

# The Geography of Authorship Regarding Research on Education

C. C. Wolhuter

Faculty of Education Sciences, North-West University

## Abstract

*The first aim of this study was to build a theoretical framework considering the relevance of the author's provenance with respect to research on Education, and then to investigate the current patterns of the above-mentioned provenance. The author's provenance was found to have a bearing on a number of the research process components, including the following: collection, processing and interpretation of data, ethics of research, content of research, construction of theory, and improvement of practice. There was investigated the location of 18 523 authors of the articles published in 2012 in 219 Thomson Reuters indexed journals in the field of Education. An extremely uneven pattern emerged. Almost half of all the countries did not register a single author in this pool. Close to ninety per cent of the authors resided in the North American and Western European primary hub, and the Asian-Pacific weaker secondary hub of the international network of Education scholars. Smaller-order nodes occurred in Turkey, South Africa and Brazil. In conclusion, some recommendations for further research, and for rectifying this uneven pattern of scholarly activity, are made.*

**Key words:** *authors of articles; education journals; education scholars; education theory; world-systems analysis.*

## Introduction

A central concern in the world since the mid-twentieth century has been that of global wealth inequality, and the attendant imperative of development. Despite the impressive economic growth, inequality, and according to some writers, the growing levels of inequality continue to cast a dark, ominous shadow over humanity and global security in the middle of the second decade of the twenty-first century; this pertains to both the intranational and international levels of inequality (see Stiglitz & Greenwald, 2014). While factors, for instance, the rising Creed of Human Rights and

theories, such as the Modernization Theory and the Human-Capital Theory have all contributed to the expansion of the global education project — the other signature feature of the post-Second World War world — it was the Columbia University Economist, Ken Arrow who, since his ground-breaking paper published in 1962 (Arrow, 1962), has highlighted knowledge and information as critical factors in the economic development of nations.

Arrow, the 1972 Economics Nobel laureate, together with Robert Solow, laid the basis for a new branch of Economics, namely the Growth Theory. According to Arrow, the critical factor in the rate of economic development of a nation lies not in its natural resources, access to capital, level of technological development or whatever, but in the possession of information or knowledge. If this was true fifty years ago, when Arrow formulated his views, surely it is much more the case today, with the advent of a knowledge society/economy, that is, where the driving axis of a national economy is the production and consumption of new knowledge.

Then, the geography of knowledge and knowledge production also assumes great importance with respect to the scholarly field of Education — the field of scholarship tasked with guiding the international project of expanding education. The aim of this article is twofold. Firstly, an attempt will be made to synthesize the existing body of literature on the significance of the author's provenance of knowledge generated in Education. Secondly, the existing patterns of the author's location of knowledge produced in Education will be investigated. The article commences with a literature review, culminating in a theoretical framework of the relevance of the author's provenance in scholarship.

After an explanation of the method of procuring research data on the geography of authorship regarding education research, the patterns of this geography are presented and interpreted against the backdrop of the theoretical framework.

## **Survey of the Relevant Literature**

This literature survey falls into three parts, namely the state of the scholarly field of Education, the importance or relevance of the author's provenance in Education scholarship, and finally, the literature on the geography of authorship regarding research on Education, with the North-South division as the main theme.

### ***State of the Scholarly Field of Education***

Salient features of the scholarly field of Education — all concern-raising — include as follows: the young and insecure institutional presence of the field, the lack of intellectual or theoretical coherence in the field, the non-accumulative nature of research on Education, the lack of autochthonous theory, the perception of the field as being inferior to that of other scholarly fields, and the low impact of research on practice. Education does not have a long history at universities (Furlong, 2013, pp. 14-16). The first professor of Education was appointed as late as 1776 (at Göttingen,

Germany); even in a country, such as England, with a history of universities spanning almost a millennium, the institutional presence of Education dates back only one and a half century (University of Manchester, in 1852) (Furlong, 2013, p. 16).

Education has been described as a field with uncertain knowledge, an incoherent field, and most of all, a field that is characterised by non-accumulative knowledge (Furlong, 2013, pp. 10-11). Furthermore, the field lacks a body of autochthonous theory, with its theoretical frameworks being wholesale appropriated from the related fields, such as Sociology, Philosophy and Psychology. Ermenc (2013, p. 137) states that, in continental Europe, there has been, since the 1960s, a school of thought in the education research community, according to which education should be conceptualized as an applied research area, which merely develops proposals for the operation of schools, and for the improvement of educational practice, rather than being a field of scholarship with its own theories and methodological and theoretical core.

Another problem besetting the field of Education is the low impact of research regarding the improvement of practice (*cf.* Levin, Edelstein, & Sohn, 2013). This pertains to both (national) policy level and to school and classroom levels. One factor impeding the practical impact is the fact that national/local contextual differences preclude the summary transplantation of educational practices from one context to another (*cf.* Wolhuter, 2003). Because of all the above factors, it is not unexpected that the scholars of Education are often regarded by their peers at universities as being somewhat inferior in standing, a view which has been regularly expressed in the scholarly literature ever since Larrabee's (1998) much-cited publication expounding this thesis.

### ***Relevance of the Author's Provenance in the Scholarship of Education***

Before Postmodernism became fashionable and scientific knowledge was considered objective, independent of the scholar and his/her physical location, a question related to the significance of the author's provenance would have been a valid question. However, a case for attaching significance to the author's provenance in terms of the scholarly research in Education can be made from a number of perspectives. These entail the research method (including data collection, processing and interpretation), research ethics, research content, building of theory, and improvement of practice.

To commence with research data collection, Tillman (2002, p. 8) cites a number of studies, which demonstrate how cultural concordance has assisted researchers to establish relationships with their research community. Foster (1994) shows how using the cultural knowledge of education research participants can reveal the range of experiences within a specific context. Regarding data processing and interpretation, the researcher and his/her context and background can also be powerful determinants. This statement can be corroborated, not only by the contemporary learning Theory

of Social Reconstructionism (*cf.* Berger & Luckmann, 1966), but also by Dunbar's (1999) research, which shows how an understanding of African-American students at a school in the United States of America can be affected by social, economic and political forces, or by Nisbett's (2003) research on how Western and Eastern students' perceptions and thought processes differ, and how they are shaped by cultural-historical factors.

