

International Perspectives on the Goals of Universal Basic and Secondary Education

**Edited by Joel E. Cohen
and Martin B. Malin**

**American Academy of Arts and Sciences
Cambridge, Massachusetts**

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
New York London



First published 2010
by Routledge
270 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

Simultaneously published in the UK
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2010 American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
136 Irving Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138-1996

Introduction and Chapter 10 (entitled, “Educational Goals: Art, Science, Love and the Importance of Binocular Vision”) Copyright © 2010 Joel E. Cohen, used by permission. Photograph “El Ensueño” by Manuel Álvarez Bravo © Colette Urbajtel.

Typeset in Sabon by IBT Global.
Printed and bound in the United States of America on acid-free paper by IBT Global.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

International perspectives on the goals of universal basic and secondary education /
edited by Joel E. Cohen and Martin B. Malin.

p. cm. — (Routledge research in education ; 22)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Basic education. 2. Education, Secondary. 3. Education—Aims and objectives.

I. Cohen, Joel E. II. Malin, Martin B. III. American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

LC1035.I58 2009

370—dc22

2008035693

ISBN10: 0-415-99766-6 (hbk)

ISBN10: 0-203-88214-8 (ebk)

ISBN13: 978-0-415-99766-9 (hbk)

ISBN13: 978-0-203-88214-6 (ebk)

Contents

List of Figures and Tables
Acknowledgments

xi
xiii

PART I Introduction

- 1** **Goals of Universal Basic and Secondary Education** **3**
JOEL E. COHEN

PART II Educational Goals for Tomorrow's Society

- 2 **Education for All, but for What?** 43
KAI-MING CHENG
- 3 **Goals of Universal Primary and Secondary Education in the
21st Century: Reviving the Spirit of Socrates** 66
KISHORE MAHBUBANI
- 4 **What Will Be the Near-Future Goals of Education?** 73
WILLIAM K. CUMMINGS

PART III Educational Priorities in Poor Countries

- 5 **Quality Education: The Work of Optimists** 83
BERYL LEVINGER

6	Achieving Education of High Quality in Islamiyya Schools of Nigeria BALA AHMED	88
7	Nurturing Learning Ability: The Goals of Universal Primary and Secondary Education CAMER VELLANI	94
8	Quality, the Heart of Equity VIMALA RAMACHANDRAN	104

PART IV

Empowering Children through Art and Science

9	<i>The dia</i> Program: The Development of Intelligence through Art CLAUDIA MADRAZO	113
10	Educational Goals: Art, Science, Love, and the Importance of Binocular Vision JOEL E. COHEN	125

PART V

The Special Role of Skepticism as Universal Educational Goal

11	What Does “Universal” Education Mean? JAMES CARROLL	141
12	Teaching Tolerance and Open-Minded Approaches to Understanding Sacred Texts MOHAMED CHARFI AND HAMADI REDISSI	145
13	Educating All the People for Democratic Governance: A U.S. Perspective DEBORAH MEIER	176

PART VI
Educating Global Citizens

- 14 Educating for Global Competency 183
 FERNANDO REIMERS
- 15 Education and the Globalization Paradigm 203
 MARCELO M. SUÁREZ-OROZCO

PART VII
Perspectives on Assessment and Educational Goals

- 16 Evaluating Basic and Secondary Education 215
 ANA CAROLINA LETICHEVSKY
- 17 For What Should Schools Be Held Accountable? 225
 RICHARD ROTHSTEIN AND REBECCA JACOBSEN

PART VIII
Defining Educational Quality as a Basis for Educational Policy

- 18 Quality Education: A UNESCO Perspective 235
 MARY JOY PIGOZZI
- 19 Quality Education: What Is It, and Who Decides? Briefing
 Paper for a Policy Maker 246
 GEORGE M. INGRAM
- 20 The Challenge of Defining a Quality Universal Education:
 Mapping a Common Core 252
 LAURA HERSH SALGANIK AND STEPHEN J. PROVASNIK

- Contributors* 287
- Index* 295

1 Goals of Universal Basic and Secondary Education

Joel E. Cohen

What should be the goals of basic and secondary education of high quality? Which, if any, of these goals should be universal? What does “universal” mean? What happens when educational goals conflict? What are the meanings of “high quality” in basic and secondary education? Who decides these questions, and by what process do they decide? How should the quality of decisions about educational goals be evaluated?

Attention to educational goals is intrinsic to achieving educational quality. Knowing where one wants education to go, ultimately or incrementally, facilitates deciding whether one is getting there effectively. In the final decades of the twentieth century, the international movement toward universal primary education focused on expanding access to schooling and largely sidestepped trying to define goals. Yet the same international community promoted educational assessments as a means to improve educational quality. Such assessments are most useful if they measure what education is trying to accomplish.

The project on Universal Basic and Secondary Education (UBASE), based at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, recognized a lack of consensus within and among countries and a lack of focused international discussion on the desired content and aims of basic and secondary education. Acting on the conviction that questions of educational goals were too important to leave unargued and unanalyzed, the project invited individuals from different geographic, cultural, professional, and religious backgrounds to address these questions. These individuals wrote from different levels of analysis, reflecting their backgrounds as, among others, teachers and headmasters of schools, a diplomat, a philosopher, a statistician, an economist, a lawyer, a minister of state, a physician, an artist, a journalist and novelist, and professionals related to the study and administration of education—and from cultures and geographical locations in Africa north and south of the Sahara, Arab regions, East and South Asia, Europe, North America, and Latin America. Some of their written responses are the following chapters of this book.

The purposes of this volume are to stimulate attention to educational goals on the part of individuals, families, educational professionals,

community leaders in business, religion, and politics, local governments, national governments, and international organizations, and to provide some starting points for future discussions among the different groups with different agendas that compose any society. Educational goals are at the heart of contests of values and interests at most times in many societies. The diversity of educational goals in the chapters of this volume illustrates the challenges local communities, nations, and the international community will face in trying to set educational goals. Although the proposed goals vary with their authors' political, economic, social, and religious contexts, the multiple voices reflected in these chapters provide valuable material for an informed discussion. This volume may be the only place in recent decades where divergent, insightful views of the goals of primary and secondary education from around the world confront one another between the same covers.

This introduction reviews the context and content of the following chapters. I first identify some difficulties in establishing and evaluating educational goals. I then sketch the history of educational goals. The second half of this introduction summarizes the educational goals of basic and secondary education proposed by the authors of this volume.

This volume leaves major questions unanswered. It will have succeeded if it contributes to broadening and deepening conversations about the goals of education. Rich countries and poor, and rich people and poor, should devote more attention to the goals of basic and secondary education, and to what universal education should mean.

WHY DEFINING EDUCATIONAL GOALS IS DIFFICULT

The chapters in this volume collectively do not indicate a single set of educational goals. Specifying educational goals and agreeing on them are difficult for multiple reasons. Stating some of these reasons may help to avoid naive optimism and may encourage sustained attention to the challenge.

A society's goals for education and a society's goals for schooling (when these goals can be defined) may differ. For example, a society that wants its youth and adults to be trustworthy, courageous, and patriotic may sponsor youth movements outside of formal schooling. How a society encourages or regulates newspapers, magazines, the Internet, popular music, radio, television, film, political and commercial advertising, and video games reflects a society's implicit educational goals for its young people and adults. If there are differences between a society's goals for education (what kind of young people and adults does the society want?) and a society's goals for schooling, there may also be differences between high-quality education from a broad social perspective and high-quality schooling.

Goals for schooling may pertain to educational inputs, processes, immediate outputs, or long-term outcomes. Educational budgets and physical

facilities are inputs. Hours of instruction per year are both inputs and processes; pedagogical techniques and procedures of discipline and administration are processes. The fraction of primary school entrants who complete primary school and the fraction of primary school graduates who know their multiplication tables are both immediate outputs. Long-term outcomes could be measured by the fraction of young adults who are able to compete in global labor markets and who participate in national political debates on an informed basis, or by progress toward national political and economic goals.

Goals for educational inputs, processes, and immediate outputs may affect the possibility of reaching goals for long-term outcomes but do not determine what those long-term goals should be. A goal of increasing the use of computers in classrooms or incorporating art, music, or science into primary schools does not specify the long-term outcomes of education. Ranking educational goals for schooling requires some definition of long-term educational goals, and that definition is the responsibility of the society at large. A society may find it difficult to face or fulfill that responsibility if the views or interests of powerful actors within the society are too divergent.

A society's broad educational goals usually pertain to long-term outcomes but may often also affect the resources for and content of educational inputs and processes. For example, a society's goals for freedom of speech may influence the freedom of speech permitted in schools; a society's goals for democratic participation may influence the democratic participation permitted students in schools.

In short, what the society wants for itself affects the goals of schooling. The goals of schooling affect the long-term goals a society can hope to achieve. In the two-way causal interactions between the goals of schooling (regarding educational inputs, processes, and immediate outputs) and a society's broad educational goals (regarding long-term outcomes), there is a large margin of indeterminacy in both linkages. For example, in rulings on June 25, 2007, the United States Supreme Court forbade one kind of free speech to a high school student and authorized a greater range of free speech in political campaign advertisements (Stout, 2007).

Long-term outcomes may be specified at multiple levels, for example, the individual learner; the population of teachers (their training and orientations toward tolerance, the diversity of student needs, and technological innovation in education, for example); the educational system (for different age groups or tiers of education); the population reaching the age of 18; the adult population; and the society and economy. Goals at one level are not necessarily sufficient to determine goals at all levels. For example, a goal that the individual learner realize his interests and potential to the fullest extent possible, regardless of gender and urban or rural location, does not determine whether the population reaching the age of eighteen has the distribution of academic, vocational, commercial, and interactive skills and political loyalties required

for a viable society. Hence it seems necessary to specify educational goals at multiple levels. The UNESCO goals for individual learners and for the educational system (Mary Joy Pigozzi, Chapter 18, this volume) are a start in this direction of multi-level specification of goals.

Educational goals are subject to influence at multiple geographic or spatial scales, and may be determined differently at each scale from international to individual. Different spatial scales of influence interact in a complicated network. International organizations have goals for education based on their understanding of the reasons for providing education. For example, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child says that education is a basic human right, while some multinational businesses promote education where they want an educated labor force. Nongovernmental organizations and organized religions also attempt to influence education internationally. Educational goals are promoted by national governments, which may listen to the international community, and by national ministries, unions, and professional associations. State, provincial and local school boards, religious groups, and home-schooling parents may set goals for children's education in countries where the central government does not preempt that right. The parents in a family set educational goals and standards for their own children that need not coincide with those of the local or national community. Finally, individual children within a family may set themselves differing educational goals and standards.

