

## Book Review

# Research in International Education: Experience, Theory, and Practice

Edited by Liora Bresler & Alexander Ardichvili

Peter Lang Publishing

Reviewed by François Tochon  
University of Wisconsin–Madison

From reading this book, it is clear that speaking of globalization can engender strong feelings: I found it by turns enlightening, exhilarating, frustrating, and even, at times, infuriating. Some chapters discuss international research; some discuss international, comparative education; others, the implications of globalization for education. In the final analysis, however, *Research in International Education: Experience, Theory, and Practice* is an important book, and one which shows that semiotics could be of much interest in the study of international education. As a whole, the book deals broadly with the implications of globalization for educational research and its implementation. Some authors are enthusiastic globalists, while others have clear reservations about globalization. Some see globalization as an important opportunity for their field to grow and spread the word outside United States, while others more modestly hope that U.S. educators will be able to learn lessons on specific topics from their counterparts in foreign countries. Given the complexity of the issues raised, and the diversity of views expressed, what follows is a rather extended, detailed review.

In his foreword, **Earl Kellogg** suggests that four trends prevail in current globalization processes: (1) globalization or transnationalization; (2) it is becoming more and more impossible to control the flow of information, and as a result the very nature of the nation-state is changing; (3) increasing democratization; and (4) privatization. The focus of the foreword is generic rather than contextualized, allowing Kellogg to avoid taking stands regarding certain crucial issues related to the different trends. For instance, changes in the nature of the nation-state occur in different ways and have very different meanings in Europe and in the United States. Have we witnessed increased democratization in the U.S.? For that matter, do multinational industries support democratization? Is globalization an extended localism and possible monopolization? Privatization benefits from systematic support by the World Bank; does it represent a new type of colonial-

ism? As lived in the U.S., isn't the opening to other languages and cultures quite unilateral?

The editors, **Liora Bresler** and **Alexander Ardichvili**, follow with an introduction, "Personal and Institutional Contexts," in which they articulate this broad field of inquiry, and summarize the book's chapters. I appreciate that the editors give clues about their own context, providing a human dimension often missing in discussions of globalization. The introduction could have been perhaps a bit more incisive, which would have raised the discussion to another level, particularly with regard to those chapters that could use a thorough, critical perspective.

The first section of the book, Theoretical and Methodological Issues in International Education Research, is a problematization of the field. The first chapter, by **Alexander Ardichvili**, is a very important, well-structured, and clear overview. Ardichvili offers a classification of international and comparative studies, and discusses means to overcome current problems in this field of research and its paradigms. Ardichvili's categorization of the field matches basic epistemological assumptions and distinguishes emic from etic approaches that define major paradigmatic paradoxes in this field of study. Ardichvili proposes three ways of dealing with these paradoxes: (1) ways to live with them and find an inherent solution, (2) means to clarify levels of reference and analysis and connections between them, and (3) ways to dialectically find a more encompassing perspective. A series of fascinating analyses and methodological suggestions are made, some rooted in early anthropology — such as maintaining an inner conversation with a generalized other, taking the other's perspective, developing multivoicedness, leading appreciative inquiries. The most interesting perspectives come from activity theory and semiotics: "An activity system is any on-going, object-directed, historically conditioned, dialectically structured, tool-mediated human interaction." The Russian linguist Yuri Lotman worked with this substrate in mind: semiotic systems like language or cultural rules are explanatory models of the world that construct the world as we interpret it through their operation. Ardichvili develops Lotman's conception to introduce an encompassing perspective of international research, using semiotic models of culture. Switching the attention to "semiosphere," it becomes possible to view an event from many perspectives. Semiosphere is the meaning-making environment that includes multiple symbolic systems, of which language is the primary one.

