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Today’s rapidly evolving global landscape challenges educational researchers to look beyond national boundaries and to critically evaluate the way that we approach questions of educational importance. In response to these challenges, Geoff Whitty and John Furlong (2017) embark on a novel endeavor to expand how educational studies have heretofore been analysed in the United Kingdom. Cautioning against a parochial worldview, Whitty and Furlong invited scholars from France, Germany, Latvia, Australia, China, the USA, as well as the UK, to discuss the diverse ways that educational studies as an academic discipline has developed within their respective jurisdictions. As explained by the editors themselves, they were initially interested in exploring how other countries have reconciled academic knowledge traditions (the study of education) with their practical implications (teacher education). However, it is through this intellectual exploration that Whitty and Furlong acknowledge that not all knowledge traditions have found a way, or even aspired to, bridge the gap between theoretical and practical knowledge. Consequently, there are passages where the contributing authors creatively weave together disparate orientations in order to respond to the book’s initial goals. This feat can certainly be appreciated by academics, even if implications for teacher education remain largely implicit. The book ultimately focuses on the broader social, political and historical dimensions that have affected the development of educational studies in different contexts around the world. This direction is just as valuable and is arguably more adapted to the diversity of educational histories shared within this volume.

The book is divided into four sections, beginning with the editors’ comprehensive introductory chapter. Here, the editors utilise Bernstein’s sociology of knowledge as their analytical framework. This perspective reflects the idea that university “knowledge traditions have a political life” and, as such, can be debated and change over time (p. 15). This perspective supports their cross-case analysis and serves as a common thread throughout the book.
Part 2 is comprised of relatively standalone chapters that take the reader through each of the six countries’ particular social and ideological histories. In Chapter 2, Malet traces the history of les sciences de l’éducation in France back to its institutionalisation within the university over a century ago. It is through these historical accounts that we learn that educational research in France today has largely remained a coordinated effort amongst what is often considered the “foundation disciplines”—psychology, sociology, history, economics and philosophy. Compared to other European countries, les sciences de l’éducation in France remain relatively distanced from teacher education. In Chapter 3, Schriewer describes how teacher training institutions in Germany were integrated into universities beginning in the 1960s, partly in recognition of the high standards demanded of future teachers. While the integration of teacher education into universities raised awareness of empirical directions within educational studies, Schreiwer remains critical as to whether any meaningful alignment between teacher education and educational research has actually taken place.

In the next four chapters, we turn to cases where knowledge traditions have been largely impacted by external pressures. Compelled to integrate the European model of educational studies at a time when political movements pushed for Latvia’s entry into the European Union, Žogla (Ch. 4) recounts how the field of education experienced transformations that challenged, though they did not replace, Latvia’s deeply rooted philosophical foundations in Pedagoģija. This framework, defined as a “philosophy-in-use”, conceptualized and guided teaching practice and can be compared to Groundwater-Smith and Mockler’s description (Ch. 5) of the “critical/emancipatory” knowledge interests (how one should teach) challenging the technical knowledge interests (how to teach) in Australia today. Groundwater-Smith and Mockler argue that this theoretical-practical dichotomy has been further aggravated by the Australian government’s call for evidence-based teaching practice and large-scale analyses which, they believe, under-value contextual factors and nuanced variations.

Relatedly, Wen and Weihe highlight issues of national identity within educational studies in China (Ch. 6). The authors demonstrate how cultural and disciplinary coherence have been challenged by globalisation and dominant Western traditions. Ironically, Western traditions have also been the object of criticism from local sources. Indeed, Paine (Ch. 7) portrays a rather negative picture of recent institutional shifts in education departments in the United States. Paine describes a general disappointment in education faculties in the early 2000s that pushed scholars and policy makers to seek impact and experimental methods deemed to be more “scientific.” Focusing on the tensions surrounding notions of rigour and accountability in educational research, Paine, like Groundwater-Smith and Mockler, questions whether
large-scale performance assessment mechanisms, fueled by trends toward market efficiency and accountability, really encourage the quality teacher education that they claim to promote.

Part 3 is devoted to theories and specific cases that further explore education as a field of study. This includes Hordern’s in-depth presentation of Bernstein’s sociology of knowledge (Ch. 8), McCulloch’s investigation of interdisciplinarity in the UK (Ch. 9), Kuhlee and Winch’s analysis of the teaching “archetypes” underpinning teachers’ knowledge in England and Germany (Ch. 10), and Tatto and Hordern’s cross-country analysis of mathematics teacher education (Ch. 11). Two main ideas can be drawn from these chapters: first, that understanding the social and epistemic nature of knowledge structures is an essential part of successfully transferring knowledge from theory to practice; and, second, that different conceptualisations of what teaching and education should look like affect the manner in which education theory is studied, although various methods may be adopted.

In the final section of the book, David Labaree ends with a brief overview wherein he comments on three main tensions running across the examples given in the book: normative versus objective values, abstract versus practical knowledge, and multidisciplinary versus interdisciplinary perspectives. These common tensions point to a fourth and fundamental question: what is the purpose of education and educational research in society today? Indeed, the unique cases presented in this book encourage scholars to critically reflect on the diverse trajectories that have made educational knowledge what it is today. More importantly, they urge scholars to resist insular mindsets and consider how we might envision the future of education, both locally and globally, this in light of diverse traditions.
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