

4

International Curriculum Research

Why and How?

DANIEL TRÖHLER

“Education” is a tricky notion because it refers to at least two practices that are clearly distinct, but also interrelated. First, it indicates a set of formal and informal social practices; second, it refers to a distinct academic discipline in which research activities are designed to generate academic knowledge about these formal or informal social practices. The blurred boundaries between these two practices—social practice and research activity—have obscured the fact that in different cultural and/or national systems, the mutual relationship between these two practices have been and still are constructed in different ways. Whereas in the United States, for instance, research aims at generating knowledge about social practices in order to make them more efficient, in Germany, for example, research tends to clarify educational ideals in order to transcend social practice.

One of the effects of these different cultural and/or national understandings in the relationship between the two practices related to the notion of “education” was that, for instance, educational discourse in the United States was, when facing immigrant problems in the large cities around 1900, inclined to think about the interrelation between education and democracy. Democracy was construed as “social progress,” including in terms of mutual interaction and communication: John Dewey’s publication *The School and Society* is paradigmatic (Dewey, 1900). A comparable approach to education cannot be found in Germany. Neither before nor after 1900 did democracy or social progress play an important role in German educational discourse. Instead, philosophers postulated the concept of *Bildung* (see Horlacher, 2012), the ideal of inward self-realization as counter-thesis to a world that was understood as dangerous: diverse, plural, and democratic (Tröhler, 2012).

Whereas the American tradition of research in education—oriented towards service of social progress emphasizing social unity in diversity—depended on experience, knowledge stemming from experience, and mutual exchange of this knowledge, the German discourse in

education—oriented towards inward unity understood as opposed to external plurality—depended on inward transformation by the aesthetic education, especially Greek art and German E-literature (Goethe most prominently). The “E” in E-literature derives from the German adjective “*ernst*” (serious, earnest) and is opposed to the “U,” deriving from the German adjective “*unterhaltend*” (entertaining, amusing):¹ *Bildung* is the earnest process of the aesthetic education of the soul, with the aim of transforming an uneducated soul to an aesthetic unity. Given this aim, it is no coincidence that Plato’s educational philosophy—foremost developed in his *Republic*, with its emphasis on *περιαγωγή* (*periagoge*),² played in Germany an incomparably more important role than in France, in the United Kingdom, or in the United States. The aim of education is the transformation of the soul in the (educational) process from an enchained state to the encounter of the very cause and recognition of eternal truth. In this “transformation,” the soul of the student accesses the sun, which has, in Plato’s metaphysics, two fundamental functions: it is ontologically the cause of everything (by virtue of its energy) and epistemologically the cause of knowledge (by virtue of its light) (516c, 518c, 537d). In other words, in order to (get to) know the ultimate cause and truth of everything, one has to transform his/her soul through education.

The difference between the United States and Germany is not restricted to educational theories; it includes the self-construction of scholars in education, too. Whereas a characteristic autobiography of an educator in the United States is likely to focus on learning and advancement in knowledge, German autobiographies of educators narrate their lives as stories of sacrifice and salvation (Tröhler, forthcoming). Differences in education or educational theories encompass more fundamental ways of interpreting the world, the child, and the ideal citizen. Understanding education—or understanding curriculum (Pinar et al., 1995)—means to understand the cultural construction of the child and the future citizen; and to understand this

construction as a construction asks for reconstruction of its genealogy. Following deliberations make this thesis explicit. I examine the already indicated general differences between the United States and Germany with specific regard to curriculum research. I deduce from these an epistemological problem in curriculum research, namely cultural and/or national narrowness. Then I advocate a difference between rationalization as relevant to curriculum policy and rationalization as a promising research paradigm to curriculum and curriculum, delimiting differing cultural and/or national constructions of curriculum, and the reconstructing of its genealogies. Fourth, I suggest a concrete approach to this research on curriculum, namely to understand curricula as educational designs to create future citizens within lines of dominant perceptions of sameness and difference. Finally, I summarize my arguments in regard to international research on curriculum research.

