Educational Research: the Educationalization of Social Problems

Educational Research

VOLUME 3

Aims & Scope

Freedom of inquiry in educational research can no longer be taken for granted. Narrow definitions of what constitutes 'scientific' research, funding criteria that enforce particular research methods, and policy decision processes that ignore any research that is not narrowly utilitarian, in many countries, create a context that discourages scholarship of a more speculative, exploratory, or critical sort.

In this series, internationally leading scholars in *philosophy and history of education* engage in discourse that is sophisticated and nuanced for understanding contemporary debates. Thus social research, and therefore educational research, is again focused on the distinctive nature of what it studies: a social activity where questions of meaning and value must be addressed, and where interpretation and judgment play a crucial role.

This educational research takes into account the historical and cultural context and brings clarity to what actually constitutes science in this area. The timely issues that are addressed in this series bear witness to the belief that educational theory cannot help but go beyond a limited conception of empirical educational research to provide a real understanding of education as a human practice. They surpass the rather simple cause-and effect rhetoric and thus transgress the picture of performativity that currently keeps much of the talk about education captive. The authors are united in the belief that 'there is a place within the social sciences in general', and within the discipline of education in particular, for 'foundational' approaches that enable the systematic study of educational practice from a discipline-orientated approach.

Paul Smeyers · Marc Depaepe
Editors

Educational Research: the Educationalization of Social Problems

Editors
Prof. Paul Smeyers
Universiteit Gent
Faculteit Psychologie en
Pedagogische Wetenschappen
Dunantlaan 1
9000 Gent
Belgium
paulus.smeyers@ugent.be

Prof. Marc Depaepe
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Campus Kortrijk
Subfaculteit Psychologie en
Pedagogische Wetenschappen
Sabbelaan 53
8500 Kortrijk
Belgium
marc.depaepe@kuleuven-kortrijk.be

Printed on acid-free paper

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

springer.com

Contents

Chapter 1
Introduction–Pushing Social Responsibilities: The *Educationalization* of Social Problems

Paul Smeyers and Marc Depaepe

One does not have to look hard to find examples of the educationalization of social problems. Glancing through newspapers gives ample choice of what could come under this heading. For example, in February 2008 a local newspaper reports[1] that a number of companies in and around the port of Zeebrugge are facing staff shortages. To tackle this problem they are trying to convince young graduates to apply for jobs in this sector. However, as the newspaper points out, generally students are not terribly attracted to courses that focus on shipping and logistics – such courses are held in low esteem. Moreover, although the notion that such courses represent a typically male world unconducive to female candidates no longer holds, few women attend them. Consequently, the regional social–economic committee of Bruges decided some time ago to respond to this need in order to change the image that children and young people have of working at the harbour. It therefore asked K.U. Leuven's centre for informative games to develop an 'educational' game that challenges its players to develop the area of a port. This should involve a sense of balance that takes on board the relationship between port activities, the natural environment, tourism, mobility issues and housing conditions. The resources needed to allow trade to prosper have to be earned in the 'foreland game', where goods are imported and processed, and in the 'hinterland game', where goods are transported by inland waterways, by train and by road. The new game will be designed to fit in with the 'Anticipating Change' project, where the port regions of Zeebrugge and Hull are arming themselves against, and thus preparing themselves for, the rapidly changing economy.

Transferring these kinds of 'social' responsibility to the school is a phenomenon that historians are familiar with. It is a process that has been underway for a long time. Who does not recall the 'day' or 'week of . . .' from one's own schooldays, where special attention was paid to one or other social problem that was clearly only touched upon by the traditional curriculum. This would include paying attention to road safety, healthy eating, polished speech and manners, alcohol abuse and animal welfare. Such practices undoubtedly continue nowadays. In the history of Belgium's

P. Smeyers (✉)
Ghent University, K.U. Leuven, Belgium
e-mail: paulus.smeyers@ugent.be

educational system this form of 'occasional' education was nearly institutionalized in what was called the 'school for Life' at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries.[2] It may be seen as a compromise: the progressive educational reform and its call for emancipation of the child were channelled in the direction of 'adapted social-ization', the hallmark of real 'education' since the Enlightenment. In exchange for obedience towards authority, children acquired some knowledge and skills (and thus the opportunity to acquire a good position, or as the case may be, to climb up the established social order). It was not in the least bit coincidental that 'school savings' (of money), 'temperance associations' concerning the consumption of alcohol and 'school mutual societies' (in view of mutual help) were propagated in Belgium at the end of the 19th century. Such interventions were seen as effective ways of solving the social issue of poverty and of resisting the threats of socialism and seculariza-tion. A permanent feature of the school for Life was the notion that education should foster the economic expansion of Belgium, which of course targeted Congo. Prac-tically all primary school subjects focused attention on the colony. Subjects such as history and geography went to great lengths to detail the enterprise and courage of colonists who went to Africa and emphasized how much the colonized people enjoyed the 'benefactions' of Leopold II. Such themes also found their way into reading classes and dictation exercises, in writing business letters, in the problems they were confronted with and, last but not least, in school trips (to the port of Antwerp for example).

Insofar as this form of 'adapted socialization' constituted the core of a changing vision of education and the perception that social problems could and would be solved by education, it can be regarded as paradigmatic of Modernity. 'Looking ahead' and 'hard work', combined with the cultivation of frugality, obedience, use-fulness, patriotism, decency, health, hygiene and so on, belonged to the essence of good citizenship, which in the course of the 19th and 20th centuries would, despite resistance, be gradually assimilated by the 'people'. Thus, according to historians of personal life,[3] the grand 'fight' against alcoholism among 'workers' was orches-trated in such a way that the conductors presented themselves as apostles of civil re-spectability. They generally wanted to improve others (as well as themselves), gather knowledge and rise above the level of their superiors. This explains why they pretty much blindly adopted (e.g. through education) the values and standards of the dom-inant class. Some authors even speak of a genuine 'civilization offensive'[4] through which the dominant classes were able to impose their values by inducing imitation,[5] though the resistance to it may probably be seen as a 'civilization defence'.[6] The solution to social problems (such problems were tackled within educational settings) created new ones, which, in their turn, could be tackled 'educationally'. This set off a spiral of educationalization as it were, the effects of which can easily be identified in the 19th and 20th centuries. An increased longing for individual freedom along-side the fear of abusing it characterized the internalization of the increasingly strict requirements. This involved a spiral of ever advancing modernization, medicaliza-tion, hygienization, privatization, etc. As a process, this phenomenon resulted in the fleshing out of a clearly demarcated set of social roles and expectations (father as the head of the household, the breadwinner, the idea of motherly love, civic duty,

respect for elders, employers, property, etc.) that ensured the rise of the (neo-)liberal, (neo-)capitalist market economy and which endeavoured to 'tame' the individual into accepting this form of society.[7]