The researcher's provenance is also of relevance with respect to the ethical side of research. What might be appropriate in terms of research ethics in a given context depends on the local cultural norms (Phillips & Schweisfurth, 2014, p. 137). Warwick (1983), for example, identifies wide cross-national differences in the evaluation and meaning of privacy. The ethical implications of the researcher's provenance become more salient in the present world system of knowledge production – with a large number of researchers from the northern hemisphere doing research in the Global South.

Within the global context of unequal power relationships and the post-colonial framework of such research, there is always a heightened danger of an erroneous confirmation of the researcher's expectations, or of the research subject feeling threatened – to the extent that the validity of research results can become dubious.

Theoretical frameworks, constructed from research by scholars coming from a narrowly circumscribed range of contexts, always run the risk of being accordingly impoverished. In her presidential address to the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES), Hayhoe (2000), for example, demonstrates the value that the East Asian, Indian and Arabian perspectives can add to an exclusively Western epistemological framework. With the mindful of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, according to which linguistic categories determine cognitive categories, this problem becomes especially acute in view of the current rise of English as the international *lingua franca* in the academic world, and even more so with the (Anglo-American) connotations of hegemony being attached to that trend.

The author's provenance is relevant not only with respect to the construction of theory, but also with the other point of culmination of research in education, namely, the improvement of practice. As indicated above, under the survey of the state considering the field of Education research, demonstrable improvement of practice as the outcome is one of the weak facets. If it can be accepted that the author's contextual background influences his/her interpretation of data, then the researcher's provenance likewise would have a bearing on acumen, when it comes to identifying the practice-related implications of research results.

### ***Literature on the Geography of Authorship in the Research on Education***

Criticism against the dominance of the northern hemispheric (or Western-European & North-American) authors in scholarly publications has been a long-standing theme.

A classical publication in this regard is that of Altbach (1982). The subsequent content analysis of articles, published in peer-reviewed journals in the field of Education, have confirmed this trend of dominance by the northern hemispheric authors.

Wolhuter (2008) has done a content analysis of all the articles published in the *Comparative Education Review* during the first fifty years (1957-2006) of the journal existence, and tabled the frequency of the authors' countries for five-year periods. In each period, authors from the United States of America (USA) strongly dominated. In the last five years, covered by this analysis, scholars from the USA authored 59% of the articles (Wolhuter, 2008). The US scholars were followed by authors from Canada (8%), the United Kingdom (6%), Israel (4%), Taiwan (3%), South Africa (3%), and Australia (2%).

Tight (2012) analyzed the authorship of articles, published in 15 eminent higher Education journals in Oceania, Europe and North America in 2010. This author found that the country contributing the largest percentage of the first-author pool was the United States of America (30%), followed by Australia (20%), and the United Kingdom (17%). Six other countries had more than 10 first authors (in the total pool of 567 articles), namely, New Zealand (21), South Africa (20), Canada (14), Spain (14), the Netherlands (13), and Portugal (11) (Tight, 2012, p. 735).

## Methods

When this research commenced, in the beginning of 2014, there were 219 journals on the Thomson Reuters Web of Science (previously known as the ISI Web of Knowledge), indexed in the field of Education. For all the articles, published in this pool of journals during 2012, the authors and their national provenance were recorded.

## Results

A total of 18 523 authors were found to have published in the 2012 editions of the Thomson Reuters pool of journals in the field of Education. In Appendix 1, their national breakdown is presented. The first striking observation refers to the unequal distribution of authors. Almost half (48.03% to be exact) of the listed (UNESCO recognized) countries had no author at all. These included not only geographically and demographically small countries, but also the countries, such as the Democratic Republic of Congo, representing a significant proportion of the global geographical and demographical mass, as well as the countries well-known for their remarkable reform initiatives in the field of education in recent decades, such as Nicaragua or Cuba.

The absence of such countries, as well as Ukraine, Belarus and North Korea, for example, makes an impression of the ideological erstwhile Cold War borderline still operating as a barrier in creating a fully global network of scholars.

Twenty countries with the largest number of authors are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1

*The twenty countries with the largest number of authors*

Rank-order	Country	Number of authors	Percentage of authors	Rank-order	Country	Number of authors	Percentage of authors
1	USA	6616	35.72	11	Belgium	298	1.61
2	UK	1915	10.34	12	Finland	286	1.54
3	Australia	1490	8.04	13	New Zealand	276	1.48
4	Taiwan	755	4.08	14	South Africa	273	1.47
5	Canada	709	3.82	15	Sweden	258	1.39
6	Netherlands	688	3.71	16	Brazil	198	1.07
7	Turkey	614	3.31	17	South Korea	178	0.96
8	Spain	600	3.23	18	Ireland	162	0.87
9	Germany	546	2.95	19	Israel	146	0.79
10	China	455	2.46	20	Norway	142	0.77

The first observation is the overwhelming dominance of the United States of America, where over a third of the authors are located. Almost one half of all the authors hail from only two countries, namely, the United States of America and the United Kingdom. In Table 1, the dominance of North America and Western Europe is clearly demonstrated. Outside this core, Australia, and further afield, Turkey, Taiwan, China, South Korea, South Africa and Brazil appear. Overall, this small number of (20) countries provides 89.61% of the author pool.

The regional distribution of the authors is presented in Table 2. The regional UNESCO groupings were used (with the exception of Taiwan, not being a UNESCO member, but included in the category of East Asia-Pacific).

Table 2

*Regional distribution of authors*

Region	Percentage of Authors
Arab Countries	0.73
Central and Eastern Europe	4.60
Central Asia	0.11
Eastern Asia-Pacific	18.81
Latin American-Caribbean	1.97
North America-Western Europe	71.01
South and West Asia	0.81
Sub-Saharan Africa	1.96

## Discussion

The dominance of the North American and Western European core in the global map is conspicuous, representing over seventy per cent (71.09%) of all the authors. A secondary hub was found in the Eastern Asia-Pacific region, representing just below

twenty per cent (18.83%) of the author pool. Ninety per cent of all the authors are located in these two global scholarship centers, reducing each of the other six global regions to single digits in the author pool.