International Variety in Understanding Curriculum

Plato's unmatched popularity in German idealism in philosophy and philosophy of education promotes, as Plato's allegory of the cave tells us, the freedom of the soul—an idea that echoes in Luther's theology, leading him to the dualistic conclusion that the freedom of the soul was an "inward freedom," opposed to "outer freedom," which is political freedom.³ The idea of a higher-ranking inward freedom (as opposed to outer freedom) has been a paradigm in German philosophy ever since, and it was John Dewey who, in his lecture series *German Philosophy and Politics* (Dewey, 1915), identified the willingness of Germans to march for the emperor with this dualism and its emphasis on inward (rather than political) freedom. Be that as it may, the fact is that the German tradition aimed at transforming the soul, and in so doing, devalued that knowledge to be learned at school. Knowledge (and certainly empirical knowledge) is not the important issue but the inward transformation of the soul. The well known historian of education, Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, said in accordance with this German tradition in an interview on August 15th, 2011: "*Bildung* is what remains if we forget everything that we ever learned in school" (Tenorth, 2011).

It is not surprising, then, that in Germany, research on education questions of curriculum or syllabus are side issues. A more or less continuous research tradition under the catchword "curriculum" has never existed, and the interest in relevant research abroad has been marginal. Ralph W. Tyler's *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (Tyler, 1949), for instance, was not translated until 1973 (Tyler, 1973), taking the 31st printing of 1971 as its basis. (The 45th printing in 1989 seems having been the last one in the United States, whereas the German translation never enjoyed a second printing.) In the same manner, none of the three editions of Herbert Kliebard's *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893–1958* (Kliebard, 1986) has ever been received in Germany, and

almost the same applies to Michael Apple's *Ideology and Curriculum* (Apple, 1979) or to the classic *Understanding Curriculum*, edited by William F. Pinar et al. first in 1995.

Accordingly, institutional support for curriculum studies does not exist. "Departments of Curriculum and Instruction," easily found in the North American contexts (the most famous of all probably in Madison, Wisconsin), do not exist in Germany, and the counterpart of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) in Germany, the DGfE (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Erziehungswissenschaft* [German Educational Research Association]), has no comparable division to the AERA-division B Curriculum Studies. The lack of relevant chairs in curriculum research expelled interested scholars from Germany: Stefan Hopmann taught, after having completed his studies in Germany, first in Trondheim and Kristiansand, Norway, and since 2005 in Vienna, Austria (Hopmann and Riquarts, 1995), and Moritz Rosenmund as a Swiss has made his career in Switzerland and has been teaching since 2009 in Vienna, Austria, too (Rosenmund et al., 2002).

There was only one time that "Curriculum" became more broadly accepted in Germany, and that was after 1961, when the OECD urged the member states to found national institutions for the dissemination of their educational ideology. The Germans founded the Max Planck Institute for Human Development in 1963/1964, and one of the first directors was Saul Benjamin Robinsohn, a Jew who had fled Germany in 1933 (to Jerusalem), returning to Germany 25 years later, in 1959, as director of the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE) in Hamburg⁴ before being appointed to the Max Planck Institute for Human Development in Berlin. With reference to relevant research in the United States, the United Kingdom, Sweden, and the Soviet-Union, Robinsohn developed the theoretical fundaments of curriculum research, often criticizing the traditional liberal arts curriculum ("*Lehrplan*") in Germany (see the R. Horlacher and A. De Vincenti's contribution "From Rationalist Autonomy to Scientific Empiricism: A History of Curriculum in Switzerland" in this volume). His widely read publication *Bildungsreform als Revision des Curriculum* [Educational Reform as Revision of the Curriculum], first published in 1967 (Robinsohn, 1967), had five editions and several printings, the latest in 1981. Robinsohn died in 1972, and a year later, Tyler's *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* was published in German. A decade later, the notion of curriculum vanished.⁵

Epistemological Problems

These comparative points concerning "curriculum" in the United States and in Germany serve to identify an epistemological problem in understanding curriculum, for they demonstrate how research itself can be bound to the respective cultural or national preferences. Today, there is hardly any doubt anymore that curricula are cultural constructions, as Thomas S. Popkewitz states: "Curricula are historically formed within systems of ideas that inscribe

styles of reasoning, standards, and conceptual distinctions in school practices and its subjects" (2001, p. 151). Being unaware of the overall cultural dispositions behind the individual curricula, research runs the risk of reinforcing cultural or national conditions of curriculum constructions rather than identifying and analyzing them (Cowen, 2011). Comparing curricula means, therefore, not to state more or less obvious differences (for instance in timetables), but to compare different "power" systems and thus "systems of ideas," and that is exactly where Foucault, not much of a comparatist at all, leaves us a bit out in the rain.