Current discussions of the quality of education largely overlook the challenge of defining educational goals when means are limited (George Ingram, Chapter 19, this volume):

... presentations on quality education most often describe what is required to produce quality education in ideal circumstances—strong political commitment, adequate resources, supportive and involved parents and community, trained teachers and systems to support them, healthy students, etc. (p. 149).

But how do you maximize quality in less favorable circumstances?

Missing is a systemic analysis of what would define quality education and how it would be maximized in a resource-poor environment—crowded classes, poorly trained and compensated teachers, inadequate materials, and unengaged parents (p. 250).

When Mexican sixth-grade students who were the first in their families to go to school had teachers they rated as consistently effective, they acquired literacy skills at the same level as students with educated parents; but the first-generation students were handicapped in acquiring literacy when they perceived their teachers as ineffective (Reimers, 2006). This empirical finding underlines the importance of Ingram's emphasis on the quality of

teaching. Ingram also suggests a second missing ingredient: examination of the definition of an education of quality for students who are not in school, are vulnerable, or are hard-to-reach, such as “street children, rural dwellers, disabled children, HIV/AIDS orphans, dropouts, child laborers, night travelers in Uganda, and children with mental, physical and emotional disabilities” (p. 250). He notes that although interventions are currently directed toward these groups, basic questions of quality are not being addressed. He asks, “[W]hat are realistic, relevant goals? What type of learning is relevant for such groups?” (p. 250).

These questions can create tensions within countries as well as between or among them. Does universal education include students who are learning disabled or severely emotionally or physically disabled? If so, how are they to be reached, and how should a society decide how much to spend on educating them at the possible expense of educating others who learn more readily? In the public schools of the United States, for example, according to the National Education Association (2004):

The current [2004] average per student cost is \$7,552 and the average cost per special education student is an additional \$9,369 per student, or \$16,921. Yet, in 2004, the federal government [was] providing local school districts with just under 20 percent of its commitment rather than the 40 percent specified by the law [Individuals with Disabilities Education Act], creating a \$10.6 billion shortfall for states and local school districts.

The 5.3 billion people in the less developed regions with 2004 average Gross National Income of \$4,450, let alone the roughly 2.7 billion of those 5.3 billion people who were living on less than two U.S. dollars per day, cannot afford such expenditures for students with special needs. How can the educational needs of such students be respected?

I have spoken of “a society’s goals for education” as if a society were to have unified goals for education. But societies are usually composed of different groups with different agendas and interests. Attaining agreement throughout a society on goals for education and schooling can be expected to be a difficult political process in which power, compromise, and self-restraint are complexly mixed. Many individual people want to influence educational goals within schools and more broadly, including, among others, children, parents, teachers, education officials, policy makers, religious leaders, labor leaders, business leaders, politicians, and members of the community at large. In addition to individuals, many organized groups of people, which we may call corporate interests, seek to influence educational goals, for example, labor unions (including teachers’ unions), organizations of industrialists, organized religious groups, political parties, and governments. All these have an interest in what goes on wherever education takes place, in and out of schools, and

their interests may concur at some of the levels and scales identified previously and may differ at others.

International economic requirements and international comparative educational assessments can powerfully influence decisions about the goals of education within a country. At present, no international body has the authority to establish international goals or standards for schooling. If *de facto* standards emerge from international requirements for commerce and scientific and technological exchanges, an institution devoted to formalizing the emergent standards may be found useful in the future.

A related difficulty in establishing goals concerns assessment. Once goals are established, individuals (students, teachers, parents) and authorities (school administrators, nongovernmental organizations, and ministries of education, finance, and defense) have an interest in tracking progress toward those goals. In the process of measuring progress, questions arise that are important for the determination of goals. When a verbal statement of goals is proposed or adopted by an educational authority, are the goals sufficiently well defined to make assessment possible? What are the implications of goals for methods of assessment? What are the implications of available methods of assessment for the choice of goals? How can the educational effects of media and institutions outside of schools be assessed? New collaborations or new institutions may be required to improve the coupling between educational goals and educational assessments.

The evolution of evaluations from checking students' rote mastery of facts to measuring the capacity for value judgments requires the development of criteria of excellence in judgment (Ana Carolina Letichevsky, Chapter 16, this volume). When different stakeholders have different values about excellence in judgment, the task of evaluation and assessment becomes complicated by the requirement that values be negotiated among those who require the evaluation, those who carry out the evaluation, and those who are affected (positively or negatively) by its results. Letichevsky writes, "Discussions of educational evaluation require a discussion of how the results will be used to improve education and a discussion of the standards to be adopted" (p. 216).

Eisner (2005) argued that new methods of assessment should be developed to correspond to more ambitious and less tidy goals. Camer Vellani (Chapter 7, this volume) reports an effort in Pakistan to develop new forms of assessment for secondary-school leavers that would favor the ability to reason and solve problems over rote memory. He acknowledges that, even with a successful implementation of the new form of examination, it will take many years to determine whether the new examinations will shape education to achieve the long-term goals favored by the new examination.

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) launched in 1997 the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) "to measure how far students approaching the end of compulsory education have acquired some of the knowledge and skills essential for full

participation in the knowledge society” (OECD, no date, p. 4). In 2000, when PISA first went into the field, forty-three countries participated in the assessment. In 2006, fifty-seven or fifty-eight countries participated. Participating countries or areas that were not members of OECD were Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Colombia, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Macao, the Russian Federation, Slovenia, Tunisia, Croatia, Estonia, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Qatar, Serbia and Montenegro, Taiwan, Uruguay, Brazil, Chile, Israel, Jordan, Latvia, Romania, and Thailand.¹

PISA is designed to monitor progress toward goals defined by OECD and is administered to fifteen-year-olds in schools, 4,500 to 10,000 students in each country. The assessments compare what students know and can do in reading, mathematics, science and problem solving. PISA suggests that students also need “literacy” and “lifelong learning.” Literacy is defined as “the capacity of students to analyze, reason and communicate effectively as they pose, solve and interpret problems in a variety of subject matter areas.” Lifelong learning is students’ “motivation to learn, beliefs about themselves and learning strategies.”² Further,

Reading literacy [is] [t]he capacity to understand, use and reflect on written texts, in order to achieve one’s goals, develop one’s knowledge and potential, and participate in society. . . . Mathematical literacy [is] [t]he capacity to identify and understand the role that mathematics plays in the world, make well-founded judgments, and use and engage with mathematics in ways that meet the needs of one’s life as a constructive, concerned and reflective citizen. . . . Scientific literacy [is] [t]he capacity to use scientific knowledge, identify scientific questions and draw evidence-based conclusions, in order to understand and help make decisions about the natural world and the changes made to it through human activity.³

Whatever PISA’s success in measuring all of these components, the articulation of goals and continued effort to improve monitoring of their achievement across countries is an important step. That it is also a contentious and internationally tenuous process is illustrated by the fact that the United States elected not to participate in the PISA 2007 assessment, presumably to avoid drawing attention to the comparatively mediocre performance of U.S. students, even as progress toward the goals expressed in “No Child Left Behind” should by now be evident.

A further difficulty in choosing educational goals is the challenge of understanding and measuring the consequences of education (Hannum and Buchmann, 2006). In principle, adopting economic growth as a goal to be produced as a result of investing in universal education is defensible if evidence shows that economic growth is, or can be, a consequence of universal education. Such consequences are in fact very difficult to measure. If education is incapable of producing a desired long-term consequence,

it makes little sense to invest in education toward that particular end. A closer intellectual and practical linkage between education's demonstrable consequences and proposed goals might add realism to reflections about educational goals.

In defining goals for universal education, another question arises: What does "universal" mean? Does it demand that all children have access to education of some kind or kinds, with uptake optional, whether uptake is free or dependent on payment? Or does it mean that all children finish a full course of education? UNESCO's 2006 *EFA (Education for All) Global Monitoring Report* states that universal primary education "will be achieved only when all children have access to and complete primary education" (UNESCO, 2005, p. 48). The UN Millennium development goal likewise describes universal primary education as completion of primary education by every child.

Less has been done to address questions about the universality of educational content, which varies across countries and regions. Universal could mean that all children get the same education. Or it could mean that all children get some education, but the content differs by place, type of school, or technology of instruction. Or it could mean that there are universal principles that apply everywhere but that the implementation and specification of these principles in practice depend on the local context. If content differs, there may be some or no common elements for all children. Or it could mean that education is the same for everybody except for those children who are disabled, remote, rural, minority, or otherwise handicapped.

Conflicts of values are a fundamental difficulty in choosing educational goals. Between and within cultures, choices based on values must be made about the priority of goals. For example, values differentiate the orientation of Deborah Meier's Mission Hills School (described in Chapter 13, this volume) to prepare children for democracy from the orientation of Mallam Bala Ahmed's Qur'anic school (Chapter 6, this volume) to inculcate traditional moral values, and values differentiate both of these from the orientation of Kai-ming Cheng's proposal (Chapter 2, this volume) to prepare students for global commerce.

One of the most difficult questions posed at the beginning of this introduction is: How should the quality of decisions about educational goals be evaluated? To amplify slightly, by what process, using what criteria, and over what time span could one decide whether a society is better off adopting one set of educational goals versus another? Rothstein and Jacobsen (Chapter 17, this volume) find a large discrepancy between what people in the United States currently say they want from public schools and what federal education laws seem to be promoting. But who is to say which alternative set of educational goals for the public schools is better for the United States to pursue in the long run? Suppose I have my prejudices about the goals of education and you have different prejudices about the goals of education. What objective evidence could you and I agree in advance to

consider decisive about the relative merits of our prejudices? Using what information and by what process could you and I and others collaboratively design educational goals that are superior to those favored by my prejudices and by yours? The educational goals that are best for the United States may turn out to depend on the educational goals adopted elsewhere in the world, for example, in Brazil, China, Japan, Saudi Arabia, or Russia; may depend on the time span chosen (what is best for the next five years may differ from what is best for the next fifty years); and may depend on who within the United States is defining “best.” I have found little or no discussion of how to evaluate choices of educational goals.

Modesty requires recognition that, however desirable may be the goals chosen for education, external conditions constrain the effectiveness of any school system in realizing those goals. Case studies in this volume include a girl in a village in West Africa (reported by Beryl Levinger, Chapter 5, this volume), and a boy in the remote mountains of Pakistan (reported by Camer Vellani, Chapter 7, this volume). More generally, what basic and secondary education can hope to accomplish is constrained, Vellani recognizes, not only by the capacity learners bring to school, but also by “operational and political reasons. Chief among the former are the paucity of appropriately trained teachers and managers, adequate physical facilities, geographic access, and finance. These issues are compounded by the enormous school-age population and public perception of value, especially for girls, in underprivileged communities” (p. 102). The goals of schooling and of education broadly, no matter how wise and enlightened, are not the only factor in the ultimate effectiveness of education.