In the second chapter **Liora Bresler** defines the development of a lively interpretive zone as a possible solution for international inquiry and also shows its value as lived in her own case study, that of being in Israel in the no-man's land of immigration. For years, Bresler was "on her way to Israel," accepting positions there and changing her mind at the last minute. The one thing she is conscious of is that she belongs to Israel and loves it, even now, yet there was never a conscious decision to immigrate. This is a very sensitive issue. Having left a country for years and going back after thirteen years for a long stay, you don't find it quite as it was when you left: The country has changed, its people have changed; they aged, you aged, and there is a new youth, with new stands, to which you cannot adhere. You never go back

to your past; your past died when you left. Nonetheless the clash is not immediately discernable. At first sight everything seems to go as usual when you return, but little by little you notice that a gap has been created. You have been acculturated. Large companies who need international administrators all around the globe search for internationally acculturated employees. They are more adaptive, have broader views, a larger, world comprehension. Nevertheless, for the individuals who live it, losing everything that was dear to them is quite a troubling experience. And losing it twice while they thought it could be recovered can be a haunting reality. Nobody can understand what happens in the migrant mind, unless an interpretive zone has been secured, the chance for dialogue to begin. Bresler aims at defining the hermeneutics of this interpretive zone, how it can be built, maintained, destroyed. How it should be shared, nourished, developed. This is a major, new concept in the field. The central concept of an interpretive zone is crucial and most useful, and it is well developed in the lived case analyzed. This methodological reflection is precious. For instance, the idea of team building on the values that underlie data interpretations is essential, and its illustration is beautiful. The guidelines for applying field studies to clashing experiences are opportune and sound. The concept of knowledge as transaction is crucial. A whole work of “psychologization” of data is proposed, to decipher their interpretive values. The humane side of research is nicely illuminated. This is one of the more “humanistic” authors of the book, along with Gottlieb and Walsh, and I appreciated it greatly.

The third chapter, “Deconstructing the Notion of Education: A View From West Africa,” by **Alma Gottlieb**, is absolutely stunning. Gottlieb challenges the Western definition of education, presenting a particular context that shows our definition to be far from universal. Gottlieb is an anthropologist, and the study presented is ethnographic. In her study of cultural scripts in Ivory Coast with Beng villagers, she found that the conception of the child as being a *tabula rasa* is inaccurate. Preconceptions of this rural population go much farther than innuist, Chomskyan postulates. For Beng parents, children reincarnate with a whole background that has to be rediscovered. Thus parents have to learn from the child, not the opposite. The child becomes the master of parents who are willing to learn lessons of the afterlife, a dramatic difference in the meaning attributed to education compared to Western beliefs. For Beng people, education is not defined as the way to sustain the development process in the child. Rather it is the listening process, through local seers, that allows the parents to capture the essence and destiny of the reincarnated soul. Education being in Beng the process through which parents discover the child’s hidden knowledge, one is quite far from any Western conceptions of learning. Children do not learn languages: they knew all languages in the afterlife and are — in Gottlieb’s words — considered maximally multilingual. Children will lose this multilingual perception around the age of three. The language reactualizing process is one of selection of the right channels that will be useful in this new life to communicate with others. It is a process of forgetting the other languages, not learning one. Reading this study, one may wonder: If language education and education as a whole are not universal concepts, what about international education? This is the question raised by Gottlieb. In a de-

tailed and contextualized demonstration, the author shows that prevalent Western concepts are far from being able to catch realities from other cultures. I found the chapter quite eloquent.

In the fourth chapter "Assessing Culture: Prospects and Limitations of Quantitative Cross-National Research," **Peter Kuchinke** proposes a review, through questionnaires, of quantitative, factorial analytic research on culture held mostly in multinational company settings. The author first alludes to Ardichvili's chapter (they have been co-authors in other works), and I would have liked for Kuchinke to have taken a stand regarding Ardichvili's proposals as they affect the interpretation of the data presented: about how culture is "staged"; the etic/emic debate, how culture matters, and its ill-definition; how validity inevitably is an interpretive concept; and about the limited scope of questionnaires as culture tests. The emphasis on values is most relevant and the large-scale survey data that are presented are of much interest as well. On the methodological side, one may wonder whether one could really reach a "quasi universal" factorial definition of culture. Nonetheless, this type of research has the merit of maintaining inquiries about cross-culture contacts in large companies, which in itself is very positive. Even though a trend may develop toward multidimensional models of culture as data increase, biostatisticians know that a questionnaire cannot be considered a measurement instrument. Also, the idea that theory building has to be preceded by valid and reliable measures is traditionalist and corresponds to a very specific research culture.

