

## Part 2

### Key Directions and Characteristics of Research Organization in Contemporary World

### Ключевые направления и особенности проведения научных исследований в современном мире

OKSANA CHIGISHEVA

#### GLOBALIZATION AND ITS INFLUENCE ON COMPARATIVE EDUCATION METHODOLOGY

##### Abstract

The article is devoted to the research of the methodological changes that occur in the field of comparative education as a result of globalization. A deep analysis of the globalization phenomenon is undertaken with a special focus on the differentiation of globalization, internationalisation, regionalisation and integration. UNESCO's role in the support of globalization tendencies in education is discussed. Methodological approaches used for comparative research are indicated and a new metacivilisation approach is introduced. It is represented as the most adequate methodological instrument for global research in comparative education domain.

Key words: comparative education, globalization, comparative method, methodology, metacivilisation approach

##### Introduction

Contemporary world faces deep geopolitical and socio-cultural transformations defining a new vector for the development of world educational systems – educational globalization. It stimulates not only cross-border scientific and educational partnerships but also demands closer attention of policy makers and educational managers to the sphere of comparative education and its prognostic potential. These trends stimulate growing transformations in the methodological apparatus of comparative education and make necessary to discuss and analyse them in a new global context.

### **Globalization in the theoretical reflection of foreign and Russian scholars**

The problem of defining methodological format permitting to single out globalization influence on comparative education methodology cannot be solved without examining the key definition for this paper i.e. of *globalization* and the variants of its interpretation represented in the world scientific thought. The existence of a great spectrum of approaches and definitions of this term has not led so far to a common approach of representing its essence and theoretical interpretation in Russian and foreign social sciences. Provisionally we may single out several approaches paradoxically coexisting within one scientific encyclopedia "Globalization" published in 2003.

Two diametrically opposite approaches are represented within this academic issue. The first one is offered by Utkin A. I. emphasizing the economic basis of this process. He understands globalization as "merging of national economies into a single, world system based on rapid circulation of capital, new information openness of the world, technological revolution, adherence of industrially developed countries to the liberalization of goods and capital flows, communication convergence, planetary scientific revolution characterized by interethnic social migrations, new means of transport, telecommunication technologies, international system of education" (Globalistika, 2003, 181) This view point is shared by such scholars as Delyagin M. G. (Globalistika, 2003, 185), Ivakhnyuk I. V. (Globalistika, 2003, 194), Kiss A. (Globalistika, 2003, 190), Markov S. A. (Globalistika, 2003, 198). A key role of the economic development factors is also acknowledged by some German authors (Gerster, Riedel, 2008), pointing at the primacy of socio-economic formats over other even political.

The second approach reflects cultural and socio-cultural aspects of this process what enables Panarin A. S. to define globalization as "the process of formation of united interrelated world where nations are not separated from each other by habitual protectionist barriers and borders simultaneously preventing communication and protecting them from disordered external influence" (Globalistika, 2003, 181). This standpoint is shared by Akopyan K. Z. (Globalistika, 2003, 196), Klyucharev G. A. (Globalistika, 2003, 197), Menon E. P. (Globalistika, 2003, 197), Fedotova V. G. (Globalistika, 2003, 191), Chubays I. B. (Globalistika, 2003, 189).

Beyond the frame of this issue there are also some authors (Barlybaev, 2003) considering globalization as an objective historical process of growing interconnection between the countries of the world as a result of transboundary processes in economy, politics, capital, culture, technologies. This position seems to be synthetic and fully characterizing the phenomenon of globalization from the view point of functional aspect of this process and its consequences. Within such consideration of globalization the following tendencies of its development are pointed out: demographic and ecological, economical, geopolitical, socio-cultural, informational (technocratic) (Prykin, 2007; Yakovets, 2003).

Not less theoretical discord accompanies the process of defining the number of globalization stages and the basis for their separation. Thus, Chumakov A. N. (Chumakov, 2005) considers as a basis for the division of global society history the scale of the occurred events and marks 4 main epochs in the making of global relations (connections) that went with the history of mankind. Cheshkov M. A.