Even when it is possible to choose educational goals for today, a further difficulty is that the choice is never final and, until the world stops changing, can never be final. Even those who believe that inculcating tradition is the primary goal will have to concede, upon critical scholarly study, that traditions change in response to changing circumstances. The difficulty of adapting educational goals to changing circumstances locally and globally will never disappear. The absence of systematic attention to procedures and institutions that could facilitate changes in educational goals exacerbates the difficulty.

The next section gives a brief overview of some historical highlights in thinking about educational goals. The section after that reviews ideas about the goals of basic and secondary education proposed by the following chapters of this book.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE GOALS OF EDUCATION

The following survey of the history of thought on educational goals is necessarily superficial and incomplete because it must be brief. This survey shows that many of this book’s authors are picking up threads with a long

history. Up to the middle of the twentieth century, the goals of education, especially in the West, shifted gradually and incompletely from a focus on elites to a focus on all citizens (initially narrowly defined by gender and race), and then nominally to all children, although different children continue to receive very disparate levels of education. The major changes were, not surprisingly, driven by changes outside of educational systems: the rise of nation-states in Europe, the rise of democracy in North America, the widespread demand for skilled labor associated with the Industrial Revolution, and the availability of cheap books and newspapers as a result of the invention and diffusion of printing. As the need to educate more people grew in the United States and Europe, the institutional model of education by means of scheduled and graded classes in schools largely locked into nationally or locally prescribed curricula triumphed over earlier models. Political and economic interests usually dominated the goals of schooling.

Ancient Perspectives

People have been worrying about the purposes of education for at least 2,500 years, from the times of the Buddha, Confucius, and Plato until today (Bailey, 1976; Curtis and Boulwood, 1977). Often commentators espoused one view and neglected or dismissed all others. Beliefs about the purposes of education influenced who was educated and how education was offered.

The nominal purpose of education for Plato (approx. 427 BCE–approx. 347 BCE) in *The Republic* was knowledge of the good. Education, Plato wrote, aimed to remove the veil from people's eyes so that they could see the reality of pure ideas. Plato's educational vision was not universal. Not everyone was supposed to receive an education, and no educational content was common to all who were supposed to be educated. Education fitted people for their class. The guardians, or the philosopher-kings, received one kind of education, the soldiers another, and the citizens a third. The slaves did not receive an education. The prescribed education had the political or civic purpose of creating the city-state Plato thought perfect. The discrepancy found in Plato's *Republic* between the announced purpose of education and the effective purpose the prescribed education serves is an early instance of a discrepancy that persists to today.

According to Plato's *Republic*, primary education for the guardians lasted until age twenty. Primary education included basic intellectual development, extensive physical training on the Spartan model, and musical performance to develop the sense of harmony and proportion in the individual. Secondary education continued to age fifty, covering first arithmetic, geometry, and theoretical (not observational) astronomy; then philosophy and apprenticeship in governance. The people who rose to the top in these areas became the guardians, who governed the country. Those who did not rise

to the top became the soldiers. For Plato, it was important to censor all arts, because poetry and drama could mislead people through stories about the passions and revenges of the gods; the models created by these stories were not useful for government. Plato's argument in favor of state censorship of the arts reveals clearly his political mission for education. Because men and women did not differ in their capacity for guardianship, even though they differed in their capacity to be soldiers, future guardians received equal education regardless of gender.⁴

Confucius (551 BCE–479 BCE), whose influence on Chinese thought was comparable to that of Socrates and Plato on Western thought, regarded morality as the most important subject of education (Zalta, 2006). In addition to morality, he taught proper speech, government, and the refined arts (ritual, music, archery, chariot riding, calligraphy, and computation). Natural understanding was not sufficient to learn any subject; long and careful study was required. Study consisted of imitating the words and deeds of a good teacher familiar with past ways and ancient practices. Confucius was willing to teach any eager and tireless student regardless of social origin or standing. In the millennia since Confucius emphasized right behavior and transmitting the heritage of the past, these themes have recurred in subsequent discussions of educational goals in all parts of the world.

Buddhist monasteries in India and China served as schools, centers of higher learning, and refuges from persecution during the early centuries of the Buddhist religion (400 BCE–800 CE). Women and untouchables were permitted to join these Buddhist communities and to receive instruction there. Enlightenment was to be attained by means of the Middle Way between self-indulgent sensual pleasure and pointless self-torture. Enlightenment consisted in knowing the four Truths. The fourth Truth was a program of training required to obtain an understanding of all of the Truths. This program, which may be viewed as the educational agenda of Buddhism, consisted of the Noble Eightfold Path: right views or right understanding, right intention or right thought, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness, and right concentration. This essentially ethical training required giving up a household life in favor of residence in a strictly regulated monastery. Although anyone, male or female of any caste, could aspire to enlightenment, only the monks and nuns of the monasteries were seen as having taken the necessary steps to achieve it. This educational system appeared to be open to all in principle but was elitist in practice.

Early Western Perspectives on the Goals of Education

Western perspectives have come to have a dominating influence in many, though not all, parts of the world. With the decline of feudalism, Protestant Prussia and Catholic Austria initiated universal education as a consequence of the rise of the concept of the individual (Salganik and Provasnik, Chapter 20, this volume). The leaders of the Protestant Reformation and

the Catholic Counter-Reformation in the sixteenth century sought to use schools to train their subjects to save their own souls and to be loyal to the state of their own volition. The goal of education was indoctrination in religious dogma that would generate piety and loyalty. After the end of the wars of religion, the religious importance of the state-supported schools declined and the political importance increased. States increasingly viewed universal education as an instrument to produce citizens with the motivation and skills required to serve the purposes of the state (initially militarily; more recently, economically). For further elaboration of the history, see Benavot and Resnik (2006), Corrales (2006), and Rothstein and Jacobsen (Chapter 17, this volume).

Early Western treatises on education reveal changing views of the purposes of education, from suiting students to the tasks of their class to preparing young adults for the workforce, from instilling moral and civic virtues in individuals to promoting democracy. All of these purposes continue to be present in discussions of educational goals today.

The English philosopher John Locke (1632–1704) argued that education should further the knowledge and morals useful for both the pupil and the community. Locke shared Plato’s assumption that different kinds of education were appropriate for different social classes. Locke’s two later books on education described education for the elite and education for the working classes. His 1693 volume, entitled *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, collected letters to a friend in England about how to educate the friend’s son. Locke suggested that elite education was for boys, not girls, and that good morals and good manners were more important than knowledge. Any knowledge taught should be usable and practical. As there were no schools at the time, instruction was by tutors, with the involvement of parents. In *On Working Schools* (1697), Locke wrote that education should teach children of the masses to work, and to become useful and God-fearing people not dependent on charity so that they would not have to be supported by the upper classes.⁵

Some early American thinkers, following Locke, included moral and civic purposes among the goals of education as well as the fundamental skills of reading and computation. Thomas Jefferson (1743–1826), for example, specified the objects of primary education in his 1818 *Report of the Commissioners for the University of Virginia*:

The objects of this primary education . . . would be,

To give to every citizen the information he needs for the transaction of his own business;

To enable him to calculate for himself, and to express and preserve his ideas, his contracts and accounts, in writing;

To improve, by reading, his morals and faculties;

To understand his duties to his neighbors and country, and to discharge with competence the functions confided to him by either;

To know his rights; to exercise with order and justice those he retains; to choose with discretion the fiduciary of those he delegates; and to notice their conduct with diligence, with candor, and judgment;

And, in general, to observe with intelligence and faithfulness all the social relations under which he shall be placed.

To instruct the mass of our citizens in these, their rights, interests and duties, as men and citizens, being then the objects of education in the primary schools, whether private or public, in them should be taught reading, writing and numerical arithmetic, the elements of mensuration, (useful in so many callings,) and the outlines of geography and history. (p. 434 of the printed version)

In this report, “citizen” referred only to white males. Only citizens who owned enough property could vote at the time.

For Horace Mann (1796–1859), who promoted public education in Massachusetts before the Civil War, the “common school” had a purpose beyond teaching morals and basic knowledge. Mann saw the common school as an instrument to unify the diversity of Americans, create social harmony and promulgate common, non-sectarian values (Cremin, 1961). He thought that the schools would promote social harmony if state legislatures and local boards of education, rather than professional educators, assumed political control over the schools. Mann advocated putting control in lay hands because he believed that the public should be entrusted with the task of defining what would be taught in the common schools. He rejected private tutoring of individuals, as Locke had recommended for the elite of England. For Mann, the goal of unifying Americans could be achieved only by bringing together heterogeneous students in common schools. Mann recognized differences among children in interests and abilities and advised that the lessons be adapted to such differences. To reconcile values of individuality with teaching children in groups, Mann called for self-control and self-discipline. Teaching children self-discipline was the common school’s way to prepare its students for freedom.

By 1860, the majority of states in the United States had public school systems. Free public education had been extended to secondary schools in a few states like Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania.

Educational reformers and leaders after the Civil War were guided by William Torrey Harris (1835–1909), superintendent of the St. Louis public schools, United States Commissioner of Education, founder of the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, and devotee of the German philosopher Georg Hegel. Harris conceived a purpose for common education even grander than Mann’s aim of social harmony. Harris saw the public school as the means of enabling all people to participate in civic and civilized life, a life of order, self-discipline, civic loyalty, and respect for private property (Cremin, 1961).

Harris’s schools confirmed a social order that Mann helped create and shape. Elementary schools were to stress discipline and orderly behavior

while giving mastery of the “five windows of the soul,” as Harris called them: mathematics, geography, literature and art, grammar, and history. High schools and colleges were to concentrate on mathematics, languages, and the classics. The desired final product was a reasoning person who exercised freedom in the context of his own civilization (Cremin, 1961). Harris emphasized order over freedom, work over play, effort over interest, prescription over election; he emphasized regularity, silence, and industry as the foundations of civil order. He strongly resisted demands for vocational education and training for trade, setting the stage for the protests and educational reforms of the succeeding generation.

