

Transnational Perspectives in Historical Educational Research

Eckhardt Fuchs

It has been confirmed for more than a decade: historical educational research is said to be in crisis. In that respect it was characterized by de-institutionalization; thematically and methodologically it had allegedly lost touch with international developments. A review of the history of the field appears to confirm this dictum. If the scientification of historical educational research after 1945 is characterized by an institutional expansion phase that reached its peak in the 1970s, a downturn which continues to the present followed in Europe and North America a decade later. The reasons for this are multiple, but especially the curriculum changes in teacher training and shifts within the discipline of pedagogy led to historical educational research receiving far less recognition within its own discipline than was the case at the turn of the century. These crisis indicators, however, are in contrast to the impressive results of historical educational research. In the wake of the paradigm change in social and cultural studies in the humanities, it presented numerous studies that far exceed the traditional historiography of education and classical historiography. They proceed in a more pluralistic way and therefore broke through the formerly calcified fronts of the cultural debates. Demands for theoretical and disciplinary self-reflection, and for international comparison and transnational perspectives receive a positive echo and lead to new research approaches.¹ Above all, in

1 D. Tröhler, Historiographische Herausforderungen der Bildungsgeschichte, in: *Bildungsgeschichte. International Journal for the Historiography of Education* 1 (2011), 9-22; E. Fuchs, Historische Bildungsforschung in internationaler Perspektive: Geschichte – Stand – Perspektiven, in: *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik* 56 (2010) 5, 703-724; M. Caruso/H. Kemnitz/J.-W. Link (eds), *Orte der Bildungsgeschichte*, Bad Heilbrunn 2009; E. Fuchs, Die historische Bildungsforschung im Spiegel ihrer Fachzeitschriften – ein Überblick, in: *Jahrbuch für Historische Bildungsforschung* 14 (2008), 269-296.

respect to the embedding of historical educational phenomena in global or transnational contexts, the aim of connecting to current trend in historical research placed in context, namely historical examination in the context of de-territorialization, de-governmentalization, and de-nationalization.² In the course of the “spatial turn,” the category of space also receives increasing attention in the field of historical educational research.³ It is interesting to note that the representatives of a transnational analysis of the educational history do in fact retain historical literature as contextual frame of reference. Its analytical approach, however, is acquired from political and social sciences. In that way, they react to the fact – if not always self-reflexively – that the historical research representatives of transnational and world and global historical approaches still struggle with their theoretical sources and methodological instruments and lead to an ever increasing number of topics, approaches and interpretations about an vast diversity of studies, which appear to have no conceptual or methodological nucleus. In contrast, conceptually challenging models for the explanation of globalization and transnational processes can be found in the social, political and educational sciences. These also affect the field of education and therefore offer attractive interpretation possibilities of historical educational phenomena for educational historians who are already favorable towards social and political sciences due to their discipline.

1. On the one hand, the social-scientific reconstruction of globalization processes focuses on the process of networks and dissolution of borders in an international system determined by national states. On the other hand, it refers to a global connection through a macro-sociological approach that with the world society produces a new form of social organization with specific structural characteristic and constitutes the requirements for other social phenomena as a system.⁴ An institutional-historical approach in which organizations function as the main supporters of the globalization process is preferred for the analysis of international and global processes in the field of training and education. In that respect, based on the world-systemic, neo-institutional approach, macro-sociological studies have diagnosed the formation of world-wide networking and interdependencies of global trends in the field of education diagnosed the development of dynamic world culture in an empirically convincing way.⁵ The institutional re-alignment con-

2 An overview of the historiographic literature on this subject can almost no longer be achieved. For a summary, see M. Middell/K. Naumann, *Global History and the spatial turn: from the impact of area studies to the study of critical junctures of globalization*, in: *Journal of Global History* 5 (2010), 149-170; G. Budde/S. Conrad/O. Janz (eds), *Transnationale Geschichte. Themen, Tendenzen und Theorien*, Göttingen 2007.

