

# What can we learn from comparative education. Great Britain, Spain and Peru: three territories to characterize contemporary developments in education and schooling<sup>1</sup>

Qué podemos aprender de la educación comparada. Gran Bretaña, España y Perú: tres territorios para representar los desarrollos contemporáneos en educación y escolarización

BENJAMIN ZUFIAURRE<sup>2</sup>

OLGA BELLETICH<sup>3</sup>

---

## ABSTRACT

Education and schooling focus on how society integrates young people in dominant norms and values. But what knowledge, what cultural values, and which educational practices are of most worth, has not an easy answer today as the situations and the contexts of development for humans have different connotations in different geographical areas. In this global scenery where diversity is in the screen, but not in the realities and the facts which characterise evolution, our contemporary societies get lost. Schooling in its short history, advances social aspiration and contributes to initiate youngsters in their social and cultural identities, either physical, spiritual, domestic, private, public, or economic... Education, prior to the invention of schooling, bothers about how all these processes can be developed properly according to each ones needs, options, and possibilities. That is why, when it is up to find a common language in education and schooling, it becomes difficult to share the same terms to refer to different realities and different demands in the different countries. Probably we are living times which deny realities while colonizing humans and societies more and again in the process of access to knowledge. And this is what justifies this paper: "to appoint to the realities of evolution in education and schooling from an international stance at the light of recent international developments in comparative education, as developed in: Great Britain, Spain and Peru".

*Keywords:* Education, schooling, diversity, youngsters, knowledge.

<sup>1</sup> The first draft of this paper was originally prepared for the European conference, hosted in Vienna from the 27<sup>th</sup> to the 30<sup>th</sup> of September, 2009. The authors thank Professor David Hamilton for his contribution.

<sup>2</sup> Prof. of Education, Public University of Navarra, Spain. E-mail: zufiaurre@unavarra.es

<sup>3</sup> Researcher, Public University of Navarra, Spain.

## RESUMEN

La educación y la escolarización se preocupan de cómo la sociedad integra a los y las jóvenes en unas normas y valores dominantes. Pero qué conocimiento, qué valores culturales y qué prácticas educativas tienen más valor, no tiene una fácil respuesta hoy, cuando todas las situaciones y contextos de desarrollo arrastran diferentes connotaciones en diferentes áreas geográficas. En este escenario global, en el que la diversidad está en la agenda, pero no en las realidades de los hechos que formatean la evolución, las sociedades contemporáneas se encuentran perdidas. La escolarización, en su corta historia, avanza hacia aspiraciones sociales, y contribuye a iniciar a jóvenes en su identidad social y cultural, tanto física como espiritual, doméstica, económica, pública y privada... La educación, previa a la escolarización, se preocupa de cómo todos estos procesos se pueden desarrollar apropiadamente, según necesidades, opciones y posibilidades de cada uno o una. Esta es la razón por la que para encontrar un lenguaje común en educación, y en el desarrollo de la escolarización, resulta difícil compartir unos mismos términos lingüísticos y unas prácticas derivadas, que refieren diferentes realidades y demandas en diferentes países. Vivimos tiempos en los que negamos realidades mientras se coloniza a humanos y a sociedades en el acceso al conocimiento. Y esto es lo que justifica el contenido de este artículo que pretende "apuntar a las realidades de la evolución en la educación y la escolarización desde una visión internacional en el desarrollo de la educación comparada, tal como se ha caracterizado en Gran Bretaña, España y Perú".

*Palabras clave:* Escuela, escolarización, jóvenes, diversidad, conocimiento.

Recibido: 18/06/09. Aceptado: 22/09/09.

## INTRODUCTION

### *Comparative Education: An historical perspective*

When in 1925 (December, 18) the leading team of the J.J. Rousseau Institute (adscribed to the High Normal School of Education in Genève, Switzerland) decided to push forward an International Office for Education (OIE-IOE), whose Statutes were officially approved in August, 1927, the developments of international cooperation in education, were not clear enough. In April, 1927, a first Conference of the OIE-IOE: "Education and Peace", was organised in Prague under the frame of the Society of Nations. The compromises of the OIE-IOE as an International Institution, "independent from nations while politic, philosophic, and religiously neutral", were to push forward: \*a documentation centre for both public and private education; \*scientific research; and \*coordination between institutions involved in education, Gilabert (1982: 85-97). To start with the work of the OIE-IOE, 12.000 Swiss francs were assigned, while sharing space and resources with the J.J. Rousseau Institute and opening a space for debate with important educationists and intellectuals such as Claparède, Piaget, Ferrière, Einstein.

When, in 1929, it was the time to organise the Conference of the World Fed-

eration of Education Associations with anglo-american partners, the limitations of the Institution emerged and by July 25 (1929), the idea of an Inter - Governmental Organisation as “institution of public general interest”, instead of individuals membership, got its way. The reorganisation of the OIE-IOE as an International Office to frame the future structure for comparative education, followed the model of the Work International Organisation (OIT). Since and during 1930`s and 1940`s, the compromises and tasks of the OIE-IOE included: \*permanent educational exhibitions, \*the International Bureau of Education, \*Conferences, \*publications of series of books and International Bulletins in education, \*intellectual help for prisoners of war, \*pedagogic and scientific libraries, \*editing and sharing educational books and materials, \*exchange of teachers all around the world, \*push forward educational reforms, among others. Once the second world war finished, an agreement between UNESCO and the OIE-IOE was signed in February (1952).

In 1967, for reasons of economic, politic and scientific crisis, global changes in development, and tensions between colonial and colonized world, the OIE-IO integrates in the UNESCO as an International Centre for Comparative education. Under this partnership, it was the time for political delegations, not so for pedagogical representations. The shared actions of the OIE-IOE got to an end, but the OIE - IOE gave a content to the period of “post war consensus” in a time when education had a meaning to change society, and its contribution to the development of “Comparative Education” remained through: \* the publication of the “Year books of Education and teaching”, and \*the organisation of “International Conferences of Public Instruction”.

