

LEONCIO VEGA

## **EMPIRES, POST-COLONIALITY AND INTERCULTURALITY**

*New Challenges for Comparative Education*

XXX CESE CONFERENCE

The central topic of discussion and debate for the XXX CESE Conference, held at the University of Salamanca on 17–21 June 2012, was approved by the Executive Committee of the CESE in April 2012 together with the structure of the thematic sessions. The main focus proposed for the debates of the Conference can be encompassed within an intellectual effort aimed at reappraising and redirecting the scientific discipline of Comparative Education on the basis of the major cultural trends affecting the internationalization and/or globalization of education. Reconsidering and/or rethinking our discipline involve studying the influence of three large international forces on it. On one hand, we see empires, not so much in the sense of discipline or government but rather from the cultural, technological and knowledge perspective. This addresses both historical processes and present events and is expressed through networks, research programs, the academic processes of university reform under the auspices of governmental criteria and efficiency, transnational mobility, and linguistic monopolies. Second, it is necessary to rethink the influence of post-colonialism on educational models and citizens' education, not only from the point of view of its impact on the curricular reordering of educational systems, but also of its educational and socio-cultural expression; both forms were expressed in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries within different international geographic contexts. The third component of the discursive triangle is the reconsideration (not only historical) of the impact of migratory flows, or perhaps better said of cultural migrations", and their relationship with the reordering of the curricular and educational processes, both in the educational systems and within the social framework. Education is from a "monoculture" to multi-cultures in schools.

With a view to achieving our goals, the Conference was organized in eight sessions (seven working groups and the Symposium). WG1, on Education and Empires (Chair: E. Klerides), aimed to answer the question about the type of comparative thinking we need to understand the "old" and the "new" empires, studying geographic contexts on the five continents. The topics of comparative analysis focused on the EU, the Council of Europe, the OECD, the World Bank, UNESCO, etc. That is, the international agencies and their practices (discourses,

L. VEGA

rankings, benchmarks, governance, legitimization, experts, etc.). From a geographic perspective, the contributions presented at the WG focused on Argentina, China, Finland, Portugal, the European Union, Pakistan, the Philippines, Spain and Italy. It should be noted that most papers corresponded to the central theme of the Conference: the involvement of Comparative education of the new “imperial” forms of knowledge, technology, discourses, and identity.

WG2, addressing Post-socialism and Education (Chair: V. Domovic), aimed to study issues related to Post-socialist States and their construction or reconstruction as regards education (curricula, universities, instructor training, civic education, etc.). A further aim was to explore how the “new empires” affect the reordering of education systems. Geographic contexts should not only refer to Eastern Europe but also to Cuba, North Korea, Africa and Russia. The papers presented and discussed in this WG came from countries such as Italy, Poland, Eastern European countries, Russia, Kenya, Armenia and Kazakhstan, among others.

WG 3 dealt with Imperialism, Education and Interculturality (Chair: J. Gundara) and their relationships with comparative education through scientific contributions from anthropology, political science, sociology and other disciplines of the social sciences. This WG received papers from Finland–Japan–Turkey, Spain, Scandinavia, the United Kingdom, Europe, and Cyprus, together with others with no specific geographic circumscription.

WG 4, addressing Post-colonialism and Education (Chair: L. Wikander), looked at thematic issues related to post-colonial education after the collapse of the large empires of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Comparative reflection on the educational perspective of post-colonialism theory includes discursive constructions about the British, Portuguese, Spanish, etc., post-colonial times, but also attending to South Korea, Japan and China. The papers presented at this WG focused on Angolan, Latin–American, Argentinean, Tanzanian, Bolivian, Jamaican, Korean and Rwandan contexts.

WG 5, focused on New Empires of Knowledge (Chair: H.G. Kotthoff), was dedicated monographically to the study of international programs and institutions for the assessment of competencies (TIMMS, PIRLS, PISA, etc.). This group studied the sociology and international politics of numbers (Education by Numbers, W. Mansell, 2007), and how programs have become the matter of study of Comparative Education as regards ideology, the sciences, policies, systems and processes. The thematic contributions to this WG came from Greece, United Kingdom, United States, Cyprus, Turkey, Middle East, N. Africa, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Finland, Germany, Norway and Romania.

WG6, which looked at International Cooperation and Education (Chair: E. Buk-Berge), focused on the infrastructures, mechanisms and processes that use both discourses (evidence, rigour, relevance, etc.) and practices (agencies, programs, bodies, etc.) in the new forms of international cooperation and the role played by education in their initiatives and projects. Should this international educational cooperation be studied within the scientific discipline of Comparative Education?

The thematic contexts of the contribution to this WG came from Finland, Italy, EU, UK, Sweden and Japan.

The NSWG (Chairs: L. Vega and J. Valle) was devoted to welcoming young researchers or investigators who were participating for the first time in CESE Conferences and who had the opportunity to position their contributions within an international setting. The work topics were the main ones addressed at the Conference. However, this section was in great demand and received works with contextual references to Europe, Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Russia, Norway, Spain and Bolivia.