Based on the North American and the Western European region, the United States of America towers above the rest, with 6616 authors, accounting for over half of the authors within the region; this is followed by the United Kingdom with 1915 authors. North America appears stronger than Western Europe, and within Western Europe, the United Kingdom is much stronger than continental Europe. However, within the region as a whole, several countries can boast substantial numbers of authors: apart from the United States of America and the United Kingdom, also Canada (709), the Netherlands (688), Spain (600), Germany (546), Belgium (298), Finland (286), Sweden (258), Ireland (162), Israel (146), Italy (135) and France (123).

The Eastern Asia-Pacific region is dominated by Australia (1490 authors) and Taiwan (755 authors). Further on, New Zealand (276 authors), South Korea (178 authors), Singapore (130 authors) and Japan (102 authors) are registered as the countries with prolific scholars. However, countries, such as Indonesia (5 authors), Malaysia (6 authors) and Vietnam (7 authors), i.e. the countries with substantial populations and a sizeable academic professional sector, and widely hailed as economically emerging countries, present a very low profile on the scholarly map.

In Central and Eastern Europe, the bulk of authors, 614 (or 72.40% of them) in the region, hail from Turkey (classified by UNESCO in this region, although this classification is strongly debatable given its history and context different from those in the other countries). Apart from Turkey, this region is virtually invisible in the education-focused academic world, the two largest players being Serbia (52 authors) and Slovakia (51 authors). With regard to the demographic, geographic, political and economic power of Russia, as well as its history of the Soviet educational experiment as a focus of attention for scholars worldwide, the mere ten authors hailing from Russia is as unexpected as surprising.

Latin America supplies a small number of authors, with only two medium-sized players, namely, Brazil (198 authors) and Chile (79 authors). Especially disappointing is the low profile of two upper-middle income economies, with sizeable higher education sectors, that is, Mexico (38 authors) and Argentina (5 authors). Sub-Saharan Africa is characterized by the dominance of South Africa (supplying 273 or 78% of the authors in this region). Apart from South Africa, the only countries with more than a single digit number of the authors are Zimbabwe (22 authors), Nigeria (13 authors), Kenya (12 authors) and Ghana (10 authors). The rest of the Sub-Saharan African countries either have a single-digit number of authors, or (many, as can be seen in Appendix 1) no authors at all.

South and West Asia supply less than one percentage point of the author pool. The strong countries in the region — though minuscule in the global picture — are India (48 authors), Iran (74 authors) and Pakistan (24 authors), which is disappointing if we

consider that India and Pakistan, for example, are respectively the second and sixth-most populous countries in the world, and both have been implementing education reform in recent times. In the Arab world, the only countries with double-digit authors are: Saudi Arabia (42), Lebanon (24), Qatar (24), Egypt (15) and Jordan (12); the rest have either a single-digit number of authors, or (in the case of several ones) zero. This last category includes Algeria (a country occupying a large tract of land and having a large population) and the United Arab Emirates (a wealthy country presenting an interesting case study, with its cosmopolitan population and globalized economy). The only countries from the Central Asian region appearing on the author list are Kazakhstan (18 authors) and Georgia (1 author).

Across the regional groupings, the dominance of the Anglophone countries is salient. Between them, the United States of America, Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand account for 11 006 or 58.73% of all authors. If we add countries in which English is the established *lingua franca* and the language of learning and teaching in higher education, namely, South Africa, Singapore, India, Malaysia, Egypt, Nigeria and Kenya, this figure rises to 11 503 or 61.13% of the total author pool.

## Conclusion

A key determinant of power, development and equality, also between nations on the global level, is knowledge: the production and use of knowledge. In this regard, large parts of the world are currently hampered by a poor state of scholarship, and by not sharing in the global network of knowledge production, with its attendant benefits. This global system of knowledge production is extremely unequal, concentrated as it is in the North American and Western Europe core. Heartening, however, is the emergence of a second center in East Asia-Pacific, as well as smaller nodes in Turkey, South Africa and Brazil.

Even the nations in each core area suffer from a disadvantage of this lopsided international system of knowledge production since the resultant corpus of scholarly knowledge is impoverished –in the sense of being developed and tested in a very narrow range of contexts. This impoverished corpus may well relate to the state of Education lacking a body of substantial autochthonous theory (the hallmark of any acknowledged field of scholarship), as well as to the low impact of Educational research, or at least an edifice of theory tested in a larger variety of contexts would be conducive to the development of an autochthonous theory and also to a higher impact on educational practice.

Recommendations for the improvement of this state of affairs can only be made on the basis of suggestions for further research. The above-described picture of the geography of research on Education should be supplemented by a finer-textured analysis, taking as a basis the specific sub-fields of Education, particular themes and individual countries, and investigating how each is plugged into the global scholarship network. Such research should not only be based on the provenance of authors, but also on the analysis of citations and the impact of PhD theses.



Studies of this type should also be repeated, with respect to the language division. Only on the basis of such research can plans be drafted for rectifying the unbalanced production of Educational knowledge, and can the scholarly field of Education be placed on the trajectory of developing an all-encompassing, defensible autochthonous theoretical construction of knowledge, guiding educational practice and serving humanity in the globalized world.