The major epistemological problem is how to design and conduct research on curriculum (be it national or international) without being blindly trapped by one's own cultural or national "systems of reasoning." Transcendence (idealism's solution since Plato) has been identified as culturally biased, too (see, for instance, Dewey's Clifford lectures in 1929, *The Quest for Certainty*),⁶ and it would be intellectually rather easy to identify Immanuel Kant's ideal of a pure reason (theoretical and practical) as a Pietist reaction against the progress of the natural sciences in order to save the "purity" of the inner soul, called reason. In other words, the quest for an Archimedean point is a cultural construction itself and the Foucauldian reference to inescapable power systems is of little help.

Between the illusion of transcendent idealism and the fatalism of inescapability, there seems to be only one way out of the dilemma, and it is certainly an imperfect one. The idea is to combine two different ways of comparison in the analysis of "systems of reasoning" (Popkewitz 2010, p. 15), namely synchronous and diachronic analyses. Synchronous comparison—so far dominant—compares elements within one space of time; the model in the United States would be, probably, Horace Mann's *Report of an Educational Tour in Germany, and Parts of Great Britain and Ireland* (Mann, 1846) or something like *Curriculum Reform in the Early 1960s in the United States and Soviet Union*. There are diachronic comparisons of elements between several selected spaces of time—e.g., the *Curriculum Before and After the Second World War* in either of these countries, or the impact of the OECD in curriculum construction of the European nation-states in after 1960 (OECD, W. Stoke, H. Löwbeer, and J. Capelle, 1966).

The latter of these would be normally subsumed within curriculum history, which, traditionally, has not been very comparative. Bernadette Baker has advanced the notion of *New Curriculum History* (Baker, 2009) in order to open historical enquiries into comparisons—and vice versa to lend traditional un-historical comparisons more historical depth. If curricula are, according to Popkewitz, historically formed within systems of ideas, research cannot but proceed with historical methods, understanding curriculum genealogically. In order to escape the risk of any historical research—reinforcing the same cultural convictions that brought forth the curricula—then research must take a synchronic comparative stance in order to gain emancipatory energy. William Pinar's genealogy of whiteness of the

Western culture in his *Race, Religion, and a Curriculum of Reparation* is an impressive example of transcending taken-for-granted assumptions for the "practical" use of teaching in schools (Pinar, 2006).

The problem is that curriculum research is—by nature of its object—inclined to be caught by the taken-for-granted assumptions behind the object of study: "More than other fields perhaps, curriculum studies tend to be explicitly situated within the national borders in which they are conducted" (Pinar, 2003, p. 2). In other words, a German theory on the course of study in primary school had to be aligned with the German *Volk* and the German nation, as the eminent German educational theorist Wilhelm Rein stated in his important *Encyclopedic Handbook in Education (Enzyklopädisches Handbuch der Pädagogik)* in 1906. All the aforementioned difficulties in developing curriculum are "solved" if the curriculum designers consider that the "becoming of the individual personality is nourished by the becoming of the national culture" (Rein, 1906, p. 551). Accordingly, a German scholar at the same time could not avoid reaffirming that more than fifty percent of the curriculum of the Upper High School *had to be* devoted to Greek and Latin, simply because he himself had undergone this curriculum and became socialized with the cultural ideal of *Bildung* that depended on competencies in Greek and Latin (Tröhler, 2012).

Trans-Nationalization as Process and Inter-Nationalization as Research Paradigm

To escape this (often unintended and unconscious) nationalism, researchers have recommended the use of the notion of globalization or at least refer to globalization as a phenomenon, whereas William Pinar suggested using the less intrusive notion of "international." The decision has fundamental epistemological consequences: "It is a question contextualized in our national cultures, in the political present, in cultural questions institutionalized in academic disciplines and educational institutions. It is question that calls upon us to critique our own national cultures" (Pinar, 2003 p. 3). Observing the difference between curriculum policy and curriculum research, it is easy to underline Pinar's epistemological argument in favor of the notion of "international" over "global," and history shows why.

The first acknowledged comparatist in education was the French officer, diplomat, and man of letters, Marc-Antoine Jullien, living an extremely eventful life between the French Revolution and Napoleon's Empire. In 1816, he initiated a comparison of the educational systems in Europe, in a first step in the twenty-two cantons of Switzerland, parts of Germany and Italy, and, in a second step, of all other European nations (Jullien, 1817). Antecedent to his initiative was the end of the Vienna Congress (1815), bringing the old political structures of the dynastic territorial powers to an end by defining clearly territorial borders of the nation-states. Despite the Vienna Congress and its program labeled "Restoration," Europe was not the same anymore: the new

nation-states had to define their legitimation (mostly the common language), their fundamentals of cohabitation (constitutions), and how they wanted to integrate people into the new entities (the new mass schools and also the army). The question was how to organize the new mass schooling as guarantor of the nation building and national unity. Marc-Antoine Jullien suggested a systematic approach of what today is called “best practice.”