**Anne McKee** and **Robert Stake** follow with a very appealing chapter, "Making Evaluation Democratic in a Climate of Control." They are the proponents of a fascinating evaluation model that posits itself between traditional assessment and empowerment evaluation, called "democratic evaluation." Following MacDonald's Cambridge manifesto meant to legitimize qualitative forms of evaluation and authors who work within a deliberative, democratic view of evaluation, McKee and Stake demonstrate the advantages of a form of evaluation that is more reflective of the different people composing an institution, and where the evaluator is a facilitator of deliberation. Depending where you currently place the pendulum swing, you may interpret the proposal as not going far enough in the empowerment of participants, or as a safer way to come back to a position that secures the role, value, and expertise of academic consultants! The focus is on moral sensitivity rather than shared or conjoined action like in the empowerment model. While there is a short reference to Fetterman's work, it would be very interesting to address the issue of the differences between both models, and why the democratic position, while a bit more conservative, is relevant in many evaluative situations, and may empower people as well. Compared to the absolutist positioning of empowerment for all, this middle-of-the-road, moderate position is probably difficult to handle. McKee and Stake recognize that such a position is difficult, and that their deliberative democratic approach may be too idealized for straightforward implementation. Democratic evaluation is a very interesting approach, and rests on classical bases: The evaluator assumes his role as an outsider. What I find fascinating is the stand for an entirely qualitative evaluation that honors

“the issues, experiences, and values of people, especially the poor and minorities and those remote from the centers of power.” The model’s illustrations — medical field practitioners — are convincing. The approach is based upon case methodology and its developments to match evaluative goals. Rather than dealing with sameness or commonality, these evaluative case studies respect uniqueness and diverse perspectives. The chapter is elegantly written with great economy, although I do wish there were more emphasis on the need for ethical safeguards.

Chapter 6, “Honoring Difference and Dialogue in International Education and Development: Mixed-Method Frameworks for Research,” by Alison **Mathie** and **Jennifer Greene**, proposes a reflection on the inquiry process rather than data analysis. Their stand is that education is too varied and broad to be encompassed by one research approach only, thus the value of mixed-methods. What is new vis-à-vis other approaches to mixed-methods is the multi-paradigmatic perspective proposed. While most authors who write on mixed methods propose to search for one broadly encompassing paradigm and thus use quantitative and qualitative methods that match this unique interpretive framework, Mathie and Greene propose to confront in one single inquiry several different paradigmatic perspectives, and benefit from their varied insights, their clashes, and the deliberative challenges that the research team has to meet — not to reach a consensus but to achieve a wider, possibly conflicting set of interpretations. The position is strong and well-grounded, although it seems to me that, by its very nature, a mixed paradigmatic approach would need to be implemented by a team rather than by a single researcher. In this chapter, vignettes — or mini-cases — support the demonstration. Some are helpful and illustrative, and serve the demonstration well.

The second section of the book, Contexts for Research in International Education, starts with a brief essay on “Contexts for Research in International Education” by **Nicholas Burbules**. With this chapter, the attention switches to globalization, and the way educational research has become increasingly internationalized. The chapter is divided into four sections. The essay’s paradoxical organization should be highlighted. Although he has published extensively in the field, Burbules seems currently divided between two perspectives, and the chapter embodies a sort of identity clash. The chapter carefully avoids taking explicit stands, while it is argued at the end that “dispassionate inquiry seems a chimera.” There is a subliminal message that the trend toward globalization is dangerous, that there is a need for more passionate stands on such crucial issues, arguing for the politicization of international education research. It is interesting as such. Yet while some implicit assumptions surface as to dangers related to globalization, another set indicate that the author appears to be quite in favor of the whole “market” process: if critical studies “are being marginalized” it would be because they do not have the “market-value” of other approaches to knowledge, and it would seem that the result is good! Some stands taken in this chapter are somewhat outrageous, such as that concerning language issues and the English monopoly: “Very few educational researchers are fluent in second languages, unless they are bilingual in the other direction

