FROM CITIZEN TO PERSON?

RETHINKING EDUCATION AS INCORPORATION

FRANCISCO O. RAMIREZ

SCHOOL OF EDUCTION
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Comparative educational research has influenced the development of the world society perspective as surely as the world society perspective has shaped research directions in comparative education. Rooted in neo-institutional ideas emphasizing the extent to which actors and activities are profoundly constructed and influenced by their environments, the world society perspective imagines world models or blueprints of progress and justice that give rise to and increasingly standardize nation-states, organizations, and individuals. The role of education and educationally certified professionals in the overall process of standardization is a core premise in this perspective and a recurring feature of comparative educational research motivated by this perspective. The universalistic character of these models and the formal rationality associated with them facilitates standardization, in aspiration and policy, if not always in practice. Simply put, what all of this means is that we increasingly live in a world in which there are shared standards about who is a person, what constitutes an organization, and what does a nation-state look like. Furthermore, there is a sense that those entities not in the know can learn to become and act like proper nation-states, organizations, and individuals. How else can one explain the proliferation of expertise roaming the world with the latest word on learning to learn, benchmarking, accountability, transparency, democracy, civil society and other virtues de jour!

Much of the empirical research which situated the world society perspective on the comparative education map is well known and has been summarized elsewhere (cf; Ramirez, 1997; Meyer and Ramirez, 2000). Suffice it to say that the two global trends that serve as corner stones of the world society research edifice are the enormous expansion of educational enrollments at all levels and the expanded scope of the aims and uses of education and the plethora of educational organizations that embody and elaborate these purposes. Ours is truly a world certificational society. There are of course alternative ways of accounting for the rise and impact of the world certification society. And, these in turn have raised critiques of the world society perspective, critiques often centering on issues of agency and power. These critiques are not without merit, but unfortunately, they often

lead to exaggerated and culture free understandings of agency (see Jepperson and Meyer, 2000) and to oversimplified notions of power cum coercion, notions that underestimate the authority and influence of world cultural models (See Ramirez, 2003a).

In what follows I first briefly reiterate some of the main ideas of the world society perspective and explore its roots in neo-institutional theories. Next, I identify a direction of future theorizing and research which both challenges and extends the world society perspective and comparative education research. I first propose to distinguish between institutionalized domains and contested terrains. A clearer understanding of the former is enhanced by the explicit recognition of the latter. Thirdly, I apply this distinction to the question of the role of education in the political incorporation process. The transformation of the masses into citizens via mass schooling is an established theme in comparative political sociology, which has strongly influenced key strands of world society driven research. Here I emphasize a second distinction, one between earlier issues of exclusion versus inclusion and current issues regarding the terms of inclusion. Lastly, I reflect on the changing character of the polity to which one is offered membership in the education based incorporation process. Much of the literature continues to privilege the nation-state and national citizenship.   But there is also an emerging literature on human rights and even human rights education. So, I conclude by distinguishing between national citizenship and world or transnational citizenship.

THE WORLD SOCIETY PERSPECTIVE AND NEO-INSTITUTIONAL THEORIES

Comparative education has typically focused on differences across countries and sought to explain these differences as a function of differences in historical legacies, in societal prerequisites (as in variants of functionalist analysis), or in internal patterns of competition and conflict across social classes and status groups. In these studies the independent and the dependent variables of interest are endogenous characteristics of national societies. The latter are presumed to operate mostly as "closed systems" with their past trajectories (think path dependencies) and their present states (think present system needs or current power configurations) shaping the educational outcomes of interest.   These endogenous characteristics may depict properties of the economy, e.g., degree of industrialization, the polity, e.g. democratic versus authoritarian regimes, the culture, e.g. Confucian

group centric versus Protestant individual oriented, etc. or the educational system itself, centralized versus decentralized. The latter, of course, may be viewed both as a dependent variable influenced by the degree to which the polity is centralized or decentralized as well as an independent variable, influencing the growth of enrollments. In the classical Collins formulation (1979) the comparatively greater growth of post primary enrollments in the United States was an outcome of status competition which itself was made more likely by a decentralized educational system. The latter in turn reflected and was shaped by a decentralized political system.

Status competition dynamics and other endogenous factors may continue to be important influences on varying educational outcomes. Some chapters in this volume highlight the continued importance of historical traditions and cross-national variations in internal structures in accounting for some differences (see in this volume, for example, Buchmann on the historical legacy of immigration and its influence on immigrant/native achievement gaps, or Park on why parental participation is more beneficial in some national school systems, or Astiz on the importance of varying conditions within Argentina in influencing local reaction to community participation goals.)

But it is the observation of a growth in common educational outcomes, despite cross-national variations in historical legacies and societal characteristics, which initially triggered the idea of a common world, a common source of influence. This idea was employed to make sense of the "world educational revolution", that is, the global expansion of primary enrollments after World War II (Meyer, Ramirez, Rubinson, and Boli-Bennett, 1977). All sorts of countries were committing resources to increase enrollments and extolling the virtues of mass schooling for individual and national development. This idea was also used to examine the European origins of mass schooling as a state instrument for the political incorporation of the masses. (Ramirez and Boli, 1987). Both with respect to the origins and expansion issues the puzzle was to figure out why different entities increasingly acted in common ways: creating schools, expanding enrollments, establishing national educational ministries and passing compulsory school laws, allocating curricular time to privilege some school subjects, attributing economic, political, and even military success to the quality of schooling. These are some of the common organizational and ideological educational outcomes we sought to explain.