In his preliminary sketch of this comparative endeavor (which was never completed), Jullien summarized a European feeling after the end of the Vienna Congress in 1815: after almost a quarter of a century of wars, no one expected progress anymore by military conflicts, but rather by improved education. In this process of educationalizing social problems (Tröhler, 2011) Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, with his institute in Yverdon (Switzerland), had become a star in the European scene, courted by kings, dukes, wealthy parents, and the like (Horlacher, forthcoming). Marc-Antoine Jullien himself had sent his own children to Pestalozzi and published on the educational enterprise of the Swiss (Jullien, 1812 a, b) and served as member of the economic committee in Pestalozzi’s institute. Legitimizing his comparative endeavor, Jullien wrote: “The reform and improvement of education, true bases of social development, first source of habits and opinions, exerting powerful influence over the whole life-span, are a generally accepted need, almost by instinct, in Europe” (Jullien, 1817, p. 7, freely translated here). Comparative education should, therefore, “indicate the means to satisfy these needs in the surest, most efficient, and most rapid way” (Ibid.).

The method for this attempt was—in the tradition of the French enlightenment—to generate a “*Tables comparatives d’observations*,” a synoptic-comparative table of observations of education systems.⁷ This table should serve to judge “those who progress,” “those who step back,” and those who don’t move in either direction. Furthermore, the table would serve to identify which parts of the individual systems are the weakest and why; why they obstruct religion, social, and moral development; and how one can overcome these obstacles. In other words, such a table would indicate which “branches offer improvements susceptible being transported from one country to another, with the modifications and changes that the local circumstances would suggest” (p. 9, freely translated here). Comparative education serves the development of the national or even local systems and assumes a trans-national character, for it transfers “foreign” models to other countries.

Although the nation-states—feeling the need to install mass-education after the Vienna Congress in 1815—aimed to emphasize the uniqueness of their respective nations, the practice of peering around the borders was much more than an exception. The French school law, for instance, developed by Condorcet in 1792, was almost literally translated into German during the Helvetic Republic in 1798, where it was somewhat more successful than in France. And when the Dutch King in the 1830s insisted

that the German speaking segregated southern parts of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands—the newly founded Belgium—should stay independent as Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, then Luxembourg had first to erect a constitution and then a school law. This school law brought together ideas from the Dutch law of 1814, the French law of Guizot 1833, and the Belgium law from 1835, the latter two depending on the Dutch law of 1814, which in turn, had affinities with the French law of 1792 (Thyssen, forthcoming). Trans-national exchange was common in the process of nation building: successful models elsewhere were always perceived as successful in the eyes of the observer and translated into the national needs and circumstances.

These undeniably trans-national practices in curriculum development have led scholars to detect the effects of “cultural principles exogenous to any specific nation-state and its historical legacy” (Meyer and Ramirez, 2000, p. 115) on national educational systems. The genesis of these trans-national “exogenous” cultural principles was detected in the time years *ahead* of the Reformation, “perhaps 1500” (Meyer et al., 1987, p. 23), when, according to the authors, the church had become “trans-national” and thus able to comprise a multitude of cultures symbolically. This historical narrative enables these scholars to construct the narrative of globalization that resembles a postMarxist idea of development by interpreting diversities as antitheses that are synthesized and historically interpreted as “globalization” (Tröhler, 2010). “Globalization” is then less a concept of history than of history of philosophy, obscuring the difference between trans-national policies and international research. However, today we are asked to take the step “from curriculum development to understanding curriculum” (Pinar et. al., 1995, pp. 3–11), from the concern for τέχνη (téchne) to the concern of πίστις (episteme).

