHK bulletin which had a print run of 1000. Further, the CCES *Comparative Education Review* had 12 issues a year, compared with four each for the CIES *Comparative Education Review* and *Comparative Education*.

Qualifying the above paragraph about volume, the CCES journal was a less substantial publication than its CIES counterpart or than *Comparative Education*. Articles in the CCES journal were typically five to seven pages in length, and were therefore restricted in depth [20]. The fact that the articles were shorter permitted a larger number to be published; but each issue of the journal had fewer than 70 pages. The CCES-T journal was in style and length more similar to the CIES journal and to *Comparative Education*; but the CESHK bulletin set out only to be a bulletin, with more modest goals than an academic journal.

Nevertheless, even with these qualifications, the scale of journal output in Greater China was clearly considerable. To the journals may be added many books, again commonly with

much larger print runs than their counterparts in other languages. One striking example is the book by Wang *et al.* (1982), cited above, of which 108,700 copies had been printed by 2000 [21]. Further, the fact that these journals and books are in Chinese helps to balance the dominance of English in the global arena.

Concerning the content of studies, one obvious contribution is to comparison of systems within Greater China. Many comparisons have been made between Hong Kong and Taiwan, Mainland China and Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macau, and various other combinations [22]. Such comparisons are especially easy for Chinese scholars to undertake because they can be done entirely through the medium of Chinese. The comparisons have many thrusts. For example, Hong Kong and Macau have both been colonies of European powers which underwent colonial transition at the end of the twentieth century; Hong Kong and Taiwan are two of the four Asian Tigers which achieved dramatic economic advances in the 1980s and 1990s [23]; Mainland China and Taiwan have a common cultural heritage but contrasting political systems; Taiwan and Hong Kong, in part for cultural reasons, are societies with high rates of out-of-school supplementary tutoring; the fact that Macau is among the smallest of the small, Mainland China is the largest of the large, and Taiwan and Hong Kong are intermediate, permits identification of the implications of population and geographical size for education systems; and Hong Kong, as an urban society with a Chinese heritage, can be compared with counterpart cities such as Guangzhou, Shanghai and Taipei. Comparisons based on all these dimensions already exist in the literature; and no doubt many more studies will be undertaken, both on these dimensions and on others.

Scholars in Greater China may also contribute to wider literatures through their understanding of the distinctive features of their own societies. As noted above, during the 1990s scholars from Hong Kong contributed to the international literature on colonial transition by highlighting the distinctive features of Hong Kong's circumstances. Parallel contributions by scholars who focused on Macau were in some respects even more valuable because the international literature on former Portuguese colonies is much less developed than the international literature on former British colonies. International literature is also underdeveloped on former Japanese colonies, and further analysis of Taiwan's experiences could thus be a valuable contribution to the wider field. Scholars in Mainland China are well placed to contribute understanding of the processes of transition to market economies. They could also develop instructive comparisons of pedagogy in Chinese and other societies, the impact of one-child families, rural/urban disparities, the changing role of the state, expansion of higher education, and many other dimensions. Further, scholars across Greater China may collaborate to explore the dimensions and implications of those aspects of the Chinese intellectual heritage for their academic cultures.

Another contribution made by scholars in Greater China is to the wider organisational framework. The Comparative Education Society of Asia (CESA) was formed at a meeting in Hong Kong in 1995, and became a WCCES member in 1996. CESA was formed to serve Asian scholars who have no national societies, and to provide a wider regional arena within which to promote comparative research. CESA's inaugural conference was held in Tokyo in 1996; its second conference was co-hosted by the CCES and held in Beijing in 1998; and its third conference was co-hosted by the CCES-T and held in Taipei in 2001. The CCES, CCES-T and CESHK have also played significant roles in WCCES affairs. Their representatives have been active in the WCCES Executive Committee, and in 2000 the Comparative Education Research Centre at the University of Hong Kong became the WCCES Secretariat.

Worth adding here is that the CCES-T and CESHK are, in per capita terms, the largest societies of their type in the world. In absolute numbers, the largest society among the 29 WCCES members is the US-based CIES, which at the turn of the millennium had

2300 individual and institutional members. However, one-third of the CIES membership was international. Thus, in 1998, for example, the CIES had only 650 US individual members and 780 US institutional members—in a country with a population of 263 million [24]. The CCES-T, by contrast, had 320 members in an island of 22 million; and the CESHK had 80 members in a territory of just 7 million.