The first premise underlying the world society perspective is that nation-states and national educational structures operated as if these were "open systems." (Meyer, Boli, Thomas, and Ramirez, 1997). That is, it would not do to pretend that these entities were well buffered from one another. Exogenous factors were clearly at work and figuring out what these were and how they lead to common outcomes was a major challenge for the development of the world society perspective. There were two alternative explanations that we found inadequate. First, following a functionalist imagery, one could argue that the worldwide triumph of schooling was brought about because schooling worked! Neo-institutional theories do not presuppose that nothing works. There is no doubt that there are some goals for which some forms of schooling add up to an efficacious technology. But the ever expanding and diffuse goals of schooling at all levels indicate that we are not in the limited and concrete realm of "efficient mousetrap production." Expanded school systems with elaborated curricula are not adopted across national boundaries because their expected payoffs are clearly realized elsewhere. The frequency of educational reforms and their relatively short life spans suggests that we really do not have a strong handle on what constitutes the optimal level of curricular and pedagogical inputs that lead to economic growth, political integration, and social well being. Macro level educational effects appear to be unstable especially when dealing with political and social objectives. Even with respect to economic outcomes different results are found in different studies; contrast Hanushek and Kimko, 2000 with Ramirez, et al. 2006 on the relationship between academic achievement and economic growth.

A second explanatory line stresses the role of power dependency ties. These arguments share with the world society perspective the premise that nation-states and national educational structures operate as "open systems.' From this perspective there are exogenous influences and these involve the more powerful dictating educational outcomes to the more dependent ones. Just as one can find some evidence of educational efficacy at work one can also find some support for power dependency processes. Coercion is in fact one of the three mechanisms that neo-institutional theories emphasize in accounting for a growth in commonalities, that is, institutional isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). National states and national legal systems are the main examples of coercive sources of institutional isomorphism. Absent a world state, at the international level center periphery dynamics are often emphasized, e.g. the power of international donors or international governmental organizations such as the IMF or the World Bank to impose

their agendas on aid or loan dependent countries. The other two mechanisms emphasized by neo-institutionalists are mimetic and normative processes. A growth in educational commonalities may be brought about because some national educational system gains heroic status and others imitate it.   German, American, Japanese, and Scandanavian schooling have enjoyed heroic status in different eras and with different national goals in mind. More recently this has been referred to as educational policy borrowing (but see Steiner-Khamsi, 2004 for a renewed emphasis on power and dependency dynamics underlying policy borrowing).   Lastly, the role of professionals, scientists, and experts in theorizing education, and more broadly, theorizing its role in individual and national development, has been stressed. Instead of borrowing specific policies what we have is enacting broad principles. A growth in common educational discourse as in affirming national educational standards (of the world class variety, of course) and national educational goals may especially be susceptible to the influence of educational experts. In many cases the affirmation of broad educational principles may be loosely coupled with actual school practices. The celebration of human capital, for instance, may go hand in hand with high rates of student and even teacher absenteeism.

On evidentiary grounds summarized elsewhere (see Chabbott and Ramirez, 2000) we eschewed explanations that mostly relied on the presumed efficacy of education or the sole exercise of coercion to make sense of the world educational revolution.   There are too many educational outcomes that simply cannot be made sense of through either of these explanations. National educational ministries, for example, have flourished (see Kim in this volume) but their economic or political efficacy is unclear. A stable political democracy and sound economic growth characterized the United States long before its establishment of a distinctive cabinet position for education. Furthermore, this example also shows that it is possible for some educational structures such as a national educational ministry to spread worldwide even though it is not in place in a dominant power.

From a world society perspective nation-states are not only open to other nation-states but also to the theorization of an influential army of education and development experts. From the latter come norms as to how nation-states should act and ideas as to what constitutes an authentic nation-state. There are thus both cognitive and normative elements in the definition of the nation-state and the standards against which it is to be evaluated. These standards operate as models setting forth the appropriate goals of the

nation-state and the rational (often educational) means through which these goals are to be realized. Through international organizations and conferences these standards are articulated and elaborated. It is through these mechanisms that progress and justice goals become nation-state goals. The worldwide enactment of these standards leads to highly scripted nation-state goals: economic growth, political democracy, social equality, human development etc. The centrality of education in these scripts accounts for its worldwide triumph as legitimated means to an array of national goals.

Nation-states are thus not just "open systems" but model driven and script enacting ones. The models are universalistic in character: all nation-states are imagined to be capable of attaining progress and justice. Alternative theories stressing inherent national superiorities or virtues are taboo. The scripts are highly rationalized: a lot of theorization confidently links means to ends, regardless of the evidence. What follows from this is the optimistic premise that learning can take place: nation-states, organizations, and individuals can learn. Thus, much of the theorization is explicitly educational in character, culminating in current themes such as the learning society, lifelong learning and learning to learn. Perhaps these themes lead to some policy borrowing. They most surely constitute principles that can be enacted as sought after goals. Goal enactment displays proper nation-state, organizational, and individual identity. The world society perspective thus emphasizes the importance of identity and identity management at the macro societal level of analysis. The underlying social psychology is Goffmanesque: nation-states operate within a world of frames that inform their identity and legitimate their activity and there is much "presentation of self" among nation-state actors.