It is thus not surprising that the notion of 'educationalization' (or 'pedagogization' – the concept is derived from the German '*Pädagogisierung*') was taken by educational historians, (who paid inadequate attention to philosophical considerations), as an umbrella term for the modernization process. This process became stronger in terms of upbringing and education from the 18th century onwards.[8] In this book the historically generated 'container concept' is dissimulated through the confrontation with the philosophy of education.[9] This kind of approach is a common feature of annual Leuven interdisciplinary seminars on the history and philosophy of education and has been remarked on before in previous introductions.[10]

In their contribution *Marc Depaepe*, *Frederik Herman*, *Malanie Surmont*, *Angelo Van Gorp and Frank Simon* admit that during the last decades they have treated the term 'pedagogization' as an essential research category to depict the general orientation of central processes and developments in the history of education. Following Ulrich Herrmann, they insist that this concept must be identified with the quantitative as well as qualitative expansion of the 'educational' ('pedagogical') intervention(s) in society. The increase in the number of child-raising and educational institutions was, according to them, accompanied by an increasing importance of the 'educational' gaze on society, even in sectors that initially did not belong to the professional fields of teachers, educators, psychologists and the like (which led, of course, to the annexation, i.e. colonization of new markets for educational experts). Aiming to describe one of the sub-processes of the 'modernization' of society, the educationalization/pedagogization concept was intended to be a neutral one. As a result of some internal contradictions and paradoxes, this concept (as a 'container' concept) acquired more or less negative (and even ironic) connotations. It was argued that educationalization did not lead to emancipation but contributed to the infantilization and subjection of the mind in order to serve the one-sided desiderata of a neo-conservative society. Against the background of such developments, Depaepe et al. gave the concept of pedagogization a more concrete place in the history of education, namely as the pedagogical basic semantic of the so-called 'grammar of schooling'. According to them this interpretation can be successfully developed as an essential component of a historical 'school theory'. This is due to the fact that the moral (even theological) dimension that lay at the heart of the pedagogization process at its inception had, in the meantime, been replaced by a psychological one. But this observation obviously does not constitute the end of pedagogization.

Taking us back a couple of centuries, *Daniel Tröhler* addresses the educationalization of the modern world. At the turn of the 17th to the 18th century, western Europe experienced a dramatic shift in its economic structure that challenged the kind of political ideals that had dominated up to then. A particularly prominent expression of this process is the founding of the Bank of England in 1694, which partook in an understanding of politics that viewed it as the object of private interests and therefore presented politics as a sphere that was largely indifferent to moral

questions. This kind of development evoked public criticism – commerce was accused of inciting the passions of the people. Passion was seen as being coterminous with femininity and by dint of this association, with desire and hysteria. In order to transcend this gender-biased conflict between passion and reason, two things needed to be dealt with during the 18th century. First, the nature of woman had to be domesticated, and botany was promoted so as to instil order in women. Second, the passions had to be separated from commerce and thus vocation from politics. The solution of this latter task was generated in the Reformed Protestant context, and it was in principle educational: The soul of the young should be strengthened in order to overcome the temptations of commerce, wealth and power. This educational paradigm successfully and enduringly promised to safeguard the modern world against possible dangers of modernity. Ever since, ideas of progress and concepts of education have been closely connected.

Next *Lynn Fendler* focuses on how educationalization has been characterized over time by a peculiar interweaving of knowledge and social reform. She offers a historical and critical analysis of changes in features of educationalization. The histories of the American Social Science Association written by Mary Furner and James Kaminsky provide a backdrop for this analysis of the interdependent relationship between knowledge and social reform. Drawing on the writings of Deleuze, the chapter highlights historical differences between previous and current educationalization features in research and schooling. Deleuze's depiction of 'societies of control' provides a framework for the analysis that distinguishes control societies from disciplinary societies. Fendler's chapter brings Deleuze's theory into conversation with standards, norms and practices in educational research. Three components of Deleuze's theory are outlined: an increased frequency of monitoring interventions, which is evident in the intensification of assessment mechanisms in both schooling and research, the multiplication and diversity of accountability standards, which is evident in models such as $360°$ evaluation and the foreclosure of possibilities for completion, which is exemplified in trends towards lifelong learning. Examples from educational research and teaching are cited to illustrate each of these trends. Building on the Deleuzian analysis, the chapter then examines characteristics of problem-based learning, which is a fashionable curricular approach that originated in the education of medical students. Problem-based learning is an example of the interweaving of knowledge and social reform because it casts education as an engineering task. In PBL, the purpose of education is to solve social problems. Education-as-problem-solving is contrasted with a very different sort of utilitarianism that was articulated by J.S. Mill. The chapter concludes with a critical analysis of norm-referenced standards in educational research and schooling, questioning the relationship between education and empowerment.

Lynda Stone takes up the organizing concept of the present volume. She looks at e*ducationalization* or *pedagogization* in the particular historical, cultural, social, political and centrally educational context of the United States. By being framed within a strongly historicist philosophical stance, a distinct concept, *educationalization*, is manifest. Educationalization manifests itself within writings that range from government documents to cultural studies accounts. It is discursive, permeating the

discourses of institutional practices that are themselves underpinned by rhetorical conceptions. Being situated in historicist philosophy and the concept of historicism, the chapter is organized so as to account for three aspects of an institutional present 'surrounded' by two major forms of rhetoric. The 'standard account' constituted of commonly held terms and understandings that organize positions towards institution and rhetoric helps us to make sense of these aspects of an institutional present and their rhetorical forms. Examples that are alluded to in this chapter include schooling movements, sections of No Child Left Behind, Structures of the Disciplines, Character Education, contemporary classroom discipline and responses to youth culture. Themes of 'reform' and 'crisis' are woven through such examples. This chapter draws on philosophical contributions from the likes of John Dewey, George Counts Nel Noddings and Ian Hacking. Historical inspiration is provided by Marc Depaepe, David Tyack and Thomas Popkewitz, while ideological positionings are taken from politicians such as Hyram Rickover, William Bennett and George W. Bush, and social–cultural interpretations from researchers James Coleman and George Lipsitz. The intent, overall, is to complement but extend a broad general conception of education and schooling in the west through a particular philosophical rendering.