3 Cf. C. Burke/P. Cunningham/I. Grosvenor, “Putting Education in its Place”: Space, Place and Materialities in the History of Education, in: *History of Education* 39 (2010) 6, 677-680; E. Fuchs/S. Kesper-Biermann/C. Ritzi (eds), *Regionen in der deutschen Staatenwelt. Bildungsräume und Transferprozesse im 19. Jahrhundert*, Bad Heilbrunn 2011; R. Lowe/G. McCulloch, Introduction: Centre and Periphery – Networks, Space and Geography in the History of Education, in: *History of Education* 32 (2003), 457-459.

4 F. J. Lechner/J. Boli (eds), *The Globalization Reader*, Malden, MA 2000; D. P. Baker/G. K. LeTendre, *National Differences, Global Similarities: World Culture and the Future of Schooling*, Stanford 2005.

5 J. W. Meyer, *Weltkultur: Wie die westlichen Prinzipien die Welt durchdringen*, Frankfurt am Main 2005; McNeely/Y.-K. Cha, *Worldwide Educational Convergence through International Organizations: Avenues for Research*, in: *Educational Policy Analysis Archives* 14 (1994) 2, 11. (<http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/677/799>).

nected to this development rests on the fact that an educational semantics and structure valid world-wide that has become consensus reproduces itself in interaction with various national systemic manifestations.

2. While international regime research long accepted in political science has traditionally limited itself to national politics, an expansion of research to non-national actors and global political networks can be observed as explanation of international political systems since the 1990s. In relation to the globalization in the field of education, international educational organizations shifts into the focus of research. Here the starting point is formed by a new concept of international political regiment from political scientific internationalization research that views a new actor on the international stage in international organization next to the traditional national policy. Correspondingly, in this perspective the creation and functional mechanism of the system of multilateral education wins a central significance in the context of the analysis of international educational policy.⁶

3. Third, attempts to unite transfer history and comparison or analytically bring them closer to global educational processes come from comparative education.⁷ Here the concept of “lending and borrowing” has achieved particular appeal. For example, Gita Steiner-Khamsi defined three phases for transnational transfer relationships: reference to an external model (externalization or reception), its modification on its own location (re-contextualization or implementation), and its slow metamorphosis into a local model (internalization or indigenization).⁸ Other authors distinguish different phases; what is shared is attempt to develop analytic criteria for transfer processes and make them methodologically manageable.⁹

6 K. Mundy, The Evolution of Educational Multilateralism from 1945 to 2005, in: E. Fuchs (ed.), *Bildung International: Historische Perspektiven und aktuelle Entwicklungen*, Würzburg 2006, 181-199; K. Mundy, Educational Multilateralism and World (Dis) Order, in: *Comparative Education Review* 42 (1990), 448-478; K. Mundy/L. Murphy, Transnational Advocacy, Global Civil Society? Emerging Evidence from the Field of Education, in: *Comparative Education Review* 45 (2001), 85-12; J. Jones, The United Nations and Education. Multilateralism, Development and Globalisation, London 2005; C. Chabbot, *Constructing education for development. International organizations and education for all*, New York 2003.

7 D. Crook/G. McCulloch, Introduction: Comparative Approaches to the History of Education, in: *History of Education* 31 (2002), 397-400; J. Beech, Redefining educational transfer: international agencies and the (re)production of educational ideas, in: J. Sprogøe/T. Winther-Jensen (eds), *Identity, Education and Citizenship – Multiple Interrelations*, Frankfurt a. M. 2006, 175-196; J. Beech, The Theme of Educational Transfer in Comparative Education: A View over Time, in: *Research in Comparative and International Education* 1 (2006) 1 (web-print).

8 G. Steiner-Khamsi/T. S. Popkewitz (eds), *The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending*, New York 2004; G. Steiner-Khamsi, Re-Framing Educational Borrowing as a Policy Strategy, in: M. Caruso/H.-E. Tenorth (eds), *Internationalisierung. Semantik und Bildungssystem in vergleichender Perspektive*, Frankfurt a. M. 2002, 57-89; G. Steiner-Khamsi, Vergleich und Subtraktion: Das Residuum im Spannungsfeld zwischen Globalem und Lokalem, in: H. Kaelble/J. Schriewer (eds), *Gesellschaften im Vergleich. Forschungen aus Sozial- und Geschichtswissenschaften*, Bern et al. 1998, 369-397.