The *International “Year book of Education and teaching”*, was first published in 1933, after two previous initiatives in 1931 and 1932. The first Inform of the Ministries of Public Instruction – “Le Bureau International de l’Education 1930-31”, offered information from Ecuador, Poland. Canton of Génève in Switzerland, Egypt, Spain and Checoslovaquia. The second Inform 1931-32 (1932, July, 8<sup>th</sup>), expanded to 24 countries referencing the third meeting of the Committee. In July 1933, before the 4<sup>th</sup> International meeting, the OIE-IOE renewed the “Annuaire” in order to frame education and schooling under a global panoramic perception. The introduction of the “Annuaire” was charged to Pedro Rossello (an Spanish educationist). Rossello managed to advance the global philosophy for “comparative education”, as referred in Noah & Eckstein (1969), and in Rossello (1960). Since 1933, another 31 “Annuaire” followed (Stock *et al.*, 1979: 69), and these included information about: \*the consequences of economic crisis in education; \*the efforts to improve vocational and professional training; \*the new modern pedagogical methods; \*the generalisation of secondary education; \*the development of post school and popular education, among others.

Since their early years, and till 1968, the meetings of the Committee: “*International Conferences of Public Instruction*”, included informs of each country

participating where they insisted about how to push international educational recommendations forward on different subjects. In 1934, as referred in the 2<sup>nd</sup> "Annuaire" (3<sup>rd</sup> Conference: situation of education: 1932-33), 53 countries participated and three general recommendations were approved. The years next, more than 50 countries participated with three, or more recommendations each year. In 1938 and 1939, over 60 countries presented their Informes. There were no Conferences and no "Annales" between 1940 and 1945 for reasons of war. After 1946, and till 1968, new Conferences developed and more "Annales" were published: 24 countries in 1946; 44 years next; 54 in 1952; over 60 from 1953 on; 70 in 1956; 1959: 77; 1961: 86; 1965: 93; 1966: 91; 1968: 96 (31<sup>st</sup> Conference). The last "Annuaire" was published in 1969, and after 1971, the "International Conference for Public Instruction" celebrated each two years as "International Conferences of Education".

At that time, *comparative education* pretended to compare educational systems, structures of instruction, theories, plans, programmes, methods, descriptions and explanations (Rossello, 1960: 60). That is: *improve planning while keeping care of the relations of interdependence in education, school and life* (Noah & Eckstein, 1969). *Comparative education* was to deal with the promotion of peace and human rights. But from the point of view of today, when international cooperation in education is being driven under neoliberal and neoconservative contradictory premises: -accreditation, efficiency, effectiveness, excellence, quality, what questions public education and defends options in favour of choice and market-, it is important to reflect on these initiatives from the perspective of the times. And this is what justifies our analysis.

## ECONOMIC PRESSURES ON EDUCATION AND SCHOOLING AFTER 1960'S

Economic pressures on schooling from 1960's on, was sorted through the introduction of neo-liberal ideas into discussions of educational policy. The creation of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development: OECD, in 1961, growing from the former Organization for European Economic Cooperation: OEEC (organized to administer American and Canadian aid for the reconstruction of Europe after II World War), represented a move towards the interdependence of national economies and cooperation to contribute to peaceful and harmonious relations in the world, but not to forget, under a Western capitalist frame. The OECD assumed since, that the economically more advanced nations, should co-operate to assist countries in process of economic development.

From educational perspectives, this move represents to develop policies to enhance efficiency and effectiveness in educational provision. Statistical information about educational systems, and measuring competence levels, becomes

important as “new public management” policies. And with this, ideas from outside the public sphere are introduced into educational policy making and management practices, while the responsiveness of public services gets to consumers. This represents to diminish the demands on State resources (education, health ...), reduction of State bureaucracies, decentralization of control, and opening up to different pedagogical options, while challenging the ideals of the welfare State as framed under the move of “post war consensus” and pushing a move for education as a private better than a public good.

In this global arena, equity finds a place, but it refers better to ideas about a natural order than to ideas about equality. The issue of gender, raised by feminist movements, pushes the idea of education for all as a part of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), perhaps the most progressive stance for changes in the global panorama of the times, even when equality in education does not represent equality in society, and at work levels (Zufiaurre, Pellejero, 2000). In developed countries, ambivalence about equality can push to better. In less developed countries, instead, it can push to worst, or better, depending on how endemic differences, situations, cultural contexts, and others, can be properly dealt. All around the world, education expands and improves, but a different way of colonization: “western style” also expands.

Universal access to learning according to Dakar framework (UNESCO 2000: article 4), which involves 164 countries, focuses on equity but emphasizes learning outcomes, enhances the environment for learning, reinforces partnerships, and others. New rhetoric of national policy – making appear in the Dakar framework, but the language derives from modern management, and the notions of deregulation substitute former *post war open policies and practices* for the good of education and development. The enlightened frame however, appears progressive as defined under the “New Education – Fellowship” in 1921, offers options for child centered education, social Reform, democracy, world citizenship, peace and international understanding. The allocation of responsibilities to agencies subordinated to central States, represents that the educational market moves from States protection, founding, ownership, and delivering, to a kind of public service industry, which can be privatized and differentiated more easily. The shift from government to governance (Ball, 2007) pushes towards new forms of self-organization, with the State as a form of control (market maker, not market leader), while social and educational institutions re-configure under partnership regimes to be approached through the “interest of subjects and organizations”.

Led by multinational agencies, education gets driven by “economic” or “human capital” priorities. In a context of a globalized economy, harmonious relationships between the creation of efficient and low cost flexible learners, and efficient low cost flexible workers, deal with using social policy for such aims. Meanwhile, the requirement of flexible learning and teaching opens edu-

cation to learners, to customers choice, and isolates learning from teaching through communication technologies. And when the school-room economies require marketable tools: targets, learning outcomes, benchmarks, learning objects..., contribute to re-engineer the educational assumptions of the welfare State in the interest of flexible, low cost processes.

## CLARIFYING ASPECTS IN SEARCH OF SHARED LANGUAGES AND PRACTICES IN EDUCATION

Since early 1970's, the aims for international comparative education are not to compare educational systems, or structures of instruction, theories, plans, programmes, or methods..., to learn from others while taking account of the particular circumstances in each country, the context of their good or bad practices, that is to say, bother about educational organisations and administrations..., driving from the History of each country with their own contradictions. From 1970's on, the new version, resumes to copying what seems to be working elsewhere for international comparisons, fulfil conditions of rankings, etc. But the special and specific circumstances which clarify and justify the circumstances about how the different educational systems are working, compared to others, is not considered important anymore.

Regarding evolution in education (Zufiaurre, 2007a,b, Hamilton, 1999, Simon and Taylor, 1981), the search for a *common international language in education*, should drive to share questions and realities further on than economic pressures on education and schooling. But, as a consequence the fuel crisis, in early 1970's, neoliberal ideas drove to an end to former progressive moves. In 1961, when the OECD was founded, the interdependence of national economics and joint cooperation was supposed to contribute to peaceful relations among countries and people. Advanced nations were to help countries in process of economic development with their recipes, while colonizing development and challenging the ideas and practices of welfare States.