Conclusions

The principal benchmark taken by the Co-editors of the millennial special issue of *Comparative Education* was a 1977 special issue (Grant, 1977) devoted to the ‘present state and future prospects’ of the field (Crossley & Jarvis, 2000b, p. 261). If one compares the nature of the field in Greater China in 1977 with that at the turn of the millennium, the differences are indeed striking. The CCES-T had been established 3 years before 1977, but had not yet become a major force. The CCES was not established until 1979, and the CESHK was not established until 1989. The Beijing Normal University bulletin *Foreign Education Conditions*, which had been established in 1965 but suspended during the Cultural Revolution, had resumed publication at the time of the 1977 special issue, but was only designed for internal circulation and was thus practically invisible to the wider field. Only in 1980 did it become an open publication, and only in 1992 did it become more explicitly comparative. Likewise, only after nearly a decade of operation did the CCES-T launch its newsletter which in 1997 became a fully fledged journal.

In all parts of Greater China, comparative education continues to face major challenges. It is arguable that much work is methodologically weak, and, as elsewhere, contains too much description of patterns in foreign places rather than analysis grounded in systematic comparison. The geographical foci for comparison by scholars in Greater China remain rather unbalanced; and, particularly for scholars in Mainland China, for financial and political reasons the scope for fieldwork in other countries remains restricted.

Nevertheless by the beginning of the new millennium, comparative education had been firmly established in Greater China. In the millennial special issue of *Comparative Education*, Crossley (2000, p. 319) echoed Arnove (1999) by referring to ‘the regrouping and growth of the institutional base for the field, a growth that is especially notable throughout Asia and beyond the English-speaking world’ (p. 16). The developments in Greater China were a major part of this change; and the stage seemed set for continued development and an increasing voice in the decades to come. Policy-makers in Mainland China have announced dramatic plans for expansion of the university system (China, 2000), and China’s entry to the World Trade Organisation will accelerate the country’s internationalisation process (Huang, 2000). The effects of these changes will be felt in the field of comparative education as well as in other domains. Growth and maturation may also be expected in Taiwan and Hong Kong, and perhaps even Macau. Thus, just as the picture in the global field changed markedly in the quarter century from 1977 to the beginning of the millennium, work in Greater China during the next quarter century may bring further change of equivalent magnitude.

Acknowledgements

A considerable number of individuals assisted this paper by providing information. In addition, several people read the draft and provided helpful suggestions. The authors particularly thank Bob Adamson, Ruth Hayhoe and Emily Mang.

NOTES

- [1] Readers are asked to note that the family name of Dr Gui Qin is Gui, not Qin. The ordering of names presented here is the normal one in Chinese usage. When writing in English, some Chinese authors reverse the order of names to fit the dominant Western pattern of placing family names last. Dr Gui has not done this in the present article.
- [2] As noted by Harding (1995, p. 8), some people include Singapore and even overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia, America and Europe in a definition of Greater China. However, for the purposes of this paper these categories are excluded.
- [3] The fact that this work was described as a 'short' history deserves note, for it comprised three volumes totalling 2273 pages. One is left to wonder what the Editors would have described as a long history.
- [4] This journal was quite wide ranging. For example, the 1903 issue contained articles on the UK, USA, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Austria, Sweden and Russia.
- [5] Precise calculation of membership numbers was difficult because some institutions took group membership, and some individuals were left on the books even though they had not paid recent subscriptions.
- [6] Initially, this bulletin was edited by Beijing Normal University but published by Tianjin People's Press. Since 1984 the journal has been published by Beijing Normal University.
- [7] In addition were several journals focusing on education in specific foreign countries. One focused on Japan and was launched by Hebei University in 1973; and another focused on the Soviet Union and was launched by Anhui University in 1981.
- [8] An English-language version of Gu's presentation is contained in Gu (2001, Chapter 17).
- [9] Only one issue appeared in 1982 and 1998, and only two issues appeared in 1988, 1992, 1993, 1996 and 1999.
- [10] This institute was expected to open in 2002 (P.W.S. Shan, 2001, personal communication).
- [11] However, both of the Chinese-language journals provided English-language versions of their contents pages.
- [12] For information on the centre, see <http://www.hku.hk/cerc>.
- [13] The English-language journals were *Comparative Education Review* [Chicago], *Comparative Education, Compare, International Journal of Educational Development* and *International Review of Education*. The Chinese-language journal was *Comparative Education Review* [Beijing].
- [14] Macau can boast a longer history of higher education through St. Paul's University College, which was founded by the Jesuits in 1597 (dos Santos, 1968). However, that institution was rather different from modern-day universities, and it was closed in 1762.
- [15] These scholars were not employed concurrently at the university. The contract for the first came to an end before the second was recruited.
- [16] China was the focus of 3% of the articles, so the figure for Asia excluding China was 21.5%.
- [17] However, from the 1950s China did have an external aid programme for Africa. It has not gained much attention in the field of comparative education, but is an interesting parallel to Western aid programmes (Gillespie, 2001).
- [18] For example, delegates from Macau have commonly joined the meetings of the Associação das Universidades de Língua Portuguesa (AULP), which has brought them into contact with counterparts from Angola, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Mozambique and Portugal [see e.g. AULP (1999)].
- [19] This is an English-language translation of a paper originally written in 1990 and published in Chinese in 1991.
- [20] However, Chinese is a more compact language than English, which means that ideas can be expressed in Chinese in less space.
- [21] This is the total print run of all three editions. The first edition, as noted above, was published in 1982. The second edition was published in 1985, and the third edition was published in 1999.
- [22] Many comparisons have also of course been made within each of these jurisdictions. However, such studies are less likely to be described as comparative education.
- [23] The other two are Singapore and the Republic of Korea.
- [24] These figures are derived from subscription numbers to the CIES journal *Comparative Education Review* (Hawkins, 1999). Membership of the society brought a subscription to the journal, and subscriptions to the journal could not be achieved without membership.