The Symposium with the main topics of the Conference was also well received by those attending: there were works from the Italian, Spanish, Mexican, Portuguese, Argentinean and Brazilian contexts

The participants at the Conference came from different countries, although it seems pertinent to distinguish between the registered (150) and (non-registered) (160) participants. This second category included accompanying persons and those interested or involved in some of the sessions of the working groups or of the Conference. 86.2% of those who were registered came from European countries (taking as a reference the country in which they worked): Spain, 50; The United Kingdom, 20; Italy, 12; Portugal, 10; Germany, 7; Norway, 3; Sweden, 3; Greece, 3; Belgium, 2; Denmark, 2; The Netherlands, 2; Poland, 2; France, 2; Croatia, 2; Cyprus, 2; Finland, 1; and Ireland, 1, an indicator of the full attendance of the CESE in the European university. 14 % came from both North and South America: USA, 8; Canada, 3; Brazil, 3; Argentina, 3; Mexico, 2; Chile, 1; and Uruguay, 1, and the remaining 3.33 % from the Asia-Pacific area: Japan, 2; Korea, 1; Hong-Kong, 1, and Australia, 1.

The Local Organizing Committee (presided by the Professor of Comparative Education of the University of Salamanca, Leoncio Vega) offered an academic, social and cultural program that led to intense academic sessions for thematic discussions (with a broad high-quality participation), and was combined with some cultural initiatives, such as a visit to the majestic Renaissance Old Library of the University of Salamanca, where the visitors had occasion to enjoy the historical beauty and documentary quality of the manuscripts and incunabulae conserved there, and a nocturnal visit to the “Golden City” to appreciate and enjoy the city built of Villamayor stone and its rich architectural and artistic heritage (the ample series of civil Renaissance buildings, the “procession” of Gothic or Romanesque churches. This was headed by the two Cathedrals, and also the rich University heritage, special attention being paid to the main façade of the Major Schools (the Historical University Building), constructed in the 16<sup>th</sup> century in a Castilian Plateresque style and guarded by the austere skull and frog as a symbol of the loneliness and rigors of intellectual work and the licentious life-style of the students of the day).

Among the programmatic actions, we should not overlook the institutional act of reception offered by the City Hall of Salamanca, which included the emotional and highly merited appointment of the comparatist Professor B. Cowen as a

L. VEGA

distinguished guest of the City and the later gathering on the balcony for those present to enjoy an “aerial view” of the uniform “Churrigueresque” (from Churriguera, the architect) Main Square, constructed in two phases along the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

In panel format we had the opportunity to attend a round table coordinated by Professor M. Pereyra, whose contributions focused on the intellectual effort involved in rethinking or redirecting research and teaching in the field of Comparative Education from perspectives that situate human beings (their education, training and moral construction) at the reference epicenter of the comparison, of educational systems and the daily activities of comparativists. The words of researchers such as J. L. García Garrido, Karin Amos, Carlo Cappa and Andreas M. Kazamias allowed us to gain further insight into the historical construction of comparative education since the advent of Humanism, in which the University of Salamanca has been a well-known and renowned intellectual reference.

The academic work program included the delivery of seven plenary speeches. Four were in English, two in Portuguese and one in Spanish. The first one was delivered by the Professor at the University of Bayreuth (Germany) Sabine Hornberg (an expert in PIRLS tests and in the transnational dimension of educational spaces), addressing “*Transnational Education Spaces: Border-transcending Dimensions in Education*”. The second was given by Iveta Silova (Professor of Comparative and International Education at the College of Education, Lehigh University, Pennsylvania (USA) and Editor of European education) on “*The Futures of (Post) Socialism; Critical Reflections on Transitologies and Transfer in Comparative Education*”. The third was delivered by Professor at the University of Pernambuco Zélia Granja Porto (an expert in pre-school education in Brazil) on “*Infancias y Poder: Discursos Transnacionales en las Formas de Regulación de Políticas para la Educación Infantil*”. The fourth contribution was delivered by Professor of Comparative Education at the University of Valencia (Spain) María Jesús Martínez Ussaralde (an expert in relations between cooperation and education) on “*Sentipensar la Cooperación al Desarrollo en Educación desde las Políticas Internacionales y de Subjetividad*”. The fifth was given by Professor at the Piaget Institute (Portugal) Joao Ruivo (an expert in teachers training) on “*La Globalización, la Escuela y la Profesionalización de los Profesores*”. The sixth corresponded to Juan Manuel Moreno (Senior Education Specialist at the Department of the Middle East and North Africa of the World Bank) on “*Skill Gaps and Meritocracy in the Transition from Education to Work: The case of the Middle East and North Africa*”. The Lauwerys delivery, or closing speech, was given by Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Wisconsin–Madison (USA), Thomas Popkewitz (a specialist in curricular analysis, advisor of education systems in different countries and a renowned publisher of political-educational themes, schooling and instructor training as the construction of power). His stimulating historical talk addressed “*The paradoxes of Comparative Studies: The Representation of the Others as Exclusions and Abjections*”.