9 D: Phillips, *Educational Policy Borrowing: Historical Perspectives*, Oxford 2004. For the various forms of “diffusion” see F. Dobbin/B. Simmons/G. Garrett, The Global Diffusion of Public Policies: Social Construction, Coercion, Competition, or Learning?, in: *Annual Review of Sociology* 33 (2007), 449-472; M. Tanaka, The cross-cultural transfer of educational concepts and practices: a comparative study, Oxford 2005; S. Yamada, Educational Borrowing as Neotiation: Re-Examining the Influence of the American Black Industrial Education Model on British Colonial Education in Africa, in: *Comparative Education* 44 (2008) 1, 21-37; R. Cowen, Acting Comparatively

Historical educational research dedicates increasing attention to the historical dimension of this transnational process, the multi-lateral interrelations, transfer relationships and interdependencies. Although an “intensive reprocessing of educational history – as history of ideas, actual history, and social history – under the aspect of globalization”¹⁰ remains to be completed, historical educational research slowly approaches these concepts and trends developed in other discipline.¹¹ This occurs most often where comparative-international educational studies overlaps institutionally with historical educational research and where they dock onto existing research on internationalization processes. While Bernd Zymek already researched the internationalization processes in the area of education in 1975,¹² applying the theoretical and methodological program of an internationalization of education from a historical perspective, Jürgen Schriewer has raised the research concerning internalization of education to a new level since the 1990s.¹³ Since then it has grown continually,¹⁴ and particularly in the context of the history of monitor systems, has turned to transnational questions regarding history of education.¹⁵ This program expanding traditional comparative educational studies by a historical dimension has been in the meantime satiated¹⁶ by the first empirical studies, and with its theoretical goals, moves beyond traditional topics like the international reception of leading educators or bilateral educational relations. Attempts to connect global history and transnational approaches from historical studies and network analysis with educational history

upon the Educational World: Puzzles and Possibilities, in: *Oxford Review of Education* 32 (2006), 561-573.

- 10 A. Scheunpflug, Stichwort: Globalisierung und Erziehungswissenschaft, in: *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft* 6 (2003) 2, 159-172. Initial attempts can be found in A. Acevedo/S. Quintanilla, La perspectiva global en la historia de la educación, in: *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa* 14 (2009), 7-11; K. Myers/I. Grosvenor/R. Watts (eds), *Education and Globalisation*, in: *History of Education* 37 (2008), 737-741.
- 11 E. Fuchs (ed.) *Bildung International: Historische Perspektiven und aktuelle Entwicklungen*, Würzburg 2006.
- 12 B. Zymek, Das Ausland als Argument in der pädagogischen Reformdiskussion. Schulpolitische Selbstrechtfertigung, Auslandspropaganda, internationale Verständigung und Ansätze zu einer Vergleichenden Erziehungswissenschaft in der internationalen Berichterstattung deutscher pädagogischer Zeitschriften, 1871–1952, Ratingen/Kastellaun 1975.
- 13 From the numerous publications see J. Schriewer, Welt-System und Interrelations-Gefüge. Die Internationalisierung der Pädagogik als Problem Vergleichender Erziehungswissenschaft. Antrittsvorlesung 7. Dezember 1992, in: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. Philosophische Fakultät IV, Heft 34, Berlin 1994; id., Multiple Internationalities: The Emergence of a World-Level Ideology and the Persistence of Idiosyncratic World-Views, in: *Transnational Intellectual Network. Forms of Academic Knowledge and the Search for Cultural Identities*. Ed. C. Charle/J. Schriewer/P. Wagner, Frankfurt am Main/New York, 2004, 473-533.
- 14 M. Caruso/H.-E. Tenorth (eds), *Internationalisierung. Semantik und Bildungssystem in vergleichender Perspektive*, Frankfurt am Main 2002; B. Zymek, Regionalität und Internationalität, Mobilisierung und Egalisierung, in: Dietrich Benner und Heinz-Elmar Tenorth (ed.), *Bildungsprozesse und Erziehungsverhältnisse im 20. Jahrhundert. Praktische Entwicklungen und Formen der Reflexion im historischen Kontext* (= 42. Beiheft der Zeitschrift für Pädagogik), Weinheim/Basel 2000, 93-115; B. Zymek, Zwei Seiten der Internationalität. Profilbildung und Kooperation von Schulen in regionalen Bildungslandschaften, in: *Bildung und Erziehung* 59 (2006), 251-268.
- 15 J. Schriewer/M. Caruso (eds), *Nationalerziehung und Universalmethode. Frühe Formen schulorganisatorischer Globalisierung* (= *Comparativ* 15 [2005] 1).
- 16 E. Fuchs/J. Schriewer (eds), *Internationale Bildungsorganisationen als Global Players in Bildungspolitik und Pädagogik* (= *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik* 52 [2007] 2); E. Fuchs, Children's Rights and Global Civil Society, in: *Comparative Education* 43 (2007), 393-412; M. Depaepe, Die europäische Dimension in der pädagogischen Historiographie: Rhetorik und Realität, in: *Zeitschrift für pädagogische Historiographie* 10 (2004), 3-9.