Vocational skills became an aim of education in some institutions, despite Harris. The Philadelphia Centennial Exposition of 1876 emphasized the relation between education and the progress of the nation (Cremin, 1961). An exhibit to demonstrate the teaching of the mechanical arts in the instructional workshops of the Moscow Imperial Technical School caught the attention of John D. Runkle, then president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who saw in it “the philosophical key to all industrial education” (Cremin, 1961, p. 25). By August 1876, the trustees of MIT established a School of Mechanic Arts for manual training of future workers in industry.

Calvin M. Woodward of Washington University, St. Louis, adopted, generalized, and abstracted the ideas from Moscow and MIT. He created the Manual Training School of Washington University in 1879 as a three-year secondary program that combined mental skills (mathematics, drawing, science, languages, history, literature) and manual skills (carpentry, wood turning, patternmaking, iron chipping and filing, forge work, brazing and soldering, and bench and machine work in metals). The emphasis was on education and principles rather than production and narrow skill. Woodward was critical of the existing educational system that trained only for the learned professions and neglected the working classes. In a famous phrase, Woodward urged schools: “Put the whole boy in school” (Cremin, 1961, p. 28). The slogan echoed not only in the United States but throughout Latin America through the reporting and writing on educational theory and pedagogy of José Martí (1853–1895), leader of the Cuban independence movement of the late 1800s (Martí, 1979).

In the United States, opponents (with Harris) and proponents (with Woodward) debated the desirability of manual training hotly within the National Education Association. Meanwhile, manual training generalized to home-making in high school and to arts and crafts in elementary school (Cremin, 1961). A parallel conflict developed at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. The National Association of Manufacturers denounced organized labor’s opposition to trade education, while the American Federation of Labor favored apprenticeship under union control and opposed, initially, the mass training of competitors for union jobs as a result of cooperative arrangements between manufacturers and

school administrators. But from 1910 onward, the Federation proposed a bill for federal support of secondary-school instruction and teacher training in agriculture, home economics, and the trades. If vocational training would be offered, the Federation wanted to be involved in determining how it was offered.

From its founding in Philadelphia in 1857 to the end of World War I, the National Education Association was the meeting place and forum for leaders of American education from universities, colleges, academies, normal schools, and public primary schools, without distinction by level.⁶ The National Education Association's 1918 report, *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*, was supported by representatives of the entire educational system. It listed seven aims: (a) health; (b) command of fundamental processes; (c) worthy home membership; (d) vocation; (e) civic education; (f) worthy use of leisure; and (g) ethical character. One twenty-first-century commentator wrote that this report "would become one of the most influential education documents of the twentieth century." Another wrote: "The downfall and undoing of education in America can be said to have commenced upon the release and implementation of the Cardinal Principles here set forth and submitted for your disapproval." At least in definition, if not in reality, the universal educational system in the United States came to embrace goals for work and for home, and for moral, intellectual, and civic life.

The leading educational thinker of the United States during the first half of the twentieth century was John Dewey (1859–1952), founder of the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago and author of *The School and Society* (1899) and *Democracy and Education* (1916), among other influential works. Dewey, elected honorary life president of the National Education Association in 1932, believed that education could embrace multiple and changing aims as required by a changing society. Like Socrates as reported by Plato, Dewey rejected authoritarian teaching methods. Contrary to Plato, Dewey's philosophy of instrumentalism held that truth has no reality apart from human purposes but is an instrument humans use to solve their problems. For Dewey, the problems that affect most people have educational priority: "The things which are socially most fundamental, that is, which have to do with experience in which the widest groups share, are the essentials. The things which represent the needs of specialized groups and technical pursuits are secondary" (Dewey, 1916, p. 225). Dewey devoted Chapter 8 of *Democracy and Education* to pointing out "the futility of trying to establish the aim of education—some one final aim which subordinates all others to itself" (p. 225).

[S]ince general aims are but prospective points of view from which to survey the existing conditions and estimate their possibilities, we might have any number of them, all consistent with one another. As [a] matter of fact, a large number have been stated at different times, all having

great local value. For the statement of aim is a matter of emphasis at a given time. And we do not emphasize things which do not require emphasis . . . a given epoch or generation tends to emphasize in its conscious projections just the things which it has least of in actual fact (p. 225).

Some Recent Perspectives on the Goals of Education

In the second half of the twentieth century, the rise of international institutions concerned with primary and secondary education led to confrontations between Western educational thinking and the goals and values of some non-Western societies. The results were sometimes friction at points of contact and sometimes reluctance to engage in contact where friction would be expected to follow, especially in international institutions governed by consensus. These cross-cultural contacts stimulated some people to desire that education prepare people to deal with cross-cultural contacts and conflicts.

When international institutions did espouse educational goals, the goals were sometimes stated at a level of abstraction insufficient to guide action. I now examine this process in greater detail.

Carl Ransom Rogers (1902–1987), a theologian turned clinical and educational psychologist, was influenced by the writings of John Dewey. In 1969, with explicit reference to the atmosphere of crisis in education produced by widespread conflicts over the Vietnam War, he described the goal of education as giving learners the capacity to adapt to continual change and to learn under conditions of freedom. He states his view of the goal of education in terms of the individual and of the society:

Here then is my theoretical model of the person who emerges from therapy or from the best of education, the individual who has experienced optimal psychological growth—a person functioning freely in all the fullness of his organismic potentialities; a person who is dependable in being realistic, self-enhancing, socialized, and appropriate in his behavior; a creative person, whose specific formings of behavior are not easily predictable; a person who is ever changing, ever developing, always discovering himself and the newness in himself in each succeeding moment of time. Let me stress, however, that what I have described is a person who does not exist. . . . What I have described is my version of the goal in its “pure” form (p. 295).

At the social level, Rogers wrote, “The goal of education must be to develop a society in which people can live more comfortably with *change* than with *rigidity*. In the coming world the capacity to face the new appropriately is more important than the ability to know and repeat the old” (p. 295). This perspective contrasts diametrically with that of Confucius.

Other recent definitions of educational goals have focused on the intellectual, moral, and physical characteristics of the individuals shaped by the ideal education. Charles Slater (2005) proposed that students (and teachers, parents, administrators, and staff) should be: (a) readers of literature; (b) poets whose words envision new ways of being; (c) writers who reflect thoughtfully; (d) problem solvers who can use mathematics; (e) observers who sense the wonder of science; (f) citizens who study history and take action; (g) speakers of at least two languages who cross cultural borders; (h) workers who can create with their hands and use technology; (i) artists who sculpt, draw, or paint; (j) musicians who sing or play an instrument; (k) athletes who exercise for a lifetime; and (l) leaders who recognize the moral dimension.

The goals of Rogers and Slater touched tangentially on the role of education in promoting cross-cultural understanding. That role was stressed above others when educational goals were discussed internationally. The Convention on the Rights of the Child, which entered into force (in United Nations' language) in 1990, proposed educational obligations in article 28 and educational goals in article 29. All countries of the world have adopted the Convention on the Rights of the Child by ratification, accession, or succession, except Somalia and the United States of America, which signed but had not ratified it as of 9 June 2004.⁷ The Convention calls for universal primary education and encourages the development of "different forms of secondary education, including general and vocational education." It also details the aims of education to which participating states have agreed:

- (a) The development of the child's personality, talents and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential;
- (b) The development of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations;
- (c) The development of respect for the child's parents, his or her own cultural identity, language and values, for the national values of the country in which the child is living, the country from which he or she may originate, and for civilizations different from his or her own;
- (d) The preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin;
- (e) The development of respect for the natural environment (United Nations, 1990, article 29).

However desirable these aims may appear to some eyes, their operational effect in primary and secondary education is often unclear. John Daniel, then head of the education sector at UNESCO and former rector of the Open University, wrote bluntly (Daniel, 2002):

If declarations and exhortations alone could produce textbooks that are suffused with respect for human rights, universal values and fundamental freedoms[,] we should have got there a long time ago. Sadly, . . . Respect for human dignity and difference is in short supply in many parts of the world. UNESCO is frequently asked to prevent textbooks being vehicles for intolerance and hatred.

Textbooks in many countries present views of in-groups and out-groups that are controversial for some in-groups and some out-groups. Recent examples may be drawn from many countries, including Japan (International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism Japan Committee, 2001; Onishi, 2006; Kyodo News, 2006), Bosnia and Hercegovina (Low-Beer, 2001), Pakistan (Ansari, 2004; Sarwar, 2004), Croatia (Kovac, 2002), and Saudi Arabia (Shea, 2006). Such problems are serious wherever they occur.

For example, in Japan, a middle school teacher “was dismissed on March 31 [2006] from her position at a public school run by Tokyo’s Chiyoda Ward for describing a member of the Tokyo Metropolitan Assembly and a history text publisher as ‘history distorters’ last year. . . . The teacher believes remarks by the assembly member and the history textbook contradict the government’s recognition of Japan’s wartime aggression, and that telling her students about them was therefore not inappropriate” (Kyodo News, 2006).

In another example, according to a report issued in May 2006 (summarized by Shea and introduced by Ackerman, 2006),

. . . a study conducted in 2003 by former Saudi judge Sheikh Abd Al-’Aziz Al-Qassem and Saudi author and journalist Ibrahim Al-Sakran, . . . examined three curricula for Saudi middle and high schools—*Al-Hadith*, a general curriculum on Islamic traditions, *Al-Fiqh*, a curriculum on matters of religious law and ritual, and *Al-Tawhid*, a curriculum on matters of belief. This study was presented at the Second Forum for National Dialogue, held in Saudi Arabia in late December 2003 under the patronage of then-Crown Prince Abdallah Ibn Abd Al-’Aziz and published early the following year. It noted that the Kingdom’s religious studies curriculum “encourages violence toward others, and misguides the pupils into believing that in order to safeguard their own religion, they must violently repress and even physically eliminate the ‘other’” (p. 8).

On May 18, 2006, the Saudi foreign minister, Prince Saud Al-Faisal, in a joint appearance in Washington, DC, with Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, told journalists that Saudi Arabia had overhauled its textbooks. However, the Shea–Ackerman (2006) review of twelve textbooks⁸ for Islamic studies published by the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia

and apparently in use during the 2005–2006 school year in Saudi Arabia and in Saudi-supported Islamic academies in other countries (including the United States) found that

. . . the Saudi government continues to propagate an ideology of hate toward the “unbeliever,” which includes Christians, Jews, Shiites, Sufis, Sunni Muslims who do not follow Wahhabi doctrine, Hindus, atheists and others. . . . We do not know with certainty what is taught on a daily basis in the Saudi schools. What we know is what these textbooks contain (Ackerman, 2006, pp. 8–9).