But nation-states vary in the degree to which they are linked to (or buffered from) world models of progress and justice and their organizational carriers and professional articulators. In more recent formulations the world society perspective has emphasized that common outcomes are more likely among nation-states with stronger links to world models of progress and justice (cf. Ramirez and Meyer, 2002). This has lead to studies that not only identify world and regional educational trends but also test hypotheses regarding the effects of varying organizational and ideological links to world models on educational and related outcomes (cf. Suarez, 2006). These links may reflect greater membership in international organizations, greater participation in international conferences, or greater access to "neighbors" with the right membership/participation profile. The earlier research lead to

the general finding of greater institutional isomorphism (common educational outcomes) over time. Recent studies refine this general finding by setting forth the conditions under which common educational outcomes are more likely to take place. Furthermore, these studies help account for deviant cases by emphasizing their relatively isolated character. The core idea is that relatively isolated nation-states are more likely to pursue distinctive educational goals or maintain unique educational structures.

To summarize, the world society perspective assumes that nation-states (and other actors) seek to enact a legitimated identity and that much professional theorization defines and standardizes what constitutes proper identity and reasonable action. Scripted goals and rationalized strategies for attaining these goals follow from the worldwide institutionalization of the nation-state.   The "world educational revolution" is the triumph of education as a rationalized strategy for attaining an array of scripted goals. In a world certificational society highly certified experts play a major role in creating and diffusing the professional theorization that leads to common educational goals, e.g. education as human capital or education as human rights, and structures, educational ministries or compulsory school laws. Nation-states with greater access to educational expertise are more likely to experience common educational outcomes.

From a world society perspective education as a national instrument for transforming the masses into national citizens is very much an institutionalized or taken for granted domain. In the next sections this conceptualization is both amplified and problematized. First, we consider the distinction between institutional domains and contested terrains. Next, we reflect on national versus postnational citizenship and the shift from an earlier debate on inclusion versus exclusion to the current controversies hinging on the terms of inclusion issues.

INSTITUTIONALIZED DOMAINS AND CONTESTED TERRAINS

The right to education is clearly institutionalized. It is articulated in national legislation and in international conferences. Both the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the National Interest are invoked to firmly frame this right. The right to education is theorized both as human right and as human capital. No one seriously disputes the right of all children to be educated and everyone understands that this means going to school for a prescribed period of time. There is also growing consensus on what is to be

learned in school. Lastly, enrollment, achievement, and other school data are collected and often compared to ascertain how well a country is doing by its children. National educational report cards have become a commonplace. National economic and political crises are increasingly diagnosed as having both educational roots and educational remedies.

What we have here are the basic elements of what makes actors and activities within a given domain taken for granted or institutionalized. Despite huge differences in the resources assigned to this educational domain (both between and within countries) the enactment of student and teacher roles within classrooms is recognizable and distinguishable from other role enactment patterns in other domains. Moreover, recurring patterns of activity are meaningful because they are theorized and theorized in a universalistic idiom (Strang and Meyer, 1993). All sorts of similar expectations are activated in observers with the simple information that the actors they observe are teachers and students in a setting called a classroom. Lastly, the theorization assigns value to the domain and indicates the ways in which the value can be best realized. Thus, the normative emphasis is added to the cognitive one and a rationalizing how to get this done recipe is further added to the mix. The ubiquitous character of educational reforms and the great likelihood that the reforms will be cast in universalistic language makes sense only if one understands that the right to education is institutionalized as a positive for both the child and the national society. There are indeed debates on how to best teach mathematics or science but both sides agree that their favored pedagogy or curricula would work best for all children. To be sure, there are exceptions to this rule. But the educational reforms that command the greatest attention are universalistic in scope. The right to education is cognitively intelligible, normatively valued, and organizationally displayed in school and classroom roles and routines. It is this confluence of cognitive, normative, and organizational elements that result in a strong degree of institutionalization, (See Jepperson, 1991 for a formal explication of the concept of institutionalization.)

None of the elements discussed above were in place in 1800 and only weakly so in a few countries by1900. Much of its worldwide establishment takes place after World War II with respect to both its universalistic thrust and its rationalization around human capital and the national interest and human rights and personal development. The educability of the peasants, the working class, women, and people of color was highly contested in different countries in earlier centuries. Whether schooling the masses would

transform them into good, loyal, and, productive citizens was also disputed. Lastly, even some supporters of schooling, John Stuart Mill, for instance, were skeptical about the extent to which government supported compulsory schooling was a positive development. So, what was once a contested terrain has now become an institutionalized domain. And, for most countries born after World War II there was no transition from contestation to institutionalization. What had been a suspect innovation in an earlier era for some countries was now so trans-nationally validated that there were virtually no local counter forces to schooling the masses. Exceptions to this taken for granted pattern, the apartheid regime in South Africa obviously, were slowly but surely stigmatized throughout the world.