(Cheshkov, 1999) singles out 3 stages considering globalization in the historical retrospective, Rutkevich M. N. (Rutkevich, 2002) also offers to define 3 stages of globalization development but spreads this notion on the whole historical process of internationalization of people's life, Utkin A. I. (Utkin, 2002) singles out only 2 stages of globalization being guided by the idea of changing technological phases in the progress of society.

At present a number of scholars (Skott, 2000; Zaretskaya, 2001; Oelkers, 2005) separate the terms globalization and internationalization and put the dividing line on presence/absence of geopolitical borders. They tend to interpret internationalization as a process of intensification of international connections and exchanges and globalization as an outgrowing of this process into making united integral world where separate societies, countries and regions more and more acquire the features of the unit. These scholars consider internationalization to be a forerunner of globalization (but after the emergence of globalization these processes become parallel) however globalization seems to be the phenomenon of another order denying global competition but serving as a catalyst of intensive cooperation in the world division of labor between cheap mass production and hi technologies and innovations, radical reconsideration of the world order when national boundaries become archaic.

Some scholars agree that internationalization and globalization emerge one from another and globalization serves just as a qualitatively new phenomenon or phase of internationalization embracing all the processes of reproduction: from production and distribution to circulation and consumption (Shenaev, 2002; Sokolovskaya, 2004). There is one more approach where regionalization, integration and globalization are seen as particular forms of internationalization while globalization is believed to be its superior form (Voronin, Voronina, 2004).

Thus, nowadays there are significant contradictions in the interpretation of these terms that define author's methodological positions when examining their influence on the system of education and overall theory of pedagogical science. In this article when dealing with globalization and its influence on comparative education methodology we will treat globalization and internationalization as two parallel processes by supporting the view of the first group of scholars.

We will also keep to the theoretical position of Cheshkov M. A. regarding globalization as "a wide range of processes and structures which can be denominated as a process of interdependency, interpenetration and correlation of totally different components of world community" that lead to the creation of "such a unit where any local event is dependent by the events in other locuses and inversely" (Cheshkov, 1998, 8).

We will also take into account theoretical positions of German comparativists (Allemann-Ghionda, 2004) underlining that in the era of establishing globalization education tends to transform into the process supporting training of labor force needed at the present stage of economic development and declaring (Hotz-Hart, Kuechler, 1999) that globalization nevertheless is a threat to national and cultural identity of different nations of the world.

## **UNESCO and comparative education**

Intensification of globalization processes attracts special attention to the development of comparative education as a priority sphere of socio-cultural practice in all countries of the world. This objective is central for the United Nations Organization (UNO) and especially for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) which works out and promotes fundamental ideas of peace, culture and non-violence, preserving cultural and natural heritage and education for all into public conscience. It seems interesting to analyze the main directions of globalization in education in the logic of the UNESCO's strategy and define how these issues are reflected at different levels of educational practice in Russia and Germany as one of the leading European countries.

The main lines of the UNESCO's work are represented in the framework of its structure's functioning. In contemporary Germany there are:

- 190 UNESCO Associated schools (Projectschulen), the number of which is growing steadily all over the world. In 1953 there were only 33 schools in 15 countries and already in 2008 there were 8000 schools in 180 countries;
- 8 UNESCO Chairs function in 374 higher educational establishments of Germany i.e. in every 47<sup>th</sup> institution. It is easily stated that the dynamics of their organization is less intensive in comparison to Russia where today every 25<sup>th</sup> higher educational establishment possesses a UNESCO Chair;
- 2 International education institutes i.e. the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning in Hamburg and the UNESCO-UNEVOC Centre for Technical and Vocational Education and Training in Bonn are carrying out intensive research work making special contribution and enhancing access to learning, improving the environment and quality of lifelong learning for all in all regions of the world (German Commission for UNESCO, [www.unesco.de](http://www.unesco.de)), UNESCO Moscow office ([www.unesco.ru](http://www.unesco.ru)).