The deliveries, widely followed by the participants at this event, focused on the topics basic to the Conference and, although with different perspectives and levels, acted as an academic stimulus to comparative reflection in education.

The reflection of the work involved in the organization and planning of the Conference, together with the condensation of research richness in the comparative field, could be encapsulated in the two documents that the organization made available to all the participants. On one hand, there was the booklet, which detailed the composition of the various committees (both that of the CESE and of the Local Organization), general information for the participants, the general program of academic activities, the organization of the Panel, the Working Groups (these gathered the abstracts presented and debated and the programming of their presentation) and the final list of participants.

The CD-ROM (ISBN 978-84-695-3792-3) includes the 50 papers that the authors accepted for publication in this format for academic research works. The distribution some homogeneous levels, but the sections most demanded were the Symposium, the New Scholar Working Group, and WGs 1 and 6.

The CESE Conference that was held in Spain for the fourth time (Valencia 1979, Madrid 1990, Granada 2006 and Salamanca 2012) should first be interpreted as a new opportunity to continue broadening the international dimension of the comparative research of the Spanish scientific community. This is an extensive and diverse collective that to a large extent responded with its participation and contributions. The presence of curricular contents in the subjects of Comparative Education (CE) and similar materials in the study plans of Pedagogy, Social Education, Infant Education Teaching, Primary School Teaching and the formal Master's degree in Teachers Training in Secondary education, with different levels of development in the Spanish university spectrum, requires a constantly updated academic effort and a renovation in a social context of progressive consumption of contents and information of an international nature. Second, we are also supporting a process of aperture and expansion of the CESE, not only in the internal European and North-American contexts but also in the Latin-American sphere, that of the Middle East and that of Africa and, of course, in the rapidly economically developing Asian zone.

Third, apart from the above contributions to the "internationalization" of the discipline of CE, we should underscore those of strictly academic and intellectual nature. The initial proposal of comparatively reflecting and rethinking the relations between knowledge societies, the teaching and research activities that are expressed through social and/or institutional education and the cultural trends, current and movements (political and economic) that act as "empires", was achieved with complete satisfaction, as may be seen both from the participation and from the intellectual richness and interest pervading the debates that took place in the Work Groups, the contributions, and the Panel. The material embodiment of this richness is seen in the CD-ROM, available to all participants and is more intensely expressed via the bibliographic documents to be found in this volume. All this suggests that CE is not what it was some decades ago. Education systems as we knew them are

L. VEGA

not undergoing reforms (internal and external) derived from the “world culture”. Additionally, new programs and knowledge are being added to reflection and teaching. Examples are those deriving from international assessments of competencies and the educational contributions or determinations from international agencies. We are also advancing in the scientific construction (theoretical and intellectual) of Comparative Education in an attempt to overcome data fetishism and “on-the-spot democracy” (A. Nóvoa).

From the domestic viewpoint, we cannot overlook the fact that the Conference also served to lend continuity to the historical and international trajectory of the University of Salamanca, with centuries of external relations that are now expressed in terms of student mobility, cooperative programs, signed agreements, doctorate programs, the training of researchers and an endless list of collaborative academic activities with other universities, teams and researchers from all five continents. The CE team of which we form part has also joined that academic trajectory.

#### AUDIENCES IN COMPARATIVE EDUCATION

Currently, following the scheme proposed by Professor A. Viñao (2003) our avenue of enquiry involves the social groups that use Comparative Education: the audiences or the “consumers”. According to Prof. Viñao, the reference audiences would be the official, social, professional and scientific groups. Eckstein (1990) concentrates these audiences in three sectors: teachers, researchers and users (to implement and assess policies). It is clear that the main audience of comparative studies comes from the Administration and the political system. In this sense, Comparative Education has been the victim of its own success (Nóvoa, 2003) since research has been governed by political and administrative concerns in the field of schooling, which has mortgaged scientific construction. Support for international references can be seen in parliamentary discourses, reports and interventions. This is the case of the European Network on Education and Policies in Europe (Eurydice), whose comparative research work on education systems is performed with two collectives in mind, the political and the administrative collectives, the former being the one that sets and determines both the agenda and the rhythms and processes. In other words, comparative studies are converted into a “System of Governability” (Nóvoa, 2006) as a result of the revitalization of comparative education brought about by globalization (Vega, 2006). Regarding the social audience, it should be borne in mind that education forms part of the concern and social debate and comparativists must act as key elements in this process of conformation. The social consumption of the international perspective of education can be found in the literature, the communications media (television, radio, etc.) and in the press (in their regular contributions or in education supplements such as those published by *El País*, *Le Monde*, *The New York Times*, etc.). Nevertheless, these books, documents, reports, supplements or sections not only become converted into instruments of the social process of education but also act as a support and/or academic reference