As a consequence, the wave in *comparative education* from years before changed. The history of OIE-IOE was to an end, and little by little, accreditation and new public management initiatives got their path in education and schooling all around the world. Each country was to be looked from the mirror of others, and everything was to be shaped western way. From educational perspectives, Lundgreen (1982), insists on this move: *the path from the first to the second generation of school reforms*. The *first generation of school reforms*, were based on the faith of democratization of culture. Reforms were to extend education in time, space, and to all humans: boys, girls, races, social classes... Reforms were to attend the responsibilities of schools in development, to educate

citizens, changes in life relations, social and market evolution, better qualifications... This represented that the power in relation to school systems moved from the world of politics to the world of practice: integration, decentralisation, participation, dialogue.

From 1970's on, the *second generation of school reforms* was figured under politic control of the reforms defined by experts and administrators. The interests were the transition between educational stages, educational planning, distribution of resources and school supports, promote competence based learning, develop pressures towards quality, control and delegation of autonomy... Under this move, PISA Informs, and external evaluation and accreditation, appeared on the agenda in order to analyse the educational systems according to the frame of: "*how the different national systems are placed in international rankings*". It is not anymore in the agenda "*what are their circumstances, and how to develop to better*". And the contradictions between neoliberal (market) and neoconservative (back to basics) ideas and practices, settle the frame for economic and politic demands in education and schooling which substitute the demands of practice: education at consumers choice, and traditional values, justified for reasons of progress and development, oppose enlightenment ideas of education for all.

The different countries, face this new wave in education differently depending on their own histories and their own practices, that is, depending on how each country (each nation state) has been facing its evolution in educational politics for own circumstances. Geographic, politic and religious boundaries, limited the developments of education and schooling up to the 18<sup>th</sup>. After the 19<sup>th</sup>, economic and politic boundaries have determined how republicanism and secularization processes have influenced education and scientific management, western way defined, and meanwhile, the functions of schooling expanded in space and time. Different forms of education are addressed to all (Zufiaurre, 1999, 2007b) shaped in this global evolution which leaves aside specific circumstances to improve for better in one or other country.

As a consequence, discussion in education has been diminished, while driven to a world of poor realities and practices. All at the same time, the language of education becomes misused, the meanings of the words and facts get altered, the implications of historic experiences forgotten, and the future of education in a welfare world, lost in the way. The time of "post war consensus" (Jones 1983) and international moves in education such as the development of the OIE-IOE, are to be remembered from the perspective of the times as progressive contemporary contributions to the development of education and schooling. To reflect on this from the context and circumstances of education and schooling in Great Britain, Spain and Peru, helps to clarify the global panorama in education out from colonial perspectives.

## CONTEXT AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF EDUCATION AND SCHOOLING IN GREAT BRITAIN

When in 1981 Brian Simon published *Why no pedagogy in England*, referred in Simon & Taylor (1981), Simon was thinking about pedagogy as the “science of teaching” (*Oxford English Dictionary*). This notion of “pedagogy” as a science, derived from Herbart (1982), and circulated in the Anglo-American world at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup>. As Simon argued, English understanding of education and schooling was based on their pragmatic outlook which attributed little value to notions of mental growth, understanding, and social change, while insisted on training and accreditation.

In the Anglo American space, the development of a “science of teaching” has moved under the limitations of pragmatism influenced by English schooling conservatism of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Brian Simon argued that at the 1980s, it was time to renew scientific approaches to the practice of teaching while “revitalise *pedagogy*”. And highlighting the concept of *pedagogy*, Brian Simon tried to refocus and to problematize the study of teaching and learning further on than limited and limiting conceptions of curriculum which were, by that time, reduced to questions about instructional content and classroom delivery (Hamilton, 1999: 136), the short termism of “what should they know”, replacing the strategic curriculum question “what should they become” in educational activities.

In Britain, the term “pedagogy” was rarely used till the 1970s. At that time, it developed to refer to school-based activities, or techniques of teaching and learning, making a difference to mainland European perspectives, as *it first reduces to a technology: teaching techniques, and secondly, loses its etymological status as a vector implying direction* (Hamilton, Zufiaurre, Belletich, 2009), when it is the case that pedagogical activities “lead out” in a particular direction. But Pedagogy refers to schooling and to upbringing. Schoolteachers can be manufactured (didact), but the relationships with younger peers: students and others, refer to upbringing (thinking as a pedagogue) better than to developing as a schoolteachers (didact). This represents that teachers adopt a moral compass to steer their didactic praxis.

This moral dimension, attempts to come to terms with the Anglo-American use of *Curriculum*. But in parts of Europe, notions of a teaching plan (lehrnplan) were also in the agenda, although these notions were not representative of curriculum positions. Better to say, a schema to be followed line by line, hour by hour, or month by month, prescribes *curriculum* when a pedagogic resource, or storehouse of ideas and values, facilitates, but does not prescribe the praxis or moral steering of pedagogues. (Hamilton, Zufiaurre, Belletich, 2009).

The context of development of education and schooling in Britain, is to be analysed from these perspectives. It will refer to *curriculum* as an educational space to be approached pragmatically in past times. More recently, it will refer

to *pedagogy* out of a moral European dimension, but with the aim of reconstructing a territory of *multiple pedagogies* of the oppressed, gender, race, class, culturally..., biased. Another question to be considered in Britain, is the degree of decentralisation in education and schooling. Local Authorities (LEAs), organized in school districts, are responsible of overall planning, distribution of resources, school inspection, school curriculum..., clearly till end 1970s, when Thatcher educational reforms pushed for more control. The Boards of Education, and the teams in the LEAs, compromised in renewing education and producing materials to help teachers develop their duties in better conditions, while school teams, Head teachers and Supervisors, are responsible of their actions and not administrative bureaucracies.

In another sense, Great Britain has lived most of the 20<sup>th</sup> a kind of political consensus around the reorganization of elementary and secondary education. 1994 Education Act, a century after the regularisation of elementary education in Britain, formalised the comprehensivisation of the secondary system, after some former stages to be mentioned: \*1902 Education Act, \*1926 Hedow Report, \*1938 Spins Report, and \*1943 Norwood Report, while following, in a way, former experiences developed in the USA around the “Cardinal principles for Secondary Education” in 1918 (Zufiaurre 2002: 43-49).