According to two American observers of Saudi Arabia (Bronson and Coleman, 2005), “over the longer term nothing will benefit U.S.–Saudi relations more than tackling educational reform.” They referred to educational reform in Saudi Arabia. But these problems are limited neither to Saudi Arabia nor to Islam, nor are they universal in all parts of Saudi society or all parts of Islam.

In her 1961 doctoral dissertation at Saint Louis University, a Jesuit university, Sister Rose Thering⁹ found that Catholic textbooks widely used in United States parochial schools calumniated Jews and Judaism (Thurber, 2006). Her findings were introduced in Catholic Church councils through Augustin Cardinal Bea and contributed to the Vatican’s pronouncement *Nostra Aetate* (Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions) on October 28, 1965:

. . . what happened in [Christ’s] passion cannot be charged against all the Jews, without distinction, then alive, nor against the Jews of today. Although the Church is the new people of God, the Jews should not be presented as rejected or accursed by God, as if this followed from the Holy Scriptures. . . . Furthermore, in her rejection of every persecution against any man, the Church, mindful of the patrimony she shares with the Jews and moved not by political reasons but by the Gospel’s spiritual love, decries hatred, persecutions, displays of anti-Semitism, directed against Jews at any time and by anyone.¹⁰

This pronouncement called for the reversal of the Church’s then-standard teaching of hostility toward Jews, a reversal that required substantial rethinking within the Church and among some of its followers (Carroll, 2001, pp. 41, 568, and elsewhere).

Like the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, *Learning: The Treasure Within* (henceforth the Delors report; Delors, et al., 1996), affirms the role that education should play in promoting cross-cultural understanding. The report was chaired by Jacques Delors, former President of the European Commission (1985–1995) and

former French Minister of Economy and Finance. Its opening chapter asserts:

We must be guided by the Utopian aim of steering the world towards greater mutual understanding, a greater sense of responsibility and greater solidarity, through acceptance of our spiritual and cultural differences. Education, by providing access to knowledge for all, has precisely this universal task of helping people to understand the world and to understand others (Delors, et al., 1996, p. 34).

The report describes “four pillars of learning”:

- learning to know, by combining a sufficiently broad general knowledge with the opportunity to work in depth on a small number of subjects. This also means learning to learn, so as to benefit from the opportunities education provides throughout life.
- learning to do, in order to acquire not only an occupational skill but also, more broadly, the competence to deal with many situations and work in teams. It also means learning to do in the context of young peoples’ various social and work experiences which may be informal, as a result of the local or national context, or formal, involving courses, alternating study and work.
- learning to live with others, by developing an understanding of other people and an appreciation of interdependence—carrying out joint projects and learning to manage conflicts—in a spirit of respect for the values of pluralism, mutual understanding and peace.
- learning to be, so as better to develop one’s personality and be able to act with ever greater autonomy, judgment and personal responsibility. In that connection, education must not disregard any aspect of a person’s potential: memory, reasoning, aesthetic sense, physical capacities and communication skills (Delors, et al., 1996, p. 37).

The Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Delors report indicate an international consensus that education could serve international political purposes, a belief shared by some scholars of education. Martha Nussbaum elaborated a “model of education for democratic citizenship” (Nussbaum, 1997; I rely here on her summary in Nussbaum, 2005, p. 4). She proposed that three capacities are essential for such citizenship: first, “the capacity for critical examination of oneself and one’s traditions”; second, “an ability [for children] to see themselves as not simply citizens of some local region or group but also, and above all, as human beings bound to all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern”; and third, “narrative imagination . . . to think what it might be

like to be in the shoes of a person different from oneself, to be an intelligent reader of that person's story, and to understand the emotions and wishes and desires that someone so placed might have" (p. 7).

As Nussbaum pointed out, each of these capacities is related to the idea of freedom, a key to successful democratic societies:

At the heart of all three . . . capacities is the idea of freedom: the freedom of the child's mind to engage critically with tradition; the freedom to imagine citizenship in both national and world terms, and to negotiate multiple allegiances with knowledge and confidence; the freedom to reach out in the imagination, allowing another person's experience into oneself (2005, p. 9).

Nussbaum illustrated the desired freedoms with anecdotal comparisons of non-governmental and governmental schools in India. In some democracies, people who practice the freedoms that she advocated may be vulnerable to others with greater power who may have different interests. For example, in nominally democratic Indian villages with highly unequal distributions of wealth and power, wealthy landowners may not always respond kindly or justly to children who exercise too vocally their school-taught freedoms. How to survive with dignity and integrity in the face of hostile power may be a useful skill along with the three freedoms Nussbaum identified as appropriate for an equitable democracy.

In the United States of America, educational goals have received insufficient attention in the view of some critics, and too much thoughtless attention in the view of other critics. In 1994, President William J. Clinton signed into law the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act" (P.L. 103-227). In this law, Congress added two educational goals to six goals adopted in 1989 by President George H. W. Bush and U.S. governors. According to the Act,¹¹ by the year 2000:

1. All children in America will start school ready to learn.
2. The high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.
3. All students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, the arts, history, and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our nation's modern economy.
4. United States students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.

5. Every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.
6. Every school in the United States will be free of drugs, violence, and the unauthorized presence of firearms and alcohol and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.
7. The nation's teaching force will have access to programs for the continued improvement of their professional skills and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century.
8. Every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children.

Richard Rothstein wrote in 1999:

We can now declare defeat, having flunked all eight goals we were to reach by the millennium. . . . Some "Goals 2000" were ridiculous in the first place. Others required substantial resources to accomplish, and these were not provided. Still others required far more than 11 years to achieve. . . . Policy makers' lack of candor about the irresponsible way the goals were set can breed local educators' contempt for the entire standards movement.

A contrast with an excess of unachievable or inadequately funded educational goals is an absence of educational goals. According to the United States Department of Education,¹² "On Jan. 8, 2002, President George W. Bush signed the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (P.L. 107-110) into law with overwhelming bipartisan support. . . . No Child Left Behind ensures accountability and flexibility as well as increased federal support for education." The announced "four pillars" of NCLB are described as "stronger accountability for results, more freedom for states and communities, proven education methods, and more choices for parents." Educator Nel Noddings (2005) criticized NCLB for its broad "failure to address, or even ask, the basic questions . . . : What are the proper aims of education? How do public schools serve a democratic society? What does it mean to educate the whole child?" (p. 8).

Noddings argued that educational policy in the United States failed to address significant social needs by not considering goals beyond literacy and numeracy. She wrote, "Unfortunately, public policy in the United States today concentrates on just one of the Cardinal Principles proposed by NEA in 1918: 'command of the fundamental processes.' Although reading and math are important, we need to promote competence in these subjects while also promoting our other aims [the NEA aims listed earlier in this chapter]" (2005, p. 11). Noddings noted that broadening educational

policies to include the other NEA aims could address school-level and national concerns:

We will not find the solution to problems of violence, alienation, ignorance, and unhappiness in increasing our security apparatus, imposing more tests, punishing schools for their failure to produce 100 percent proficiency, or demanding that teachers be knowledgeable in “the subjects they teach.” Instead, we must allow teachers and students to interact as whole persons, and we must develop policies that treat the school as a whole community. The future of both our children and our democracy depend on our moving in this direction (Noddings, 2005, p. 13).

Elliot Eisner (2005), in an article immediately following that by Nel Noddings, agreed with her on the importance of holistic education. He proposed that “Our schools, teachers, and students might be a lot better off if schools embraced the idea that education means learning what to do when you don’t know what to do” (p. 17). He proposed a return to the vision of education for “the whole child” provided by the progressive education movement (see Calvin Woodward’s contribution, mentioned earlier). He pointed out that this approach had implications not only for methods of teaching and for content, but also for assessment. He argued that where education addressed the needs of the whole child, “assessment should . . . be concerned about more than the measurable. Not everything that matters is measurable, and not everything that is measurable matters. . . .the social and emotional life of the child needs to be as much a priority as measured academic achievement—perhaps an even greater priority” (Eisner, 2005, p. 18).

The distinguished psychologist Howard Gardner proposed his own ambitious goals for basic and secondary education (Gardner, 2001) and tertiary education (Gardner, 2005).

Many of the debates over the goals of education in the second half of the twentieth century could have taken place in the second half of the nineteenth century with only small changes. Where late nineteenth-century educational thinkers wanted public schools in America to build a tolerant civil society from the diverse immigrant and native cultures gathered in the United States, many late twentieth-century educational thinkers wanted schools, public and private, all over the world to build tolerant civil societies everywhere. The change from the nineteenth to the twentieth centuries was that the tolerance was expected to extend across wider cultural and geographical gaps. At the same time, the debates between technical education for specific skills versus education of the whole child continued. The change from the nineteenth to the twentieth centuries was that new technical skills were required, especially those related to the handling of information and the provision of services and collaborating

with culturally diverse co-workers. The continuing strands of discussion from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries are reflected in the chapters in this book.

PERSPECTIVES ON THE GOALS OF EDUCATION FROM THE UNIVERSAL BASIC AND SECONDARY EDUCATION (UBASE) PROJECT

The chapters in this volume were commissioned to address the question “What should be the goals of basic and secondary education of high quality?” Diverse themes emerged in the answers. The chapters are organized under seven broad headings, though few of these chapters fit neatly into just one of these categories: educational goals for tomorrow’s society; educational priorities in poor countries; empowering children through art and science; the special role of skepticism as a universal educational goal; educating global citizens; defining educational quality as a basis for educational policy; and perspectives on assessment and educational goals. This ordering is one of many ways of organizing these chapters. Moreover, few if any of the topics presented here are comprehensively addressed. Our purpose was to initiate an international examination of the goals of education in hopes of providing a starting point for further investigation. If this book succeeds in its aim of stimulating additional discussions of the goals of universal basic and secondary education, it is to be hoped that other, still richer ways of structuring the issues will emerge.

Educational Goals for Tomorrow’s Society

Several chapters acknowledge that yesterday’s goals—and yesterday’s means for pursuing them—may not be appropriate for tomorrow’s world. Kaiming Cheng (Chapter 2) discusses education to enable students to understand and participate gainfully in the increasingly globalized economy of the twenty-first century. For him, a principal educational goal is to enhance economic and work-related success. Cheng argues that if people are not educated for the world economy, then they are excluded from the benefits of the world economy. Education has to respond to the needs of the economy, and those needs include technical skills as well as skills in teamwork. The world economy requires students who know how to negotiate with people and how to specialize while also being aware of the bigger picture. Cheng paints a rich picture of what it takes to survive in the world economy.