for professionals (teachers, school teachers, administrators, politicians). Moreover, this social information about international education plays a substituting role with respect to CE. Current international issues –such as the evaluation of teachers in Portugal, segregated schooling in Spain, the reform of the *Lycées* in France, the student protests in Greece against the political system and the divorce of the system from youth or the ranking of countries according to the evaluation of competencies derived from PISA and the subsequent debate and reforms concerning the standards of school performance in Sweden, the USA and other countries– should not, despite the political, cultural and social relevance harboured within them, mark the academic agenda in CE (a trend also seen in Educational Policy). However, we are aware that they offer detailed information based on international reports or reports on the professional and academic consequences of expected and desired reforms and, in this sense, they should form part of a more structural, systematic and planned approach to teaching activities or research projects. However, all this is a clear reflection of the “popularity” of CE. Social enthusiasm for comparisons has two consequences of interest for the academic field of CE. On one hand is the “society of spectacles” (“on-the-spot democracy” or “urgency regime”, with new ways of socialization). On the other we have the policy of accountability (the discourse of the “experts” that is able to create concepts, methods and tools for “comparing” education systems) (Nóvoa, 2003).

Thirdly, the collective of education professionals (school teachers, professors, administrators, inspectors, orientation providers, educators), which so strongly contributed to the birth and consolidation of comparative studies, has been converted into an audience that is now contributing to reconstruction the field. As an example, one could refer to the common directives of the study plans of the teacher-training degrees from 1991 and 2007; the Regulatory Bill providing for the grades in pre-school children and Primary education gathers international competencies such as “situate the school in the Spanish, European and international context”, or “international experiences in pre-school teaching”. In degrees in Social Education and Pedagogy (non-regulated professions) the organization of study plans lies in the hands of Departments as well as influential groups and individuals. In this case, we see two reform-directed trends: the continuation of the present academic weight of the disciplines and equality. That is, the aim is to put the weight of the curricular blocks (history of education, Comparative Education, education policies, social pedagogy, environmental teaching and women’s education) on the same level. Such equality involves the need for certain renunciations and the “*deconstruction*” of certain professional profiles. However, in the pedagogical academic community in Spain there is not even consensus about the knowledge and disciplines that make up the Education Sciences. As an example, one could cite the meeting that the School of Education of the University of Santiago de Compostela organized in 2004 to commemorate the centenary of the first University Chair of Pedagogy in Spain (created in 1904), which aimed to concentrate reflection and debate on the state of the art in the education sciences. The corresponding publication includes contributions

L. VEGA

about the history of education, social pedagogy, didactics, the theory of education, educational organization, orientation, and research methodology (Trillo, 2005). No contribution from Comparative Education is mentioned but we are bound to ask ourselves about the reason for this irrationality... On one hand, it could be due to a misinterpretation of comparisons as a methodological application and not as the scientific construction of knowledge. On the other hand, Galician academic tradition has not been sensitive to studies (disciplinary and investigatory) of a comparative nature in education.

The last audience comes from the scientific community of comparativists. CE as a research field, and above all as an academic discipline in universities, is international. In some contexts, as well as being a discipline and a field of Comparative Education encompasses a third meaning that encompasses practical work, mobility, awards, exchange, collaboration, contests, school networks, associations and other international actions from the organization and functioning of education centres at the primary and secondary levels (Porcher, 2002). That is, international activities developed in classrooms, workshops or the schooling environment. The scientific community of comparativists, the “discursive communities” are unitary in their institutional dimension but heterogeneous as regards the basic training of its component elements (pedagogues, economists, inspectors, psychologists, sociologists, etc.), the methodological focuses used by them, the means of expression used, and internal scientific circles (Masemann, 2007; Martínez, 2003).

#### THE MYTHS OF RESEARCH INTO COMPARATIVE EDUCATION.

The dictionary of the *Real Academia Española* distinguishes between “myth” and “fallacy”. One of the meanings of the former refers to a person or thing attributed with qualities he/she/it does not have or a reality that is not present. The second term refers to the use of falsehoods although it can also be interpreted as referring to fraud, trickery or lies with the intent to cause harm. Since this latter characteristic of the second term is not present in the processes we wish to analyze, we shall use the first one. The issue of “myths” in education has been addressed by Prof. R. Cowen (2003 and 2012) in several works. In the first, Prof. Cowen briefly presents the three myths of Comparative Education: education systems as commercial spaces, that is, the education markets (market-driven); the new values or discourses used to explain success in education (Thatcherism, competitiveness or Confucianism), and life-long learning. It is true that these discursive categories do not act simultaneously but prevail in some countries, with more or less explanatory power, as a function of the history, culture, sociology and politics of the context of each country. In his latest work he explains in more detail the fundamentals and expressions of the market myth, focusing his discourse on quality, quality control, the classic myths in the academic construction of Comparative Education and the “political” governance of our lines of enquiry. The context chosen is the United Kingdom and the universities can be seen as the institutional circumscription. The detailed analyses of Prof.



Cowen inform us that “the doctorate has increasingly become a performance of an act of empirical research calling for the display of research techniques and careful reporting of research results” (Cowen, 2012, p. 17).