This historical transformation should not blind us to the fact that there are contested terrains within educational circles. Nor should we assume that the historical pathway is always in one direction, from contestation to institutionalization. That which is institutionalized can be contested. Successful contestation leads to de-institutionalization or to emergent institutions. No, the right to education has not itself been contested. But if you think of mass schooling as an instrument of political incorporation, linguistic homogenization was clearly a feature of this process in some of the earlier innovators. The transformation of peasants into Frenchmen presupposed the codification and celebration of French as the national language and the demise of dialects therein. The movement was from "A Wealth of Tongues" to 'France, One and Indivisible." (Weber, 1976) The right to education went hand in hand with the obligation to learn French. Parallel developments can be found in other countries though market forces, not state bureaucracies, played a more decisive role in the United States, for example. Throughout the 20th century the amount of official curricular time dedicated to the teaching of the national language sharply increased worldwide. (Cha, 1991) Time allocated to the study of classical languages, Latin and Mandarin Chinese for example, declined. So too did the time for local or sub-national languages.

However, in recent years there has been an increase in the number of official languages that countries have identified in their reports to the International Bureau of Education (Benavot, 2004) The question of language of instruction in school and what languages should the child be exposed to is now clearly much contested. Does not a child have a right to learn in her mother tongue? Will not the child learn more effectively if taught in a tongue that more directly resonates with him? Do not minorities

and indigenous peoples have a right to their culture, and thus, to the language that reflects and activates their culture? Is it not time to show more respect for Patois and other tongues? Moving from a rights discourse to a more pragmatic human capital one the question is whether societies would not be better off if their populations were more bilingual or even multilingual? More broadly this involves a celebration of diversity and multiculturalism at both the national and international levels. In some countries that celebration has collided with proponents of a more uniform common ground (see the papers in Smelser and Alexander, 1999). These proponents worry about national fragmentation; they seek to conserve what was a 19th progressive view which assumed that "the other" could (optimistically) and ought (normatively) learn French, English, German, etc and become citizens. Twenty first century progressives are less likely to privilege national sovereignty (a point to which we later return) and more likely to concern themselves with the rights of sub-national entities. From their perspective the human rights of these entities trump the demands of the nation-state, another point we later address. Suffice it say that the right to one's language was not even vaguely a citizenship right in the debates regarding citizenship in Western Europe. Neither modern psycholinguistics nor current anti-hegemonic sensitivities could have earlier been mobilized to frame and support this right. Today, however, psychological research can be cited in support of the thesis that multiple language exposure leads to cognitive enrichment for children. And, from a macro perspective, the argument is made that the world as a whole would be better if linguistic diversity was promoted instead of accepting the hegemony of English. (Macedo, et, al., 2003) Note that what is called for is not a defensive return to national languages as state instruments but rather a celebration of dialects the world over.

FROM EXCLUSION/INCLUSION TO TERMS OF INCLUSION

Nineteenth century conservatives preferred a more exclusive polity and a more limited franchise. They contended that not everyone was qualified for citizenship. In its early development the franchise was restricted by property ownership and literacy criteria that had the net effect of excluding women and people of color as well. Literate property owners were imagined to be more responsible decision makers because ownership, it was argued, literally gave them a greater stake in the system. Not surprisingly nineteenth century conservatives also opposed mass schooling. Some reluctantly accepted this educational initiative when the expanded

franchise handwriting was clearly on the wall. Robert Lowe, a conservative spokesperson put it this way: "I believe it will be absolutely necessary to compel our future masters to learn their letters." (Simon, 1987, p.105). However exaggerated in tone, this remark clearly indicated a sense that educational socialization was needed for those who would now wield more political power. Throughout the 20th century the exclusionary position has collapsed in country after country; the principle of one-person one vote has triumphed. All sorts of excluded categories have been recast as citizenship material. Not surprisingly schooling for all has also increasingly become a world legitimated mantra (Chabbott, 2003).

The movement toward a more inclusive polity/inclusive school system, however, could co-exist without much changing the terms of inclusion. Before World War II there is little evidence of a search for working class or peasant role models as these categories of once excluded people became eligible for incorporation via mass schooling. There were no serious efforts to discover and promulgate working class or peasant contributions in the teaching of national history. And, needless to say, the cultures and languages of ethnic minorities and indigenous peoples were not attended to in educational policy or practice. Nineteenth century progressives favored an inclusive polity but not one in which the newly incorporated could negotiate or question the terms of incorporation. And, until very recently, the champions of "Third World" nationalisms sought to re-organize the exclusive colonial polity into an inclusive nationalist one without much attending to the interests or rights of sub-national entities. Until very recently the lingering debates were still along the exclusion/inclusion dimension.