REFERENCES

- ARNOVE, R.F. (1999) Introduction—reframing comparative education: the dialectic of the global and the local, in: R.F. ARNOVE & C.A. TORRES (Eds.) *Comparative Education: the dialectic of the global and the local*, pp. 1–23 (Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield).
- ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (2000) *Key Indicators of Developing Asian and Pacific Economies* (Hong Kong, Oxford University Press).

- ASSOCIAÇÃO DAS UNIVERSIDADES DE LÍNGUA PORTUGUESA (AULP) (1999) *VIII Encontro-AULP Associação das Universidades de Língua Portuguesa* [Eighth Meeting of the Association of Portuguese Language Universities] (Macau, Gabinete de Apoio ao Ensino Superior).
- BASTID, M. (1987) Servitude or liberation? The introduction of foreign educational practices and systems to China from 1840 to the present, in: R. HAYHOE & M. BASTID (Eds.) *China's Education and the Industrialized World: studies in cultural transfer*, pp. 3–20 (Armonk, NY, M. E. Sharpe).
- BEREDAY, G.Z.F. (1964) *Comparative Method in Education* (New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston).
- BI, S. & SI, Y. (Eds.) (1995) *Comparative Adult Education* (Beijing, Beijing Normal University Press) [in Chinese].
- BRAY, M. (1999) Comparative education research in Hong Kong: a decade of development, and an agenda for the future, *Comparative Education Bulletin* [Comparative Education Society of Hong Kong], 3, pp. 2–7.
- BRAY, M. (2001) Higher education and colonial transition in Macau: market forces and state intervention in a small society, in: M. BRAY & W.O. LEE (Eds.) *Education and Political Transition: themes and experiences in East Asia*, pp. 139–161 (Hong Kong, Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong).
- BRAY, M. & KOO, R. (Eds.) (1999) *Education and Society in Hong Kong and Macau: comparative perspectives on continuity and change* (Hong Kong, Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong).
- BRAY, M. & LEE, W.O. (Eds.) (1997) *Education and Political Transition: implications of Hong Kong's change of sovereignty*. Special Number 19 of *Comparative Education*, 33(2).
- CHANG, D. (1930) *Comparative Education* (Shanghai, China Book Co.) [in Chinese].
- CHANG, D. (1932) *New China Comparative Education* (Shanghai, China Book Co.) [in Chinese].
- CHEN, S.C. (1992) Comparative education studies in the People's Republic of China. PhD dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- CHEN, S.C. (1994) Research trends in mainland Chinese comparative education, *Comparative Education Review*, 38, pp. 233–252.
- CHEN, Y. (1997) *A Comparative Study of International Reforms in Teacher Education* (Beijing, People's Education Press) [in Chinese].
- CHEN, Z. (1933) *Comparative Education* (Shanghai, Great China Book Co.) [in Chinese].