(with English as their second language).” Most European educational researchers are bilingual or trilingual, and there is quite a lot of international research going on in numerous non-English languages. Some of the arguments presented here seem so much misinformed about world language research, data, and results that their reading may upset the well-informed reader, despite a neat reference to Tocqueville, reminding “Americans ... that one of the most revealing books on the U.S. political culture was written by a Frenchman.” One cannot be blind to the number of new journals being published in three languages, to the possibilities of automatic translation which improves every year, to world-wide reactions to culturally-illiterate administrations (and language is a large part of culture), to the importance of Chinese in the near future, and so on. Even so, the essay addresses interesting issues. For instance, the idea of a cosmopolitan, world citizenry; also, international action research is proposed “to resist globalization and to maintain national autonomy and distinctiveness,” in contrast to the previous statement that “international contexts multiply enormously the factors that cannot be controlled for ... and increases methodological imperfections.” Burbules seems divided between methodological trends. There is a contrast between positivist positions for a neutral, well controlled research and politicized (reactive?), action research. To sum up, this is an essay that has much potential to make the reader react!

Next, **Chip Bruce** deals with “New Technologies and Social Change: Learning in the Global Cyberage.” Information science specialists are often very articulate, and this chapter is no exception. It is theoretically well grounded, up-to-date, and instrumentally wise. Bruce starts with a comparison of the current world situation and world economy at the end of the nineteenth century. Globalization may be a return to an earlier situation, between 1890 and 1914, when America was, with Britain, the world’s largest economy. New social relations and technologies were born and supported much wider immigration flows than is the case even now. Evidence shows that inventions were more significant, social changes were more crucial, and consequences for education were more important at the beginning of the 20th century. This may be an excellent pretext to reexamine the philosophies of that time. The chapter’s demonstration lies upon Dewey’s definition of learning as an inquiry process. The century-old Deweyan conception of world exploration-in-action may be a paradoxical choice when “traditional ways of teaching and learning” are claimed “outmoded in a age defined by the worldwide web, biotechnology, and globalization.” Bruce also points out that the “worldwide web is far from worldwide,” and new technologies play a role in standardizing curricula and assessment, “reinforcing the normalizing function of schooling.” Thus the stands taken in the chapter are balanced and are also well situated with concrete examples of what a search can bring in terms of exploratory learning. Bruce notes that information worldwide is manipulated, privacy is endangered, and it appears more important than ever to teach people “to assess the author’s purpose when interpreting any information.” Bruce seems confident that solutions will be found, and notes some efforts in that direction, such as tools and sites that are supposed to guarantee anonymity in emails and web surfing ... unless government-owned.

**Gary McLean** follows with “Human Resource Development as a Factor in the Inevitable Move to Globalization,” a chapter that deals with Human Resource Development (HDR) in international adult education. This well-informed chapter raises difficult questions inherent with the so-called “inevitable move to globalization,” such as how to work with managers abroad — when trainers, markets, consumers, and business people from several countries are involved. The chapter starts with definitions: what is HDR, and what is globalization. He notes that, although globalization is a two-edged sword, there is no choice but to continue with this large, new world system with transnational organizations and companies that export umbrella cultures. Corporate cultures and value systems move their resources all over the world to achieve the highest competitive advantage. Though globalization appears unstoppable as a process, its negative effects could “be softened only through new and higher levels of cooperation and consultation, filtered through a new system of moral values that puts human welfare and social justice ahead of the predominantly materialistic paradigm currently in vogue.” In exploring this avenue McLean suggests that globalization may actually mean diversification for a company. Being open to new countries and cultures brings with it the imperative that managers and submanagers learn foreign languages quickly and efficiently, or they will not become part of the new system. In a section on factors inhibiting globalization, McLean reviews the perverse effects of this new system. One of his claims is controversial: “Those who react against globalization tend to be those who are either already out of the system (the poorest of the poor) or those who are afraid that they cannot stay in the system and who fear exclusion from the benefits of globalization.” When the poor are the vast majority of the people on this planet, and multinational banks and companies build year after year immense fortunes to no real advantage for this majority of low-income people, then it appears only legitimate to doubt that the new system can solve the incommensurable problems that it has itself produced — like environmental pollution, centralization of poverty around mega-cities, higher discrepancies between the wealthy and the poor, child slavery in third world countries, networking with organized crime, control of information through media, and in worldwide political corruption. Governments in turn act as agents of business corporations. People are trained to be like-minded and think alike. One may wonder how televisual information will evolve when media are muzzled. Even now, American daily news networks do not to give more than one international topic per day, along with one “light information,” and one serious local information. As McLean expresses, “there is no shortage of arguments against globalization”: how it destroys cultures and local potentials, breaking treaties and regulations, using intimidation abroad and killing competitors or local union leaders, colluding with Mafias to sell untaxed products, disseminating mortally dangerous products in legally unprotected countries... With these sort of global “advantages,” the question for HDR is: “How can we support a globalization process that minimizes exploitation and truly works for the well-being of humanity?” McLean proposes nine guidelines to do so. What seems strange is that, after the discussion of quite a few safeguards at the beginning of the chapter, he ends with a series of advices to