But along many different fronts the terms of inclusion has become the lightning rod of our times. I have elsewhere discussed the terms of inclusion issue with respect to women, distinguishing between issues regarding women in science as mostly access and inclusion issues versus women and science as mostly epistemological and organizational issues more in line with terms of inclusion considerations. (Ramirez, 2003b ; see also Wotipka, 2001) The first set of issues does not lead to the interrogation of the domain (science) into which women seek greater access. The gendered character of the domain is indeed interrogated in the women and science literature. In assessing the gendered character of the welfare state Orloff (1993) also deals with the terms of inclusion question. She contends that the underdevelopment of citizenship rights such as right to childcare is due to

the fact that welfare states envisioned citizens as male full time workers. The relationship between social class and schooling also lends itself to the distinction between exclusion/inclusion issues and terms of inclusion questions. It is clear that polities and schools have an easier time aligning themselves with an inclusive logic of citizenship than with coping with the rise and intensity of the terms of inclusion challenges. But it is also clear that these challenges are unlikely to subside and need to be better understood.

Much of the earlier educational focus of the world society perspective fell squarely on those issues that primarily deal with the triumph of inclusive citizenship/inclusive schooling. The world trends refereed to earlier—educational expansion and the growth of educational rationalization—were frequently discussed as exercises in and displays of nation-state legitimacy. The proper nation-state committed itself to schooling the masses and to fostering the credential society. Its probity was not dependent on results but on its conformity to world models or standards. These were authoritatively articulated, if not crafted by certified professionals and their organizational carriers. Regardless of whether economic growth, social equity, or efficient universities was a discernable outcome, the adaptation of the appropriate means was a good enough indicator that the country was moving in the right direction. More often than not the appropriate means involved consultation with scientists, professionals, and other experts and engagement with their rationalizing discourse of world standards and best practices. It is through these mechanisms of increased ties and increased engagement that educational systems become more homogenous over time. What neo-institutionalists call "a logic of confidence" is widely activated through the enactment of world standards. Minus clearly efficacious educational technologies, the countries of the world rally around educational standards, thereby achieving a higher level of world standardization.

But what can we learn from the rise in the terms of inclusion arguments? Does this imply the decline of the "abstract individual" and the sense that there should not be any "partial societies" between the individual and the state (in pacem Rousseau)? Does the new focus on terms of inclusion represent an era of group or collective rights? How is this reconcilable with the neo-liberalism emphasis on individuals and markets? Are nation-states now in the business of incorporating groups ala the corporatist tradition? The world society perspective has always emphasized the tensions between the rights of individuals and the authority of the nation-

state (cf: Meyer, et. al.1997). This tension is evident in critiques of the nation-state for imposing on all a common language or a common culture. But this adds up to group rights only in those circumstances where groups now have rights of representation or decision making in this or that sphere. If a ministry of education is required to have sub-ministers from various groups to deal with their group interests that would indeed be evidence of group rights. Group rights in action are clearly displayed when the owners of some properties face restrictions on their uses due to ancestral tribal land rights.   But where individuals have the right to role models from their gender or ethnicity or where indigenous peoples have the right to have their history and culture included in textbooks on the national history and culture, such rights appear to be individual rights.   Here it seems that more empowered individuals can assert the cultural right to have their group or collectivity membership be recognized as part of their personal identity. This is less about group rights per se, but rather the rights of individuals to have their sub-national languages or cultures gain official standing. Note that one could strongly argue for bilingual education in the schools or women's studies in the university without making these innovations requirements. An expanded menu of options is much less likely to encounter opposition than a new set of canonical requirements. What this menu displays is not so much expanded group power but increased individual choice.

The net effect of the rise of terms of inclusion arguments is both an increase in group emphases and rights and an increase in individual rights, especially in the realm of cultural rights. Bringing back Patois affirms Patois speakers rights to their language and their culture regardless of the extent to which these rights are exercised.   Opposition to this and other similar developments in language policy often cling to the grand narrative in which state and nation come together with common language as the moral glue. But the grand narrative is no longer taken for granted and more pragmatic cost effective ideas are now brought to bear in defense of linguistic uniformity. This pragmatism further tames the grand narrative, which welded state, nation, and society and assigned to schools the heroic task of transforming the nameless masses into national citizens (Hobsbawm and Ringer, 1983)

NATIONAL AND TRANSNATIONAL CITIZENSHIP

At the heart of the world society perspective is the premise that the legitimacy of the nation-state, individual citizenship, and mass schooling as

political incorporation into the nation-state is in large part contingent on the wider world. Notions of state sovereignty were trans-nationally validated, as were the limits of state sovereignty. The distinction between institutionalized domains and contested terrains is crucial to understanding what was the range of principles, policies, and practices that states needed to display in order to be viewed as legitimate states. Outside this range there were contested terrains made up of future contenders and former but faded winners in the institutionalization of nation-state identity game. There was also an array of optional principles, policies, and practices. A nation-state commitment to schooling became a mandatory principle in the 20th century but the extent to which schooling was centralized or decentralized was an optional policy. Until very recently states were imagined to have the right, though not the duty, to construct a single official language and to purse a mono linguistic policy in the schools. So, where does the right to be taught in one's own language and its multicultural correlates come from? There is no getting around the fact that this right has been asserted and critiqued and that the question of language is a deeply contested issue. It is not a matter of exclusion versus inclusion; it is quintessentially a debate over the terms of inclusion.