Kishore Mahbubani (Chapter 3) argues that “The huge challenge for the twenty-first century will be to weave in some universal elements that will remind children all over the world that they belong to a single common humanity. . . . [O]ne key stream of Western civilization, the spirit of Socrates, could well provide some key universal threads to weave humanity

together” (p. 67). Mahbubani here suggests that the pedagogical methods of Socrates—the questioning, the critical reasoning—may be a more important legacy for education in the twenty-first century than the political and philosophical agenda of Socrates’ scribe and interpreter, Plato.

Mahbubani’s perspective on China’s principal educational need in the coming century—namely, cosmopolitanism rather than Sinocentrism—complements and reinforces (but for very different reasons) the emphasis of Kai-ming Cheng on giving all students, including Chinese, the capacity to engage productively in the world economy. Mahbubani suggests that changing the methods of the Chinese educational system is essential, not because it will better prepare students for the world economy, but because it will promote international understanding. Mahbubani suggests that “Traditional Islamic education has suffered from the same handicap as traditional Chinese education: an emphasis on rote learning. Just as China will have to rise to the challenge of the twenty-first century by introducing a heavier emphasis on questioning and critical reasoning in its educational system, the Islamic world will have to do the same” (p. 68). Mahbubani warns “educational policymakers that if we enter the twenty-first century on auto-pilot using existing conventional wisdom, we may be delivering a prescription for both misunderstanding and disharmony” (p. 71).

William K. Cummings (Chapter 4) observes that because education on the recent Western model (with school buildings, teachers, textbooks and other equipment) has become increasingly expensive and because transnational entities failed sufficiently to share the costs of the educational models they asked the developing countries to emulate, the willingness of developing countries to accept the Western educational model with all its expenses has declined while the educational ambitions of developing countries have increased. A comparison of national educational plans in 2001 with those of 1982 shows that governments now want to eradicate illiteracy rather than merely extend literacy, want education to reduce specific inequalities (gender, regional, rural-urban, poverty, and historical injustices), view technology both as an asset for learning and as a means for social development, and emphasize promoting values through education such as democracy, religiosity, and tolerance—but also national unity and the need to counter extremism and terrorism.

Cummings envisions a future of education in which computer-assisted technology takes over many of the duties and burdens of teaching “such as the presentation of materials, the facilitation of exercises, the evaluation of student performance, and the analysis of student learning difficulties” (p. 78). He argues that “there are ways to design education that reduce dependence on the modern props of school buildings, the uniform curriculum, textbooks, trained teachers, and one-time national examinations. Focusing on the goals of education as contrasted with the modern means is the key to the elaboration of these possibilities. Educational technology opens up many of these possibilities” (p. 79).

Educational Priorities in Poor Countries

Determining educational priorities in poor countries, particularly those in Africa and South Asia, raises daunting challenges. Describing the daily struggle of a typical ten-year-old West African girl, who lives in a village 5 kilometers from the nearest school, Beryl Levinger (Chapter 5) defines an education of quality as an education that “enable[s] learners to dramatically surpass the full range of limitations imposed by the circumstances of their birth” (p. 87). Such an education is the key to disrupting cycles of poverty in developing countries. If the billion people or more who live on less than one U.S. dollar per day are to earn a living, protect their environment, contribute to family life, and be enlightened citizens, they

will need the instrumental skills of reading, writing, and basic computation as well as content-driven knowledge in the natural sciences, social studies, health, and nutrition. But [their] education must also focus on . . . values, processes, and attitudes. Three building blocks that form the core of “quality education” lie within this realm[:] metacognitive skills that contribute to the transfer of knowledge and to the solution of novel problems. . . . skills that prepare learners to avail themselves of development opportunities. . . . [and] processes that add to the store of social capital in the community (pp. 84–86).

Education must enable poor children and their cities and nations to integrate into the world economy, she argues. Thus she links personal capacities and economic consequences.

Nigerian schoolmaster Bala Ahmed (Chapter 6) reports that the leadership of UNESCO and the support of international donors have redirected the aims of education toward participation in society, particularly in the workforce. Ahmed writes that the goals of universal primary and secondary education have been extended beyond reading, writing, and teaching of morals to include life skills. He mentions four specific skills: the ability to communicate in both Arabic and English; the ability to keep records of events in both Arabic and English; preparation to qualify Islamiyya primary and secondary school leavers for employment as teachers, judges, agriculturists, and in other relevant professions; and knowledge of trade and commerce.

Ahmed lists eighteen specific and pragmatic measures to ensure a basic and secondary education of high quality in Nigerian Islamiyya schools. These measures include the adoption of standard curricula, secure classrooms, hygienic bathrooms, clean drinking water, nutritious food, teacher training, and compensation. The task of meeting these prerequisites must be shared, he says, by governmental and religious authorities, parents, teachers, and local communities.

Camer Vellani (Chapter 7) describes an encounter he had with a seventeen-year-old boy from Pakistan's North West Frontier Province. The boy perceived insurmountable political, economic, and cultural barriers to his professional advancement, despite having completed ten years of schooling. Acknowledging the powerful influence of social environment, Vellani looks beyond economic circumstance and stresses the importance of nurturing learning ability, a crucial property of the brain developed during infancy and early childhood, when it is affected by nutrition, health, and the stimuli provided by the social environment (Young, 2002). In one study of the development of 1,200 children aged zero to three years in urban and rural Sindh (B. Iqbal, 2003, unpublished data), the proportion of children in their first, second, and third years of life who had delayed psychomotor development increased from 14 percent to 22 percent to 37 percent, associated statistically with various elements of the social environment. Since psychomotor performance reflects development of the brain and nervous system, the delay in development of higher orders of function of the nervous system in almost two children in five by the age of three years is astonishing.

Vellani proposes the goals of basic and secondary education broadly as an understanding of "one's . . . identity in a global context" (p. 99), acquisition of "attitudes and skills . . . that are relevant to responsible citizenship" (p. 99), and moral reasoning. He concludes that "perspectives on the purposes of education should be broadened to consider a holistic, interdependent view of human development, encompassing early childhood and development of society. No investment in formal education alone will reverse long-term limitations in learning, health, and behavior that are established in the early stages of life as a result of insufficient child nurture" (p. 103).

Vimala Ramachandran (Chapter 8) examines the inadequate access to and quality of primary and secondary schooling in India. She argues that educational quality is at the heart of India's national struggle for equality and justice. She writes, "There is an urgent need to re-imagine education, overhaul the system and link education to life, livelihood, peace and social justice. While striving for equality, the education system should respond to aspirations and opportunities while enhancing choices. . . . The education system should have the depth as well as the range to span different worlds that people live in and also create bridges" (p. 108).

Empowering Children through Art and Science

Many educators have argued for a long time that education in the arts can be a very important ingredient of an education as a working example of integrating knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values (Eisner, 2002; Read, 1943). Madrazo (Chapter 9) presents one example of how it has been possible to bring the goals of integral education with the *dia* (Development of Intelligence through Art) program to more than thirteen thousand classrooms in Mexican schools in the last decade, providing teachers with useful

and specific tools as they develop the necessary didactic abilities to become mediators who can focus on their students' affective, social, communicative, and cognitive abilities. Because all humans have an immense inner potential to feel and think, to integrate and balance these two fundamental elements, art is an excellent stimulus for human development in other contexts (besides schools). Madrazo writes, "Since 1999 we have worked with underprivileged groups such as life-term prisoners, children with Down syndrome, indigenous communities, migrant workers and homeless children. In these spaces, new questions emerge along with new possibilities for mediating through art" (p. 123).

My Chapter 10 emphasizes that nurture is physical, intellectual, and emotional. I propose that basic and secondary education should support making a bigger pie (better technology), bringing fewer forks to the table (lower fertility, rational consumption), and practicing better manners (less violence, less corruption, fewer barriers to economic rationality, more equity within and between societies, and more acceptance of other societies and cultures) by cultivating the intellectual and emotional capacities of all children. On the intellectual side, sophisticated primary and secondary education in the arts and sciences offers substantive, developmental, civic, and personal benefits. On the emotional side, love is a crucial ingredient of the inputs, processes, and results of education. In agreement with the recommendations of Charfi and Redissi, I stress the importance of providing children with at least two different perspectives—for example, two languages, intimacy with the arts and sciences, differing religious traditions—to give depth and contrast to children's understanding of the world. The educational importance of binocular vision precedes and extends beyond formal education.

The Special Role of Skepticism as a Universal Educational Goal

James Carroll (Chapter 11) distinguishes two meanings of universal: one imperial and imposing, the other inclusive, tolerant, and endlessly skeptical even of itself. His chapter shows that conflicts arising from claims of universality have afflicted the Abrahamic religions for not less than the last two millennia and recognizes that some of the same conflicts arise with respect to the pursuit of universal education. To avoid "the pitfalls that that have turned previous efforts at 'universal' education into exercises, however nobly defined, of imperial triumphalism" (p. 144), Carroll writes, it is necessary to acknowledge that the ideal of universality is itself problematic. Such an approach to universal education would be "consistently self-critical, aware of the implications of power," and focused on teaching "intellectual humility" (p. 144).

Mohamed Charfi and Hamadi Redissi (Chapter 12) describe the struggle over educational goals in the Arab-Muslim world. In balancing secular versus religious values in the curriculum of the Arab world, they argue that

education must enable people to read their sacred texts along with the texts of Freud and Darwin, to think critically about the texts and the history of their own culture, and to incorporate into their own worldview the worldviews of others and initiate a conversation. They write that if a society is going to coexist with other societies, critical thinking about one's own and other cultures is necessary. They ask that students become citizens of their own culture and of the world.

Deborah Meier (Chapter 13), an outspoken critic of state-mandated standards and tests, argues that the purpose of basic and secondary education is to prepare students to use their minds for democratic governance, specifically "to develop in our young strong democratic habits of heart and mind—appropriate intellectual skepticism and informed empathy for others unlike ourselves" (p. 178). With John Dewey, she recommends: "[E]very potential voter needs the education that was once reserved for the ruling classes . . . people [should] see school as a tool for enlarging the intellectual . . . life of our citizens, as, above all, the place where everything must be justified by how it prepares people to be decision-makers in the larger society, how it allows them to join the debate on the future of their community, state, nation and planet. . . . That most of these habits may be useful in the job market is at best a lucky coincidence. If it fails the latter test, then we need to insist that K–12 schooling is not the place to make it up" (p. 177). ". . . The litmus test of each and every reform is whether it provides more, not fewer, opportunities for the adults who surround kids to be taken seriously, to exercise judgment, to show off knowledge in public settings, and to bear witness to the problems of democratic decision making. The litmus test of good reforms is whether they encourage respect for the power of one's own and other people's ideas" (p. 179).