- CHEN, Z. & LIU, J. (Eds.) (1934) *Comparative Education* (Shanghai, Commercial Press) [in Chinese].
- CHENG, Y. (1987) *A Course in Comparative Education* (Beijing, Beijing Normal University Press) [in Chinese].
- CHINA, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF (2000) *2000 Green Paper on Education in China* (Beijing, Ministry of Education) [in Chinese].
- CHINESE COMPARATIVE EDUCATION SOCIETY-TAIPEI (CCES-T) (2000) *Comparative Education Theory and Practice* (Taipei, Taiwan Bookstore Press) [in Chinese].
- CHINESE COMPARATIVE EDUCATION SOCIETY-TAIPEI (CCES-T) (2001) Constitution of the Chinese Comparative Education Society-Taipei. <http://www.ced.ncnu.edu.tw/ccest/constitutionsE.html>.
- CLEVERLEY, J. (1991) *The Schooling of China: tradition and modernity in Chinese education* (Sydney, Allen & Unwin).
- COMPARATIVE EDUCATION SOCIETY OF HONG KONG (CESHK) (2001) Constitution of the Comparative Education Society of Hong Kong. <http://www.hku.hk/cerc/ceshk/english/constc.htm>.
- COWEN, R. (2000) Comparing futures or comparing pasts?, *Comparative Education*, 36, pp. 333–342.
- CROSSLEY, M. (2000) Bridging cultures and traditions in the reconceptualisation of comparative and international education, *Comparative Education*, 36, pp. 319–332.
- CROSSLEY, M. & JARVIS, P. (Eds.) (2000a) *Comparative Education for the Twenty-first Century*. Special Number 23 of *Comparative Education*, 36(3).
- CROSSLEY, M. & JARVIS, P. (2000b) Introduction: continuity, challenge and change in comparative and international education, *Comparative Education*, 36, pp. 261–265.
- DOS SANTOS, D.M.G. (1968) *Macau: Primeira Universidade Ocidental do Extremo Oriente* [Macau: the first Western university in the Far East] (Lisboa, Academia Portuguesa da História).
- EPSTEIN, E.H. (1992) The problematic meaning of 'comparison' in comparative education, in: J. SCHRIEWER & B. HOLMES (Eds.) *Theories and Methods in Comparative Education*, pp. 3–23 (Frankfurt, Peter Lang).
- FRANK, A.G. (1971) *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: historical studies of Chile and Brazil* (Harmondsworth, Penguin).
- GALTUNG, J. (1971) A structural theory of imperialism, *Journal of Peace Research*, 8, pp. 81–117.
- GILLESPIE, S. (2001) *South-South Transfer: a study of Sino-African exchanges* (New York, Routledge).
- GRANT, N. (Ed.) (1977) *Comparative Education: its present state and future prospects*. Special Number of *Comparative Education*, 13(2).
- GRANT, N. (2000) Tasks for comparative education in the new millennium, *Comparative Education*, 36, pp. 309–317.
- GUI, Q. (1996) *Traditional Confucianism and Modern Education in China and Japan* (Wuhan, Hubei Education Press) [in Chinese].
- HALLS, W.D. (1990a) Trends and issues in comparative education, in: W.D. HALLS (Ed.) *Comparative Education: contemporary issues and trends*, pp. 21–65 (London, Jessica Kingsley; Paris, UNESCO).