Kathleen Coessens and Jean Paul Van Bendegem argue that Bourdieu's analysis of dominant forces in society, linking economic capital (objective, material goods and means) with cultural capital (subjective experiences, habits and taste), has revealed hidden factors that are relevant to the education of youngsters. The authors analyse the evolution of the concept of cultural education, that is to say the transmission and objectification of cultural taste in educational processes. The field of education contributes to the transmission and the 'seemingly natural' interiorization of dominant cultural values. A lot has been written on the influence of cultural capital on educational attainment. In the past, these dominant patterns were clearly defined and received the label of 'high' or 'elite' culture, reflecting social stratification. Today, we are witnessing the emergence of a variety of lifestyles brought together in the figure of the 'cultural omnivore'. Such a figure is the product of social, cultural and technological change on a global scale. Reflecting on this evolution allows the authors to ask particular questions and raise certain issues. How are these new patterns, which take the form of symbolic discourses and a semiotics of practices, sustaining ideas of globalization, democratization and postmodernist conceptions expressed in educational discourses? Are educational researchers aware of the merging of these processes, or are they just caught up in current practices and forms of transmission of cultural capital? Thus they end with some reflections on the need for a genuinely reflexive and ethical attitude concerning the educationalization of cultural capital.

Nancy Vansieleghem and Bruno Vanobbergen argue that today progressive education has become a main 'interest' in speaking and thinking about education. Producers as well as consumers of education are attracted by alternative forms of education in their search for optimizing the quality of education. The general aim is to indicate how a particular kind of 'educationalization' is active through the use of the contemporary discourse on progressive education. Their research does not aim to denounce the idea of progressivism as a myth, but to analyse the conditions

within which the discussion on progressive education has been possible. In their analysis they make use of three examples. The first one addresses the similarity one may recognize between progressive education and learning theories. The second one concerns the speech delivered by the Flemish minister of education, Frank Vandenbroucke, at the occasion of the 10th anniversary of FOPEM (The Flemish Federation of Independent, Pluralistic and Emancipatory Schools). The third deals with the starterkit for progressive schools. These examples *present* the way in which people are addressed today as individuals who have to look at themselves and others as investors in added value, both at the level of the producer and at the level of the consumer of education. Aligned with Foucault, it is argued that the actual discourse on education that welcomes progressive education is not imposed by a political party or by a group of intellectuals but meets a historical reality that forces us to relate ourselves in a particular way both to others and to ourselves. The second part explores the nature of a true alternative, one in which the critique of what we are is at the same time the analysis of the limits that are imposed on us. Inspired by the Célestin Freinet, this alternative can be considered as writing a free text, i.e. looking for a possibility to think something different that might serve to liberate us. Consequently, a certain kind of 'experience' is alluded to that takes precedent over epistemological questions.

Geertrui Smedts claims that what it means to be a parent today is framed technologically: educational researchers and those in the field of writing about and working with parents cannot help but see things in technological terms. That is hardly surprising, – we are people of our time: ICT has insinuated itself into our lives. Writing about parents and the Internet are forms of practical utterance that reflect this condition. It is therefore not the case that, in such writings, the computer is simply a mere artefact or tool that parents should get to know of in order to educate their children. Rather such writings exemplify the fact that the meaning of being a parent has been reduced to something technological. Educational research contributes to the continuation of this -ization, reducing parents to mere executors of tips and tricks that they are supposed to have learnt. She argues that this tendency is not new: technologization has its predecessors in medicalization and more generally in educationalization. Educationalization is present within technologization as the latter embraces the paradox of wanting to emancipate versus wanting to control or patronize. Technologization is just another dominant construct that frames our uncertainties, anxieties and problems when something new comes to light. This dominance is dangerous as it serves to provide a narrow lens on what it means to be a parent. Smedts therefore proposes that educational research should acknowledge that it is indeed yet another human construct that might have taken a different form. This also implies that what it means to be a parent might also have been different. She concludes that parents should be provoked into being more self-reliant and therefore attentive to what adherence to technological thinking means and how it may be exceeded by life experiences.

The introduction of citizenship education in England and elsewhere is often seen, *Naomi Hodgson* claims, as a response to contemporary social problems including a lack of democratic participation, anti-social behaviour, immigration and

globalization. She views citizenship education as an example of the educationalization of such social problems. The way in which educational research has responded to the introduction of citizenship education in England is illustrated by a review of research, policy and practice over the last 10 years commissioned by the British Educational Research Association. Hodgson argues that this review exemplifies work done within field of education policy sociology. Education policy sociology is derived from its parent discipline of sociology, being structured around the same concepts but lacking critical theoretical engagement with them. Instead, such concepts are operationalized in service of educational policy solutions. Such work is therefore conducted in the language of the policy it seeks to critically assess. A reading of the review identifies three dominant discourses – the academic discourse of education policy sociology, contemporary political discourse and the discourse of inclusive education. Hodgson draws attention to the relationships between citizenship education, policy and educationalization. The use of Foucault's concept of normalization in the study of educationalization is reconsidered following Depaepe's suggestion that it is inappropriate. This enables further consideration of contemporary policy and the relationship of research to it. Normalization is then discussed in terms of the demand on the contemporary subject to orient the self in a certain relationship to learning informed by the need for competitiveness in the European and global context. Hodgson argues that the language and rhetoric of education policy sociology implicates such research in the process of educationalization itself.