Educating Global Citizens

Globalization's consequences for education are not only economic and pedagogical, as Cheng and Mahbubani emphasize, but also political and social. Fernando Reimers argues that schools should teach global civility: to tolerate and appreciate individual and cultural diversity and to settle conflicts through peaceful negotiation. For Reimers (Chapter 14), global civility competes with three other contenders to be the principal goal of education: economic competitiveness, nationalism, and local relevance (religious, cultural, or political). Global civility renders its adherents vulnerable to those who are more belligerent and aggressive unless this goal is promoted universally or nearly so. Hence, the cooperation of an appropriate transnational organization would facilitate the widespread simultaneous adoption of global civility as a goal. UNESCO, originally chartered to promote the teaching of global civility, instead devoted its energies to promoting literacy and access to school. The World Bank's agenda for education is to promote economic competitiveness and reduce poverty, not to promote global

civility. A promising avenue is to scale up successful local efforts that now educate children for global civility. By building sufficient grassroots support among individuals and institutions, it may eventually be possible to engage the support of governments and international institutions.

Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco (Chapter 15) proposes a program of research to improve understanding of how to prepare children to engage globalization. Like Cheng, he focuses on the effects of globalization on education, but emphasizes the cultural as much as the economic consequences of globalization. He suggests that globalization requires successful children in the twenty-first century to have “(a) . . . autonomy and creativity of thought and the capacity to work with others on complex problems that often cut across disciplinary traditions; (b) the ability to communicate and understand others across cultural boundaries; and (c) the development of hybrid identities indexed by the ability to navigate across discontinuous or incommensurable linguistic and epistemic systems” (p. 208).

Suárez-Orozco calls for research on several areas of interaction between globalization and basic and secondary education. For example, migratory flows of unprecedented magnitude “. . . generate new identities and ways of belonging. How would reforming education in Arab countries be relevant to the seven million Muslims being educated in Europe today?” (p. 209).

Defining Educational Quality as a Basis for Educational Policy

Increasing access to education has been a long-standing goal of national and international agencies that fund and provide education. Access is relatively easy to define as a target, though achieving that goal has eluded the world for decades. Far more difficult, and increasingly crucial, is defining what is meant by educational quality. Mary Joy Pigozzi (Chapter 18) provides a perspective from UNESCO on the goal of improving educational quality. Each school, in her account, includes individual learners, teachers and administrators, and schools collectively constitute a system. Pigozzi spells out ten dimensions—five system-related—required for a country to provide an education of high quality for all its children. Her first five suggestions are administrative or organizational goals that are focused on learners. They include seeking out learners; responding to what the learner brings from experience and endowment; providing a safe environment; providing appropriate content; and recognizing that the processes of education are part of the learner’s education. Her second five suggestions focus on the educational system. They include structuring management and administration around the learner with fair, transparent and approachable procedures implemented by responsive people; communicating educational policies to the classroom, supporting the policies by mechanisms of implementation, and coordinating educational policies with policies in other sectors of the society; facilitating changes in the education system through an enabling legislative framework; providing resources of money, human capability,

and time; and monitoring educational outcomes and attuning monitoring more closely to the evolving goals of education.

Laura Salganik and Stephen Provasnik (Chapter 20) take a Western perspective elaborately developed under the auspices of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). They suggest that “a successful life and a well-functioning society” are universal goals; “a successful life” includes individual fulfillment and economic sufficiency, while “a well-functioning society” includes political and economic functioning of the society.

The OECD’s project on the definition and selection of key competencies (Rychen and Salganik, 2001, 2003) asked, “What competencies do we need for a successful life and a well-functioning society?” Here, “we” refers to individuals in OECD countries, but Salganik and Provasnik argue that their conclusions apply equally to individuals in developing and transitional countries. According to the project, “Each key competency must: contribute to valued outcomes for societies and individuals; help individuals meet important demands in a wide variety of contexts; and be important not just for specialists but for all individuals” (OECD DeSeCo Project, 2005, p. 4). As defined by the OECD, “competencies [are] understood to cover knowledge, skills, attitudes and values” (OECD DeSeCo Project, 2005, p. 4).

Individuals (regardless of age, but beginning in primary school and continuing through secondary school and adulthood) should acquire competence in three broad areas. They should be able to (a) “use . . . tools for interacting effectively with the environment: both physical ones such as information technology and socio-cultural ones such as the use of language. [They] need to understand such tools well enough to adapt them for their own purposes—to use tools interactively”; (b) “engage with others . . . from a range of backgrounds . . . in heterogeneous groups”; and (c) “take responsibility for managing their own lives, situate their lives in the broader social context and act autonomously” (OECD DeSeCo Project, 2005, p. 5).

These competencies contribute to individual capability. Whether increased individual capability leads to individual fulfillment and supports societal goals of education depends on political, economic, and social circumstances. Under favorable circumstances, individual competencies are likely to contribute to economic self-sufficiency for the individual and prosperity for the society. Under unfavorable circumstances, individual competencies may conflict with national political goals (e.g., Romania under Ceausescu, the Chinese Cultural Revolution, and Prussia under militarism). A recent review of the evidence (Hannum and Buchmann, 2006) found

. . . considerable controversy surrounding the effects of educational expansion on the democratization of societies, though expansions of primary and secondary education . . . are likely to improve the informed citizenship of individuals. . . democratization, perhaps more so than

other outcomes, may hinge directly on the hard-to-measure content of education. . . . the consequences of expanding universal basic and secondary education for political democratization remain an empirical question (p. 522).

George M. Ingram (Chapter 19) reviews many diverse proposals (including UNICEF's and UNESCO's) about "what is required to produce an education of quality" (p. 248). If any theme is common to all the proposals for what constitutes an education of quality, Ingram suggests, "it is the concept that education should prepare a student to be a constructive, contributing member of society by delivering a minimum quality of competence in literacy, numeracy, life skills, and problem solving. . . . Many educational systems also are expected to deliver values, but there is a wide range of differences in what those values should be" (p. 248). Ingram notes that education of high quality has yet to be defined for hard-to-reach and very poor populations.

Perspectives on Assessment and Educational Goals

Ana Carolina Letichevsky (Chapter 16) describes how evaluation is helping to improve primary and secondary education in Brazil, raising questions and challenges that apply much more broadly. Although educational evaluations originally focused on the performance of individual students, evaluation is now used to create and implement new educational policies, to estimate the proficiency of students, to improve educational processes and schools, and to justify education to society. Brazil has made strenuous efforts to use evaluations, not to punish or reward, but to aid learners in identifying their own educational strengths and educational deficiencies with a view to further learning.

Richard Rothstein and Rebecca Jacobsen (Chapter 17) examine the shortcomings of educational assessments in the United States. They compared what four samples of Americans say they want education to achieve with what the school system is being required to achieve by recent legislation. The announced goals of samples of adults, school board members, state legislators, and school superintendents were surprisingly consistent across all four groups and were much broader than basic academic skills in core subjects, such as reading, writing, mathematics, and knowledge of science and history. Most individuals surveyed gave weight to critical thinking and problem solving, social skills and work ethic, citizenship and community responsibility, physical and emotional health, the arts and literature, and preparation for skilled work that does not require a college degree. Rothstein and Jacobsen conclude, "This gap between the preferences for educational goals expressed in our survey and the educational standards established through political processes reflects a widespread policy incoherence" (p. 231). According to Rothstein and Jacobsen, schools are sacrificing

history, civics, science, the arts, literature, physical education, social studies, and civics in favor of reading and arithmetic in efforts to meet the standards imposed by the tests. They report that the sacrifice of educational breadth is greater in schools with large proportions of poor and minority groups than in schools for the wealthy and the white.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

I began with a set of questions. The chapters in this book address mainly the first two: What should be the goals of basic and secondary education of high quality? Which, if any, of these goals should be universal? Still mostly unanswered are the remaining questions: What does “universal” mean? What happens when educational goals conflict? What are the meanings of “high quality” in basic and secondary education? Who decides these questions, and by what process do they decide? How should the quality of decisions about educational goals be evaluated? These questions deserve discussion and answers.

Discussions of these questions would benefit from empirical research into why different educational systems are more or less effective in meeting the explicit aims and purposes they have set for themselves and into the conditions (organizational, legal, and political) that enable specific educational goals to be met. Comparing goals, achievements, and assessments case by case, country by country, is a massive undertaking for the future. Globally, setting targets and tracking achievements is an explicit function of UNESCO’s yearly *EFA (Education for All) Global Monitoring Report* (e.g., UNESCO, 2005). However, the targets to date have been more concerned with enrollment, attendance, and completion of schooling than with the aims, content, and quality of education offered.

The original proposal for the UBASE project called for an integrated working group on the goals and assessment of efforts toward universal education. Only discussions of assessments (Bettinger, 2006; Braun and Kanjee, 2006; Kremer, 2006) appeared in the initial volume of the UBASE project (Cohen, Bloom, and Malin, 2006). The present volume was organized to initiate a response to the difficult challenge of setting targets for content and quality.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This introductory essay benefited from the skilled editing of Helen A. Curry and from the constructive comments of Sissela Bok, Rachel Bronson, Walter Feinberg, F. Gregory Gause, Claudia Madrazo, Martin Malin, Mary Joy Pigozzi, Stephen Provasnik, Fernando Reimers, Richard Rothstein, Laura Salganik, Martin Sleeper, Camer Vellani, Rosanna Warren,

and anonymous publishers' readers. James Carroll provided helpful background. I thank the late Mr. and Mrs. William T. Golden and their family for hospitality during this work.

NOTES

1. PISA, 2006—*List of Participating Countries*, http://www.pisa.oecd.org/document/13/0,2340,en_32252351_32236225_33666189_1_1_1_1,00.html (accessed February 1, 2006).
2. PISA Definitions. www.pisa.oecd.org
3. Ibid.
4. For a digital version of Plato's *Republic* (Book II and Book III), see <http://www.philosophypages.com/hy/2g.htm>; http://www.ilt.columbia.edu/publications/Projects/digitexts/plato/the_republic/book02.html; http://www.ilt.columbia.edu/publications/Projects/digitexts/plato/the_republic/book03.html.
5. http://www.socsci.kun.nl/ped/whp/histeduc/locke/locke_intro.html; <http://www.ilt.columbia.edu/publications/digitext.html>
6. <http://www2.nea.org/he/roots.html> (accessed October, 16 2006).
7. <http://www.unhchr.ch/pdf/report.pdf> (accessed June 11, 2006).
8. For excerpts from *Saudi Ministry of Education Textbooks for Islamic Studies: Arabic with English Translation*, see Center for Religious Freedom of Freedom House with the Institute for Gulf Affairs (2006).
9. "Sister Rose Thering" (2006, July 19). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Sister_Rose_Thering&oldid=64572060 (accessed July 28, 2006).
10. See "Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions *Nostra Aetate*," http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_nostra-aetate_en.html (accessed July 27, 2008).
11. For Sec. 102. National Education Goals, see <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/GOALS2000/TheAct/sec102.html> (accessed June 24, 2008).
12. http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/guide/guide_pg12.html#history (accessed January 4, 2006).