- HALLS, W.D. (Ed.) (1990b) *Comparative Education: contemporary issues and trends* (London, Jessica Kingsley; Paris, UNESCO).
- HAO, W. & LI, L. (Eds.) (1997) *A Comparative Study of National Education Laws* (Beijing, People's Education Press) [in Chinese].
- HARDING, H. (1995) The concept of 'Greater China': themes, variations and reservations, in: D. SHAMBAUGH (Ed.) *Greater China: the next superpower?*, pp. 8–34 (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
- HAWKINS, J. (1999) Comparative Education Review Annual Report. Presented at the annual conference of the Comparative and International Education Society, Buffalo, New York.
- HAYHOE, R. (1999) *China's Universities 1895–1995: a century of cultural conflict* (Hong Kong, Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong).
- HIGGINSON, J.H. (Ed.) (1979) *Selections from Michael Sadler* (Liverpool, DeJail & Meyorre).
- HONG KONG, GOVERNMENT OF (1998) *Hong Kong: a new era* (Hong Kong, Information Services Department).
- HUANG, Y. (2000) Realizing China's Potential. Speech at the Asian Investment Conference. www.worldbank.org.cn/English/content/529z6146591.shtml.
- HUO, L. (1995) *A Comparative Study of Early Childhood Education* (Beijing, People's Education Press) [in Chinese].
- JULLIEN, M.A. (1817) *Esquisse et vues préliminaires d'un ouvrage sur l'éducation comparée* [Sketch and preliminary views of a work on comparative education] (Paris, Société Établie à Paris pour l'Amélioration de l'Enseignement Élémentaire). (Reprinted 1962 Genève, Bureau International d'Éducation).
- KANDEL, I.L. (1933) *Studies in Comparative Education* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin).
- LECLERCQ, J.M. (Ed.) (1999) Première partie: Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris, d'hier à aujourd'hui, [Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris, from yesterday to today] in: *L'Éducation comparée: mondialisation et spécificités Francophones* [Comparative education: globalisation and Francophone specifics], pp. 11–103 (Sèvres and Paris, Association Francophone d'Éducation Comparée and Centre National de Documentation Pédagogique).
- LEE, E.F.J. (1999) Comparative education in Taiwan: retrospect and prospect, in: *Educational Sciences: internationalization and indigenization*, pp. 431–471 (Taipei, Yang-Chih Book Co.) [in Chinese].
- LEI, G. (Ed.) (1967) *Comparative Education Systems* (Taipei, Taiwan Bookstore) [in Chinese].
- LEI, G. (Ed.) (1968) *Comparative University Education* (Taiwan, Chung Hua Bookstore) [in Chinese].
- LEI, G. (Ed.) (1974) *Comparative Vocational and Technology Education* (Taiwan, Chung Hua Bookstore) [in Chinese].
- LEI, G. (Ed.) (1978) *Comparative National Education* (Taipei, San Min Bookstore) [in Chinese].
- LEI, G. (Ed.) (1979) *Comparative Education Principles* (Taipei, Jiao Yu Wen Wu Publishing Co.) [in Chinese].
- LI, Q. (1983) The developing history of China's comparative education science, *Journal of Foreign Education Studies*, 1, pp. 12–18.
- LIN, Q. (Ed.) (1983) *Comparative Education* (Taipei, Wunan Publishing House) [in Chinese].
- LITTLE, A. (2000) Development studies and comparative education: context, content, comparison and contributors, *Comparative Education*, 36, pp. 279–296.
- LO, Y. (1999) Historical development of the study of comparative education in Taiwan, 1945–1998. Masters dissertation, National Chi-Nan University, Taiwan [in Chinese].
- LOXLEY, W. (1994) Comparative education and international education: organizations and institutions, in: T. HUSÉN & T.N. POSTLETHWAITE (Eds.) *The International Encyclopedia of Education*, 2nd edn, pp. 933–942 (Oxford, Pergamon Press).
- LUO, T. (1939) *A Review of Current Educational Conditions in Europe and America* (Shanghai, Commercial Press) [in Chinese].
- MACAU, GOVERNO DA REGIÃO ADMINISTRATIVA ESPECIAL DE (2000) *Estimativas do Produto Interno Bruto* [Estimates of Gross Domestic Product] (Macau, Direcção dos Serviços de Estatística e Censos).
- MELLOR, B. (1988) *The University of East Asia: origin and outlook* (Hong Kong, UEA Press).
- MOK, K.H. (2001) *Progress Report of Comparative Education Policy Research Unit* (Hong Kong, Department of Public and Social Administration, City University of Hong Kong).
- MORRIS, P. (1992) Political expectations and educational reform: the case of Hong Kong prior to its return to the sovereignty of the People's Republic of China, *Compare*, 22, pp. 153–164.
- PARKYN, G.W. (1977) Comparative education research and development education, *Comparative Education*, 13, pp. 87–93.
- ROSSELLÓ, P. (1943) *Marc-Antoine Jullien, dit de Paris, 1775–1848: père de l'éducation comparée et précurseur du Bureau International d'Éducation* [Marc-Antoine Jullien, said to be from Paris, 1775–1848: father of comparative education and precursor of the International Bureau of Education] (Genève, Bureau International d'Éducation).
- SHAMBAUGH, D. (Ed.) (1995) *Greater China: the next superpower?* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
- SHEN, H. (2001) A new centre of comparative and international education in China: background, goals and implications for the broader field. Seminar presented at the Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong, 5 May.