I contend that the taming of the grand narrative is a key to understanding the rise of terms of inclusion debates across a wide front and the escalation of the question of language in particular. The grand narrative presupposed a clear divide between the nameless excluded and the established included; the progressive solution was to include, and through an educational baptism, transform masses into citizens. The progressive inclination today is to think in terms of persons and their rights independent of their citizenship status. So, if established citizenship is suspected of envisioning a citizen with a particular gender, race, ethnicity, or class background the latter needs to be challenged. The price of inclusion should not involve the shedding of identity pegs not formally or informally enshrined in the dominant conception of citizenship. This challenge clearly affects education and language policy and use therein. Consider, for instance, this declaration of children's linguistic human rights

""(1) Every child should have the right to identify positively with her original mother tongue(s) and have her identification accepted and respected by others. (2) Every child should have the right to learn the mother tongue(s) fully. (3) Every child should have the right to choose when she wants to use the mother tongue(s) in all official situations" (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995)

Note that the same proponent of these children's linguistic rights also argues that just as the world needs biodiversity so too it needs linguistic diversity. What we have here is the assertion that linguistic rights are good for children and for the world, a subtle recasting of the well established idea that what was good for children (education) was also good for their national societies. The recasting emphasizes rights but also the sense that the world would benefit from this development. This perspective is also found in the education for all conference, a confernce that emphasized the right of the child to a quality education and the value of achieving this goal, not just for countries, but also for the world as a whole.

The taming of the grand narrative goes hand in hand with the rise of the world as the subject of professional rationalizing. There is a growing interest in the state of the world with respect to environment, health, and other related matters that are quickly subjected to a world scientized discourse and analysis. There are more efforts to depict the world via the collection and analysis of world level indicators, for example, measures of world economic output, global warming, and international political stability, etc. Expertise that in principle applies to the world as a whole gains prominence. Local knowledge must undergo a process of "glocalization" in order to be sustainable and respectable. The movement to preserve local languages is worldwide in character and illustrates "glocalization" in action; a discourse of global value and human rights greatly facilitates transforming local matters into global concerns. (See Robertson, 1994 for an explication of the concept of glocalization). The language policy debates illustrate this transformation, highlighting linguistic human rights and the place of languages in the world as whole. Bringing back Patois is about children's linguistic human rights but arguably also about national and world enrichment.

Not only is the world more the subject of theorization but also the theorization leads to the premise that the world can be conceived of as an actor or, to be more precise, as a domain of world actors and activities. The expansion of international governmental and non-governmental organizations is evidence of world or at least transnational structures. World conferences and treaties and resolutions that are intended to be ratified around the world also illustrate a growth of world consciousness and world organization. Within this world, a human rights perspective has emerged as an international regime, which activates standards that provide one and all

with rights not necessarily codified in their national constitutions. To be sure nation-states are expected to recognize and respect these rights and that may well lead to their affirmation in national legislation. But the net effect of these theorized world standards is that new rights can be claimed and claimed even in the absence of national legal foundation. What may emerge as a 21st century mantra—know your human rights—is not about knowing your constitutional rights but about those rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The dynamic is less about social contracts and more about discovering natural human rights.

The shift in emphasis from citizenship to human rights is uneven and contentious. Its corollary is a shift from national to postnational or world citizenship (See Soysal, 1994). These shifts have ramifications for the political uses of mass schooling as incorporation instruments. The politically excluded from the perspective of the nation-states already have standing and rights from the perspective of a world affirming human rights. Their personhood and the rights that accrue to them are not contingent on the triumph of progressive forces and the changes in positive law that follow. To the extent that personhood is theorized independent of citizenship and international organizations and social movements dramatize this theorization in local settings, the terms of inclusion becomes a salient issue. An equal opportunity to be a man (if one is a woman) or to be fluent in the official national language (if one identifies with some other tongue) will no longer do. Even male identifiers with the national language, if they choose to act like 21st century progressives, can be mobilized to support terms of inclusion sensitivities and demands. The right to be taught in one's own language and its multicultural correlates is grounded in a human rights discourse (with some pragmatic references to learning benefits) which itself presupposes a transnational or world common ground.

The educational implications of these developments constitute a new research direction for the world society perspective. The education, citizenship, and nation-state links are not going to disappear. Much of the practical responsibility for coping with cultural rights demands will fall squarely on the nation-state. Some older interests and demands will be couched in human rights terms and their chances of sticking are greater if the human rights frame is invoked. Success is even more likely if both human rights and human capital can be simultaneously invoked. And, increasingly, these fames will be invoked with not only the national interest but also the world interest in mind. Even when efforts fail it will be interesting to see if

and how diversity claims were managed in often unexpected ways by earlier established or "insider" groups (cf: Davies, 1999 on the cultural rights discourse of religious fundamentalists seeking better standing in Canadian schools).