The next chapter, by *Michael Watts*, addresses educationalization by considering policies intended to widen participation in higher education in the United Kingdom and the apparent reluctance of educational researchers to interrogate those policies. The central argument is that the drive to widen participation has taken on a life of its own and that educational researchers typically fail to ask whether those policies can tackle the economic and social problems that underpin and justify them. This argument makes use of Jean Baudrillard's notion of the hyperreal whereby the link between the real and its representation is severed, as the representation of the real becomes its own reality. The economic and social justice bases of widening participation policies are examined, questioned and found to be wanting. In line with Baudrillard's perspective, it is suggested that widening participation is not happening. The chapter concludes with the assertion that by framing social problems as educational problems and by leaving higher education to deal with them, there is a risk that educational researchers are seduced by the government's policies and fail to notice that the strategies they generate all too often perpetuate the very social injustices they are intended to overcome.

In the changes that have occurred in Western education in the last two decades we have seen, *Jim Marshall* argues, national education systems moving from what may have been called a liberal education to a technocratic and entrepreneurial form of education. In New Zealand's past, such education took place in science departments, polytechnics and industrial settings. Within the last two decades polytechnics have either become universities or offer university courses. Whereas industry in the past shared the cost of qualifications through apprenticeship schemes and day release to

training institutions such as polytechnics, this has mainly been abandoned. Marshall argues that the process of entering the knowledge economy has been pushed right back to secondary and primary education. Therefore, social problems (as perceived by the State) have been educationalized. He argues that this situation is not unique to New Zealand. This paper looks first at Charles de Gaulle's efforts, mainly during the 1960s, to unite government, the military, industry, business and education for economic, military and social reasons. Marshall introduces the example of de Gaulle because the latter wished to bring these ideas to fruition as early as 1944 when he returned to France upon the liberation of Paris. This example provides an early case of modern educationalization in regard to the knowledge economy. After identifying several strategies in the French example, the chapter turns to the different example of New Zealand's educationalization of their economic, social and educational 'problems' in the 1980s and 1990s. Writing as an historian of ideas, Marshall, in drawing such a comparison, is concerned with the strategies adopted to *initiate* changes in education – the *how* – rather than the content of such changes.

Tom Popkewitz considers the thesis of pedagogicalization through focusing on the cultural theses generated around the family and child in American social and education sciences. Science embodies particular forms of expertise that function as the shepherds of what is (im)possible to know and do. It constructs the limits in accordance with which experiences are acted upon and the self is located as an actor in the world. Popkewitz argues that at the turn of the 20th century, Pedagogicalization can be identified as the *educationalization* of the family that rationalized the home to socialize the child for collective social belonging, and in the turn of the 21st century as the *pedagogicalization* of the family as lifelong learners, a mode of living as continuous innovation, self-evaluation and monitoring one's life without any apparent social centre. The notions of reason and 'reasonable people' embodied in the different kinds of expertise, however, do not merely refer to who the child is and should be. They entail double gestures of inclusion and exclusion. The expertise of the social and education sciences is a particular historical practice that emerged in the 19th century and mutates into the present. It has two overlapping qualities in modern societies. Science is the calculated knowledge about social and personal relations, such as knowledge pertaining to research about learning. It is knowledge brought into daily life for ordering personal experiences and takes on board the 'rationality' involved in planning one's biography and thinking about 'learning'. His approach is a History o*f the Present*; thus he considers how objects of the present become knowable components of reality and are shaped, fashioned and change position due to diverse conditions of possibility. Knowledge is the political. It partitions the sensible through the principles generated about the objects of reflection and action. Furthermore, the practices that generate cultural theses about modes of life are simultaneously processes of casting out and excluding what does not fit into normalized spaces.

A somewhat similar focus is provided by *Maarten Simons and Jan Masschelein* who draw attention to the concepts of 'educationalization' and 'the grammar of schooling' in the light of the overwhelming importance of 'learning' today. Facing

the current importance of learning they doubt whether the school/education-oriented concepts of 'educationalization', the 'grammar of schooling' and the related historical-analytical perspectives, are still useful to understand the present state of things. Additionally, they want to indicate that concepts such as 'disciplinary power' and 'panopticism' are no longer adequate for an understanding of what is at stake in so-called 'learning societies'. The term 'learning apparatus' is suggested as both an alternative concept to address these issues and a point of departure for an analysis that focuses on the 'grammar of *learning*'. For this analysis, they draw on Foucault and in particular on his understanding of governmentality. They use the formula 'governmentalization of learning': learning has become a matter of both government and self-government. In order to describe the governmentalization of learning and the assemblage of a 'learning apparatus' today, they indicate how the concept of learning, being disconnected from education and teaching, has been used to refer to a kind of *capital*. Such *capital* is something for which the learner herself is *responsible,* something that can and should be *managed* and something that has to be *employable*. Furthermore, they elaborate how these discourses are currently combined and play a crucial role in advanced liberalism that seeks to promote entrepreneurship. They explain that entrepreneurship implies an *adaptation ethics* based on self-mobilization through learning, and that advanced liberalism draws upon a kind of *learning apparatus* to secure adaptation for each and all. In the conclusion, they focus on the mode of power within the learning apparatus.

Richard Smith argues that philosophy itself has been the victim of a kind of *Pädagogisierung*. It has been subjected to many attempts to school it and render it orderly – to establish a definitive method for the practice of philosophy. The attempt to discover and stipulate method is of course characteristic of modernity. This chapter discusses one such attempt, R.G. Collingwood's classic *Philosophical Method* (1933). Collingwood argues that philosophy must avoid figurative language, on the grounds that it provides a distraction from thought. The aspiration here is reminiscent of the logical positivists' attempt to identify the crystalline purity of the logical a priori order of the world, and of the employment by some analytical philosophers of education of mathematical tropes, as if these guaranteed clarity of thinking and 'rigour'. These enterprises are cognate with the general effect of educational research to represent the business of education as tidy and prosaic. Clarity, however, while of course desirable, is itself a metaphor. Collingwood's own text makes considerable and often vivid use of figurative language, and his claim that the philosopher 'must go to school with the poets' is layered and revealing. Metaphoricity and even rhetoricity are ineliminable from philosophy as from other uses of language, and the boundary between philosophy and literature is not a secure one. Both are all the more complex and more interesting for it. To acknowledge this is to admit a richer range of language to thinking about questions of education and thus to conceive education itself more richly and with greater sensitivity to its diversity, nuances and differences.