National-Cultural Aspirations, the Cradle of the Citizen, and Curriculum

When after the Second World War the Germans were in the need of—among many other things—reconstructing their school system, one of the speakers at a teacher’s association in Bremen reminded his colleagues that the curriculum as a whole reflects the ideal of citizenship. He said: “All the schools have to emphasize citizenship education and democratic attitudes by their curricula, textbooks, and teaching aids and the organization of the schools itself. . . . The curricula must have the aim of fostering the mutual understanding and respect of the modern people and has therefore also to foster the modern languages, too” (Berger, 1947, p. 17, freely translated here).⁸ Such citizenship education is clearly not limited to specific aspects of the curriculum, such as civics or democratic education, but related to the whole curriculum. The modern school and its curriculum aimed, as stated in a Memorial of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg in 1828, to serve as the “cradle of

the citizen" (Witry, 1900, p. 34), and the same idea Benjamin Rush, one of the Founding Fathers of the United States, expressed in his *Thoughts Upon the Mode of Education Proper in a Republic* a year before the ratification of the Constitution (Rush, 1786): "A form of government we have assumed has created a new class of duties to every American," Rush emphasized, and that the United States needed now "an education of our own" in order to generate 'patriotism.' " Religion is a self-evident part of the ongoing citizen: "A Christian cannot fail of being useful to the republic," and the Bible must be part of the curriculum (p. 12). Physical education is crucial (p. 15), music as well (p. 16), but Latin and Greek excluded (p. 18). In contrast, eloquence and history (p. 19) are important for the converse of men into republican machines (p. 17), economy, too, and also chemistry, military exercises, and "the nature and variety of treaty" (pp. 20f.).

When Marc-Antoine Jullien published his project on comparative education in 1817, he thought in the categories of French cosmopolitanism. Together with many other contemporaries he recognized the educational need of the newly "born" nation-states after 1815, but in his optimism he underestimated the cultural differences between the new autonomous territories. Blinded by French enlightenment and its belief in the positive effects of knowledge and religion, Jullien ignored the differences in the political, social, and economical visions of the formally similar nation-states, and education was designed to emphasize these differences, most of all teacher education. It is no coincidence that in the curriculum of teacher education towards the end of the nineteenth century the subject history of education—basically invented for teacher education—was the major subject in implementing national-moral values. Accordingly, the German histories of education emphasized almost exclusively German heroes of education (often by naturalizing the Swiss Pestalozzi), whereas the French histories of education copied formally the German model but replaced the German by French heroes of education (often by naturalizing the Swiss Rousseau) (Tröhler, 2006).

These differences make sense, because behind them we find different ideals of citizenship. The American citizen is culturally distinct from the citizen in Canada or in the United Kingdom, and the French *citoyen* is something distinct, too, and the same applies to the German *Bürger*. Lexically spoken, the *Bürger* means citizen, and the citizen means *citoyen*, but semantically they are very different. The difference is not linguistic in the sense of natural languages, but linguistic in the sense of ideological languages that usually have (nowadays often hidden) religious roots, whereby the different denominations reveal themselves in the different cultural traditions of education and curriculum: The differences between the United States and Germany, mentioned in the beginning, are to a large extent expressions of the differences between American reformed Calvinism and German Lutheranism (Tröhler, 2011).

These differences become evident, for instance, in the four completely different ideological constructions of the *Bürger* in Germany, the former German Democratic Republic, Austria, and Switzerland. These differences have long historical roots. The Swiss *Bürger*, for instance—ideologically much closer to the U.S. citizen than to the German or Austrian *Bürger*—represents a concept of being fundamentally responsible for the common good and quite the opposite of a subject. The German *Bürger* has always been basically compatible with the status of subject. Therefore, the *Bürger's* reference group is not the state but the private family. The difference becomes particularly obvious with regard to the public interpretation of politics. Recently, when President Barack Obama introduced universal health insurance, he was labeled a socialist by many right-wing citizens in the United States. However, when the first chancellor of the German Empire at the end of the nineteenth century, Otto von Bismarck, introduced the same issue, it was in order to prevent the workers turning to socialism, and Bismarck was successful because the German *Bürger* expected as a matter of course broad protection by the state, rather than feeling responsible to provide this protection him/herself (Tröhler, Popkewitz, and Labaree, 2011, pp. 3f.).

It is differences like these that cause today's empirical comparative research severe problems for they cannot work with the traditional binary coding of input and output. For example, when in the 1990s comparative study of civic education in six countries (Hahn, 1998; Mellor, 1998) and the International Association of the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IAEEA) study of the relation of civic education and citizenship identity in 28 countries (Torney-Purta et al., 2001) had to interpret their results, they were indignant because the German results did not correlate at all with the enormous German effort in citizenship education. These "failings"—in contrast to other countries, there were hardly any effects in Germany despite the immense inputs—show the limits of this kind of quantitative empirical comparative research, ignoring the different ideals of citizenship across the different cultures/nations. It results in confusion about "illogic" data: "Whether they are rooted in culture, history, or some aspects of schooling is not evident," the Hahn (1999, p. 246) concluded. The results appear to be some sort of a "combination of all those factors," which cannot be operationalized by empirical research. The problem is, Hahn goes on, rightly, that what works in one political culture with its "distinct set of values" cannot simply be adopted in another with "differing traditions, values and meanings" (p. 231). That is exactly the problem of comparative research, especially in national ventures such as curriculum.