All along these processes, the systems for school selection changed in Great Britain. Till 1944, intelligence tests were well valued in Great Britain. Pressure groups in education defended selective school. Students, after primary school, had to pass a test: “eleven plus”. Those students who got higher marks, were selected for “grammar” schools. Approximately 90%, were to fit in “secondary modern” and “technical” schools. However, a big proportion of those, approximately 10% of the students derived from “grammar” schools, could not get into the University, while a big proportion of brilliant students, derived from “secondary modern” schools, had access to the University.

The comprehensive reorganization was justified for this pretension under new “secondary modern” schools with a revised curriculum to melt the best from “secondary modern” and “grammar” schools (Zufiaurre 2002: 65-80). For 1956, “comprehensive schooling” was considered the best model in Scotland, and also for rural spaces while in some areas the threefold system: 20% “grammar”, 10% technical”, and 70% comprehensive, was defended (Fenwick IGK, 1976: 70-110). In 1944, the idea was also to solve problems of early selection and loosing educational prestige. In 1959: “Gowder Report”, under the idea of social mobility and equality of opportunities, insisted on this. With the labours in power: 1960’s, the option for a comprehensive common school, reinforced, and for 1978, 83% of State secondary schools in Britain were based on a “comprehensive school” model. After 1979, with the conservatives in power, the move was for more control over the whole educational system in England and Wales, not so in Scotland. This move pushed for more centralisation, more control of

the LEAS, control of the curriculum, and development of new right policies in education, very active during 1980s, but changing to better 1990s on, in times of neoliberal discourses and practices around accreditation, new public management, supervision and control.

It is so that the debate in Britain about “grammar”, or “comprehensive” schools, in one or different schools, gets to the space of discussions in the USA at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and beginning 20<sup>th</sup>. And as a debate, compromises a fundamental curriculum question. Is the purpose of public schooling to produce diligent workers or law-abiding citizens? Or when analysing the idea of *public schooling* derived from classical Latin: “res-publica”, as prestiged options which could be used by everyone (public independent schools in Britain, by the way), faced to the idea of *public things* referring to systems of government of public affairs derived from classical Greek as roots of the modern politics (public schools in their dependence of the States, as in Spain, for example). But there is also a third option developed by late middle ages, the term *commonwealth*, which lacked the imperial connotations of Roman and Greek equivalents, while assuming that responsibility for the welfare of its members should be taken by corporate institutions.

Looking from these different points of view, what is the purpose of public schooling in Great Britain today? Is it an institution of upbringing into the sphere of democratic citizenship? Is it an ideological institution to bring prospective citizens into the sphere of democratic citizenship? Is it an economic agency to prepare young people as future workers? Is it an agent of reconstruction for a new world order and an uncertain future? The melting pot journey to knowledge, should, or not, be faced differently in the different contexts of and for development?.

## CONTEXT AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF EDUCATION AND SCHOOLING IN SPAIN

In Spain, *curriculum* as a notion has historically identified “trained men” to follow prescribed norms and rules in order to become young aristocrats once following specific “programmes of study”, the *systematization of arts* to define wisdom: logic, dialectic, grammar, arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy, that is, *curriculum* referenced under the notions of “trivium and quadrivium” (Mendo, 2009), the liberal arts tied to such subjects teaching to be apprehended by the students. When the foundation of the first Universities, this development was clear. It occurred, for instance, at the University of Salamanca derived in 1218 from a former cathedral school (Rodriguez San Pedro, 2009). The academic atmosphere was directed towards scholastic and religious training. Humanist and scientific knowledge, were excluded.

During the 19<sup>th</sup> century, owing to political differences between “carlists” and “liberals”, the process of secularization in education was delayed. As a consequence, the bourgeois revolution arrived late, what affected the process of organising “public education” as a service to society. The first Education Law in Spain (Moyano Law), was passed in 1857, under the liberals (Zufiaurre, 1994). The aspiration was to organize a system of elementary education between 7 to 10 years, as a way to unify former educational policies and to reorganise educational administration mainly in charge of the Catholic Church. Under the frame of this Law, the first structure for “free universal gratuity education for all” was settled, but the Law had limited success under the subsequent “carlist” regimes.

Politic differences among liberal rationalism and traditionalism, interrupted by shorts periods of revolutionary times, have dominated since the sequence of the times and interfered the developments of education and schooling in Spain till the civil war (1939). The *feeling around rational instruction against inequalities* settled a frame for *progressive educational movements* under the first Republic (1866-1974). Next a *first progressive movement*: the “Free Institution for Teaching” (ILE), expanded around a free enlightened atmosphere getting to influence education to *contribute to freedom and open rationality*, what expanded during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, through Ministers and intellectuals educated in an ILE atmosphere which pushed the opening of the country during the second Republic (1931-39), and contributed to opening educational perspectives at the 1970`s. Another *progressive educational movement* was framed under the influence of workers movements: trade unionists and anarchists end 19`s, beginning 20`s, when ideas and practices around “public, rational education”, got on further than progressive liberalism.

The open republican heritage in education, got a frame in Spain influenced by these ideas and practices connected to the “new active school” in Europe: *free, rational, and laic coeducative schools settled in a cooperative popular atmosphere while leaded by new social groups in times of industrialization and urbanization*. Ferrer y Guardia (1976) and the *model of modern school*, was the symbol for a new school era (1901-1909). Ferrer was shot in 1909 (October 13<sup>th</sup>), in Barcelona, and again, traditional Catholic forces and conservatives iterferred the spreading of open laic movements: *science as master in life, free access to knowledge, teaching through play, no exams, no punishment, sport and health education, natural life, pedagogic museums, etc, in active and dynamic urban industrial areas*, in some parts of Spain. In 1923, Primo de Rivera dictatorship, turned education again in the hands of traditional forces. However, by 1931, and until 1939, active movements exploded under the II Republic. Pedro Rossello, who pushed “The International Office of Education” in Switzerland, was born in this context of active open values in a changing Spain (in Calonge, Girona, Catalonia, in 1897). It is not strange that he developed as an open minded international moral, intellectual, physical active educational defender, influ-

enced by active educationists of the time, such as: Claparède, Ferrière, Decroly, Pestalozzi, Piaget, and others.

