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ABSTRACT This study presents an analysis of Comparative Education from the basic material presented in the discipline "Introduction to Comparative and International Education Studies" of the PostGraduate Program in Education, at UNESP, campus of Marília/SP, mainly focused on research and methodological procedures. Then, a synthesis of selected research on the subject presented by graduate students is presented. Through content analysis, the study revealed that Comparative Education, as an interdisciplinary research bias, requires schemes that are supported by studies that address social, political and cultural aspects, passing through reflective criticism, understanding the specifics of education, as well as by trends, internal and external influences, and the challenges of Comparative Education in the educational conjecture of Brazil and the world. The analysis allows us to infer that studies focused on this methodology do not seek only to find similarities or differences, but to promote in-depth discussions about the role of Comparative Education for educational development and its influence on the history of education, permeating challenges, possibilities and contributions.


RESUMO: Nesse estudo apresenta-se uma análise da Educação Comparada a partir do material básico apresentado na disciplina “Introdução aos Estudos de Educação Comparada e Internacional” do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, da UNESP, campus de
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Introduction

Historically, Comparative Education was concerned with the description of educational systems, a challenge faced by several researchers and scholars in the discussion of different educational strategies, collecting information from experiences in other realities, trends, internal and external influences that delineated and/or influenced the educational systems of their countries.
Thus, Comparative Education followed a sinuous path anchored in the constant effort to develop studies with the purpose of mapping educational systems, in order to understand their dynamics and complexities. Between historical reflection and the concerns of the challenges of frontiers and limitations of comparison, it has remained, since its inception, committed to understanding the dynamics of local, regional, national and global educational systems in the search for re-signification, for their restructuring (HALLS, 1990; NÓVOA, 1998).

Schneider and Schmitt (1998) about the comparative method and its role, especially in sociology, point out that it appears in the classic studies of the nineteenth century, with Auguste Comte (1798-1857), Durkheim (1858-1917) and Weber (1864 -1920) although in a different way, these authors used comparison as an instrument of explanation and generalization, according to each author and their propositions, in the use of comparison in sociological analysis.

But only in the 20th century, according to Ferreira (2008), does Comparative Education gain academic status, centered especially on the discussion about the fate of educational approaches, especially in methodological aspects, reasons for debates about these influences in their respective countries.

Ferreira (2008) also points out that the comparison extends from social relations of antiquity to the recent context of economic and cultural globalization, in which scientific knowledge is essential for the development of comparative education, in order to enable more grounded educational reforms. The author highlights, as a significant factor of the Comparative Education method, the investigation process in which:

Comparison in education generates a dynamic of reasoning that forces us to identify similarities and differences between two or more facts, phenomena or educational processes and to interpret them considering their relationship with the social, political, economic, cultural etc. context. to which they belong. Hence the need for other data, for the understanding of other discourses (FERREIRA, 2008, p. 125, our translation).

In this sense, the comparison process presupposes examining practical and/or theoretical issues that directly influence its field of action, with the intention of critical-reflective comparison of the analysis of similarities and disparities both in relation to their functions, structure, objectivity, fundamentals, as in other aspects of the educational universe permeated by the social, economic, political and cultural context of each country, system, theme or discourse.
Marc-Antoine Jullien (1775-1848) was considered a precursor of Comparative Education, with the publication, in 1817, “Esquisse ET vues préliminaires d’un ouvrage - Sur l’éducation comparée”. This work gathered his articles printed in the “Journal d’Éducation” and is considered the first systematization of a comparative approach (KALOYIANNAKI; KAZAMIAS, 2012).

In this work, the author proposed the plan of comparison between state education systems for Europe through the instrument “Analytical summaries of information” based on facts and observations, aiming to classify in analytical and comparable tables to infer well-defined principles and rules.

This instrument consisted of a questionnaire composed of a series of questions on six areas of education, namely: primary and common education; secondary and classical education; higher and scientific education; normal education; girls' education and education in relation to legislation and social institutions and for Jullien, this methodological approach would make it possible to correct the weaknesses, in general, of the condition of public education and instruction in all European countries.

For Kaloyiannaki and Kazamias (2012), Jullien's methodology can be described as "empirical-deductive" and perhaps "qualitative, quasi ethnographic", since the analysis brought together facts and observations to answer the questions proposed in the "Analytical Summaries of Information" (KALOYIANNAKI; KAZAMIAS, 2012, p. 28, our translation).