Along the same lines, we wish to mention those that we consider to be “myths” in the processes of research into Comparative Education, taking as a reference comparative research in Spain. We first have what we could consider the “*myth of language*”. This considers as comparative and/or international knowledge all studies published in other languages. In the “discursive community” it is very common to be under the belief that researchers in comparative education are the studious scholars who express themselves (both at Conferences and in journal articles or books) in European languages such as English, French or Italian. The assignation of roles depends not so much on the quality of the research processes (methodological approaches, the contribution to the progress of knowledge and narrative richness) as on ease of communication. The dominance of foreign languages (crucial in Comparative Education) is no longer a means but is the very goal of academic research. The second is what one could refer to as the “*myth of the sample*”. This involves interpreting educational research from the perspective that it contains an empirical part. In the supervision of research works, both the completion of academic degrees and doctorate programs, degree reports and doctoral theses, we become aware of the “social image”, but not the academic one, surrounding research. To a large extent I believe that this is due to the myth that Prof. Cowen refers to as “market-driven”; one which is still very present in our countries and also in Latin America. Nevertheless, we can connect it to the scientific traditions in universities that have undergone a considerable tilt, in discursive and academic terms, from the natural and experimental sciences. Such is the influence of this “empiricism” that the main value of research lies not in this context, nor in the theoretical underpinnings, structure, focus or narrative quality of the thesis, but in the empirical data presented. This is a quantification that also “adulterates” the research process on considering empirical data to be the goal of research and not a means to provide analytical and explanatory knowledge of a comparative nature. In research projects and journal articles it is also possible to note a reappearance of methodological empiricism in the social sciences; perhaps “collateral damage” of the crisis and the reduction in resources destined for investigation. Thirdly, we are witnessing the progressive academic presence of the “*technological myth*”, according to which research processes are those that allow us to handle information and perform empirical studies from the new information and communications technology. As well as favouring the “privatization of educational and training spaces” (interpreted as individualization), technological tools are becoming not only instruments and research means but also the goals of research itself. This is perhaps another example of the “education market” as regards the determination of the focus of research processes. A fourth myth can be found in the varied basic training of researchers in Comparative and International Education. This refers to “economists”, “politicians”, scholars of philology, sociologists and historians and not to researchers with training in the education sciences. This

L. VEGA

is unlike what happens in other fields of the social sciences such as economics, literature or political science, in which comparative investigation is performed by specialists trained in the subject matter.

We also consider a fourth academic myth (narrative and methodological), which consists of the attraction towards research classicism both in the topics addressed and in the working methods, which – despite the “theoretical” defense of the social sciences –, to a large extent overlooks its explanatory application. In its desire to differentiate between Comparative and International Education it remains glued to a national conception of education systems and descriptive research practices of International Education oriented to the study of education/school systems. This trend attempts to present and demarcate the scope of Comparative Education with respect to other disciplines in the Educational Sciences.

#### THE CONTRIBUTIONS INCLUDED IN THE BOOK.

The 16 chapters of the book are organized in four blocks preceded by the Introduction in which the Editor explains the organization of the XXV CESE Conference, some reflections on the social and professional dimensions of Comparative education and on the “implicit forms” that underlie research processes as well as a synthesis of each of the chapters included. The four sections of the structure refer to the following issues. The first section addresses the comparative contributions in the historical dimension. The second includes research work addressing the empires of knowledge (communications networks and competency research programs). The third one covers the presentations and papers dealing with the transnational and or colonial/post-colonial dimension of International Education. Finally, the fourth section includes two research works on the intercultural dimension of education from the international perspective. The presentation of each chapter is included below.

*Comparative Studies and the Reasons of Reason: Historicizing Differences and “Seeing” reforms in Multiple Modernities.*

The evocative work contributed by the researchers **T. Popkewitz, A. Khurshid and W. Zhao** is focused on the study of the relationship between cross-cultural and international comparative research embodies a conundrum, which lies in the very analytics of comparativeness in the human sciences. Such analytics are continually presented in some forms of connection to certain notions of the European Enlightenment of reason and rationality even when seeking to maintain the integrity of differences outside Western cultures. The challenge of comparative studies set forth in this paper is to explore differences without inscribing a continuum of values through the representations of the identities recognized for inclusion but defined as different. Their approach, a History of the Present, focuses on “systems of reason” or different historically inscribed rules and standards about what is “seen”, thought about, and acted on as the subjects of school research. The exemplars to

engage in different systems of reason are reforms in China, Pakistan, and the US. The strategy does not escape the conundrum of enlightenment attitudes; rather it provides an alternative style of thought which disrupts the hierarchy of values that differentiate the self and others. The exploration of “seeing” difference as relational has implications for curriculum and policy studies in contemporary western school reforms, discussed in the conclusions.