UNESCO alongside with other international organizations conducts multiple comparative investigations correct implementation of which requires enhancement of theoretical research studies of methodological character. They will permit both the development of methodological instruments adequate to the dynamically changing objectives of scientific activities and expansion of the bounds of conceptual vision of globally significant educational novations. It is no coincidence that these problems are in the focus of attention of educationalists and theorists in Germany who compare internationally; it facilitates the development of methodological reflection and eventually theoretical formation of such scientific conceptualization as comparative education. German and Russian comparative education is seen as a complex dynamically developing formation which theoretical and methodological bases change under the influence of globalization tendencies.

## **Contemporary approaches for international comparisons**

Contemporary pedagogy is concerned with the question of finding the most useful and adequate approach for making international comparisons. At present anthropocentric (Langveld, 1965; Scheuerl, 1982), axiological (Schulz, 1998; Seebom, 1977) and cultural (Liegler, 1992; Meyer, 1996) approaches have become widely spread in European methodological discourse. Cultural approach

substantially embraces issues connected with universal characteristics, provides deep examination of contemporary phenomena in their historical retrospective and helps to reveal connections between the studied phenomena and present and future times thus implementing prognostic function of the study. It raises the objectivity level of the obtained data as truly pedagogical phenomena are examined in the context of sociocultural characteristics against the wide background of cultural life what permits to follow the development tendencies of its key points. Cultural approach is connected with the axiological one as the nuclei of culture makes up a block of historically specified universal and national values.

For example, in Russia methodological problems of German comparative education were always examined under the influence of formation approach aimed at singling out basic and superstructural constructions in pedagogical phenomena (Klarin, 1989; Nikandrov, 1989; Fedotova, 1998; Yarkina, 1979). Nowadays under the influence of globalization tendencies a new civilization approach is formed in Russian pedagogical science. It can become an integral factor in the synthesis of the objects being compared. This approach permits to analyze pedagogical phenomena of both different and the same epochs (horizontal and vertical comparison) in comparative and contrastive plan. The hypotheses of the civilization approach (Kornetov, 2002) seems to have a considerable heuristic potential and allows to single out basic pedagogical traditions of “*great civilizations*” (Western, Middle Eastern, South Asian, Far Eastern) as steady stereotypes determined by the peculiarities of sociocultural systems and phenomena being compared.

It is clear that a very complex situation arises in the development of comparative pedagogical investigations when it becomes clear that it's necessary to find research instruments adequate to a twofold task:

1. search for the pedagogical projection of the society's development to metacivilisation;
2. keeping national culture as a distinctive heritage.

## Conclusion

It seems necessary to formulate a metacivilisation approach in the realm of which cultures will have a chance to develop, improve and acquire universal and global modus. The question concerning methods of working out methodological apparatus adequate to the assigned task must be solved by comparativists of the whole world. Comparative education theorists are intensively searching for the ways of improving comparative method within appearing new thematic fields. However it is quite obvious that they should consolidate their efforts both in separate regions and in the global context for working out conventional regulations for further development of comparative and pedagogical knowledge.

## References

- Allemann-Ghionda, C. (2004): *Einfuehrung in die Vergleichende Erziehungswissenschaft*. Weinham und Basel: Beltz Verlag.
- Barlybaev, H. A. (2003): *Obschaya teoriya globalizatsii i ustoychivogo razvitiya*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Gosudarstvennoy Dumy.
- Cheshkov, M. A. (1998): *Global'noe videnie i novaya nauka*. Moskva.