In the final chapter, *Paul Standish* observes that Marc Depaepe's adoption of the idea of 'educationalization' offers us a new word and a new concept. He then goes on to consider how we analyse concepts and think about what is involved in creating

a concept. This chapter begins by identifying Depaepe's reasons for taking up the term 'educationalization'. It goes on to consider the obvious prominence of the idea of the 'concept' in philosophy, particularly analytical philosophy, but then seeks to show the limitations of an emphasis on the purely logical aspects of concepts to the neglect of their occurrence within sentences in natural languages. The language of marketing is taken as a striking example of ways in which concepts are mobilized to achieve effects beyond their referential function. This recognition lays the way for the consideration of the idea of the concept in Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's *What Is Philosophy*? The qualities of thinking that they are concerned with promoting are compared with Bill Readings' account (in *The University in Ruins*) of the importance of 'Thought'. The strengths of Deleuze and Guattari's approach are emphasized as means to richer ways of thinking about education, with the speculation that the concept of educationalization might be fruitfully exploited to this end.

In the Afterword, *Paul Smeyers* reflects on the preoccupations of the Research Community *Philosophy and history of the discipline of education. Evaluation and evolution of the criteria for educational research.* Starting from the initial questions that this group of scholars had set themselves a decade ago, he focuses on the picture of educational research that emerges from the detailed analyses. Thus attention is also given to the convergence of the studies of these philosophers and historians of education with the present state of the art.

Notes

1. *Het Volk*, February 18th 2008, p. 23.
2. Depaepe, M. (1999). The school, cornerstone of modern society. In *Guide of the Municipal Education Museum of Ypres* (Ieper, Stedelijke Musea, pp. 3–20).
3. Aries, Ph., & Duby, G. (1999). *Histoire de la vie privée* (*De la Révolution à la Grande Guerre*). Paris: Seuil.
4. Kruithof, B. (2004). *De deugdzame natie. Het burgerlijk beschavingsoffensief van de Maatschappij tot Nut van 't Algemeen tussen 1784 en 1860*. Retrieved from *http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/ krui019deug01_01/*
5. Cf. the civilization process of Elias, Elias, N. (1969). Über den Prozess der Zivilisation. Soziogenetische und psychogenetische Untersuchungen. II: Wandlungen der Gesellschaft. Entwurf zu einer Theorie der Zivilisation (Revised edition). Bern: Francke (originally published in 1939).
6. Simon, F., & Van Damme, D. (1989). De pedagogisering van de kinderlijke leefwereld. De "Ligue de l'enseignement" en de oorsprong van enkele para-scolaire initiatieven. In E. Verhellen, F. Spiesschaert, L. Cattrijsse, & L. Apostel (Eds.), *Rechten van kinderen. Een tekstbundel van de Rijksuniversiteit Gent naar aanleiding van de Uno-Conventie voor de Rechten van het Kind* (pp.151–181). Antwerpen: Kluwer.
7. According to a concept of I. Hacking, cf. Hacking, I. (1992). *The taming of chance. Ideas in context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Depaepe, M. (1998). Educationalisation: A key concept in understanding the basic processes in the history of Western education. *History of Education Review, 27*(2), 16–28.
9. In an issue of 2008 *Educational Theory* (Vol. 58 number 4) published a number of contributions focused on 'Educationalization: The conceptualization of an ongoing Modernization process' with contributions by Marc Depaepe & Paul Smeyers, Maarten Simons & Jan

Masschelein, Naomi Hodgson, Bert Lambeir & Stefan Ramaekers, David Labaree, and David Bridges.

10. Cf. Smeyers, P., & Depaepe, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Beyond empiricism. On criteria for educational research*. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Smeyers, P., & Depaepe, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Educational research: Why 'What works' doesn't work*. Dordrecht: Springer; and Smeyers, P., & Depaepe, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Educational research: Networks and technologies*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Chapter 2
About Pedagogization: From the Perspective of the History of Education

Marc Depaepe, Frederik Herman, Melanie Surmont,
Angelo Van Gorp and Frank Simon

> *Es ist die Überzeugtheit des Rechts zur planenden*
> *Manipulierung des 'ganzen Menschen' unter dem*
> *Aspekt und der Verantwortung der 'Bildung' und 'sozialen*
> *Gerechtigkeit'. Das 'Totalitäre' darin ist die*
> *Pädagogisierung des Menschen und der Gesellschaft,*
> *die hier als selbstverständlicher Anspruch vorgetragen wird.*[1]
>
> (Schelsky, 1961, p. 161)

For history researchers, it is not a needless luxury to consider from time to time the content and the significance of the basic concepts they use, certainly if they have the ambition to interpret and/or explain history in addition to purely describing it. This self-reflection, compelled by the annually recurring dialogue with educational philosophers (cf. Smeyers & Depaepe, 2006),[2] need not necessarily place an emphasis on philosophical abstraction but can just as well start from an examination of the history of one's own research. Such an approach need not succumb to navel-gazing. Instead, such historical self-reflection possibly points to the creeping (and thereby largely unconscious) shifts in meaning that accompany various fashions (consider the swirling 'turns' of recent years), which affect the social scientific vocabulary (historiographic, philosophical, pedagogical, psychological sociological, etc.).

By rendering such developments explicit, the epistemological wrestling with the stream of experiences we call 'history', a process that can be chaotic, may in the future perhaps be somewhat less sloppy. Admittedly, even the most critical concepts that emerged from our own work (which is discussed here) were not always used with methodological care and/or theoretical purity.

2.1 Pedagogization as a Container Concept

It is generally felt that the concept of 'pedagogization'[3] appeared at the end of the 1950s and was coined by the sociologist Janpeter Kob while working in Germany (see Höhne, 2002, 2004). He wanted to indicate, from an educational perspective,

M. Depaepe (✉)
University of Leuven, K.U. Leuven, Belgium
e-mail: Marc.Depaepe@kuleuven-kortrijk.be

the trend that had emerged within virtually all societal institutions of a modernizing society. The Western welfare state revealed itself primarily as 'pedagogical'. This characteristic was related to professional groups' corporatist hunger for power and has been criticized by Helmut Schelsky (1961) and others. They would have aimed, among other things, for the expansion of pedagogical power because of the better prospects for employment. In contrast to related concepts such as 'industrialization' and 'bureaucratization', the concept initially had difficulty in securing acceptance. In German pedagogical historiography, it was only granted legitimacy in the 1980s (cf. Giesecke, 1996).