*Complexity of History–Complexity of the Human Being. Education, Comparative Educati, and Early Modernity*

The contribution offered by **C. Cappa** aims to offer a theoretical–explanatory peek, from the historical perspective, into the “philosophical” relations between education, comparative education and modernity. It is a re–reading made from the possible “humanist” view implicit in interpretations of the educational phenomenon. However, the work offers the reader highly original conclusions that can and should spark debate among the “discursive communities” of Comparative Education. These are related to the cultural interpretation of the first modernity in the Renaissance and Humanism, with emphasis on the plurality of modernities and with the interpretation of rhetoric as a discursive resource. It is an investigation with more of a philosophical underpinning than a pedagogical one, more historical–cultural than political–educational, that is found in the relativism and pluralism of the discursive orthodoxy of modernity,

*Time, Location and Identity of WWII–Related Museums: An International Comparative Analysis*

The work offered by **M. Shibata** focuses on an innovative topic, with a strong international expansion. This refers to the pedagogy of museums. After exploring the social and political functions of museums as a reflection of the historical memory in the organization and functioning of western societies (branded, like museums, by the consequences of the Second World War), it focuses its analysis not so much on explaining and understanding the pedagogical dimension of these spaces of memory (programs, courses, distance learning, congresses, etc.) as on their origins (the time and context within which they were created) in order to better understand and explain their character and meaning. The research sources are in particular taken from Germany and Japan.

*Citizenship, Values and Social Orders. The Assessment of “census” and Ritual Education in Ancient Rome*

The suggestive work of A. Paolone starts from a more pedagogical springboard in that the author make a discursive analysis of the social processes of the conformation of “citizenship” through collective ceremonies and rituals, which acquire a socio–

L. VEGA

pedagogical category. The ceremony *par excellence* studied is the “census”, which refers to a holistic symbolic construction with repercussions in the form of social and family organization. Classical Rome is where we find the origins, both juridical and institutional, of public education according to the institution theory (Meyer and Ramírez, 2010), in which academic rituals form part of symbolic learning.

*Science and Educational Models in Europe. From the Disaster of 98 to the Weimar Republic (1898–1932)*

The study of **J. L. Rubio and G. Trigueros** is focused on scientific research systems and their relationship with teaching models in Europe and North America. First they compare the Spanish and German science systems with their university teaching models between 1898 and 1936. The initial hypothesis also relates production sectors and their economic development level to the scientific research model and the role of the State concerning science and university teaching. The method used begins with interdisciplinary debates about the contrast in social science and history. Among the main conclusions, the first highlights the fact that in the most advanced economies of the twentieth century the State used to organize the promotion and foundation of those scientific institutions independent of universities, dedicated exclusively to research. Secondly, part of the leading science was linked to the solution of basic production problems due to the second industrial revolution. Thirdly, most of the research institutions were funded by the industry sector, for which they researched and which they depended on. Fourthly, the research areas lay not only in the natural sciences and mathematics, but also in studies on humanism and in the social sciences, although with their own particular characteristics. The fifth point is that university teaching established the basis of and used a network of scientific information sharing, which stopped the knowledge produced from becoming obsolete. Finally, the university model changed with the creation of an independent system of science and technology, which provides considerable upgrades since these also solve the practical problems of the industry sector and of the State, as reflected in the Great War.

*High Performance in Reading Comprehension in Poverty Conditions in South America. The Case of Resilient Student in PISA 2009 in Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay*

In the most recent version of the PISA (OECD, 2009), Latin America was one of the regions in which socio-economic status had a strong influence on reading performance (OECD, 2010). Argentina, Chile and Uruguay are three of the countries that participated in the study. In all of these countries, despite the strong influence of the environment, some students do not follow the tendency to perform according to their socioeconomic status. Research work offered by **G. Gómez, J. P. Valenzuela and C. Sotomayor** focuses on high-achieving students and low

income. They share two essential characteristics: they belong to the poorest 25% of the sample of their country and they outperform the national average academically. This phenomenon is associated with the notion of resilience. They study the features of these young people and their schooling in the three countries mentioned. The objective is to identify the factors that favor their academic performance. By means of a multilevel analysis of the probability of being resilient, common characteristics are identified among resilient students in these three countries: female gender, positive attitudes toward books and reading, remaining current with their schooling (avoid repeating grades), and the socioeconomic level of the peers with whom they share schooling.

*Approaches to Assist Policy-Makers' use of Research Evidence in Education in Europe*

The contribution of **C. Kenny, D. Gough and J. Tripney** addresses the use made by European politicians of research evidence in decision making. The content focuses on an analysis of the academic literature and on the documentary contributions of the research agencies and institutes to analyze the focuses of this relationship and the type of actions aimed at meeting the needs of political action. The conclusions, with the due reserve in data use, reveal that there are few countries that work in international cooperation; that it is the governments themselves (through agencies and specific bodies) and university academics who are the main actors. The authors also posit that the mechanisms and strategies employed by the actors in the use of research evidence are education, facilitation, interaction-collaboration, searches and social influence.