led to the first case studies.¹⁷ Particularly in the area of gender research and research regarding education in colonial contexts and colonial educational missions, studies have appeared that emphasize transnational relationships, transfer and exchange relationships and mutual influences and therefore take new actors and spaces into account.¹⁸

The four articles chosen here appropriate some of the models and research topics named above and attempt to analyze transfer processes in the area of education from regional and thematic perspectives. With regard to Chinese educational elites, Barbara Schulte investigates the ways and actors through which Western educational knowledge (largely via Japan) reached China. With recourse to the “borrowing-lending model,” she demonstrates how Chinese intellectuals negotiated differing concepts of “modernity” and “tradition,” mediated between local traditions and globally circulated ideas, and developed strategies, to integrate and “siniologize” new educational knowledge that was received and spread through various actors and channels – in particular translations and intellectual mobility – in the educational-political and societal context. Proceeding from the historical description of this transfer processes, Schulte criticizes theoretical considerations regarding diffusion processes from political science and appropriates the concept of “externalization” from Jürgen Schwiewer. This concept links to Niklas Luhmann’s sociology of knowledge model of self-referential reflection systems and works with the assumption that these systems or actors – in this case the “educational systems” – have a constant need for external references in order to define and legitimate the action patterns for its own system. This “externalization” can refer – according to Schriewer – to “world