By the same token, pedagogization has only recently been accepted as a legitimate term within the Dutch-language arena, where the *Belgisch-Nederlandse Vereniging voor de Geschiedenis van Opvoeding en Onderwijs* (*BNVGOO*: The Belgian–Dutch Society for the History of Education) elevated 'pedagogization' to the central topic of a congress that took place on 14 and 15 November 1985 in Amsterdam. Judging from the title of the collection of congress texts (*Pedagogisering*, 1985), the intention was to investigate what this phenomenon had meant for the two countries in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. When using this relatively new but primarily fashionable term, the organizers were (by implication) referring to the increasing attention being given to the educational aspect of many sectors of everyday life and (in relation to this) the increasing significance of professional assistance. Nevertheless, the term 'pedagogization' did not appear in the definitive publication of some of the conference papers (Dekker, D'hoker, Kruithof, & De Vroede, 1987). Some Flemish educational historians for instance doubted if there was really any place for such a concept within their discipline (Hermans, 1987). As a consequence of the work of the German educationist Ulrich Herrmann, who in the meantime had devoted an almost 'programmatic' contribution in a standard work on the social history of the child (Herrmann, 1986), the concept soon appeared again in Dutch-language pedagogical historiography.

In regard to the reemergence of the term pedagogization, the contribution of our research group can hardly be denied. Since the late 1980s, we have used the word in the titles of our work. Frank Simon was the first to do this (Simon & Van Damme, 1989, 1992; Simon, 1994) followed by Marc Depaepe (1995, 1998a, 1998b). This occurred without too much attention being given to either the definition or demarcation of the concept. We tended to use the term 'pedagogization' as a label, an umbrella word to indicate the steady expansion and increased depth of educational action during the nineteenth and particularly the twentieth centuries. The Interbellum, in which child-raising, formation and education became the field *par excellence* on the ideological market and the social polarizations, served in this regard as the key period in the formation of the 'pedagogized' society (Depaepe & Simon, 1999).

More or less in conformity with the double line that Herrmann describes, the understanding of pedagogization that appeared in our work had both quantitative and qualitative aspects. Thus, as we saw it, the idea of expansion as it pertained to educational action not only concerned the increase in the number of child-raising and educational governmental bodies and the greater range of the child-raising and

educational processes but also encompassed the ever-increasing central role of the pedagogical in society. More pedagogical concern and more pedagogical care also sharpened qualitatively the specificity of pedagogical intervention. Of what did this consist? Generally speaking, it presented itself as a shift in the behavioural repertoire of the child-raiser, the educator and the teacher: physical compulsion (which naturally was also accompanied by psychological pressure) had to give way to a more psychological 'treatment' of the child. This might be understood as the 'disembodiment' of educational intervention that served to intensify emotional manipulation (see also Herman, Depaepe, Simon, & Van Gorp, 2007a).

This trend was seen as the result of an increased expertise that had emerged, thanks to the scientization (and the accompanying academization) of pedagogy and the pedagogical sciences. And to the extent that increased professionalism also provided strategies for the solution of problems that initially did not belong to the professional field of educators, psychologists, etc., it naturally also yielded territorial gains for the professional groups concerned. In this sense, the phenomenon of pedagogization differed little from, for example, that of medicalization, where analogous annexation and colonization mechanisms led to status gains (Nys, De Smaele, Tollebeek, & Wils, 2002).

A good example of such 'pedagogization' is, in our opinion, the 'educational punishment' (read: training), which was provided in the Netherlands in the mid-1990s at the behest of the Ministry of Justice for the parents of persistent truants (Tönis & Zonneveld, 2000). By providing specific educational interventions to deal with 'new' groups and categories of problem cases, as a consequence, new markets were constantly being opened up in the professional field. From that market perspective, the evolution from special to inclusive education, inter alia, can be readily understood. Both the initial 'exclusion' of 'abnormal' pupils (from the end of the nineteenth century on) and the 'inclusion' of problematic (or better, newly problematized) pupils in ordinary education (at the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first centuries) are ultimately expressions of the same phenomenon (that, at least in Dutch, can also be described as 'orthopedagogization'): educational specialists first demanded segregation of all problem cases, which had to be taken care of by professionals in special institutions. This 'exclusive' market became saturated and the movement towards integration commenced. This coincided with the detection of ever more specific behavioural and learning problems among 'normal' (or 'ordinary') children (such as ADHD, gifted, dyslexic children) (see, for example, Elst-Van Den Bergh, 2005).

Although pedagogization as a 'neutral' concept intends to describe these phenomena as a sub-process of the 'modernization' of the society, the content orientations of that process (and the internal contradictions or paradoxes that accompanies it) meant that the concept of pedagogization started to acquire negative connotations. The consequences of 'more' training, education and pedagogical care, were often described in terms of increased dependence, tutelage, patronization, mothering, infantilization, pampering and so on. Pedagogization could therefore be read in oppositional terms to pedagogical projects that aim for autonomy, liberation and independence. In this respect, pedagogization looks like a concept that is not

dissimilar to 'medicalization'. A greater supply on the medical market does not necessarily lead to a more healthy society but can significantly increase the consumption of and dependence on health care. The irony that accompanies the concept of pedagogization can be illustrated by two examples. The first is taken from the 1980s, the second, two decades later.

For the French philosopher Jacques Rancière (1987, pp. 221–222), the paradox of pedagogization unfolded with the ideas of the Enlightenment that were propagated by the Republicans:

> Il suffirait d'apprendre à être des hommes égaux dans une société inégale. C'est ce que veut dire s'émanciper. Mais cette chose si simple est la plus difficile à comprendre surtout depuis la nouvelle explication, le progrès, a inextricablement mêlé l'une à l'autre l'égalité et son contraire. La tâche à laquelle les capacités et les coeurs républicains se vouent, s'est de faire une société égale avec des hommes inégaux, de réduire indéfiniment l'inégalité. Mais qui a pris ce parti n'a qu'un moyen de le mener à bout, c'est la pédagogisation intégrale de la société, c'est-à-dire l'infantilisation générale des individus qui la composent. Plus tard on appellera cela formation continue, c'est-à-dire co-extensivité de l'institution explicatrice et de la société. La société des inférieurs supérieurs sera égale, elle aura réduit ses inégalités quand elle sera entièrement transformée en société des explicateurs expliqués.[4]

There can be no emancipation, apparently, without infantilization and pedagogization. Inversely – so instructs an Austrian reader edited by Erich Ribolits & Zuber (2004) – pedagogization does not lead to emancipation but to the subjection of the spirit. Instead of adapting the society to people, the process of pedagogization (which constitutes the logical response to globalization and modernization) leads to the adaptation of the people to the neo-conservative society. The result is, therefore, the domestication of thinking and not emancipation. Pedagogization, as the title of their work expresses, is the art of making people ever more 'stupid' via learning. Here, the frequently praised notion of 'permanent education' comes to mind.