## References

- Altbach, P. G. (1982). Servitude of the Mind? Education, dependency and neo-colonialism. In P. G. Altbach, R. F. Arnove, & G. P. Kelly (Eds.), *Comparative Education* (pp. 469-484). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Arrow, K. J. (1962). The Economic Implications of Learning by Doing. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 29(3), 155-173. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2295952>
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Dunbar, C. (1999). African-American males and participation: Promising inclusion, practicing exclusion. *Theory into Practice*, 38(4), 241-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849909543860>
- Ermenc K. S. (2013). History of Comparative Pedagogy at Universities in Slovenia. In C. Wolhuter, N. Popov, B. Leutwyler, & K. S. Ermenc (Eds.), *Comparative Education at Universities Worldwide* (third expanded edition) (pp. 137-146). Sofia: Bulgarian Comparative Education Society and Ljubljana: Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.
- Foster, M. (1994). Effective Black teachers: A literature review. In E. R. Hollins, J. King, & W. C. Hyman (Eds.), *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating a knowledge base* (pp. 225-241). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Furlong, J. (2013). *Education — An anatomy of a discipline*. London: Routledge.
- Hayhoe, R. (2000). Redeeming Modernity. *Comparative Education Review*, 44(4), 423-239. <https://doi.org/10.1086/447628>
- Larrabee, D. F. (1998). Educational researchers: living with a lesser form of knowledge. *Educational Researcher*, 27(8), 4-12. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X027008004>
- Levin, B., Qi, J., Edelstein, H., & Sohn, J. (Eds.). (2013). *The Impact of Research in Education: An international perspective*. Bristol: The Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.1332/policypress/9781447306207.001.0001>
- Nisbett, R. E. (2003). *The Geography of Thought: How Asians and Westerners Think Differently... and Why*. New York: The Free Press.
- Phillips, D., & Schweisfurth, M. (2014). *Comparative and International Education: An introduction to theory, method and practice*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: Bloomsbury.

- Stiglitz, J., & Greenwald, B. C. (2014). *Creating a Learning Society: A new approach to growth, development and social progress*. New York: Columbia University.
- Tight, M. (2012). Higher education research 2000-2010: changing journal publication patterns. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 31(5), 723-740. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2012.692361>
- Tillman, L. C. (2002). Culturally Sensitive Research Approaches: An African-American perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 31(9), 3-12. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X031009003>
- Warwick, D. P. (1983). The Politics of Ethics and Field Research. In M. Bulmer, & D. P. Warwick (Eds.), *Social Research in Developing Countries: Surveys and Answers in the Third World* (pp. 315-330). Chichester: Wiley.
- Wolhuter, C. C. (2003). Die beoogde stelsel van tweeledige beroepsonderwys en – opleiding in Suid-Afrika: potensiaalbepaling vanuit 'n vergelykende perspektief. *South African Journal of Education*, 23(2), 145-152.
- Wolhuter, C. C. (2008). Review of the Review: Constructing the identity of Comparative Education. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 3(4), 323-344. <https://doi.org/10.2304/rcie.2008.3.4.323>

---

**C. C. Wolhuter**

Faculty Education Sciences, North-West University  
Potchefstroom Campus  
Potchefstroom 2520, South Africa  
[Charl.Wolhuter@nwu.ac.za](mailto:Charl.Wolhuter@nwu.ac.za)

## **Appendix 1 Number of Authors per Country**

1. Antigua: 1	38. Indonesia: 5	75. Puerto Rico: 6
2. Argentina: 5	39. Iraq: 3	76. Qatar: 4
3. Armenia: 2	40. Iran: 174	77. Romania: 4
4. Australia: 1490	41. Ireland: 162	78. Russia: 10
5. Austria: 36	42. Israel: 146	79. Saudi Arabia: 42
6. Azerbaijan: 1	43. Italy: 135	80. Serbia: 52
7. Bangladesh: 7	44. Jamaica: 1	81. Singapore: 130
8. Belgium: 298	45. Japan: 102	82. Slovakia: 51
9. Bhutan: 1	46. Jordan: 12	83. Slovenia: 7
10. Botswana: 2	47. Kazakhstan: 18	84. South Africa: 273
11. Brazil: 198	48. Kenya: 12	85. South Korea: 178
12. Brunei: 2	49. Kuwait: 2	86. Spain: 600
13. Bulgaria: 4	50. Latvia: 15	87. Sri Lanka: 4
14. Cameroon: 1	51. Lebanon: 24	88. Sudan: 1
15. Canada: 709	52. Lesotho: 1	89. Sweden: 258
16. Chile: 79	53. Liberia: 7	90. Switzerland: 84
17. China: 455	54. Lithuania: 6	91. Syria: 3
18. Colombia: 31	55. Luxemburg: 5	92. Taiwan: 755
19. Congo: 1	56. Macao: 9	93. Tanzania: 6
20. Croatia: 32	57. Malawi: 6	94. Thailand: 23
21. Cyprus: 66	58. Malta: 13	95. Trinidad and Tobago: 3
22. Czech: 40	59. Malaysia: 6	96. Tunisia: 5
23. Denmark: 71	60. Mexico: 38	97. Turkey: 614
24. Egypt: 15	61. Morocco: 1	98. Uganda: 7
25. Estonia: 33	62. Mozambique: 3	99. United Kingdom: 1915
26. Ethiopia: 5	63. Nepal: 1	100. United States of America: 6616
27. Finland: 286	64. Netherlands: 688	101. Uruguay: 3
28. France: 123	65. New Zealand: 276	102. Venezuela: 4
29. Gambia: 2	66. Nigeria: 13	103. Vietnam: 7
30. Ghana: 10	67. Norway: 142	104. West Bank and Palestine: 1
31. Georgia: 1	68. Oman: 4	105. Zambia: 1
32. Germany: 546	69. Pakistan: 2	106. Zimbabwe: 22
33. Greece: 10	70. Panama: 1	
34. Honduras: 1	71. Peru: 3	
35. Hungary: 11	72. Philippines: 7	
36. Iceland: 14	73. Poland: 58	
37. India: 48	74. Portugal: 96	

Countries which had no authors in the author pool: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados,

Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comores, Cooks Islands, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of Congo, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Fiji, Gabon, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Kiribati, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Latvia, Libya, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Macedonia, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia, Maldives, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauri, Nicaragua, Niger, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Saint Kitts & Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent & the Granadas, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor Leste, Togo, Tonga, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Yemen.