neutralize resistance to the globalization process, standardizing global mindsets, and setting them as evaluation goals to screen employees who don't fit, making sure everybody participates, promoting global leadership, and transforming the nature of organizations into global, internationalized systems through a "total (or systems-wide) commitment." The rationale for this invasive proselytism may be in the idea that those systems (and people?) which do not adapt will perish. The idea is also to promote a transformative culture through "culture audits" in determining the goal toward the global end, an end towards which McLean and his students in the Emirates — who call their brokers in London to sell stocks during breaks — probably find their own global mindset and comfort level. In his list of recommendations, McLean forgot to mention the imperative obligation for any cosmopolitan citizen to be proficient in at least one foreign language. Would he meet the criterion?

**Daniel Walsh** does his best in improving his Japanese to get in-depth understanding of the host culture and the Japanese mind. Learning a new language and culture requires great modesty and patience. "The Development of Self in Japanese Preschools: Negotiating Space" is about such an adventure. Spending a sabbatical with a family in Yashiro (northwest of Osaka) with children integrating the Japanese school system can be challenging. Walsh is a preschool specialist and a qualitative researcher. Japanese preschools have been the object of important publications recently. Any American visiting a daycare or a kindergarten there might have a culture shock. Under the seemingly unsupervised organization of free-time periods in these child centers that may have anywhere from fifty to two hundred children, all kinds of behaviors can freely be expressed so the child develops autonomy, group understanding, and body skills. Observations with digital video were complemented with field notes and interviews. Interviewing in another culture appears quite difficult. When the persons in the other culture are not expressing their feelings or appreciation for what they are doing, how is it possible to collect data on these precise issues? "The cultural prohibition against speaking well of oneself or members of one's family inhibits educators from speaking well of their own schools or practice." Japanese beliefs about children have been considerably influenced from the 18th century by early translations of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's works. Shin-Ichi Ichikawa at Waseda University developed this aspect of cross-cultural literature history: after the Meijing period, the first contact Japan had with the Western world and culture has been through Rousseau. Not surprisingly Japan's basic educational principal became the natural goodness and sensitivity of children. Children "can be trusted to make sensible decisions. If they do not, it is because they do not understand the situation; this lack of understanding can be rectified with knowledge." "All children are equal and must be treated as such." This led the Japanese to reject "local school boards arguing they would result in unequal treatment of children because of inequality of resources across districts." In their preschools, Japanese children enter a world of kids. Parents do not cross this boundary. Their water play does not resemble the water table with containers usual in Western daycare services, American children being constantly reminded not to splash water on the floor. Rather, Japanese

children freely flood the playground and turn it “into a sea of water and mud. In places the water is 15 or more centimeters deep. Children run about and pelt each other and teachers with handfuls of mud.” Children are encouraged to perform physically. They routinely ride unicycles. They not only swing across long metal structures from bar to bar but also climb over them and run across on bars that can be eight feet high. They climb trees very high and supervisors don’t seem to care. Actually they do, but decided as a team not to pay attention so the kids would increase their sense of responsibility and awareness of each move. The psychology is just different. In these unrestricted spaces, kids negotiate the joys of group life. At other times, Japanese children learn to be very formal and are socialized with numerous rules of behavior. They can bear the formality of daily life because they know they can free themselves and become less formal at any time. Walsh seems to say that American educators would have a good deal to learn from Japanese education. His depiction contrasts with the often-heard stereotype of Japanese society as being “subdued, controlled, rigidly formal.” The Japanese Self is relational; flexible, responsive to others’ expectations, concerned about fitting in rather than being unique and different. Contrary to the Western Self which is positive and success oriented, it is self-critical, sensitive to inadequacy, mastery oriented, and receptive. Walsh shows how Japanese daycare and kindergarten settings can help explain the development of Japanese Self, yet Walsh maintains his experience and study show that many cultural psychologies would be required to fully define cultural selves. For instance, it is difficult to see how Japanese self-control and self-criticism can be applied to the American models of self-esteem. Walsh ends his chapter with a few cases that show how adults themselves can switch from formal to informal behaviors and alternate these two aspects of the Japanese cultural Self. Japanese teachers have a different sense of supervision. Walsh notes that coming with one’s Western mind and projecting one’s mindset categories onto other cultures is like bringing a virus that makes people of the other culture feel uneasy and somehow obliged to conform with the Western model. Foreigners don’t have the chance to explain their rationale, because it cannot be translated into another language. “The problem of language will always remain.” Not knowing the language is being partly blind to the culture.