Outlook

Curricula of the modern mass school have been designed for two purposes: for creating the national citizen, and at the same time for creating different social citizens. The

first purpose reflects the fact that, in their constitutions, the new nation-states were obligated to define their autonomy by fashioning from the former inhabitants (noblemen, clergy, bourgeois, and peasants) the same kind of national citizen. The second purpose was to assign social differences, and this assignment had two principles, the liberal principle of meritocracy and the conservative principle of schooling children with respect to their presumed future social roles: curricula could differ along the lines of gender, between urban and the rural, or according to dominant regional economies (for the case of Luxembourg, see Schreiber, 2012).

The tension between the ideal of national homogeneity and the need of social diversity created either by meritocracy or predestination in school can, together with the textbooks and the organizational establishment of different school branches and rules of transitions between these branches, serve as Ariadne's thread of curriculum history. In the United States the comprehensive public school system expresses the reformed Protestant idea of earthly equality, whereas the high rate of private schooling expresses the old monarchical desire of social distinction. In contrast, the German state-run *Vorschule* (literally: pre-school) was the essential alternative to the primary school, but subject to tuition (expensive!). It had Latin in its curriculum, and promised access to the *Gymnasium*, the Upper High School, itself the precondition for entering a University. This sequence reflected the aristocratic denial of earthly equality, a denial that had been sustainably reinforced by Luther's political theology.

Understanding curriculum encompasses more sources than those directly connected to schools or to educational policy, and it encompasses a longer history than the history of modern schooling and the need of comparing internationally different genealogies. Regarding Quentin Skinner's assertion that "to learn from the past—and we cannot otherwise learn at all—. . . is to learn the key to self-awareness itself" (Skinner, 1969, p. 53), I would add that in order to reconstruct the past (as a key to self-awareness), the comparison is a precondition—and vice versa: probably, the most noble effect of learning about other systems of reasoning across times and spaces is this chance of becoming aware of ourselves as historical and cultural constructions. It seems to me that this effect should not be undervalued when it comes to international research that aims at more than to reinforce cultural preferences to which we have become accustomed in one way or another.

Notes

1. In Germany, the same distinction plays in the realm of music. E-music is often restricted to the music of Joseph Haydn, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, or Ludwig van Beethoven, whereas U-music covers all the popular and commercial music such as the Beatles, Bruce Springsteen, or Stefani Joanne Angelina Germanotta (alias Lady Gaga). It has to be admitted, however, that these distinctions are increasingly challenged.

2. In his famous allegory of the cave, Plato refers to the need of "περιαγογε οληζ τεζ ψυχηζ" ("Periagoge holes tes psyches"). In the English translation it is given as: "turning round of a soul" and in the German translation it is given (here translated into English) as "transformation" of the soul.
3. Luther's disdain for political freedom was the cause of a dispute between him and the Zurich reformer Huldrych Zwingli, who was much more in the tradition of classical civic humanism (classical republicanism) than the Augustinian monk Luther. Many of the English Reformers, before they left as "puritans" to the American colonies, received Zwingli's political theory of a republic.
4. "It was UNESCO's commitment to post-war Germany, expressed during its 5th General Conference held in Florence in June 1950, which led to the creation of the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE). . . . UIE was intended as a vehicle to promote human rights and international understanding. The first meeting of the Governing Board was held from 17 to 19 June 1951 in Wiesbaden. . . . During that meeting, the Governing Board members drafted the statutes and appointed Professor Walther Merck, Chair of Comparative Education at the University of Hamburg, as Director" (<http://uil.unesco.org/about-us/news-target/history/e031759c1a14f14ad80fb5fd40c321b7/>) (28 December 2012). Walther Merck had been the very first appointed professor in comparative education at the University of Hamburg in Germany (1950).
5. For three of four decades after 1960, the notion of "*Allgemeine Didaktik*" (General Didactics) tried to build a bridge between the German ideal of *Bildung* and the school curriculum. It was mostly appreciated and popular in the context of teacher education. See, for instance, Klafki 1963 or Meyer 1994.
6. And Dewey's critique is embedded in reformed Calvinist Protestantism (Tröhler, 2006).
7. The model was the *Tableau économique* or Economic Table, first described in 1759 by François Quesnay, with which he laid the foundation of the Physiocrats' economic theories.
8. I wish to thank my colleague Sabine Doff (University of Bremen) for this hint.