Lourenço Filho (2004), not disregarding Jullien's comparison plan, however, presented the following criticism:

It certainly misses this schematic notion by exaggeration. It contains, however, a portion of the truth, not because intentional educational action practically expressed by the administration of schools can be transformed into an axiomatic construction, derived from the tables resulting from such empirically based confrontations, but because studies of this nature really provide elements for more perfect analysis of the two important series of notions mentioned above. First, the view of the forces with which the factors of the educational process, in general, are projected into education systems. Then, that of the problematic situations that the organizers of education face in each case so that, less imperfectly, they can forward the solution (LOURENÇO FILHO, 2004, p. 20, our translation).

In this sense, the character of Jullien's work is evident as a precursor of a theoretical basis in Comparative Education, which aimed to improve the science of education, arising from travels to other countries with the aim of studying educational systems in the search for solutions practices for educational problems.
The discussions around the comparative method in the field of social sciences, especially in the field of education, make evident the need and importance of comparative studies in education, it is possible to see an excellent field of analysis, the different positions regarding the multiple existing relationships: political, social, economic, cultural when making comparisons.

These studies have intensified from the 20th century, with the contribution of presenting this path, following a brief overview of the European map of Comparative Education, it can be inferred that in comparative studies, the fields of investigation and application intersect and seek to highlight the multiple relationships built over time, legacies such as: a) Michael Sadlter in Great Britain who sought to unravel the fundamentals of educational phenomena, that is, understand the educational systems of each country and explain the specifics of each one, taking into account the social context; b) Nicholas Hans in England, who concentrated more on epistemological aspects, seeking to delimit the field of action and explain the methods of Comparative Education; c) Friedrich Schneider and Franz Hilker and their successors in Germany promoted the advance of Comparative Education making it a component of general education (MITTER, 2012).

These researchers, with aligned ideas, were responsible for propagating “a European dimension of the history of education and its driving forces” to Comparative Education, which was dominated by cultural studies until the end of the 20th century, as Mitter (2012, p. 123, our translation) points out the importance of “[...] studying each national system in its historical environment and its intimate connection with the development of a national character and culture”, thus characterizing systematic application of the comparative method.

Another researcher who presented a new look at the systematization of comparative research in education was George Bereday, with the publication of the report on the comparative method in education, in 1964, which characterized Comparative Education in three periods: loan, prediction and analysis. The loan period being the time for cataloging descriptive educational data and the best educational practices transported to other countries. The prediction period broadened the idea of “borrowing”, but the most significant is to predict the likely success of a given education system, using it as a basis for similar experiences in other countries. The period of analysis characterized by the development of theories and methods for the formulation of stages, processes and comparative mechanisms (FERREIRA, 2008).

Bereday (1973) also adds the fundamental aspects of preparation for comparative study, such as knowledge of the language of the area under study, residence abroad and the
observer's incessant surveillance of cultural and personal prejudices, as without these requirements, access to the true reality of the analyzed educational systems is impossible.

In this sense, it is relevant to highlight in the studies of the Comparative Education method “[...] the attention to the geographic, institutional and thematic map of Europe, with its different places of work, whenever we are invited to investigate events, trends or achievements in any comparative approach” (MITTER, 2012, p. 115).

Mitter (2012) also points out that facts and trends exerted significant impacts on territorial demarcation in regional and state units, in such a way that this demarcation became more significant in the context of Comparative Education.

In this direction, Comparative Education gains amplitude from scientific events, for example, in 1961, at the conference in London, the Comparative Education Society in Europe (CESE) appears, representing a transnational association that expanded the comparative activities of several European countries as well as in North America. Another association that resulted from the congress in Montreal in 1970 was the World Council of Comparative Education Societies (WCCES) and today it continues to work with Comparative Education issues. The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) provided innovative techniques in Social Sciences as well as in comparative studies. Other associations were founded in several countries, such as Bulgaria, Great Britain, Greece, Poland, Russia, Spain, Turkey, among other countries, featuring a growing movement based on the principles of transnational action (MITTER, 2012).

Thus, with the systematization of events, which provided theoretical support, different contemporary theoretical roots emerged, represented by Robert Cowen, Andreas Kazamias, Antônio Nóvoa and Jürgen Schriewer, and in Brazil, one of the pioneers was Lourenço Filho.