# Geografsko porijeklo autora odgojno-obrazovnih istraživanja

## Sažetak

*Cilj je ovog istraživanja najprije izgraditi teorijski okvir o relevantnosti porijekla autora koji provode odgojno-obrazovna istraživanja, a zatim istražiti trenutne obrasce s obzirom na porijeklo tih istih autora. Utvrđeno je da se porijeklo autora povezuje s brojnim komponentama istraživačkog procesa, što obuhvaća: prikupljanje podataka, njihovu obradu i tumačenje, istraživačku etiku, sadržaj istraživanja, konstrukciju teorije i unapređenje prakse. Istražena je lokacija 18 523 autora čiji su radovi 2012. godine objavljeni u 219 indeksiranih časopisa za odgoj i obrazovanje (Thomson Reuters). Pojavljuje se vrlo neujednačen obrazac. Gotovo polovina svih zemalja ne bilježi nijednog autora u ovoj analizi. Blizu 90% autora živi u dvama središtima međunarodne mreže za odgojno-obrazovna istraživanja, u Sjevernoj Americi – Zapadnoj Europi i slabijoj Istočnoj Aziji-Pacifiku. Središta nižeg ranga su Turska, Južna Afrika i Brazil. U zaključku su navedene određene preporuke za daljnja istraživanja, kao i za korigiranje tako neujednačenog obrasca znanstvene aktivnosti.*

**Ključne riječi:** *analiza sustava u svijetu; autori članaka; časopisi za odgoj i obrazovanje; istraživači odgoja i obrazovanja; teorija odgoja i obrazovanja.*

## Uvod

U svijetu od sredine XX. stoljeća središnji problem predstavlja globalna nejednakost u smislu bogatstva i imperativ razvoja koji je prati. Unatoč dojmljivom gospodarskom rastu, nejednakost, a po nekim autorima sve veća nejednakost, sredinom drugog desetljeća XXI. stoljeća nastavlja bacati tamnu, prijeteću sjenu nad čovječanstvom i globalnom sigurnošću, što se podjednako odnosi na unutarnacionalnu i međunacionalnu nejednakost (vidi Stiglitz i Greenwald, 2014). Dok čimbenici kao što su rastuće vjerovanje o ljudskim pravima i teorije poput teorije modernizacije i teorije ljudskog kapitala pridonose globalnom širenju projekta odgoja i obrazovanja – drugo značajno obilježje svijeta nakon Drugog svjetskog rata – ekonomist sa Sveučilišta Columbia Ken Arrow od objavljivanja svog revolucionarnog rada 1962. godine (Arrow, 1962) ističe znanje i informacije kao kritične čimbenike nacionalnog gospodarskog razvoja.

Arrow, dobitnik Nobelove nagrade za ekonomiju 1972. godine, u suradnji s Robertom Solowom postavio je temelje novoj grani ekonomije pod nazivom teorija rasta. Prema njegovu mišljenju, kritični čimbenik stope gospodarskog razvoja određene nacije ne leži u njezinim prirodnim resursima, pristupu kapitalu, razini tehnološkog razvoja ili sličnom, nego u posjedovanju informacija ili znanja. Ako je to bilo točno prije pedeset godina, kada je Arrow formulirao svoja stajališta, danas je sigurno još više, zahvaljujući pojavi društva znanja/gospodarstva, odnosno tamo gdje su proizvodnja i korištenje novog znanja pogonska osovina nacionalnog gospodarstva.

Stoga geografija znanja i proizvodnje znanja također pretpostavlja veliki značaj s obzirom na odgoj i obrazovanje — područje znanstvene aktivnosti zaduženo za provedbu projekta proširenja odgoja i obrazovanja na međunarodnoj razini. Cilj je ovog rada dvostruk. U prvom će se redu nastojati sintetizirati postojeći korpus literature o važnosti porijekla autorskog znanja nastalog unutar odgoja i obrazovanja. Kao drugo, istražiti će se postojeći obrasci po kojima se locira autorsko znanje nastalo unutar odgoja i obrazovanja. Rad počinje pregledom literature, kulminirajući teorijskim okvirom o važnosti porijekla autora u znanstvenoj aktivnosti.

Nakon što se objasni metoda prikupljanja podataka koji se odnose na geografsko porijeklo autora odgojno-obrazovnih istraživanja, bit će predstavljeni geografski obrasci te će se oni protumačiti u odnosu na teorijski okvir.

## **Pregled relevantne literature**

Ovaj pregled literature ima tri dijela. To su: stanje znanja o odgoju i obrazovanju, važnost ili relevantnost porijekla autora u provedbi odgojno-obrazovnih istraživanja, literatura na temu geografije autorstva u odgojno-obrazovnim istraživanjima s podjelom na sjever i jug kao glavnom temom.

### ***Stanje istraživačkog područja odgoja i obrazovanja***

Istaknute značajke znanstvenog područja odgoja i obrazovanja — sve zabrinjavajuće – obuhvaćaju: noviju i nesigurnu institucijsku prisutnost tog područja, nedostatak intelektualne ili teorijske povezanosti u tom području, odgojno-obrazovna istraživanja bez ikakve akumulacijske prirode, manjak autohtonih teorija, percepciju o tom području kao inferiornom u odnosu na ostala znanstveno-istraživačka područja, slab utjecaj istraživanja na praksu. Odgoj i obrazovanje nemaju dugu sveučilišnu povijest (Furlong, 2013, str. 14, 15, 16). Prvi profesor odgoja i obrazovanja imenovan je tek 1776. godine (u Göttingenu, Njemačka); pa čak i u zemlji kao što je Engleska, gdje se povijest sveučilišta proteže na gotovo tisućljeće, institucijska prisutnost odgoja i obrazovanja kao područja datira samo stoljeće i pol unatrag (Sveučilište u Manchesteru, 1852. god.) (Furlong, 2013, str. 16).