- 17 B. See Bagchi/E. Fuchs/K. Rousmaniere (eds), *Connecting Histories of Education: Transnational Exchanges and Cross-Cultural Transfers*, New York 2012 (in press.); J. Goodman, *International Citizenship and the International Federation of University Women before 1939*, in: *History of Education* 40 (2011) 6, 701-722; R. Cortina/S. San Román (eds), *Women and Teaching. Global Perspectives on the Feminization of a Profession*, New York 2006; E. Fuchs/D. Lindmark/C. Lüth (eds), *Informal and Formal Cross-Cultural Networks in History of Education* (= *Paedagogica Historica* 43 [2007] 2); E. Roldán/T. Schupp, *Bridges over the Atlantic: a Network analysis of the introduction of the Monitorial system of education in early-independent Spanish America*, in: *Comparativ* 15 (2005), 58-93; M. del Mar del Pozo Andres, *The Transnational and National Dimensions of Pedagogical Ideas: The Case of the Project Method, 1918–1939*, in: *Paedagogica Historica* 45 (2009), 561-584; F. Werle (ed.), *Educacao rural em perspectiva internacional. Intituições, praticas e formazao do professor*, Brasil 2007.
- 18 P. Altbach/G. P. Kelly (eds), *Education and Colonialism*, New York 1978; D. Lindmark (ed.), *Education and Colonialism: Swedish Schooling Projects in Colonial Areas, 1638–1878*, Umeå 2000; C. Whitehead, *Oversea Education and British colonial education 1929–63*, in: *History of Education* 32 (2003), 561-575; A. I. Madeira, *Framing concepts in colonial education: a comparative analysis of educational discourses at the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century*, in: J. Sprogøe/T. Winther-Jensen (eds), *Identity, Education and Citizenship – Multiple Interrelations*, Frankfurt a. M. 2006, 225-238; H. Fischer-Tiné, *National Education, Pulp Fiction and the Contradictions of Colonialism: Perceptions of an Educational Experiment in Early-Twentieth Century India*, in: H. Fischer-Tiné/M. Mann (eds), *Colonialism as Civilizing Mission, Cultural Ideology and British India*, London 2004, 229-247; H. J. A. Bellenoit, *Missionary Education and Empire in Late Colonial India, 1860–1920*, London 2007; T. Allender, *Learning Abroad: The Colonial Educational Experiment in India, 1813–1919*, in: *Paedagogica Historica* 45 (2009) 6, 707-722; J. Tschurennev, *Incorporation and Differentiation: Popular Education and the Imperial Civilizing Mission in the Early Nineteenth Century India*, in: C. Watt/M. Mann (eds), *Civilizing Missions in Colonial and Post-colonial South Asia. From Improvement to Development*, London 2011, 93-124; J. Goodman/G. McCulloch/W. Richardson (eds), *‘Empires Overseas’ and ‘Empires at Home’: Postcolonial and Transnational Perspectives on Social Change in the History of Education*, Abingdon 2009; J. Goodman/J. Martin (eds), *Gender, Colonialism and Education: The Politics of Experience*, London 2002.

situations” or “traditions” but always aims to convey actions with a legitimating “additional meaning.”¹⁹ In the case of China, Schulte demonstrates the differing externalization strategies in relation to the respective recourse, to the “world situation” as well as to the own traditions that are differentiated in dependence to the actors and the specific temporal-societal context and also produce different “additional meanings” in that way. The externalization concept is also the theoretical basis for the essay by Liou Wei-chih who argues that knowledge transfer played a key part in the emergence of academic disciplines and the reform of traditional academic cultures in many non-western countries during the 20th century. Taking the example of Taiwan, she identifies the actors of this transfer, the “mediators of knowledge”, focusing on the nine Chinese students of education who gained their academic qualifications in Germany between 1920 and 1949. In analyzing the content of their dissertations she not only shows to what extent the process of reception of German education and German education philosophy was shaped by the students’ reference to their own Chinese background. More importantly, she investigates how the transfer of German concepts was introduced to Taiwan after 1949 – to where four of the students immigrated after the revolution in mainland China, gaining important positions in academia or within the educational system – and how this transfer contributed to a modernization process within the education field in Taiwan. This reform was characterized by the efforts to harmonize western and Chinese culture, based on the cultural and philosophical assumptions of German “cultural pedagogy”. This was not restricted to their scholarly work; all of them internalized their once “foreign” knowledge and used it in their professional practice. After all, the reception of German educational concepts and their transfer to Taiwan can be interpreted as part of a long history of European-Asian educational relations in general.

In his article Tim Allender also appropriates the concept of “lending/borrowing” and the externalization model in order to examine intellectual transfer processes between India and the English colonial power. Here Allender starts with the hypothesis that transnational processes depend directly on the ever-changing form of governmental intervention measures. Using the example of school system reform and the corresponding instructional materials, Allender demonstrates that the gradual introduction of Western scientific or secular models into instruction depicts a conflicting process. If one initially tries to integrate and take indigenous religious traditions into account, it can soon be observed that on the one hand governmental resources are missing to train teachers for this knowledge transfer, on the other hand, networks of indigenous school and therefore traditional teachers at local levels are largely ignored. This led to the existence of a parallel set of knowledge that was taught in schools. In the course of the 19th century the chang-