In the work Comparative Education (2004) Lourenço Filho presents some studies, in particular, Chapter 4: “Methods and trends in comparative education” – discusses the investigation procedures through the method of observation, direct and indirect, of experimentation, of analysis and synthesis, of induction and deduction for the study of national education systems that are analyzed in social, political, cultural scales, that is, in the field of macro education analysis, with the assumption of a comparative descriptive education and at the same time an explanatory comparative education, through the investigation of the causes of the facts, as an interdisciplinary study.

Thus, for this walk that the paradigm of Comparative Education has been presenting theoretical changes in relation to:
• Key concepts of analysis and interpretation of facts and events in educational reality and in the discussion about education;
• Impacts suffered by the discipline from related sciences and the humanities (MITTER, 2012. p. 121, our translation).

Another significant comparative method for its contribution to the field of Comparative Education is the study by Bray and Thomas (1995) that uses the figure of a cube to explain the analysis in three dimensions: geographic/locational levels, aspects of education and society and non-locational demographic groups, a figure that allows the research to be mapped according to the conjectures investigated in the macro or micro fields of the system.

Another author who mapped Comparative Education was Nóvoa (2009) with the publication of the article entitled “Models of comparative education analysis: the field and the map”. In this article, he builds a cartography of the production of authors in the field of comparative education, based on seven proposed configurations: historicists; positivists; modernization; Problem solving; critical and socio historical. This division of cartography is still built along two axes: conflict theories/consensus theories; descriptive approaches/conceptual approaches. Based on this interpretive framework, the author reconfigures comparative education that considers new problems, new models and new approaches. In defending his thesis in the preparation of this cartography, Nóvoa (2009, p. 24, our translation) warns that:

This story tells us about the other, about strangeness and otherness, about the different meanings attributed to the same fact (of the same text), and reveals to us some of the limits of our interpretations of the world. It is on the margins of this triad – the other, the sense, the limits – that my reflection is organized.

In the same view of the triad proposed by Nóvoa (2009), Franco (2000, p. 198) highlights the importance of understanding the recognition of different cultural spaces in Comparative Education studies:

When reconstructing the history of countries and their peoples, or when developing a process of intercultural exchange or a project of international cooperation, the attitude of comparison is always present, even if it is not something conscious or not explicitly revealed. The very process of knowing the other and oneself, in this exchange between different cultural realities, implies a confrontation that goes beyond mere knowledge of the other. It involves comparing yourself with what you see in the other.

Therefore, the discourse of recognition of the other, the views cited by Nóvoa (2009) and Franco (2000) emphasized the need for understanding when giving new meaning to the
other, especially during the application of the Comparative Education method in an investigation process.

Thus, Comparative Education, when analyzing the structure and functioning of the education system of countries, is not restricted to representing the search for similarities and differences between the systems, but understanding and finding meanings, concerned, in particular, with the educational dimension of these systems, contemplating the different cultural aspects, political rhythms, globalization, transnational relations.

It is in this direction that comparative education studies offer a vast field of analysis of educational systems, which are materialized in reports on the institutionalization of education; analysis of sociopolitical processes and/or relations, as well as substantiated in research that can contribute to the (re)formulation of public policies.

Considering this perspective of study, of possibilities of methods and comparative approaches, it is understood that comparing is a complex tool and, in this context, we sought to reflect on Comparative Education, based on the studies that have been carried out by postgraduate students, master's and doctorate, in comparative research. For this, the objective was to outline an overview of research in comparative education presented in the development of the discipline "Introduction to Comparative and International Education Studies" of the Postgraduate Program in Education, it was not sought to evaluate the research regarding its academic quality, neither in its relevance, but rather realizing the main themes and approaches that researchers have used when developing research with a comparative bias in education and what are the challenges and possibilities of this methodology for the field of scientific research.

**Comparative Education: the paths traced in the seminar**

This work sought to analyze the academic production in the field of comparative education studies selected by postgraduate students, that is, the methodological procedures adopted were constituted through the analysis of eleven texts presented in the seminar of the discipline “Introduction to Comparative Education Studies and International”, in the second semester of 2020, of the Postgraduate Program in Education, of the UNESP campus in Marília.

For the study, the Content Analysis of Bardin (2008) was used, which constitutes a methodology used to describe and interpret the content of every class of documents and texts,
leading to systematic qualitative or even quantitative descriptions that help to reinterpret the messages and to reach an understanding of their meanings.