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, Peter. 2006. "Foreword." In *Saudi Arabia's Curriculum of Intolerance: With Excerpts from Saudi Ministry of Education Textbooks for Islamic Studies*, ed. Nina Shea. Washington, DC: Center for Religious Freedom of Freedom House. http://www.hudson.org/files/publications/CRF_SaudiReport_2006.pdf.
- Ansari, Massoud. 2004. "Newsline Special: Lessons in Intolerance." *Newsline*, May 1. <http://www.newsline.com.pk/NewsMay2004/NewsspMay1.htm> (accessed June 10, 2006).
- Bailey, Stephen. 1976. *The Purposes of Education*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Benavot, Aaron, and Julia Resnik. 2006. "Lessons from the Past: A Comparative Socio-Historical Analysis of Primary and Secondary Education." In Cohen et al. 2006, 123–230. http://www.amacad.org/publications/ubase_GlobalExpansion.aspx (accessed June 4, 2006).

- Bettinger, Eric. 2006. "Evaluating Educational Interventions in Developing Countries." In Cohen et al. 2006, 355–388. <http://www.amacad.org/publications/braun.pdf>.
- Braun, Henry, and Anil Kanjee. 2006. "Using Assessment to Improve Education in Developing Countries." In Cohen et al. 2006, 303–354. <http://www.amacad.org/publications/braun.pdf>.
- Bronson, Rachel, and Isobel Coleman. 2005. "Saudi System Is the Problem." *Dallas Morning News*, May 7. http://www.cfr.org/pub8083/rachel_bronson_isobel_coleman/saudi_system_is_the_problem.php (accessed May 14, 2005).
- Carroll, James. 2001. *Constantine's Sword: The Church and The Jews: A History*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Center for Religious Freedom of Freedom House with the Institute for Gulf Affairs, ed. 2006. *Excerpts from Saudi Ministry of Education Textbooks for Islamic Studies: Arabic with English Translation*. http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/special_report/ArabicExcerpts.pdf.
- Cohen, Joel E., David E. Bloom, and Martin B. Malin, eds. 2006. *Educating All Children: A Global Agenda*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Corrales, Javier. 2006. "Political Obstacles to Expanding and Improving Schooling in Developing Countries." In Cohen et al. 2006, 231–299. http://www.amacad.org/publications/ubase_GlobalExpansion.aspx.
- Cremin, Lawrence A. 1961. *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876–1957*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Curtis, Stanley J., and Myrtle E. Boulwood. 1977. *A Short History of Educational Ideas*. Slough, England: University Tutorial Press.
- Daniel, John. 2002. "Wanted: Better Learning Materials and Textbooks." Opening remarks at Expert Meeting on Textbooks and Learning Materials: Components of Quality Education that can Foster Peace, Human Rights, Mutual Understanding and Dialogue. http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=11416&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html (accessed June 10, 2006).
- Delors, Jacques, et al. 1996. *Learning: The Treasure Within: Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century: Highlights*. Paris: UNESCO. http://www.unesco.org/delors/delors_e.pdf.
- Dewey, John. 1916. "Natural Development and Social Efficiency as Aims." In *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan. <http://www.ilt.columbia.edu/publications/dewey.html>.
- Eisner, Elliot W. 2002. "The Arts and the Creation of Mind." In *What the Arts Teach and How It Shows*, 70–92. New Haven: Yale University Press. <http://www.naea-reston.org/tenlessons.html> (accessed June 4, 2006).
- Eisner, Elliot. 2005. "Back to Whole." *Educational Leadership* 63 (1): 14–18.
- Gardner, Howard. 2001. An Education for the Future: The Foundation of Science and Values. Unpublished manuscript, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA. Available at <http://pzweb.harvard.edu>.
- Gardner, Howard. 2005. "Beyond Markets and Individuals: A Focus on Educational Goals." In *Degrees of Mediocrity: Higher Education at Risk*, ed. Richard Hersh and John Merrow, 97–112. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Hannum, Emily, and Claudia Buchmann. 2006. "Global Educational Expansion and Socio-Economic Development: An Assessment of Findings from the Social Sciences." In Cohen et al. 2006, 495–534. <http://www.amacad.org/publications/monographs/Ubase.pdf>.
- International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism. Japan Committee. 2001. "Statement Against the Approval and Adoption of Textbooks Made by the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform, 7 August 2001, To Mr. Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi From Kinhide Mushakoji, President,"

- IMADRJC. <http://www.imadr.org/tokyo/statement.textbook.html> (accessed June 11, 2006).
- Jefferson, Thomas. 1818. "Report of the Commissioners for the University of Virginia." [machine-readable transcription], Electronic Text Center, University of Virginia Library, 1995, from *Early history of the University of Virginia, as contained in the letters of Thomas Jefferson and Joseph C. Cabell*. The e-text comes from Appendix I: J. W. Randolph, Richmond, VA, 1856 at p. 434 of the printed version. <http://etext.virginia.edu/etcbin/toccer-new2?id=JefRock.sgm&images=images/modeng&data=/texts/english/modeng/parsed&tag=public&part=1&division=div1>.
- Kovac, Vlasta. 2002. "New Study Questions Values Taught in Croatia's Textbooks." *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, December 18.
- Kremer, Michael. 2006. "Expanding Educational Opportunity on a Budget: Lessons from Randomized Evaluations." In Cohen et al. 2006, 389–412. <http://www.amacad.org/publications/braun.pdf>.
- Kyodo News. 2006. "Middle School Teacher to Sue Tokyo Over 'Illegal' Dismissal." *Japan Times*, September 15.
- Low-Beer, Ann. 2001. "Politics, School Textbooks and Cultural Identity: The Struggle in Bosnia and Hercegovina." *Paradigm* 2 (3). <http://faculty.ed.uiuc.edu/westbury/Paradigm/LOW-BEER.PDF> (accessed June 10, 2006).
- Martí, Jose. 1979. *On Education: Articles on Educational Theory and Pedagogy, and Writings for Children from the Age of Gold*. Trans. E. Randall and ed. Philip S. Foner. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- National Education Association. 2004. Special Education and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. <https://www.nea.org/specialed/index.html> (accessed June 4, 2006).
- Noddings, Nel. 2005. "What Does It Mean to Educate the Whole Child?" *Educational Leadership* 63 (1): 8–13. http://www.ascd.org/authors/led_lead/el200509_noddings.html.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 1997. *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 2005. "Education and Democratic Citizenship: Capabilities and Quality Education." Paper delivered at the second annual conference of the Human Development Capability Association, September 14. Paris: UNESCO.
- Onishi, Norimitsu. 2006. "Japan's Conservatives Push Prewar 'Virtues' in Schools." *New York Times*, June 11. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/06/11/world/asia/11tokyo.html> (accessed June 13, 2006).
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). No date. *PISA—The OECD Programme for International Student Assessment*. www.pisa.oecd.org (accessed January 15, 2009).
- OECD Definition and Selection of Competencies: Theoretical and Conceptual Foundations (DeSeCo) Project. 2005. *The Definition and Selection of Key Competencies: Executive Summary*. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/47/61/35070367.pdf>.
- Read, Herbert. 1943. *Education through Art*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Reimers, Fernando. 2006. "Teaching Quality Matters: Pedagogy and Literacy Instruction of Poor Students in Mexico." In *International Education for the Millennium: Toward Access, Equity, and Quality*, ed. Benjamin Piper, Sarah Dryden-Peterson, and Young-Suk Kim, 195–214. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Rogers, Carl R. 1969. *Freedom to Learn: A View of What Education Might Become*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Rothstein, Richard. 1999. "'Goals 2000' Score: Failure 8, U.S. 0." *New York Times*, December 22. Republished under the headline "'Goals 2000' Scorecard: Failure

- Pitches a Shutout.” http://www.epi.org/content.cfm/webfeat_lessons19991222 (accessed May 25, 2006).
- Rychen, Dominique S., and Laura H. Salganik, eds. 2001. *Defining and Selecting Key Competencies*. Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Rychen, Dominique S., and Laura H. Salganik, eds. 2003. *Key Competencies for a Successful Life and a Well-Functioning Society*. Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Sarwar, Beena. 2004. “Jehad and the Curriculum.” *Countercurrents.org*, April 3, <http://www.countercurrents.org/ipk-sarwar030404.htm> (accessed June 10, 2006).
- Shea, Nina. 2006. “This Is a Saudi Textbook (After the Intolerance Was Removed).” *Washington Post*, May 21. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/05/19/AR2006051901769.html> (accessed June 10, 2006).
- Slater, Charles L. 2005. “What Does It Mean to Be an Educated Person?” *The School Administrator*. <http://www.aasa.org/publications/saarticledetail.cfm?ItemNumber=2894&snItemNumber=950>.
- Stout, David. 2007. “Justices Loosen Restrictions on Campaign Ads.” *New York Times*, July 25. <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/25/washington/25cnd-scotus.html?hp=&adxnnl=1&adxnnlx=1182823652-eMODBJn9PH2YNEMSCrz/DA>.
- Thurber, Jon. 2006. “Obituary of Sister Rose Thering, 85; Catholic Scholar Battled Anti-Semitism.” *Los Angeles Times*, May 9.
- United Nations, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. 1990. Convention on the Rights of the Child, Adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution 44/25 of 20 November 1989, entry into force 2 September 1990, in accordance with article 49. <http://www.unhcr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm>.
- United Nations, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. 2004. *Status of Ratifications of the Principal International Human Rights Treaties as of 09 June 2004*. <http://www.unhcr.ch/pdf/report.pdf> (accessed June 4, 2006).
- United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education: Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Appointed by the National Education Association. 1918. *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1928. <http://tmh.floonet.net/articles/cardprin.html> (accessed July 28, 2006).
- UNESCO. 2005. *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2006*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Young, Mary E., ed. 2002. From Early Child Development to Human Development. *Proceedings of a World Bank Conference on Investing in Our Children’s Future*. Washington DC: World Bank. http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2002/04/26/000094946_02041304004942/Rendered/PDF/multi0page.pdf.
- Zalta, E. N. 2006. “Confucius.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/confucius/>.