2.2 Pedagogization as the Pedagogical Basic Semantic of a Didactic Grammar

It was against the background of such paradoxes that, in our later work, the concept of pedagogization gained a more concrete place. Intrigued by the great sense of continuity that characterized pedagogical action, our research in the 1990s focused on the study of the everyday practice in primary education in Belgium from about 1880 to 1970 (Depaepe et al., 2000), a research interest that, moreover, paralleled similar research in Spain (see, among others, Viñao Frago, 2001a, 2002). The intention of this research was, among other things, to find an acceptable explanation for the great resistance to renewal that characterized the world of education and the output of educational experts. We wanted to account for the reasons why such resistance continued without historical reverberation (see also Viñao Frago, 2001b). While doing this, we came close to entering the vicinity of research conducted by authors such as Larry Cuban, David Tyack and William Tobin, who had detected the existence of the irony surrounding the 'grammar of schooling' (Cuban, 1993[2];

Tyack & Tobin, 1994; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Rather than the pedagogical innovations changing education, these innovations were 'adapted' by education itself to the stubborn structure of running a school.

We found the notion that educational practice was controlled by a set of rules that are often not rendered explicit but are rooted in historical practice extremely convincing. Didactic and pedagogical renewals were constantly adapted or, better, appropriated and integrated according to the logic proper to the educational system, which explained both the conservative outlook *casu quo* the conservational character of that system. Nevertheless, we had a problem with the content orientation that was given to the internal dynamic of running a school. We felt that these North American initiatives, taken to identify a virtually universal 'grammar of schooling', were a product of an all too behaviourist view of what actually took place on the work floor. Indeed, they only took account of the externally observable didactic behavioural patterns (such as the extent to which the teacher and/or pupils were speaking), without devoting much attention to the pedagogical, let alone the cultural, context in which that educational behaviour is embedded. Hence, we have conceived the concept 'grammar of schooling' – which we have invariably translated as the '*grammatica van de verschoolsing*' (i.e. the 'grammar of scholarization' in the sense of making schools more and more 'schoolish') – in our study of the Belgian primary school as a didactic exposition structure that, at the very least, had to be related to the pedagogical semantic (here moral, ethical and thus also social finality) in which it functioned. Teaching (that is, the transfer of knowledge via subject matter) could, particularly since the Enlightenment, no longer be separated from the formation project (and formation objective) from which it derived its meaning and significance (Herrmann, 1993). In our opinion, therefore, the didactic grammar of 'schooling' was complemented by a pedagogical grammar of 'pedagogizing' – an English gerund that ultimately involved an attempt (perhaps a rather awkward attempt[5]?) to translate and interpret the German concept of '*Pädagogisierung*'. Of course, it is not a chance occurrence that these two concepts had arisen within Anglo-Saxon and German contexts, respectively.

It is in the conjunction of these two traditions that we saw the greatest merit of our work. The behaviourally conceived phenomenon of 'schooling' was situated there as a component of a broader pedagogization and modernization (*casu quo* globalization) of society. This facet of our work went unnoticed by critics of *Order in Progress* (see Depaepe, 2004). Critics of this book tended to read our interpretation of events as conforming to naïve progress models of 'the longer the more' and 'the longer the better', to which the often normative association with the pedagogical past in the training of teachers more than once gave rise via the course on the 'history of education'. For us, the educational teaching processes generated via the curriculum ultimately followed a more complex pattern. Pedagogical and didactic interventions and forms of thought were essentially diverse, multiple, mutually overlapping (and generally often complementarily but sometimes also contrarily) active discourses. Thus, the language of the new school was used by the proponents of 'progressive' education in Flanders in order to emphasize the time-honoured wisdom of schoolmastership and therefore secure the genesis of meritocracy conceived

in neo-conservative terms. Jozef Verheyen, of whom we analysed the educational discourse in one of the former books of the Research Community (see Depaepe, Simon, & Van Gorp, 2006), is an obvious example. Teaching, in any event, turned out to be imbedded in the pedagogical barter trade with social consequences that had taken form in Belgium primarily during and after the last quarter of the nineteenth century: moralization (and the socialization, disciplining and domestication that flowed from it) was exchanged for knowledge acquisition, the lever par excellence for achieving autonomy and emancipation within a class society tinted by neo-capitalism. Paraphrasing Eric Berne's transactional analysis (Berne, 1964), we can conclude that pedagogization thus concerned the 'educational' game that was played in the classroom and school. What was at stake in this game (in part specified by social origin) was the increased level of cultural capital held by pupils and by implication, their greater chances for success in later life, which they had to redeem primarily with obedience and subjection to the pedagogical authority of teachers and the administration.

But probably the phenomenon of pedagogization is still much more complex than what the tension of such binary conceptual models (*grammar of schooling* versus *grammar of pedagogization/educationalization*, or even better *educationalizing*) or combinations thereof would allow one to suspect. Ultimately, for the operationalizing of these concepts, we have focused on the unravelling of the pedagogical–didactic interaction in the classroom whereby the teaching (the didactic) was seen as a process that took place via the subject matter, while the formation (the pedagogical) took place via interventions of the administration (for example, punishment, see Herman, Depaepe, Simon, & Van Gorp, 2007a) set apart from the prescribed curriculum. The question, of course, is whether or not any other dimensions were involved within pedagogization. Our analyses of textbooks (Depaepe & Simon, 2002) and exercise books (Herman, Depaepe, Simon, Surmont, & Van Gorp, 2007b) in the meantime can lead one to suppose that the formatting of scientific knowledge content into 'subject matter' occurred, just as much, in accordance with its own logic. In regard to this situation, Tom Popkewitz (2004) spoke about the alchemy of school subjects. Perhaps, there is here a 'grammar of knowledge transfer' involved, for we can imagine that, for example, the reduction and simplification that generally accompanies the conversion of knowledge into school knowledge, irrespective of the content of each subject, follows certain stereotypical patterns (see, e.g., Matthes & Heinze, 2007).