- SHEN, S. (2000) *International Comparative Education* (Taipei, Cheng Chung Book Co.) [in Chinese].
- SU, Z., XING, K. & LI, C. (1990) *Comparative Teacher Education* (Beijing, Beijing Normal University Press) [in Chinese].
- SWEETING, A. (1999) Comparative education at HKU: the early history, *CERCular* [Newsletter of the Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong], 1, p. 8.
- TAYLOR, R. (1996) *Greater China and Japan: prospects for an economic partnership in East Asia* (London, Routledge).
- TSURUMI, P.E. (1984) The non-Western colonizer in Asia: Japanese educational engineering in Taiwan, in: P.G. ALTBACH & G.P. KELLY (Eds.) *Education and the Colonial Experience*, pp. 55–74 (New Brunswick, Transaction Books).
- VAN DAELE, H. (1993) *L'Éducation Comparée* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France).
- WANG, C., ZHU, B. & GU, M. (Eds.) (1982) *Comparative Education* (Beijing, People's Education Press) [in Chinese].
- WANG, J. (Ed.) (1979) *Introduction to Comparative Education* (Kaohsiung, Fu Wen) [in Chinese].
- WANG, R. (1999) *Comparative Education* (Taipei, Wunan Publishing House) [in Chinese].
- WANG, Y., QU, H. & LI, J. (Eds.) (1997) *Compulsory Education in Asian Developing Countries* (Beijing, People's Education Press) [in Chinese].
- WU, W. & YANG, H. (1985) Developing uniquely Chinese textbooks for comparative education, *Educational Research*, 9, pp. 58–61 [in Chinese].
- WU, W. & YANG, H. (Eds.) (1989) *A Science of Comparative Education* (Beijing, People's Education Press) [in Chinese].
- WU, L., BIN, X., HUANG, R., JU, M. & MO, F. (2000) The natural evolution of girls' education in poor regions: case analysis of girls' educational models in poor regions of Asia-Pacific developing countries, *Comparative Education Review*, 21, pp. 46–50 [in Chinese].
- XUE, L. (1993) *Methodology in Comparative Education: comparative education as a forum of international communication in education* (Beijing, Capital Normal University Press) [in Chinese].
- YANG, G. (1975) *Comparative Education Methodology* (Taipei, Zheng Zhong) [in Chinese].
- YANG, R. (1998) The teaching of comparative education in Chinese universities: reflections on teaching methods and textbooks. Paper presented at the Xth World Congress of Comparative Education, Cape Town, South Africa.
- YANG, S. (1996) *Contemporary Comparative Education Research Trends* (Taipei, Normal University Press) [in Chinese].
- YANG, S. (1998) *Comparison, Understanding and Teacher Education in International Perspective* (Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang).
- YANG, H. & HAN, H. (1997) *An Introduction to Comparative Higher Education* (Beijing, People's Education Press) [in Chinese].
- YANG, S. & SHEN, S. (Eds.) (1996) *Comparative Education* (Luzhou, Taiwan, National University of the Air) [in Chinese].
- YU, J. (1917) *Comparative Study of National Education in Germany, France, Britain and the USA* (Shanghai, China Book Co.) [in Chinese].
- YUNG, C.S.S. (1998) A comparison of comparisons in the field of comparative education: a content analysis of English-medium and Chinese-medium journals. MEd dissertation, The University of Hong Kong.
- ZHANG, M. (1997) *Conceptions and Choices: a comparative study of student financial support policies* (Beijing, People's Education Press) [in Chinese].
- ZHANG, R. & WANG, C. (Eds.) (1997) *Short History of Comparative Studies of Chinese and Foreign Education* (3 vols) (Jinan, Shandong Education Press) [in Chinese].
- ZHONG, L. (1936) *Comparative Education* (Shanghai, Commercial Press) [in Chinese].
- ZHUANG, Z. (1929) *Comparative Study of Education Systems in Foreign Countries* (Shanghai, Commercial Press) [in Chinese].