- Cheshkov, M. A. (1999): *Globalizatsiya: suschnost', nyneshnyaya faza, perspektivy*. Moskva: Pro et Contra. Tom 4.
- Chumakov, A. N. (2005): *Globalizatsiya. Kontury tselostnogo mira*. Moskva: Prospekt.
- Fedotova, O. D. (1998): *Teoretiko-metodologicheskie osnovi pedagogiki Germanii i FRG*. Moskva.
- Gerster, A., Riedel, H. (2008): *Globalisierung, internationale Politik und Konfliktbewaeltigung*. Bamberg: CC Buchners Verlag.
- Globalistika: entsiklopediya* (2003): Moskva: Raduga.
- Hotz-Hart, B., Kuechler, C. (1999): *Wissen als Chance: Globalisierung als Herausforderung fuer die Schweiz*. Zuerich/Hur: Ruegger.
- Klarin, V. M. (1989): *Kriticheskiy analiz pedagogicheskikh idey revizionizma v nemetskom rabochem dvizhenii kontsa XIX – nachala XX veka*. Moskva: MGPI.
- Kornetov, G. V. (2002): Istoriko-pedagogicheskiy protsess v zerkale tsivilizatsionnogo podhoda. *Vestnik Universiteta RAO*, No 4.
- Langveld, M. J. (1965): Antropologie und Psychologie des Erziehers. *Paedagogische Rundschau*, No 19, 745-753.
- Liegle, L. (1992): Culture and Socialization: Forgotten Traditions and New Dimensions in Comparative Education. In: Schriewer, J., Holmes, B. (Hrsg.) *Theories and Methods in Comparative Education*. Bern: Lang, 225-262.
- Meyer, J. W. (1996): Die kulturellen Inhalte des Bildungswesens. *Zeitschrift fuer Paedagogik*, No 34, 245-260.
- Nikandrov, N. D. (1989): Sravnitel'naya pedagogika: uroki I nadezhdi. *Sovetskaya pedagogika*, No 10, 129-134.
- Oelkers, Ju. (2005): *Globalisierung und Internationalisierung im Bildungssystem*. Vortrag auf der Festveranstaltung anlaesslich des zehnjaeerigen Bestehens des Programmes Socrates am 22. November 2005 in der Abtei Neumuenster in Luxemburg, 1-16.
- Prykin, B. V. (2007): *Globalistika*. Moskva: YUNITI-Dana.
- Rutkevich, M. N. (2002): Filosofskoe znachenie konceptzii ustoychivogo razvitiya. *Voprosy filosofii*, No 11, 24-35.
- Schulz, W. F. (1998): *Axiologie im Industriezeitalter: Von den Grundwerten Natur, Mensch, Kultur*. FB-Verlag.
- Seebohm, Th. (1977): Wertfrieres Urteilen ueber fremde Kulturen im Ramen einer transzendental – phenomenologischen Axiologie. *Phenomenologische Forschung*, No 4, 52-85.
- Shenaev, V. I. (2002): Globalizatsiya – obektivnyi mirovoi prozess. *Mnogolikaya Evropa: puti razvitiya*. Moskva, 123-131.
- Scheuerl, H. (1982): *Paedagogische Anthropologie. Eine historische Einfuehrung*. Stuttgart/Berlin/Koeln.
- Skott, P. (2000): Globalizatsiya i universitet. *Alma mater*, No 4, 3-8.
- Sokolovskaya, N. G. (2004): Globalizatsiya: osnovnye tendentsii i novye vyzovy. *Sovremennaya globalizatsiya i Rossiya*. Rostov-na-Donu: RGU, 21-28.
- Utkin, A. N. (2002): *Globalizatsiya: protsess i osmyslenie*. Moskva: Aspekt.
- Voronin, V. M., Voronina, T. V. (2004): Uchastie Rossii v globalizatsionnyh protsessah. *Sovremennaya globalizatsiya i Rossiya*, RGU, Rostov-na-Donu, 90-95.
- Yakovets, Yu. V. (2003): *Globalizatsiya i vzaimodeystvie tsivilizatsii*. Moskva: Ekonomika.

- Yarkina, T. F. (1979): *Kriticheskiy analiz sostoyaniya I tendentsiy razvitiya burzhuaznoy pedagogiki v FRG*. Moskva: Pedagogika.
- Zaretskaya, S. L. (2001): *Obrazovanie v kontekste globalizatsii. Globalizatsiya I obrazovanie*. Moskva: INION, 5-20.

Oksana Chigisheva  
PhD in Pedagogy (Candidate of Science), Associate Professor  
Southern Federal University  
International Research Centre 'Scientific Cooperation'  
Rostov-on-Don, Russia  
ochigisheva@rambler.ru