*Redesigning Curricula across Europe: Implications for Learner's Assessment in Vocational Education and Training*

**I. Psifidou**, from the CEDEFOP, offers a well-documented study of the political need to re-think the systems and methods of performance yield and qualifications in students and Vocational Training apprentices. The theoretical framework rests on European contributions focused on programs addressing Competencies and Life-long Learning (2006), within the **European Framework of Qualifications** (2008) and the **Strategic Framework for European Cooperation in Education and Training (ET 2020)**. Additionally, the analytical approach includes empirical data from questionnaires given out to politicians, experts, employers, trainers and students. The conclusions offered are in keeping with the perception of an increasing awareness (political, social and pedagogical) of the need to revise the methods of competence acquisition in VET; of the complexity of this field due to its intimate link with the production system, and also of the offer made by some scholars who seek to unify learning and assessment.

L. VEGA

*Performativity and Visibility. Shapes, Paths, and Meanings in the European Higher Education Systems*

In her contribution, **V. D’Ascanio** analyses the present debate on the role played by European university systems and the kind of knowledge they are called upon to produce and transmit. Performativity is a category used by many scholars to comprehend the variety and inter–relation of the factors involved. This paper regards the idea of performativity – referring to Jean–François Lyotard’s thinking – and its relation with visibility in order to understand the forces, agents and discourses involved in requests that touch upon the production of knowledge and the governance of university systems. In this frame, the plurality of agents is underlined and their role in placing performance centre–stage is identified. These tendencies are examined to explain the emergence of the audit society and why its founding element is the visibility imperative. The relation between performativity and visibility is analysed to understand the adoption of the Global Emerging Model and harmonization and differentiation processes in European higher education systems. To represent educational space, both global and local, the network image is taken as the appropriate heuristic instrument to symbolize the plurality of actors, the complexity of relations and the asymmetry in the degrees and levels of influence.

*Transnational Educational Spaces: Border–transcending Dimensions in Education*

The contribution offered by **S. Hornberg** is organized in three parts. In the first the author lays down the conceptual bases and interpretations of the term “Transnational Educational Spaces”, which are expressed in three forms or presentations: socialization, educational convergence and transnational education. The author then studies the aims and characteristics of the International Baccalaureate, offered through different international organizations, which is explained as a case of educational transnationality. In the third part, we read, by way of conclusions, of a series of open questions (issues to be addressed in the future) such as the added value of these programs for schools, parents and students; the added differentiation with respect to national programs and certifications; the relationship with the education markets and, of course, the “World Education System”.

*The Interplay of “Posts” in Comparative Education: Post–Socialism and Post–Colonialism after the Cold War*

**I. Silova** offers an exhaustive and well documented paper on post–socialism and post–colonialism in countries from the former Soviet bloc, after the fall of the Berlin Wall. The two work categories are of great methodological interest in studies addressing Comparative and International Education because they encompass the great explanatory and narrative potential of the reference area, despite the prevalent diversity (geographic, social and educational). These categories are also analyzed

as “alternative proposals” to the dominance of globalization. The study examines the literature on “blocs” and “dichotomic theories” in the last decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The categories are expressed through narratives of crisis, danger and decline and, in educational terms, they are transformed into belligerent discourses against western models (especially European ones) in their desire to break away from the most immediate context (both historical and geographic and cultural). The author concludes that comparative studies on post-socialist education have followed the pathways marked by global and neoliberal reforms (including those of a more local nature) that represent subjugation to the dominant discourse, despite the “alleged” cultural detachment. Accordingly, the categories analyzed are converted into a narrative potential that challenges the dominant neoliberal discourses of globalization.

*Childhood and Power: Transnational and National Discourses on the Regulation of Policies for Early Childhood Education in Brazil*

The Brazilian research **Z. Granja** provides a documented study of educational policies and infant attention in Brazil. From a Foucaultian focus, combined with the “ecological model”, the study analyzes both the discourses of the actors and the production contexts of these. Having explained the analytical categories and their political and academic expressions, the author offers us (in the Conclusions section) some questions as a research strategy for the future and for the case in hand. In Latin-American societies there is a profound contradiction between policies, discourses and regulation (Recall that the 1990 *Child and Adolescent Statute*), approved and applied in Brazil, was pioneer and advanced in the application of childhood rights covered in the 1989 Convention) and the practices and social and moral position of childhood. This is why these paradoxes become analytical “objects of desire”. This change in the discursive practices and their representations at different levels (local, regional, state-level and transnational) wrapped up in “global” discourse opens questions for future research; the issue is finding an answer to the question of how they operate both in the social mentality and in school cultures.