References

- Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Baker, B. (2009). *New Curriculum History*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Berger, W. (1947). [Rede vor dem Lehrerverein am 3. Dezember 1947]. *Staatsarchiv Bremen, Germany*, 4,111/1–18.
- Cowen, R. (2011). Edging closer to the hero, the barbarian, and the stranger. A note on the condition of comparative education. D. Tröhler and R. Barbu, (eds.), *In Education Systems in Historical, Cultural, and Sociological Perspectives* (pp. 21–36). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Dewey, J. (1900). *The School and Society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1915). *German Philosophy and Politics*. New York, NY: Holt.
- Dewey, J. (1929). *The Quest for Certainty. A Study of the Relation of Knowledge and Action*. New York, NY: Minton, Balch and Co.
- Hahn, C. L. (1998). *Becoming Political: Comparative Perspectives on Citizenship Education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Hahn, C.L. (1999). Citizenship education: an empirical study of policy, practices and outcomes. *Oxford Review of Education*, 25 (1 and 2), pp. 231–250.
- Hopmann, S. and Riquarts, K., (eds.) (1995). *Didaktik and, or Curriculum*. Kiel, Germany: IPN.
- Horlacher, R. (2012). What is *Bildung*? Or: Why Pädagogik cannot get away from the concept of *Bildung*. In: P. Siljander, A. Kivelä, and A. Sutinen, (eds.), *Theories of Bildung and Growth. Connections and Controversies between Continental Educational Thinking and American Pragmatism* (pp. 135–147). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