19 See J. Schriewer, *The Method of Comparison and the Need for Externalization: Methodological Criteria and Sociological Concepts*, in: J. Schriewer/B. Holmes (eds), *Theories and Methods in Comparative Education*, Frankfurt a. M. 1988, 25-83; id., *Fortschrittsmodelle und Modellkonstruktionen. Formen der Internationalisierung pädagogischen Wissens*, in: J. Büschenfeld/H. Franz/F.-M. Kuhlemann (eds), *Wissenschaftsgeschichte heute. Festschrift für Peter Lundgreen*, Bielefeld 2001, 302-327. The reference can be found in: N. Lumann/K. E. Schorr, *Reflexionsprobleme im Erziehungssystem*, Frankfurt a. M. 1999.

ing character of knowledge transfer took place in front of the background of changing colonial policies: mutual exchange relations lead to a one-way-street that affected educational policy. Secular Western knowledge was then translated and transferred to governmentally accepted school books that left little room for indigenous knowledge. In the end, this forced transfer of a strict interventional colonial policy did not have the desired success but did lead to centuries-old traditions of social and intellectual reproduction being perpetuated on the local level but also in relation to the caste system.

The role of language and translation, which became central to knowledge transfer in China as well as in India, is also the focus of the article by Almut Steinbach. Based on the example of Sri Lanka and the Federated Malay States under British colonial power, Steinbach examines British language policy in relation to the school system. Here Steinbach searches for the motives of educational politicians and the type of implementation processes. It becomes clear that, on the one hand, the concept of civilization mission played a role in the introduction of English language, as well as the goal of training loyal workers for colonial administration and British companies. In addition, the indigenous population's need to learn English in school grew because this promised social advancement, political participation, and greater career possibilities. That is why many indigenous people integrated English as their everyday language. Parallel to that, in Sri Lanka introduced educational reforms already in the early colonial times, leading to the introduction of national English-language schools, which also simultaneously provoked strong discussions about the future role of indigenous elite within the colony. The four Federated Malay States, however, offer a different picture. In the context of indirect British rule and the strong role of missionary schools, English was only introduced very hesitantly and schools using the local language were promoted. It can generally be asserted that the introduction of English was generally dependant on the degree of governmental influence and a coherent language policy did not exist.

Although the history of language policy in the British colonies or the knowledge transfer to China via Japan or to Taiwan via China represent well-researched fields, in particular in the Area and Postcolonial Studies, the articles presented here thoroughly open up new perspectives. This concerns topics – education and schooling – as well as approaches that go back to theoretical models and concepts from social and educational sciences. Globalization studies confirm that the historical dimension of the inherently paradoxical globalization process, the multitude of local appropriation logics and the mechanisms of world-wide diffusion are not able to comprehend thoroughly enough.²⁰ The macro-sociological background allows an (educational-) historical approach that historically analyzes the relationship of de-territorialization and re-territorialization, of de-governmentalization and re-governmentalization, of de-nationalization and re-nationalization, and takes into account the overlapping of different, in part competing spatial concepts.

20 M. Caruso, *World systems, world society, world polity: theoretical insights for a global history of education*, in: *History of Education* 37 (2008), 825-840; F. Waldow, *Undeclared Imports: Silent Borrowing in Educational Policy-making and Research in Sweden*, in: *Comparative Education* 45 (2009), 477-494.

Here the content-based and conceptual-methodological lines of intersection between transnational historical scholarship and historical educational research can be defined.²¹ A strong orientation of educational-historical research around the historiographical debates through cultural transfer, trans-locality, transnational or interwoven history, but also close attention to social-scientific concepts on the part of historians can promote new views for research on the respective objects of study.

21 As an example of collaborative projects, see E. Fuchs, *Der Völkerbund und die Institutionalisierung transnationaler Bildungsbeziehungen*, in: id./M. Schulz (eds), *Globalisierung und transnationale Zivilgesellschaft in der Ära des Völkerbundes* (= *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 54 [2006]), 888-899; M. Caruso, *Zweideutige Verweise. Preußen als Vorbild argentinischer Schulreformen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Projekts von Carlos Saavedra Lamas*, in: S. Carreras/G. Maihold (eds), *Preußen und Lateinamerika. Im Spannungsfeld von Kommerz, Macht und Kultur*, Münster 2004, 285-304.