Odgoj i obrazovanje opisuje se kao područje neizvjesnog znanja, nepovezano područje, te nadasve područje obilježeno znanjem koje se ne akumulira (Furlong, 2013, str. 10-11). Štoviše, nedostaje mu autohtona teorija, teorijski su mu okviri

potpuno preuzeti iz sličnih područja, kao što su sociologija, filozofija i psihologija. Ermenc (2013, str. 137) navodi da u kontinentalnoj Europi, od šestog desetljeća XX. stoljeća, postoji jedna idejna škola unutar relevantne istraživačke zajednice, koja bi najprije trebala konceptualizirati odgoj i obrazovanje kao primijenjeno istraživačko područje koje samo razvija prijedloge za školsku operacionalizaciju i poboljšanje odgojno-obrazovne prakse, a zatim biti znanstveno područje s vlastitim teorijama i metodološko-teorijskom jezgrom.

Drugi problem koji zaokuplja područje odgoja i obrazovanja jest slab utjecaj istraživanja koja se bave unapređivanjem prakse (cf. Levin, Edelstein, i Sohn, 2013), što se podjednako odnosi na razinu (nacionalne) politike i na razinu škole, odnosno učionice. Jedan čimbenik koji priječi takav utjecaj prakse jest činjenica da razlike u nacionalnom/lokalnom kontekstu ne dopuštaju jednostavno prenošenje odgojno-obrazovnih praksi iz jednog konteksta u neki drugi (cf. Wolhuter, 2003). Zbog svih spomenutih čimbenika nije neočekivano da na odgojno-obrazovne znanstvenike njihove sveučilišne kolege često gledaju kao na donekle inferiorne po statusu, a isto se stajalište redovito izražava u relevantnoj literaturi još od kada se ta teza proširila nakon Larrabeeova (1998) iznimno citiranog izdanja.

### ***Važnost porijekla autora za znanje o odgoju i obrazovanju***

Prije nego što je postmodernizam postao pomodan, a znanstveno se znanje uzimalo kao objektivno, neovisno o autoru i njegovoj/njezinoj fizičkoj lokaciji, pitanje o važnosti porijekla autora bilo bi pravo pitanje. Međutim, porijeklu autora odgojno-obrazovnih istraživanja može se pripisati značenje iz nekoliko perspektiva. One podrazumijevaju: istraživačku metodu (prikupljanje, obradu i tumačenje podataka), istraživačku etiku, sadržaj istraživanja, konstrukciju teorije i unapređivanje prakse.

Za početno prikupljanje istraživačkih podataka Tillman (2002, str. 8) citira određen broj istraživanja koja pokazuju kako kulturološka podudarnost pomaže istraživačima da uspostave odnose sa svojom istraživačkom zajednicom. Foster (1994) pokazuje kako primjena kulturološkog znanja ispitanika u odgojno-obrazovnim istraživanjima može otkriti raspon iskustava unutar specifičnog konteksta. Pri obradi i tumačenju podataka istraživač i njegov/njezin kontekst i porijeklo mogu također biti snažne odrednice. Ta se tvrdnja može potkrijepiti suvremenim teorijama učenja o društvenom rekonstrukcionizmu (cf. Berger i Luckmann, 1966), ali također Dunbarovim (1999) istraživanjem koje pokazuje kako razumijevanje afro-američkih učenika u jednoj školi u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama može biti pod utjecajem društvenih, ekonomskih i političkih sila ili Nisbettovim istraživanjem (2003) o tome kako se razlikuju percepcije i misaoni procesi učenika sa Zapada i Istoka, te kako ih oblikuju kulturno-povijesni čimbenici.

Istraživačevo porijeklo također je relevantno s obzirom na etičku stranu istraživanja. Ono što bi moglo odgovarati istraživačkoj etici u zadanom kontekstu ovisi o normama lokalne kulture (Phillips i Schweisfurth, 2014, str. 137). Warwick (1983), primjerice,

među narodima prepoznaje velike razlike u vrijednosti i važnosti koju oni pridaju privatnosti. Etičke posljedice istraživačeva porijekla postaju istaknutije u današnjem globalnom sustavu proizvodnje znanja – kada velik broj istraživača iz sjeverne hemisfere provodi istraživanja na globalnom jugu.

U globalnom kontekstu odnosa nejednake moći i postkolonijalnom okviru takvih istraživanja uvijek postoji pojačana opasnost od pogrešne potvrde istraživačevih očekivanja ili osjećaja prijatnje među ispitanicima – do stupnja kada valjanost istraživačkih rezultata može postati sumnjiva.

Teorijski su okviri, konstruirani s pomoću istraživanja u usko ograničenim kontekstima, pritom uvijek izloženi riziku od osiromašenja. U svom predsjedničkom obraćanju Društvu za komparativni i međunarodni odgoj i obrazovanje (eng. CIES) Hayhoe (2000), primjerice, ukazuje na vrijednost kojom istočnoazijske, indijske i arapske perspektive mogu pridonijeti isključivo zapadnom epistemološkom okviru. Zbog zamisli iz Sapir-Whorfove hipoteze prema kojoj lingvističke kategorije određuju kognitivne kategorije, taj problem postaje osobito akutan u smislu trenutnog uspona engleskog jezika kao međunarodnog *lingua franca* u akademskom svijetu i čak još više (anglo-američkih) konotacija o hegemoniji koja se pripisuje tom trendu.

Autorovo je porijeklo značajno ne samo s obzirom na konstrukciju teorije već također na onu drugu stranu kulminacije odgojno-obrazovnih istraživanja, to jest unapređenje prakse. Kao što je prije sugerirano, pregled stanja odgojno-obrazovnih istraživanja pokazuje da je napredak u praksi koji bi se mogao uočiti kao rezultat jedna od slabijih točaka. Ako se može prihvatiti da kontekstualno porijeklo autora utječe na njegovo/njezino tumačenje podataka, onda bi se istraživačevo porijeklo moglo na sličan način povezati s pronicljivošću kada se radi o utvrđivanju s praksom povezanih implikacija istraživačkih rezultata.

### ***Literatura o geografiji autorstva u odgojno-obrazovnim istraživanjima***

Kritika o prevlasti autora iz sjeverne hemisfere (ili zapadnoeuropskih-sjevernoameričkih) u znanstvenim je publikacijama stara tema. Klasična je publikacija u tom smislu ona Altbachova (1982). Naknadna sadržajna analiza radova, objavljenih u recenziranim časopisima za odgoj i obrazovanje, potvrđuje taj trend dominacije autora iz sjeverne hemisfere.