In this context, **Michalinos Zembylas**’s experience in reforming science curricula in Cyprus appears invaluable. His chapter, “Struggles Between Global and Local Influences: Changing Patterns of the Cypriot Elementary School Science Curriculum Development,” discusses how to build postcolonial curricula and a postcolonial identity when dominating countries continue to lead symbolic action, that is the way knowledge is shaped and taught. Difference is not welcome in curriculum and instruction, and everybody has to catch the trend. “Globalization reveals itself as nothing more than assimilatory practices of particularly localized ideas.” Cyprus offers a situation typical of developing countries where the global looks provincial in the face of multiple localities with common needs unfulfilled by the dominant system. Shared, developing localities have to gain symbolic power to get control over their own meaning making processes as expressed in their policies and curricula. The knowledge subjugation in

which foreign consultants often have placed developing educational administrations has to be modified and changed for negotiated collaborations. No curriculum can be transplanted without due consideration of the goals of the local educational administration and teachers. Zembylas forces a radical reflection and “reformulation of forms of knowledge systems and educational identities authored and authorized by British colonialism and Western domination.” His examples deal with educational reforms in sciences through guided discovery and Piagetian views of learning. He denounces “a tendency towards slavish, uncritical adoption of overseas ideas, especially those of American and British origin, and a strong disregard for what is happening elsewhere.” Trying to catch up with ideas that have already come and gone in the developed world, developing countries forget to develop their own identities and knowledge building processes, and target goals that can be locally useful, for instance in rural science and nature studies. “Foreign influences may often distract the efforts of developing countries to become autonomous and to construct science curricula that are contextually grounded in their thinking.” Foreign, top-down imposition of curricula and educational concepts has little practical effect. The lack of in-service teacher education to implement new approaches generates stress, skepticism, discomfort, and reluctance. New problems arise like the growing number of children speaking a diversity of languages, with different mother tongues and cultures within the same school. Zembylas reflects upon the possibilities of finding a midway that would allow developing countries to benefit from foreign knowledge while being critical of curricular ideas borrowed from other countries and keeping up with their goals and curricular identities: “creating spaces in which both the global and the local can coexist.” Thus this chapter conveys an accommodation strategy and a response to previous failures that provoked resistance. Building a dialectic between the global and the local may help transcend this outmoded dichotomy. Developing countries need to “develop policies that are authentic, contextually relevant, and affordable.” For that purpose it seems crucial to reflect the previous unreflective and problematic re-enactments of the curricula of other countries.

In chapter twelve, “Cross-National Transitions and Schooling: Experiences of Limited and Non-English Speaking Teenagers,” **Betty Merchant** develops a most crucial and difficult issue: she studied the perceptions and problems of adolescents who migrated to Great Britain or the US, from a small sample of classes in London, Illinois, and California. These teenagers were deprived from any support from their family, as their parents are sometimes working day and night; moreover, they most often get negative feedback from their teachers and school principals, who are unaware of their cultural features, work conditions, and problems. The situation, generally speaking, is dramatic. In most cases no specialized ESL courses are offered, and adolescents who have to take care of younger brothers and sisters when their parents are working cannot keep up with school regulations which in any event often differ widely from what they were used to in their home countries. In one case in the Illinois sample an adolescent had to wait all day long for one full week in the principal’s office before his parents dared to come and meet the principal. Only then could he get back to class