As an investigation method, this analysis comprises special procedures for the processing of scientific data. The analysis included eleven texts. The reading, analysis, accounting and categorization processes were carried out from the totality of the research contents, but special attention was given to the reading of the objectives and methodological procedures explained by the researchers. In many cases, the title of the research itself already gave an idea of the topic and how it would be approached throughout the text, and even so, the objectives and procedures were read. This process resulted in quantitative data, but to better understand what these data meant, the surveys were analyzed qualitatively based on their content.

Regarding the profile of the students, they are students enrolled in the Postgraduate Program in Education, at UNESP, campus in Marilia/SP, studying for master's and doctoral degrees. The majority (80%) work professionally in the municipal or state public education system in basic education; 15% work in higher education (private institution) and 5% are students. It appears that the criterion for choosing the text for the seminar, in its majority, is linked to the research theme of the student and others focused on the field of studies or methodology of comparative studies, categorized as follows:

**Figure 1 – SELECTED THEMES**

*Source: Devised by the authors*

Regarding the texts presented at the seminar about the levels of education, studies that address issues related to basic education, as well as to higher education, can be observed. Presenting international comparative education research with the presence of cooperation that occurred in studies carried out between researchers and universities from different countries: Brazil and Portugal; Brazil and Mexico, and Brazil and Spain. It can also be seen that they
developed research looking beyond the countries they lived in or to which their universities of origin were linked and, regarding the research theme or focus of analysis, there is also a diversity, which ranges from teacher formation to issues of educational policy and legislation.

It appears that the works were articulated with the purpose proposed by the discipline - Introduction to Comparative and International Education Studies - presenting comparative education studies focused on Processes and Effects in Education Policies, Methodologies and Practices.

However, it was possible to infer that some studies termed as comparative or that call themselves comparative studies in education are not always in fact, which Bray (2010) and Palomba (2011) warn, some research that has been presented as comparative education or what they call comparative studies in education are not always in fact. These authors point out that even the field of study and the fact of establishing educational comparisons is not new, some works, in the light of the main theorists in the area, lack theoretical clarity, epistemological and methodological depth. However, it is also worth noting that the studies analyzed, counted and categorized in this work represent a small sample of international comparative studies, as these studies have been intensified, and even the attempts to produce comparative studies end up demonstrating their importance.

The studies presented in the seminars were object of analysis of the whole group and of provocations, correlating the authors' notes with the introductory studies of the discipline. Below is a brief summary of the eleven articles reviewed.

The article “Comparações entre currículos” (Curriculum Comparisons), authors Bob Adamson and Paul Morris (2015) – discusses “the field of curriculum studies offers many theoretical and methodological tools for comparing curricula” (ADAMSON; MORRIS, 2015, p. 345, our translation). These authors used Bereday's (1973) descriptive framework method to compare curriculum components and conduct research analysis.

The article “Definição e objetivo da Educação Comparada” Definition and objective of Comparative Education by Nicholas Hans (1971) presents a historical description of education in foreign countries and concomitant with the explanation of the evolution of Comparative Education in an attempt to understand the relationship between education and society, on a national basis, developed by comparatists such as Sadler, Kandel, Hans, Schneider among other authors in their countries.

Another text presented was “História da formação de professores em cursos a distância: é possível uma comparação entre Brasil e Portugal?” (History of teacher formation in distance learning courses: is it possible to compare Brazil and Portugal?) by
Maria Luisa Furlan Costa (2009), this text takes up on the process of distance learning courses in Brazil and Portugal, provides a historical description of creation and highlights the similarities (approximation) and differences (distancing) between them.

The text “Reflexões sobre a importância dos estudos de educação comparada na atualidade” (Reflections on the importance of comparative education studies today), author Elma Júlia Gonçalves Carvalho (2013), the article presents the historical study of Comparative Education and the recent use of this method in Brazil.

Another presentation was of the article “Educação Comparada Brasil-Espanha: estado da arte 1990-2014” (Brazil-Spain Comparative Education: state of the art 1990-2014), authors Donaldo Bello de Souza and Neusa Chaves Batista (2018), approach the theme from a bibliographical study with five units of analysis of comparisons, namely: Education Policies, Ways of Learning, Times, Curriculum and Educational Organizations. These studies analyzed in this research used the following authors as a theoretical framework: Bray, Adamson and Mason (2015).