*Translating Higher Education in the British Empire. The Question of Vernacular Degrees in Postwar Malaya*

The historical-education work presented by **Grace Chou** addresses the consequences and reasons (political, social, cultural and administrative) of the British Academic Council’s refusal to accept University degrees in vernacular tongues, as had been agreed, for Malaysian universities when they still formed part of the British Empire, but towards the end-phase of colonialism in an international post-war context and following guidelines that might be termed “African”. This area is of great academic interest, especially for western scientific communities, because it helps us to understand part of the puzzle of the extensive and very diverse Asian-Pacific

L. VEGA

region. The conclusions of the study show up the difficulty involved in “translation” under imperial auspices together with the ambiguity between the necessary respect for local cultures and the academic and cultural criteria of the Empire, whose actions are not only acts of cultural imposition

*Finnish, Japanese and Turkish Pre-service Teachers’ Intercultural Competence: the Impact of Pre-service Teachers’ Culture, Personal Experiences, and Education.*

The study offered by **Hosoya, Talib** and **Arslan** is encompassed within intercultural education at the international level. The first part of the contribution is more theoretical and conceptual, with abundant and very sound bibliographic support, and a careful exploration of terms such as “self”, “identity”, “self-respect”, “personal advancement” “intercultural competency” and “professional identity” The second part, which is more empirical, is based on information provided by teacher training students from three countries with huge geographic cultural, socio-economic and pedagogical differences, namely Finland, Japan and Turkey. The aim of the author is to related two variables: intercultural competency and the professional identity of teachers. The conclusions offered in the work suggest that both variables are only partly related and that the observed relationship is not uniform but different in each country studied since it depends strongly on the cultural and pedagogical conditions of each of the societies in which the teachers live and work.

*Constructing the “other”: Politics and Policies of Intercultural Education in Cyprus*

The work of E. Theodorou focuses on an analysis of the political discourses about intercultural education in Cyprus from a post-modern analytic stance. It should be recalled that these discourses are encompassed within a context of special significance insofar that Cyprus is a fairly small country (both geographically and demographically), with strong social and economic disparities in the population, which is divided into two regimes (the Greek and the Turkish). In this case, the study focuses on the part of Cyprus that belongs to the European Union: the Greek-Cypriot half. Moreover, the financial regime has acted as a strong attractor of capital and human resources since it has acted more as a “Tax Haven” than as a democratic state of the European Union. The system has failed and has required the help of the countries of the Eurogroup and the IMF. However, the “major” discourses on tolerance, respect, diversity etc... are analyzed from the perspective of subjectivity in the mentality of the “external” students of the Greek-Cypriot education system.

In Cyprus, we see the same situation as that recorded in many western countries: the contradiction between discourses and reality, between form and content, and between politics and reality. Better said, the discourses display two, indeed paradoxical, forms of expression. The political rhetoric insists on the “goodness” of intercultural education, but at the same time the practical discourse of exclusion



occurs or re-appears. And both forms are incorporated in the subjectivity of the students. This is so much so that research ends up by delimiting, in social and cultural terms, three categories of otherness: *the tolerable “others”, the deficit (deficient?) “others” and the problematic “others”*.

## REFERENCES

- Cowen, R. (2003). Globalisation, educational myths in late modernity and reflections on virtue. In L. M. Lázaro and M. J. Martínez (Eds.), *Studies in comparative education* (pp. 11–40). Valencia: University of Valencia.
- Cowen, R. (2012). Robustly researching the relevant: A note on creation myths in comparative education. In L. Wikander, Ch. Gustafson & U. Riis (Eds.), *Enlightenment, Creativity and Education. Politics, Politics, Performance* (pp. 3–26). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Eckstein, M. A. (1990). La mentalidad comparativa. In P. Altbach & G. Kelly (Eds.), *Nuevos enfoques en educación comparada* (pp. 191–203). Madrid: Mondadori.
- Martínez, M<sup>a</sup>. J. (2003). *Educación Comparada. Nuevos retos, renovados desafíos*. Madrid: La Muralla.
- Masemann, V., Bray, M., & Manzon, M. (2007). *Common interests, uncommon goals: Histories of the world council of comparative education societies and its members*. Honk Kong: CERC/Springer.
- Meyer, J. W. & Ramírez, O. (2010). *La educación en la sociedad mundial: Teoría institucional y agenda de investigación de los sistemas educativos contemporáneos*. Barcelona: Octaedro.
- Novoa, A. (2003). Le comparatisme en éducation: Mode de gouvernance ou enquête historique? In P. Laderrière & F. Vaniscotte (Eds.), *L'Éducation Comparée: un útil pour l'Europe* (pp. 57–82). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Porcher, L. (2002). *Buts et finalites de l'éducation comparée: Dictionaired'Éducation Comparée* (pp. 23–27). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Trillo, F. (2005). *Las ciencias de la educación del ayer al mañana*. Santiago de Compostela: Universidad.
- Vega, L. (2006). La repercussion de l'évaluation internationale PISA sur la politique de l'éducation en Espagne: *In Changing knowledge and education*. Granada: CESE.
- Vega, L. (2011). *La Educación Comparada e Internacional. Procesos históricos y dinámicas globales*. Barcelona: Octaedro.
- Viñao, A. (2003). La historia de la educación ante el siglo XXI. Tensiones, retos y audiencias. In *Enohistoria de la escuela* (pp. 1063–1074). Burgos: Universidad/SEDHE.

## AFFILIATIONS

*Leoncio Vega*  
*Faculty of Education.*  
*University of Salamanca*