Wolhuter (2008) je proveo analizu sadržaja u svim radovima koji su objavljeni u *Comparative Education Review* tijekom prvih pedeset godina (1957. – 2006.) postojanja časopisa, te je tablično prikazao frekvenciju zemalja iz kojih dolaze autori za razdoblje od pet godina. U svakom su razdoblju značajno prevladavali autori iz Sjedinjenih Američkih Država (SAD). U posljednjih pet godina obuhvaćenih tom analizom znanstvenici iz SAD-a bili su autori 59% radova (Wolhuter, 2008). Slijedili su ih autori iz Kanade (8%), Ujedinjenog Kraljevstva (6%), Izraela (4%), Tajvana (3%), Južne Afrike (3%) i Australije (2%). Tight (2012) je analizirao, 2010. godine, autorstvo



radova koji su objavljeni u 15 uglednih časopisa za visoko obrazovanje u Oceaniji, Europi i Sjevernoj Americi.

Utvrđio je da su SAD (30%) zemlja koja najviše doprinosi postotku radova kada se pogleda prvi autor, zatim Australija (20%) i UK (17%). Šest ostalih zemalja imaju više od 10 prvih autora (ukupno pregledano 567 radova), a to su: Novi Zeland (21%), Južna Afrika (20%), Kanada (14%), Španjolska (14%), Nizozemska (13%) i Portugal (11%) (Tight, 2012, str. 735).

## Metode

Kada je ovo istraživanje započelo, početkom 2014. godine, postojalo je 219 časopisa u bazi Web of Science Thomsona Reutersa (prije poznata kao eng. *ISI Web of Knowledge*), indeksiranih za područje odgoja i obrazovanja. Za sve su radove, objavljene u tom korpusu časopisa tijekom 2012. godine, zabilježeni autori i njihovo nacionalno porijeklo.

## Rezultati

Utvrđeno je da su ukupno 18,523 autora objavljivala u spomenutim izdanjima 2012. godine (Thomson Reuters časopisi, područje odgoja i obrazovanja). Prilog 1 prikazuje nacionalni presjek autora. Prvo dojmljivo zapažanje tiče se nejednake distribucije autora. Gotovo polovina (točnije 48,03%) svih (UNESCO ih priznaje) zemalja nije uopće imala autore. To uključuje ne samo geografski i demografski male zemlje, već i ostale kao što je Demokratska Republika Kongo koja ima značajan udio u globalnoj geografskoj i demografskoj masi, kao i zemlje posljednjih desetljeća dobro poznate po značajnim reformskim inicijativama u području odgoja i obrazovanja, kao što su Nikaragva ili Kuba.

Odsustvo tih zemalja te, primjerice, Ukrajine, Bjelorusije i Sjeverne Koreje stvara dojam da ideološka podjela prije hladnog rata još uvijek djeluje kao prepreka stvaranju potpuno globalne mreže znanstvenika.

Dvadeset zemalja s najvećim brojem autora prikazano je u Tablici 1 dolje.

### Tablica 1

Najprije se zapaža da golemu prevlast imaju Sjedinjene Američke Države, u kojima je locirano više od trećine autora. Gotovo polovina svih tih autora dolazi samo iz dviju zemalja, Sjedinjenih Američkih Država i Ujedinjenog Kraljevstva. Tablica 1 jasno pokazuje prevlast Sjeverne Amerike i Zapadne Europe. Izvan te jezgre pojavljuju se Australija, a zatim još dalje Turska, Tajvan, Kina, Južna Koreja, Južna Afrika i Brazil. Sve u svemu, tom malom broju (20) zemalja pripada 89,61% autora obuhvaćenih ovim korpusom.

Regionalna distribucija autora prikazana je u Tablici 2. Koristilo se regionalno grupiranje prema UNESCO-u (s iznimkom Tajvana, koji nije UNESCO-va članica, a uključen je u kategoriju Istočna Azija-Pacifik).

### Tablica 2

## Rasprava

Prevlast sjevernoameričke-zapadnoeuropske jezgre uočljiva je na globalnoj karti jer predstavlja više od 70% (71,09%) svih autora. Druga zanimljivost otkrivena je u regiji Istočna Azija-Pacifik, odakle potječe manje od 20% (18,83%) autora iz analize. 90% svih autora locirano je u tim dvama globalnim istraživačkim središtima, svodeći svaku od ostalih šest globalnih regija u analizi porijekla autora na jednoznamenaste brojke.

Ako se usredotočimo na sjevernoameričku-zapadnoeuropsku regiju, onda su Sjedinjene Američke Države iznad svih ostalih, sa 6616 autora, što čini više od polovine autora iz tog područja; zatim slijedi Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo s 1915 autora. Sjeverna Amerika čini se jačom od Zapadne Europe, a u Zapadnoj Europi Ujedinjeno je Kraljevstvo mnogo jače u odnosu na kontinentalnu Europu. Međutim, u toj se regiji promatranj cjelovito nekoliko zemalja može pohvaliti znatnim brojem autora: osim SAD i UK to su Kanada (709), Nizozemska (688), Španjolska (600), Njemačka (546), Belgija (298), Finska (286), Švedska (258), Irska (162), Izrael (146), Italija (135) i Francuska (123).

Što se tiče regije Istočna Azija-Pacifik, dominiraju Australija (1490 autora) i Tajvan (755 autora). Dalje, Novi Zeland (276 autora), Južna Koreja (178 autora), Singapur (130 autora) i Japan (102 autora) zemlje su s produktivnim znanstvenicima. No, zemlje poput Indonezije (5 autora), Malezije (6 autora) i Vijetnama (7 autora) jesu zemlje sa znatnim brojem stanovnika i priličnim akademskim profesionalnim sektorom, te se široko prepoznaju kao gospodarski obećavajuće zemlje, ali im je profil vrlo slab u znanstveno-istraživačkom području.