- Horlacher, R. Forthcoming. Do educational models impose standardization? Reading Pestalozzi historically. In Thomas S. Popkewitz, (ed.), *Rethinking The History of Education: Transnational Perspectives On Its Questions, Methods and Knowledge*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Jullien, M.-A. (1812a). *Esprit de la méthode d'éducation de Pestalozzi suivie et pratiquée dans l'institut d'Yverdon, en Suisse*. Milan, Italy: Imprimerie Royale.
- Jullien, M.-A. (1812b). *Précis sur l'institut d'éducation d'Yverdon en Suisse, organisé et dirigé par M. Pestalozzi*. Milan, Italy: Imprimerie Royale.
- Jullien, M.-A. (1817). *Esquisse et vues préliminaires d'un ouvrage sur l'éducation comparée*. Paris, France: L. Colas.
- Klafki, W. (1963). *Studien zur Bildungstheorie und Didaktik*. Weinheim, Germany: Beltz.
- Kliebard, H.M. (1986). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893–1958*. Boston, MA: Routledge.
- Mann, H. (1846). *Report of an Educational Tour in Germany, and Parts of Great Britain and Ireland*. London, UK: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.
- Mellor, S. (1998). *What's the Point? Political Attitudes of Victorian Year 11 Students*. Melbourne: Australian Centre for Educational Research.
- Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., and Thomas, G. W. (1987). Ontology and rationalization in the Western cultural account. In G. M. Thomas, J. W. Meyer, F. O. Ramirez, and J. Boli, (eds.), *Institutional Structure: Constituting State, Society, and the Individual* (pp. 12–38). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. W., and Ramirez, F. O. (2000). The world institutionalization of education. In J. Schriewer, (ed.), *Discourse Formation in Comparative Education* (pp. 111–132). Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Lang.
- Meyer, M.A., (ed.) (1994). *Allgemeine Didaktik, Fachdidaktik und Fachunterricht*. Weinheim, Germany: Beltz.
- OECD, Stoke, W., Löwbeer, H., and Capelle, J. (1966). *Curriculum Improvement and Educational Development*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing.
- Pinar, W. F. (2003). *The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies*. Retrieved from [http://www.riic.unam.mx/01/02_Biblio/doc/Internationalization_Curriculum_W_PINAR_\(MEXICO\).pdf](http://www.riic.unam.mx/01/02_Biblio/doc/Internationalization_Curriculum_W_PINAR_(MEXICO).pdf)
- Pinar, W.F. (2006). *Race, Religion, and a Curriculum of Reparation: Teacher Education for a Multicultural Society*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pinar, W. F., et al. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: an introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W.F., Reynolds, W.M., Slattery, P., and Taubmann, P.M., (eds.) (1995). Introduction: From curriculum development to understanding curriculum. In: W.F. Pinar, W.M. Reynolds, P. Slattery, and P.M. Taubmann, *Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to the Study of Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses* (pp. 3–11). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W.F., Reynolds, W.M., Slattery, P., and Taubmann, P.M., (eds.) (1995). *Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to the Study of Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Plato (1966). *The Republic*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Popkewitz, T.S. (2001). The production of reason and power: Curriculum history and intellectual traditions. In T.S. Popkewitz, B.M. Franklin, and M.A. Pereyra, (eds.), *Cultural History and Education: Critical Essays on Knowledge and Schooling* (pp. 151–183). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Popkewitz, T.S. (2010). Comparative studies and unthinking comparative "thought." In: M.A. Larsen, (ed.), *New Thinking in Comparative Education: Honouring Robert Cowen* (pp. 15–28). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Rein, W. (1906) Lehrplan. In: *Encyklopädisches Handbuch der Pädagogik, Band V* (pp. 528–551). Langensalza, Germany: Hermann Beyer and Söhne.
- Robinson, S. (1967). *Bildungsreform als Revision des Curriculum*. Neuwied a. Rhein, Germany: Luchterhand.
- Rosenmund, M., Fries, A.-V., Heller, W., (eds.) (2002). *Comparing Curriculum Making Processes*. Bern, Switzerland: Lang.
- Rush, B. (1786, 1965). Thoughts upon the mode of education proper in a republic. In: F. Rudolph, (ed.), *Essays on Education in the Early Republic* (pp. 9–23). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schreiber, C. (2012). Comme compagne de l'homme, comme épouse et notamment comme mère. Staatsbürgerinnenerziehung in Luxemburg zwischen rhetorischer Homogenität und curricularer Heterogenität. *Hémecht. Revue d'histoire luxembourgeoise*, 3, pp. 5–21.
- Skinner, Q. (1969). Meaning and understanding in the history of ideas. In: *History and Theory* 8(1), pp. 3–53.
- Smeyers, P., and Depaepe, M., (eds.) (2006). *Educational Research: Why What Works' Doesn't Work*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Tenorth, H.E. (2011). "Bildung ist, was übrig bleibt." Retrieved from <http://www.zeit.de/2011/33/Interview-Tenorth>
- Thyssen, G. Forthcoming. The stranger within? On the idiosyncrasy of Luxembourg's early primary school system in the light of developments in neighbouring countries (c. 1794–1844). *Paedagogica Historica*.
- Torney-Purta, Judith, Lehmann, Rainer, Oswald, Hans, and Schulz, Wolfram. (2001). *Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries. Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: IEA.
- Tröhler, D. (2006). The formation and function of histories of education in continental teacher education curricula. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies* 2, Retrieved from <http://www2.uwstout.edu/content/jaaacs/vol2/tröhler.htm>
- Tröhler, D. (2010). Globalizing globalization: The neo-institutional concept of a world culture. In T. S. Popkewitz and F. Rizvi (Eds.), *Globalization and the Study of Education. 2009 Yearbook of the National Society for Studies in Education*, 108, pp. 29–48. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Tröhler, D. (2011). *Languages of Education. Protestant Legacies, National Identities, and Global Aspirations*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tröhler, D. (2012). The German idea of *Bildung* and the anti-western ideology. In: P. Siljander, A. Kivelä, and A. Sutinen, (eds.), *Theories of Bildung and Growth. Connections and Controversies Between Continental European Educational Thinking and American Pragmatism* (pp. 149–164). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Tröhler, D. Forthcoming. Truffle pigs, research questions, and histories of education. In: Thomas S. Popkewitz, (ed.), *Rethinking The History of Education: Transnational Perspectives On Its Questions, Methods and Knowledge*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Tröhler, D., Popkewitz, T.S., and Labaree, D.F. (2011). Children, citizens, and promised lands: Comparative history of political cultures and schooling in the long 19th century. In: D. Tröhler, T.S. Popkewitz, and D.F. Labaree, (eds.), *Schooling and the Making of Citizens in the Long Nineteenth Century. Comparative Visions* (pp. 1–27). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Press.
- Tyler, R. (1973). *Curriculum und Unterricht*. Düsseldorf, Germany: Schwann.
- Witry, T. (1900). *Statistique historique du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg: La situation de l'enseignement primaire dans le Grand-Duché de Luxembourg pendant la période de 1815 à 1900*. Luxembourg, Luxembourg: V. Buck.