The study of civic education will clearly be impacted if a postnational or world citizenship emphasis grows. Whether the older national citizenship emphasis erodes or simply co-exists with the new postnational one remains to be seen. Needless to say, the rapidity and magnitude of the educational changes are likely to vary across regions and countries.   Some countries will be at the forefront of the postnational civic education development, others may slouch in this direction (See Asitz, Wiseman, and Baker, 2002), and still others may resist. The world society perspective generates hypotheses about how national educational changes should be influenced by world and regional rates of change, by linkages to the wider world and to one's region, and by the presence of and exposure to world and regional conferences and other enabling events.   The overriding idea is that the more a country is embedded in and influenced by educational professional discourse on postnational citizenship and human rights or on personhood, multiculturalism, and cultural rights, the more the country will move in the direction of a postnational civic education emphasis. The more countries move in this direction the more we will have to think about the emerging imagined world community and its relationship to Anderson's imagined national community (Anderson, 1983).

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

I have painted with broad strokes to try to problematize citizenship and language policy issues in schooling from a world society perspective. In doing so I have avoided naturalizing nineteenth century developments that crystallized the age of nationalism and the use of education to construct citizens of the nation-state. These historical developments were contentious ones that lead to the triumph of what was then the progressive view: via schooling the excluded were to be incorporated and included. The terms of inclusion were not much of an issue but have since become a serious bone of contention. This more recent development presupposes a world that set forth rights not solely rationalized around preexisting citizenship packages. The new cultural rights are rights of persons framed in human rights terms and theorized as universal in scope. The world itself is increasingly imagined as a community; international organizations and social movements

dramatize the world community. This poses a further challenge to the grand narrative associated with the age of nationalism.

One manifestation of this challenge is the rise of terms of inclusion debates. The rights bearing person is included in a transnational polity as a postnational citizen. This is evident in the European Union but the potential is worldwide in character. The professed right to learn in one's own language and to have that respected by all is a concrete indicator of the broader terms of inclusion debates. This development goes hand in hand with efforts to preserve the tongues of the world, for the sake of the world. These developments give rise to educational innovations (see Suarez on human rights education in this volume, for example), which call for further comparative educational research from a world society perspective.

More broadly, comparative educational research is needed to shed light on the demarcation line between institutionalized domains and contested terrains. Educational innovations can be studied as candidates for institutionalization or as efforts to contest established educational principles, policies, or practices. In an earlier era women's entry into universities constituted such an educational innovation, challenging the established association between higher learning and masculinity. More recently school reforms in the teaching of science or mathematics also pose a challenge to more standard pedagogical practices. We know that single sex schooling in higher education today is at best an option, not the taken for granted reality it was at the beginning of the 20th century. But there are ongoing debates about gender equity in higher education, about whether the ideal type university student continues to be a male. So, the debates are no longer about whether women belong in the university but rather whether the university is a "chilly place" for women. How the math and science "wars" will turn out remains to be seen. Will this be an area in which there is no decisive victory for either the traditionalists or the reformers, an area in which contestation fades and tolerance rises for cross-national variability in pedagogy and curricula?

The theoretical challenge is to figure out why some principles, policies, and practices are deemed obligatory and others optional. A university that excludes women would be under great pressure to be fair and include them. But whether to offer women's studies or not continues to be optional. One could easily compile a list of obligatory and optional educational principles, policies, and practices. The challenge though is to

identify some more general criteria for ascertaining the scope of mandatory nation-state identify pegs and distinguishing it from the zone of tolerable national distinctiveness in the realm of education. All other things being equal, rights earlier established in the citizenship package are more likely to be mandatory: consider the current human rights status of the older citizenship right to an elementary education. Since the rights of citizens were more often than not set forth as individual citizenship rights these rights regardless of their age are more likely to be translated into mandatory human rights. A broad right to not be discriminated against underlies the right to fairly compete for access to higher education. Note however that the right to have a percent of the student body or the faculty reflect one's gender, ethnicity, or some other group characteristic is more contentious. Thirdly, much national educational distinctiveness is tolerated if that which is different has not been rationalized as an educational means to a scripted national goal. There is much tolerance for whether to have or not to have school uniforms though these could be construed as constraints on individual self-expression. National tradition can be effectively invoked if it does not collide with theorization that links the constrained rights to national goals. Consider the frequency with which the case for girls' education is made on the ground that their human capital must not be underutilized. National tradition that limits girls' education is transnationally unacceptable. All other things being equal, earlier established individual citizenship rights that are rationalized around national goals are more likely to stick as human rights and more likely to lead to mandatory educational principles, policies, and practices.

This general criteria suggests why the current wave of demands regarding language rights is more contentious. These are new rights that at least in part appear to be collective or group rights and these have yet to be rationalized around scripted national goals. One of two developments may tilt these now debatable rights into the mandatory zone: successful theorization linking their educational expression to scripted national goals, multiculturalism in the service of economic growth, for example, or the fuller theorization of world standards linking language rights to desirable world outcomes, multiculturalism as a means to world peace, for instance. These developments need not be conceptualized as a zero –sum game since world standards frame and inform national goals. If the taming of the grand narrative is indeed an ongoing process, we should expect to find more direct appeals to world standards and increased references to world citizenship. If the world does change in this direction, then education as incorporation will

entail a new dimension, the transformation of national citizens into world persons.

References

Anderson, Benedict. 1993. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism. London: Verso

Astiz, M. Fernanda, Alexander Wiseman, and David P. Baker. 2002. "Slouching Toward Decentralization: Consequences for Curricular Control in National Education Systems." Comparative Education Review 46:66-88.