U regiji Srednje i Istočne Europe ukupno 614 ili 72,40% autora dolazi iz Turske (UNESCO ju klasificira u spomenutu regiju iako je to vrlo upitno s obzirom na drugačiju povijest i kontekst u odnosu na ostale zemlje u regiji). Osim Turske, ta je regija virtualno nevidljiva u akademskom svijetu (područje odgoja i obrazovanja), u kojem su dva najjača igrača Srbija (52 autora) i Slovačka (51 autor). Uzimajući u obzir demografsku, geografsku, političku i ekonomsku moć Rusije, kao i povijest sovjetskog eksperimenta u odgoju i obrazovanju kao fokus zanimanja za znanstvenike širom svijeta, samo deset autora iz Rusije je isto toliko neočekivan koliko i iznenađujući podatak.

Latinska Amerika daje malen broj autora, sa samo dva igrača srednjeg ranga, a to su Brazil (198 autora) i Čile (79 autora). Osobito razočarava slab profil dvaju gospodarstava koja su po prihodima višeg srednjeg ranga, s nezanemarivim sektorima visokog obrazovanja, a to su Meksiko (38 autora) i Argentina (5 autora). Supsaharska Afrika je karakteristična po dominaciji Južne Afrike (zabilježeno 273 ili 78% autora u toj regiji). Osim Južne Afrike, jedine zemlje s više od jednoznamenastog broja autora jesu Zimbabve (22 autora), Nigerija (13 autora), Kenija (12 autora) i Gana (10 autora). Ostatak zemalja u supsaharskoj Africi ili bilježi jednoznamenaste brojeve autora ili (mnoge, kao što se vidi u Prilogu 1) uopće nema navedene autore.

Južna i zapadna Azija daju manje od 1% autora u ovoj analizi. Snažne zemlje u regiji — iako minijaturne na globalnoj slici — jesu Indija (48 autora), Iran (74 autora) i Pakistan (24 autora), što je razočaravajuće s obzirom na to da su Indija i Pakistan, primjerice, druga odnosno šesta najnaseljenija zemlja svijeta i da se u obje zemlje u novije doba provodi odgojno-obrazovna reforma. U arapskim su zemljama jedini primjeri s dvoznamenkastim brojem zastupljenih autora: Saudijska Arabija (42), Libanon (24), Katar (24), Egipat (15) i Jordan (12); ostale imaju ili jednoznamenkasti broj autora ili (u nekoliko slučajeva) nijednog. Ta posljednja kategorija obuhvaća Alžir (zemlja koja zauzima veliko područje i ima brojno stanovništvo) i Ujedinjene Arapske Emirate (bogata zemlja koja predstavlja zanimljivo istraživanje slučaja, s kozmopolitskom populacijom i globaliziranim gospodarstvom). Jedine zemlje iz srednjoazijske regije na listi autora jesu Kazahstan (18 autora) i Čečenija (1 autor).

Uzimajući u obzir regionalno grupiranje autora, prevlast je anglofonih zemalja itekako očita. Među njima, na SAD, Kanadu, UK, Australiju i Novi Zeland otpada 11 006 ili 58,73% svih autora. Ako se tom popisu dodaju zemlje u kojima engleski jezik ima status *lingua franca* i jezik je na kojem se realizira visokoškolska nastava (Južna Afrika, Singapur, Indija, Malezija, Egipat, Nigerija i Kenija), onda je ta brojka 11 503 ili 61,13% sveukupnog broja autora obuhvaćenih ovim istraživanjem.

## Zaključak

Ključna odrednica moći, razvoja i jednakosti, također među nacijama na globalnoj razini, jest znanje: proizvodnja i primjena znanja. U tom su smislu veliki dijelovi svijeta trenutno zakočeni slabim znanstveno-istraživačkim stanjem i time što nisu dio globalne mreže proizvodnje znanja i njegovih popratnih prednosti. Taj je globalni sustav proizvodnje znanja krajnje nejednak, koncentriran na sjevernoameričku-zapadnoeuropsku jezgru. Ohrabrujuća je, međutim, pojava drugog središta u Istočnoj Aziji-Pacifiku, kao i manjih područja u Turskoj, Južnoj Africi i Brazilu.

Čak i one nacije koje se nalaze u svim tim ključnim područjima pate od nedostatka tog neproporcionalnog međunarodnog sustava proizvodnje znanja jer je korpus znanja koji iz toga proizlazi osiromašen, odnosno da se razvija i testira u vrlo uskom kontekstualnom rasponu. Taj se osiromašeni korpus može dobro povezati sa stanjem odgoja i obrazovanja kojem nedostaje jedna temeljna autohtona teorija (značajka svakog priznatog znanstvenog područja) te sa slabim utjecajem odgojno-obrazovnih istraživanja ili bi pak konstrukcija teorije, testirane u većem broju različitih konteksta, bila korisna za razvoj autohtone teorije te bi imala veći utjecaj na odgojno-obrazovnu praksu.

Preporuke za poboljšanje takvog stanja mogu se jedino dati na temelju prijedloga za daljnja istraživanja. Prikazana slika geografije odgojno-obrazovnih istraživanja trebala bi biti dopunjena kvalitetnijom analizom s polazištem u specifičnim područjima znanosti o odgoju i obrazovanju, određenim temama i pojedinim zemljama, istražujući kako se svaka uklapa u globalnu istraživačku mrežu. Takvo se istraživanje ne bi trebalo

zasnivati samo na porijeklu autora, nego i na analizi citata i utjecaju doktorskih disertacija.

Sva bi istraživanja također trebalo ponoviti, s istraživanjima o jezičnoj podjeli. Samo se na temelju takvih istraživanja mogu izrađivati planovi za ispravljanje neuravnotežene proizvodnje znanja o odgoju i obrazovanju, a znanstveno područje odgoja i obrazovanja dovesti na put razvoja sveobuhvatne, obranjive autohtone konstrukcije znanja koje će usmjeravati odgojno-obrazovnu praksu i služiti čovječanstvu u globaliziranom svijetu.