At the end of Franco's regime, the 2<sup>nd</sup>. Educational Law in Spain (LGE, 1970) was passed (Zufiaurre, 1994, 29-46), and Spain entered modernity. Compulsory education was generalised till 14 years (6 to 14, with territorial options to push Preschool 3/4 to 6 years), and the privileges of Catholic Church in education were to be protected. This Law was followed by 1990's Educational Law (LOGSE), which extended compulsory schooling till 16 under a comprehensive theoretical frame, while opening a structure for Infant schooling: 3 to 6 years. The Organic Law for Quality: LOCE (2002) follows, this time under traditional conservative premises: *effort and quality*, neoliberal slogans for conservative practices. In 2006, the Organic Law of Education: LOE gets adjusted to premises of *equity and quality*, that is, progressive ideals around social justice organized together to join neoliberal tendencies around accreditation and competence based instruction (Zufiaurre, 2007a: 49-99).

As a result of this evolution, the aims of schooling in Spain have been traditionally related to defined "programmes of study" organized in different school stages according to periods agreed by the central State and Autonomous Communities. But schooling is influenced by old practices derived from the medieval forms of the "The Ratio Studiorum" (XVIth) as a source of "programmes of study", that is, teaching to text tendencies to be transferred to students. Under this instructional design, *didactic* approaches refer the transference of knowledge through defined methods of teaching and learning. The attention is in the *Method* as fostered faith in doctrine teaching in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, which has remained in place until the 1990's Educational Law (LOGSE), when active constructivist theoretical approaches to the teaching of doctrine were to be introduced into school "programmes of study". And when referring to education in Spain, the rhetoric –or intention– has been always stronger than school practices, which have remained more or less the same: didactic instrumental approaches (Zufiaurre and Pellejero, 2010).

What comes from here, is that when getting to times to introduce new school contents: technology, modern languages, transverse life contents, citizenship education..., or push forward educational innovation, this will be done plus what has always been done, school times are pressed to include subjects teaching following didactic methodological approaches to better learn what taught. Playing with knowledge, project based teaching and learning, school based projects..., have no much institutional space in education and schooling in Spain, although some active school teams and teachers can find own spaces to push open initiatives forward. School inspectors are not much dynamic. Teachers continuous training is mostly based in deeping on specialized aspects of methodological, and / or administrative interests up to date following a bureaucratic design. Any contribution to improve daily practices, seems not to be in the arena

of educational administrators. Meanwhile, local – municipal authorities, can hardly play in an educational bureaucratic stance represented by school inspectors and administrative bodies, supervisors and others. In this context, religious education, reduces the energy to the teaching of catholic religion, but catholic church can have an influence in school projects, specially when it is the case of religious, state maintained, or private schools.

The *notion of curriculum* first appears in official educational documents in the 1990s, taken from the translation of works by Tyler, Taba, and Doll. A translation of John Dewey's: *The child and the curriculum*, was first published in 1969. This represents that what in the USA was referred as *instructional pedagogy* had a parallel with *curriculum teaching and instruction* framed as *didactic* approaches, which follow teaching to text subject based options. After 1990, *curriculum* as educational term has been normalized as an instrument for educational authorities to transfer educational doctrine in a "Thomist sense", distributed by 'master' (magister) school teachers. Contemporary educational analysis since, moves around three elements. It refers to what other countries do, it sustains earlier "programmes of study", and its seeks to modify the "programmes of study" using a combination of new public management discourses and child-active approaches. Meanwhile educational bureaucracies do the rest.

There are two main school models in Spain: *public schools*, or better to say state schools, administered, financed and supervised, through the educational administration, and *private concerted or state maintained schools*, overall financed (teachers salaries, tuition expenses...) but privately administered. Both have to follow a specified curriculum defined by the State and the Autonomous Communities. *Public schools* cover most of the educational offer in all the country with the exception of urban areas. Private maintained schools can charge families extra costs for complementary activities, while do manage to select pupils (what real while assumed by Educational authorities, although not allowed by Law). Joint to these two main models, there is a minor group of *private schools* which follow the same curriculum supervised by the educational administration. These have free organisation, families pay school fares, and can select pupils.

## CONTEXT AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF EDUCATION AND SCHOOLING IN PERU

There are no registers about how education was working in pre colonial times in Peru, but the evolution of incaic cultures, their works, and the techniques transferred, ties education to three elements: "perception of the cosmos and life; conception of education as child upbringing, socialization through "school plans" and "programmes of study" (Chunga, 2009: 32). It is so that instrumen-

talisation of education shapes the overall structure of schooling and teaching and learning processes”:

Men and women as sons of the earth, develop a sense of life mediating his or her access to honour in times of colonization, and next become free republican men to create their own history, (p. 32); That is, from student - child: patient, weak, person in need, through school as a place to organize knowledge and to socialise around national aims, to curriculum contents as best cognitive and didactic tools to push forward the system of schooling (pp. 7-11).

Formal education apparently started with Pachacútec addressing royal elites, governors and administrators. The teachers known as the “Amautas” were illustrated in philosophy and moral. The contents to transfer were arithmetic and astronomy, what seemed necessary for an economic organisation based on agriculture. “Haravicus” were to invent poems. “Willac umu” were delegates of divinity. “Quechua” was the language for education. Under the “Incas”, humans were to live in their community (ayni). Culture was for citizens, while community values were to be shared. There were different educational figures and activities to give a content to this organisation: amauta (teacher); yachayhuasi (house of knowledge); acclawasi (house for virgins), quipus (places to learn how to count), aravicus (oral transmission of poems). This educational structure survived until the 15<sup>th</sup> century, when, through colonization, it came into conflict with perceptions of the liberal arts in Spain and Europe. Under colonization, the former community sense banished, while individual features in education were pushed to develop an organizational, political and administrative structure, similar to the one in Spain.

The terms: “school plans” and “programmes of study” emerge up to the XVI century, when Peru developed to a Vice Kingdom to christianize the Indians, indoctrinate and instruct young people. Elementary education was organised to culture Indians. Intermediate education was addressed to culture the criollos, mestizos and tradesmen. Universities were for aristocrats, and for people with politic and economic power. Religious organizations were charged with transferring thomist “doctrine”, and education became a political tool of the colonizers through the medium of language and religion, as a means to maintain a colonial administration on behalf of the conquerors. Jesuits, Augustinians, Franciscans, Dominics, Mercedarios, and other religious orders, deriving from a Spanish Christian Catholic Colonial heritage, were in charge of education and schooling. This framework, has shaped education in Peru ever since, and has contributed by the same means to a big slide between public education (serving the interests of the State) and private education (serving religious interests). Under this frame, the move for educational compromises, addresses two different tendencies: education at the, or as a, service of the Spanish crown, and education at the, or as a, service of an independent Peru.