Benavot, Aaron. 2004. "A Global Study of Intended Instructional Time and Official School Time, 1980-2000." Geneva: International Bureau of Education.

Cha, Yun-Kyung. 1991. "Effects of the Global System on Language Instruction, 1850-1986." Sociology of Education 64: 19-32.

Chabbott, Colette. 2003. Constructing Education for Development: International Organizations and Education for All. New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Chabbott, Colette and Francisco O. Ramirez/ "Development and Education" pp.163-187 in Maureen Hallinan, (Ed.) Handbook of Sociology of Education. New York: Plenum 2000.

Collins, Randall. 1979. The Credential Society. New York: Academic Press.

Davis, Scott. 1999. "From Moral Duty to Cultural Rights: A Case Study of Political Framing in Education" Sociology of Education 71: 1-23.

DiMaggio, Paul and Walter Powell, 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields" American Sociological Review48 (April): 147-160.

Hanushek, Eric and Denise Kimko. 2000. "Schooling, Labor Force Quality, and the Growth of Nations." *American Economic Review*, 90, 5 (December):1184-1208

Hobsbawm, Eric and Trevor Ranger, eds. 1983. The Invention of Tradition. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.

Jepperson, Ronald. 1991. "Institutions, Institutional Effects, and Institutionalism." In *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, ed. by Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio Chicago: University of Chicago Press,

Jepperson, Ronald and John W. Meyer. 2000. "The 'Actors' of Modern Society: The Cultural Construction of Social Agency." *Sociological Theory* 18: 100-120.

Khamsi-Steiner, Gita, ed. 2004. The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending. New York: Teachers College Record.

Macedo, Donaldo, Bessie Dendrinos, and Panayota Gounari. 2004. The Hegemony of English. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Meyer, John, John Boli, Geroge Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez. "World Society and the Nation-State" American Journal of Sociology July 1: 144-81. 1997.

Meyer, John W. and Francisco O. Ramirez. "The World Institutionalization of Education" pp. 111-132 in Juergen Schriewer, ed. Discourse Formation in Comparative Education Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 2000.

Meyer, John. W., Francisco O. Ramirez, Richard Rubinson, and John Boli-Bennett. 1977. "The World Educational Revolution, 1950-1970" Sociology of Education 50 (October) 242-258.

Orloff, Ann Shola. 1993. "Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States." American Sociological Review 58 (3) 303:328

Ramirez, Francisco O., Xiawei Luo, Evan Schofer, and John W. Meyer. "Student Achievement and National Economic Growth" American Journal of Education November 2006.

Ramirez, Francisco O. 2003."Women in Science/Women and Science: Liberal and Radical Perspectives" pp. 279-305 in Teresa Wobbe, ed. Zwischen Vorderbühne und Hinterbühne. Beitrage zum Wandel der Geschlechterbeziehungen in der Wissenchaft.

Ramirez, Francisco O. 2003. "Toward a Cultural Anthropology of the World?" pp. 239-254 in Kathryn Anderson-Levitt, ed. Local Meanings/Global Culture: Anthropology and World Culture Theory. Palgrave

Ramirez, Frnacisco O. and John W. Meyer. 2002. "National Curricula: World Models and Historical Legacies" pp. 91-107 in Marcelo Caruso and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, eds. Internationalization: Comparing Educational Systems and Semantics. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Ramirez, Francisco O. 1997. "The Nation-State, Citizenship, and Educational Change: Institutionalization and Globalization" pp. 47-62 in William Cummings and Noel McGinn, (Eds.) International Handbook of Education and Development: Preparing Schools, Students, and Nations for the Twenty-first Century. New York: Garland Publishing.

Ramirez, Francisco O. and John Boli. "The Political Construction of Mass Schooling: European Origins and Worldwide Institutionalization" Sociology of Education 60:2-17, 1987.

Robertson, Roland. 1994. "Globalization and Glocalization: Journal of International Communication: 1:33-52.

Simon, Brian. 1987. "Systemization and Segmentation in Education: The Case of England" pp. 88-110 in Detlef Muller, et. al. The Rise of the Modern Educational System. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1995. "Multilinguals and The Education of Minority Children" pp. 40-62 in O. Garcia and C. Baker, eds. Policy and Practice in Bilingualism: Extending The Foundations. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Smelser, Neil J. and Jeffrey C. Alexander, eds. 1999. Diversity and its Discontent: Cultural Conflict and Common Ground in Contemporary American Society. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Soysal, Yasemin. 1994. Limits of citizenship: Migrants and Postnational membership in Europe. Chicago: University of Chicago press.

Steiner-Khamsi, Gita, ed. 2004. *The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending*. New York, Teachers College Press.

Strang, David and John W. Meyer. 1993. "Institutional Conditions for Diffusion" Theory and Society 22; 487-511.

Suarez, David. 2006. Creating Global Citizens: The Emergence and Development of Human Rights Education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. School of Education, Stanford University. Stanford, California.

Weber, Eugene. 1976. Peasants Into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Wotipka, Christine Min. Beyond Access to Transformation: A Cross-National Analysis of Women in Science and Technology, 1970-2000. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. School of Education. Stanford University. Stanford, California.