because that was the imposed rule. Eventually his parents came — at the risk of losing their jobs for taking a short leave of absence for parental reasons. Immigrants have no sense of their rights, and when they do, they have no chance to appeal as they may be afraid to lose their visa. Moreover, they meet with educational administrators who have no idea of the problems of newcomers who don't master the official language. Often school administrators have prejudices against migrating populations. Citizens and un-citizens alike organize themselves so as to never meet each other. In the sometimes traumatizing event of immigration, teenagers are particularly at risk. It is the time of their identity formation. Some of them were excellent at school and loved it in their country; and suddenly they lost their friends, their relatives, and were deported into a situation where they don't catch a word and are obliged to follow classes they don't understand. They are mocked and laughed at. No course is adapted to their needs. They discover that they are being considered lowbrow, low-class people with no chance of succeeding in this new society. Hence they are not given the basic tools to compensate for their language deficit relative to native speakers, to such an extent that one may wonder whether this generalized negligence may not be intentional, to keep those young immigrants from reaching higher-level social functions. Thus the first lessons for the young immigrant is a systematic devaluing of his or her native culture, language, and social representations. This dreadful reality apparently occurs quite unnoticed from native students and teachers who find it normal to blame these students for their inability to express themselves in a "correct" language. They want them to discover on their own and follow the implicit rules of the dominant social class. These students don't even get much comfort from their peers who, as soon as they assimilate the law of the jungle that reigns in the new culture, take the newcomers as targets of their own resentment. To sum up some of the initial results of this longitudinal ethnographic inquiry, the study of contact zones of immigration show that high school adolescents feel depressed — even suicidal — rejected, discriminated, marginalized, and harassed. They express school boredom due to the absence of support and of threshold to master the language. This and the attitude of their peers and teachers lead them to heavy and intense frustration, considerable anger, and increasing depression. Moreover most of these high school students have to work at night for their survival, which places them at risk of sexual abuse by unscrupulous employers. This is how so-called civilized countries welcome the newcomers. Reading the descriptions and excerpts of this study cannot help but move the reader. The chapter is written clearly and goes straight to the point.

The book ends with an afterword by **Ivor Goodson**, "International Educational Research: Content, Context, and Methods." This is a beautiful text with political insights, and an excellent summary of the book. This afterword presents an interestingly argued review of the book. The author takes stands, his text has punch. In a provocative style, he points out the ironies in the global U.S. triumphalism and neoliberal beliefs in the end of ideology — isn't it the self-proclaimed hegemony of *mone(y)ology*? Which would imply some sort of demonology that we don't find much in the book: a good half of the authors seem to abound with the trend, and operate as

high-price consultants abroad — as most of us do in the academes — an aspect that is just alluded to in Burbules with no clear stand on its implications. In his play *The Rhinoceros*, Ionesco showed metaphorically how people become contaminated by ideologies one after the other and are changed into animals, his symbol for fanaticism. Of course this metaphor is much too strong to address issues of globalism. Nonetheless, to a certain degree, if you **align** the extended localism of dominant countries — prudishly renamed “globalism” — with some of its consequences and the way people adopt it without reflection, could it be said we are contaminated by some sort of rhinoceritis? If so, where will this “moneology” lead us? Can we accept that the alleged loss of ideology becomes the best pretext for polluting the third world countries and ours, supporting child slavery at a large scale, organizing mafia-networked smuggling worldwide to avoid taxes ... Is “globalism” a dis-informational term to cover the potential for companies to escape laws and taxes and free themselves from work ethics? There is not much about these dangers in the book. Rather it provides a positive view of how education could balance the trend and correct some of its flaws ... at the educational level. For instance the possible “cons” of the globalization trend are analyzed by McLean in terms of some remaining *resistant subsystems* (such as the demonstrations in Seattle in 1999), language which could also be found in George Orwell’s work. Indeed, *1984* depicts how the world would be dehumanized through totalitarian techniques. Thus, I approve Goodson’s Gramscian allusions when he says that we should reflect on how the “New World Order” and its “Imperial Centers” function; that we need “public intellectuals” who take clear stands. This sounds very French! Goodson reinterprets Bresler’s interpretive zone in terms of a junction point between the insider’s history and the outsider’s ethnography. History should not be lost, and at times of hegemonies, memory can be a public safeguard. Lessons could be learned from the third world countries by the so-called imperial centers, when dictatorship emerges.