Next, the stage of globalization Latin America is involved in, has forced a feeble system of public education in Peru, while defined under the influence of international comparative standardization, what pushes to consider rankings, selection, and competitiveness. And when early educational reforms sought to give a unity to study plans, the process was to be adapted to a western conception. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Enlightenment influences derived from the French and American revolutions, penetrated the Universities in the form of new democratic guidelines. The first Constitutional Act (1870), introduced new educational terms: public education, educational levels, free educational services. Yet *curriculum*, as a term, was not on the agenda, although under US influence, created a new space for the adoption of instrumental rationality. Global education was highlighted at the time (based on geography and history) by Sebastian Lorente (1813-1884), a Spanish pedagogue who came to Peru in the 1840's. The liberal policy adopted in 1855 displayed his influence, and highlighted, for instance, the importance of moral, intellectual, aesthetic and physical education.

The Organic Law in 1901, proposed "teaching subjects helpful for overall social life functions" (Chunga, 2009), while the 1904 Educational Reform aimed to expand Primary Education for all. In addition, the policies between 1904 and 1908 regulated education for employment through suitable school contents and free compulsory attendance. In 1905 (Law 162, Sept. 27<sup>th</sup>), the Republican State assumed overall control of the schools, and the educational debate spread. The educational system was defined around national aims and responded to an organization of educational planning. And since then, curriculum content has depended on the Ministry of Education. Debates around methods of teaching have developed in higher education (Universities and Colleges), while didactic approaches have been proposed to shape teachers professionalism. School practices have been structured to achieve such teaching.

*Study plans, curriculum designs, educational programmes of study*, derive today from a national educational plan passed in 1946 (Mendoza Plane), with specific "programmes of study". It is in 1950, when the Center for Pedagogical Studies was dealing with research and teachers training for Schools of Education. Primary education was left aside. Schools were in charge of transferring cultural knowledge: the doctrine and social values of the state. By 1968, the revolutionary Government profiled a new society through a new educational reform based on "*active education to develop human overall capacities, more participation in education and education as a public debate*", to respond to international pressures ignoring past heritages?, or it is not? *Public education and Private education* coexist in Peru. *Public education as a public good*, includes educational planning, educational supervision, and overall organisation of syllabuses. The State supplies teachers and resources. To make this organisation work, the system is subdivided in Regional Delegations (DRE), Unities for Educational Planning (UGE), Unities for Educational Services (USE).

Under this frame, the system proceeds to control what is to be done in schools, such as, compulsory school assistance, supervision of the syllabuses, participation of teachers in teachers continuous training activities, school informs and projects, and others.

As framed in 1993 Constitutional Act, compulsory schooling expands to Infant (3 to 6 years), Intermediate (6 to 11), and Secondary (12 to 16) stages. The General Educational Law (28044), and the 28740 Law, regulate the National system for Quality, Evaluation and Certification. The 28741 Law regulates the National system for Evaluation, Certification and Accreditation of Quality.

Decentralisation and municipalisation in education is not in the agenda for reasons of scarcity of resources. The *public offer of education* responds to decision making of the Ministry of Education in what refers to school organisation, curriculum contents, planning and expectations. The Ministry of Education determines who deserves the *principle of public interest*. When it is the case of the scarce private schools, only the ones fulfilling the *condition of public interest*, can have access to the economic help of the State, once accredited. Private religious schools can have their own ideological school projects. They can be privately run, but are to be considered under the condition of public interest in order to get founded.

#### DIDACTIC AND CURRICULUM TRADITIONS: CAN WE APPROACH AN INTERNATIONAL SHARED LANGUAGE TO IMPROVE EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES?

Didactic and curriculum traditions have developed in continental Europe. Both traditions in education refer to different practices and have different implications. With the development of liberalism and industrialisation, *curriculum thinking* moved from G. Britain to the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The pragmatic perception of development related to prepare capable students for the market production and consumption, under the frame of “human capital theory”, accommodated under different curricular tendencies. From a different perspective, *didactic tradition*, organized its journey on two different lines following the features which have defined evolution in the different European nation States. Federal Germany, Scandinavian countries, and central Europe, followed decentralised educational tendencies while opened instruction to social participation. France, Italy, Spain, and other southern European countries, instead, got accommodated under centralised versions for educational instruction decision making.

*Religion and politics* have characterised the different tendencies in the *didactic tradition*. Nation states centralised versions, have followed the heritage of the Christian Catholic perception which characterises schooling as a mission

to indoctrinate. As a consequence, external authorities define what has to be taught. Teachers have to follow what it is established, but this frame creates difficulties to confront innovation. When new tasks are to be fulfilled, this comes plus what always has been done, therefore, there will be difficulties to coordinate project based teaching, school participation, and others. The proposals around Condorcet Inform about “laïcité du combat”, and /or “laïcisme”: understood as independence of human beings and society, and participation of the State over any religious organisations, represented the new doctrine known as republicanism. This new doctrine was to be transferred through intentional education and schooling. France could represent the most open educational option as a southern European country getting free from religious dependence on education and schooling in early stages. The new mission of schooling in France, was not to indoctrinate, but to prepare enlightened citizens (Compayré, 1883), not religious servants<sup>4</sup>. Meanwhile, and confronting the laic doctrine in France, countries such as Spain (extending influence to Latin America), or Italy, have been fighting with no much success to get free from the influence of Catholic Church in education and schooling.

In central, northern Europe, instead, the mission of schooling expanded broadly to prepare free spirit citizens with open training (*bildung*) positions close to democratic life and social participation. This happened in countries which developed ideas and practices of decentralisation coming from a Christian protestant and / or Calvinist heritage. In these northern European countries, “teaching to text” developed as a kind of curricular transmission opened to innovation while focussed on flexible project based teaching, school participation, and others. The Prussian plan (1816) represented a first option to rationally organise education and school life according to a “Lehrplan”, which settled curriculum guides, programmes of study, syllabuses... This Plan allowed teachers the option to decide what to teach, or to reinterpret what scheduled depending on the circumstances of their schooling (Hopmann, 2000, 2007). Next, the reorganisation of schooling under welfare State principles, after the II World War, contributed to open the didactic Humboldt oriented version towards new options which relate the school curriculum to *democratic evolution*.