And what about the wave of ethnohistorical and school-archaeological research, which in recent years has been catching on primarily in Spain and Latin America (see, e.g., Ferraz Lorenzo, 2005; *Historia de la Educación*, 2006), and the material school culture (Lawn & Grosvenor, 2005; Escolano Benito, 2007) that is trying to interpret it, hermeneutically and otherwise, by evoking its experience? Still, apart from the fact that the rich Latin traditions cannot be ignored in the development of contemporary educational historiography, it is definitely the case that the architecture of the space in which the educational interaction took place and the material objects that were used in it can teach us much about the nature and content of schoolish behaviour. Can we say that these 'artefacts' from the educational past

(wall charts, textbooks, notebooks, and the like) do not act as contingent components of the educational strategy of emotional pressure, infantilization, and compulsion? Do they engender just as much interiorization of values and norms in the children and teenagers? Certainly, for what concerns the transition from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, it takes little effort to read the internal renewals in education as the expression of a bourgeois civilization offensive (cf. Lenders, 1988), that is, as the incorporation of children into the mills of the refinement of behaviour (which Elias called the process of civilization) and the initiation into the complex world of the behaviour determining time associated with it. For us, surely, there is sufficient reason for wanting to delve more deeply into the formal rules of that educational 'game' at school via a new ethnohistorical research project, which, by means of the applied technique of oral testimony, immediately implies a shift of emphasis towards the second half of the twentieth century (Depaepe, Simon, Surmont, & Van Gorp, 2007).

2.3 Pedagogization as a Component of a 'Historical' School Theory

That research (which, because of the controllability of the context focuses on the Flemish primary school of the 1960s) is now being worked out in detail[6] and the first results have in the meantime been published in a number of intermediary papers and communications at congresses. These concern some of the aspects of the school culture mentioned above. But the ultimate objective of our research remains, with a view to historical theory formation from within (Tenorth, 1996), the identification of the structuring elements around which educational behaviour has been settled historically in the school. What we ultimately want to expose is, as it were, the morphology of the school. This has become 'genealogical', the pillars around which the everyday action patterns of education have taken form in the course of the years and made the school into a 'school': a theoretical model that thus encloses at the same time a structure (in the sense of isolated factors) and dynamic (in the sense of processes that flow out of the conjunction of these factors) and moreover also offers space for statements on the identity of the school that are both horizontal-generalizing (*in casu* rising above the history) and vertical-diachronic (*in casu* related to chronological development).

In this last respect, therefore, such a 'historical' school theory differs fundamentally from the organograms that previously developed and still do in the framework of didactics, didactic theory, school pedagogics or educational theory (as concerns the Flemish portion of Belgium, see, for example, De Corte et al., 1972; De Block & Heene, 1986; for the German context: Zierer, 2006). However, because of their nomothetic obsession, such organograms firmly continue to deny their own historicity. On penalty of denying the uniqueness of historiography, pedagogical or otherwise, the historical school theory here envisioned cannot be inversely assigned a delivery role in the construction of such models or in the construction of any

contemporary formation science whatsoever (Depaepe, 2001; Priem, 2006). Its relevance is restricted to a pure, cultural–historical relevance, even though an apparent contradiction seems, on first inspection, to emerge from this claim, for every theory has ambitions, irrespective of the existing cultural–historical differences in origin or object, of achieving universal knowledge.

In order to be able to do justice to the multi-coloured pallet of cultural contexts in which the institution 'school' has become a school, concretization in specific historical situations still remains necessary. The construction of a historical school theory presumes more than the construction of a meta-narrative on the basis of the existing literature. Insight into the 'becoming' of the institution of the school can, ultimately, only be obtained by good historical research into clearly delineated situations. Time-resistant action patterns in connection with interpersonal relations (such as the pedagogical–didactic interaction in the school and the classroom) come to light primarily by examining longitudinal cross-sections over time. As an epistemological category, the concept of 'non-contemporariness' assumes the contemporariness of historical situations; both are, like text and context, inevitably related to each other: non-contemporariness can only be conceived by abstracting from the very concrete, historical backgrounds in which it is anchored. Arguing that the Jesuits were already present at the foundation of the present-day grammars of schooling and pedagogization (Depaepe, Simon, & Van Gorp, 2005), for example, implies, of course, the omission of historical redundancy (cf. Hamilton, 1989).

This is why the concept of pedagogization is best defined within such a historical school theory in function of a developmental perspective, in particular as the increase of what is presented within the educational game in the classroom and the school as that which is specifically pedagogical. But with this, we have got ahead of ourselves in regard to what still needs to be discussed. Before a further examination of the dynamics of the pedagogization process, we must first come back to the structuring components of our historical school theory; their constellation probably constitutes the motor behind the self-guidance of this relatively autonomous sector of modernization.

In any case, from the analysis of the available literature, we recall the dimensions of 'space' and 'time' (Viñao Frago, 1996; Escolano Benito, 1992; Compère, 1997). It was on these axes that the delimitation of the school as distinct from 'life' was given form. Within this institution, there arose a specific pattern of behaviour with its own rituals and interpretations – some even call it a 'choreography' (Eggermont, 2001), which focused on the development of a power machine for disciplining the 'social body' (Kirk, 1998). Such a development was not, however, immune to flexibility. On the contrary, those who had the power over this development continuously constructed and reconstructed time and space on behalf of those who had to endure it (Perrenoud, 1994).

De facto, the regime of 'time-practices' regulated in large measure the daily life at school. This involved the adoption of long-term and middle-term perspectives on the curriculum as regards year classes and year programs, which alternated with long and short holidays. We might also note the short-term perspective of alternating lessons, recesses and other temporally recurring activities (Depaepe et al., 2000).