Up till recent times, Anglo American educationist have rejected didactic approaches and interpretations. For Anglo American educationists, “didactic approaches” denote formalist educational practices that combine “dogma” whit “dulness”, that is, “didactic approaches” reference declamatory forms of teaching that merely require listening and excludes dialogue: “European ghosts of an unattractive educational past”. At a time when all knowledge was believed

<sup>4</sup> When in 1906 the Pope Pio X considered a pernicious mistake to separate State and Church, as the order established by God, in 1996, the Bishops in France assumed the difference between Church and State: what to God, what to Caesar, while opening a dialogue about freedom of worship, religion getting to the private space.

to be recorded in early encyclopedia (XVI- XVII centuries), didactic symbolised guaranteed methods of instruction that could be transferred from school to school, a pre- Enlightened meaning referenced in the Anglo-American world (Hamilton, Zufiaurre, Belletich, 2009).

However European “didactic approaches” refer to teaching, not as a technical enterprise, but as a moral dimension that presumes the ethical competence of the teacher. By contrast the notion of “*pedagogy*”, which re-entered the Anglo-American world with fresh meanings for a global dialogue, after 1970, opens its path through the contribution of Paulo Freire (1975) and his “Pedagogy of the oppressed”, while references an approach to the European perception of *didactics*. *Pedagogy* as an “art or science for teaching” and *Didactic* as “science or art for teaching” represent in continental Europe that teacher acquire a moral compass to steer their *didactic* praxis (Hamilton, Zufiaurre, Belletich, 2009). However, if we get to history, pedagogues in classical Greece were responsible for the upbringing of pre-puber males, older children, were to be in charge of teachers with different responsibilities. It is in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, when the relationship between *pedagogy* and *didactics* got to a more elaborated form while incorporating the terms *syllabus*, *curriculum*, *method*, which provided the conceptual infra-structure for modern European schooling (Hamilton, 1999: 138) focussed on teaching, rather than learning, while guided towards an instructional turn. With this, the problematic of *pedagogy*, *curriculum* and *didactics* intersected and became cornerstones in organisation of modern schooling.

The distinction of modern *didactic* and modern *curriculum*, arose from the separation of the activity of teaching from the activity of defining what is taught. The transmission of accumulated inherited teaching: “*doctrine*”, defined medieval times (Southern, 1997). With the time, the teaching of doctrine breams problematic, and scholastic enterprise was to be replaced by new emphasis on classroom aids (manuals and texts), which mapped the curriculum cluster. The modern conception of *didactic* represented the methodisation of doctrinal delivery, but in its evolution, as a human science, educational thought and practices were to be build upon an analysis of the experience of practitioners, what is not reduced to a set of teaching methods, but represents a combination of historical, social and cultural deliberation. In the Anglo American world, deliberative forms of *didactic* analysis, did not find a space. They were eclipsed by applied psychology and scientific management thought in education. This represented, that the new technologies of teaching got to ignore the deliberative dimensions of both: *pedagogy* and *didactic*.

Under this global frame for evolution in the conception of education and schooling, when we get to the sense and meaning of comparative education, it is clear that under circumstances of evolution, comparative education can not focus on geographical boundaries, but on international issues of education (Epstein, 2008). In times when global organisations defend the future of a “learning soci-

ety”, the search for a common language open to cross-national dialogue, becomes important, once much of the international discussion is reduced today to heterogeneity, swallowiness, reductionism and ethnocentrism.

The subject-based curriculum had its roots in the old humanist tradition (Zufiaurre, 2007b) to indoctrinated, while pushing schooling apart from education. Traditional school subjects, facilitate access to cultural heritage, but are not enough to provide social and professional competence. The world of production moves quicker than schooling, which is socially and organisationally conservative. To return to earlier practices: *doctrine transmission*, will serve as a social defence mechanism when science and social evolution develop unevenly (Bunge, 1969). Get back to discipline, order, stiffness and hierarchy, does not drive evolution anywhere. Instead, the purposes and models of schooling, need to be rethought in the light of the new social, personal and productive demands of a technological world, what demands to integrate applied knowledge and to introduce changes in school teaching and learning practices.

In a global interactive world, it is important to learn from past experiences in order to improve school practices while facing the new challenges of schooling today. But at an international level, can we share a common language?, and can we apparently negotiate the same meanings for how education and schooling develop today in the different geographical areas? When it is the case of improving educational practices, what is the sense of international evaluations, such as PISA reports? These reports classify school models, and refer them to rankings which depend on the educational uses and practices developed in the different countries. Why not consider, or take into account, the conditions which have been regulating their specific school practices along History? To classify factual situations of schooling from global perspectives, not from real positions, makes it difficult to clarify how they work, and how can they improve, while learning from others?<sup>5</sup> Under our context of globalization, in which everything can be transferred from one place to another, words can be easily translated from one language to another, the uses of the language can lead to confusing interpretations, but realities cannot be transferred so easily and practices can work otherwise.

For instance, when talking about “*competence based teaching and learning*”, how can “*competence based teaching and learning*” be faced equally following a pattern of subject based teaching from approaches in Spain, or Peru, and/or from approaches in countries which follow an open curricular tradition, where teachers can decide what to do and are able to justify their actions?. If we talk about “competence based” in the British style, when dealing with being compe-

<sup>5</sup> It is to remember that in the move around the United Nations: the OIE-IOE was an intend to organise what and how to learn from others in order to improve what expanded during 1940, 1950', and early 1960's. This could be considered a first move for comparative education.

tent enough to behave in one way, or another, can you prove to know more or less about one subject content in Britain, similarly as it happens in Spain, for example? And following the same argumentation, can *competence based approaches* be interpreted the same way in Germany, or Sweden, for example, as in Spain, Great Britain, or Peru?

Is the meaning of “*public education*”, and schooling, and/or public service, is it being interpreted similarly in Spain, Peru, or France, as it is in G. Britain? If it does not, where do differences lay? How to interpret the sense of *public - municipal education and schooling* in Sweden, comparing with other countries? Must teachers take the decisions, or not? in “*curriculum theory*”, and “*curriculum development*”, or “*curriculum implementation*”, and, what differences emerge in the different countries, and in the different educational traditions, while also in constructivist approaches? when referring to the cognitive, or social approaches to teaching and learning.

Considering *evaluation*, the plurality of terms, models and applications, in the Anglo American curricular world, is very large: *evaluation, assessment, accountability, performance, supervision, benchmarks, rankings...* But does it keep an equivalency in southern European didactically framed countries, or in Latin America, as in the Anglo American world. What about sharing meanings and realities with Sweden and Germany, for example? Can we share the same meanings, in one or other country, when referring to the terms *quality, efficiency, effectiveness*, from the realities of their practices in didactic centralised and decentralised versions, or in pragmatic instrumentalist curricular approaches?

When it gets to refer to teachers as professional elites, professionally competent, or capable, didactically capable, can terms and practices around *teachers professional development*, be shared? Can the different options be interpreted similarly in Spain, France, or Peru, in Germany, or Sweden, in G. Britain, or in the USA? Or when we face the pretensions and *the facts of innovation, reforming education and schooling*, what are the differences, both in sense and meaning, when dealing with requirements of promotion, the spirit of change, or simply, researching to improve education? When trying to include individual differences, or social differences, what about the discourses and practices of *inclusion, integration, compensation, in education*, framed in the different didactic perceptions, or in the different curricular versions? *What about gender studies, and gender pedagogies, or multicultural and intercultural approaches to education and schooling?* when introducing them into school curriculum? And / or what happens when confusing realities about *assimilative models* are transferred under enlightenment ideals as “*laïcité*”, or when diversity is to be faced as a ghetto, differences in rights and duties, being different but being equal?

Does our global world move to new horizons, or does it get back to their past origins, while educational debate and practices move backwards, to past times,

getting involved again in values such as, effort, discipline, timetables, specialization, basics and old contents, etc. In order to educate in the XXIst century, do we have to forget our old histories? How can we readapt to the new times without losing rigour while opening "bildung", or open training educational aims? How can we search our way through a world of multiple information? Do we have to reorganise and re-culture subjects teaching and learning strategies beyond colonial realities and practices? Which subjects, and which school contexts, are to be negotiated and integrated as educational aims for a human rights global society?. What about a multilateral, multicultural, multidimensional core curriculum? How to re-culture the teaching profession as an important profession in the social services arena, not so as a gender degraded pre-professional private task?

## REFERENCES

- Ball, S. 2007. *Education ple: Understanding private sector participation in public sector education*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. 1987. *Class, codes and control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bunge, M. 1969. *Epistemología: ciencia de la ciencia* (Epistemology: Science of Science). Barcelona: Ariel.
- Compayré, G. 1883. *Condorcet. Rapport et Project du Décret sur l'organisation générale de l'instruction publique*. Paris: Hachette.
- Chunga Espinoza, A. 2009. *Historia de la Educación peruana*. En: [www.monografias.com/trabajos32/historia-educacion-peru/](http://www.monografias.com/trabajos32/historia-educacion-peru/) (pp. 31-33).
- Epstein, E.H. 2008. Setting the Normative Boundaries: Critical epistemological benchmarks in comparative education. In *Comparative Education*, 44 (4), (p. 373-386).
- Fenwick I.G.K. 1976. *The comprehensive school 1944-1970*. London: Methuen and Co Ltd.
- Ferrer y Guardia, F. 1976. *La escuela moderna (Modern school)*. Barcelona: Ed. Júcar.
- Freire, P. 1975. *Pedagogía del oprimido* (Pedagogy of the oprimed). Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Gilabert, A. 1982 (Sept.) *Pedro Rosselló: 1897-1970*. Master Thesis. University of Barcelona.
- Hamilton, D. 1999. "The pedagogic paradox (or Why no didactic in England?". In *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*. Oxford. Triangle. Vol. 7 (1) (pp. 135-152).
- Hamilton, D.; Zufiaurre, B. and Belletich, O. 2009 (Sept.). "An International perspective on analytical tools in curriculum and didactics". Paper at the European Conference of Educational Research. Section: *Understanding curriculum and didactics*.
- Herbart, J.F. 1982. *The science of education: Its general principles deduced from its aim and the aesthetic revelation of the world*. London. Swann Sonnerstein.
- Hopmann, I.S. 2000. "Klafki's model of Didaktik analysis and lesson planning in

- Teacher Education". In: Westbury, I., Hopmann, I.S., Riquarts, S.K. (Eds.): *Teaching as reflective practice: The German didaktik tradition*. Mahwah, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates (pp. 15-39).
- , 2007. "Restrained teaching. The common core of Didaktik". In: *European Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 6 (2) (pp. 109-124).
- Jones, K. 1983. *Beyond progressive education*. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Lundgreen, U.P. 1982 (April). "Between schooling and education: Notes of curriculum changes within the second generation of school reforms in Sweden". Paper at *AERA Conference* (p. 26).
- Mendo, J.V. 2009. "Concepción de currículo: Espacio para la reflexión, el cuestionamiento, la crítica, la investigación y la innovación docente". In: *Revista virtual Investigando*: <http://investigando.org/educandos> (pp. 1-11).
- Noah, H. and Eckstein, M. 1969. *Towards a science of comparative education*. London: Macmillan.
- Rossello, P. 1960/78. *La teoría de las corrientes educativas*. UNESCO Regional Office. La Habana / Barcelona: Promoción Cultural.
- Simon, B. & Taylor, W. 1981. *Education in the eighties*. London: Batsford.
- Stock, R.; Suchodolski, B. et al. 1979. *La OIE al servicio del movimiento educativo*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2000. *Education for all: Meeting our collective commitment*. Dakar framework for action. Paris: UNESCO.
- Zufiaurre, B. 1994. *Procesos y contradicciones de la reforma educativa, 1982-1994*. Barcelona: Icaria.
- , 1999. "Comprehensive polyvalent schooling. Option for a technological future". In *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*. Oxford: Triangle. Vol. 7 (1) (p. 153-169).
- , 2007a. *¿Se puede cambiar la educación sin contar con el profesorado? Reflexiones sobre 36 años de cambios en España, 1970-2006*. Barcelona: Octaedro.
- , 2007b. "Education and schooling: from modernity to postmodernity". In *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*. Roudledge . Oxfordshire. Vol. 15 (2) (139-151).
- Zufiaurre, B. (Ed.). 2002. *Comprensividad, desarrollo productivo y justicia social*. Madrid: CCS. (2nd Ed. Revised).
- Zufiaurre, B. and Pellejero, L. 2000. "Woman infant school teacher. How does society and how do they considerer their professional role?" In: *Pedagogy Cultural and Society*. Vol 8 (2) (pp. 207-218).
- Zufiaurre, B. y Pellejero, L. 2010. *Formación didáctica para docentes*. Madrid: CCS.