Presentation of the article “Reformas na administração educacional: uma análise comparada entre Brasil e Portugal” (Reforms in educational administration: a comparative analysis between Brazil and Portugal), author Elma Júlia Gonçalves Carvalho (2014), a comparative study of the reforms that took place in the administration of the educational system in Brazil and Portugal, from the 1990s onwards, with the objectives of understanding the reasons for the relative homogeneity of the new school management model.

The text “Gestão da Educação: em perspectiva comparada Brasil-Portugal” (Education Management: in a comparative perspective between Brazil and Portugal), author Elma Júlia Gonçalves de Carvalho (2011), is comparative study of decentralized, participative and autonomous administrative proposals, between Brazil and Portugal.

The article “Gestão Democrática da educação sob perspectiva comparada Brasil-Portugal: entre a exigência legal e a exequibilidade real” (Democratic management of education from a comparative Brazil-Portugal perspective: between legal requirements and real feasibility), authors Donaldo Bello Souza and Dora Fonseca Castro (2012), discuss the field of public policies and discuss democratic management from a comparative perspective between Brazil and Portugal.

The article “Estudo Comparado Internacional: contribuições para o campo da Educação Especial” (International Comparative Study: contributions to the field of Special Education), authors Reginaldo Celio Sobrinho; Maria das Graças Carvalho Silva de Sá; Edson Pantaleão and Denise Meyrelles de Jesus (2015), the production of knowledge in Special
Education, in the context of Comparative Education and connections from an investigative perspective compared with the works of Norbert Elias.


The dissertation “Educação Especial no ensino superior: processos sociais comparados entre México e Brasil” (Special Education in Higher Education: social processes compared between Mexico and Brazil), author Júnio Hora Conceição (2017), proposes to analyze processes triggered by public policies of Special Education students in Higher Education, between Mexico and Brazil, in the period from 1996 to 2016.

By analyzing the texts presented, it was also sought to establish possible relationships between the studies and the objective of the discipline, such as the texts “Comparações entre currículos” (Comparisons between curricula) - Bob Adamson and Paul Morris (2015) and “Definição e objetivo da Educação Comparada” (Definition and objective of Comparative Education) by Nicholas Hans (1971), as they are written by Comparative Education theorists, contributed to the general education of students.

The seminar “História da formação de professores em cursos à distância: é possível uma comparação entre Brasil e Portugal?” (History of teacher formation in distance learning courses: is it possible to compare Brazil and Portugal?) by Maria Luisa Furlan Costa (2009) was directed towards the research of the student who studies the Open University of Portugal and the Open University System of Brazil.

requirement and real feasibility), authors Donaldo Bello Souza and Dora Fonseca Castro (2012) and “Gestão da Educação: em perspectiva comparada Brasil-Portugal” (Education Management: in a comparative Brazil-Portugal perspective), author Elma Júlia Gonçalves de Carvalho (2011), contributed to the formation of the group of students to broaden their knowledge of comparative analysis not only between Brazil and Portugal, but also a deeper understanding of the comparative method.

Another seminar stemming from the article “Educação Comparada Brasil-Espanha: estado da arte 1990-2014” (Brazil-Spain Comparative Education: state of the art 1990-2014), authors Donaldo Bello de Souza and Neusa Chaves Batista (2018), collaborated with the student who researches the issue of curriculum in basic education between Brazil and Spain.

Regarding the seminars of the productions: “Estudo Comparado Internacional: contribuições para o campo da Educação Especial” (International Comparative Study: contributions to the field of Special Education), authors Reginaldo Celio Sobrinho; Maria das Graças Carvalho Silva de Sá; Edson Pantaleão and Denise Meyrelles de Jesus (2015), “Os cursos de formação/Especialização de Professores de Deficientes Auditivos no Brasil em Portugal (1950-1980)” (Formation/Specialization courses for Hearing Impaired Teachers in Brazil in Portugal (1950-1980)), author Geise de Moura Freitas (2019) and Dissertation “Educação Especial no ensino superior: processos sociais comparados entre México e Brasil” (Special Education in higher education: social processes compared between Mexico and Brazil), author Júnio Hora Conceição (2017), contributed to the expansion of the research panorama in Special Education, the strategies and directions for teacher education in this area, as well as the challenges for the course's students who study Special Education from a perspective of Comparative Education.

Final considerations

This study aimed to present an analysis of the development of the discipline “Introduction to Comparative and International Education Studies” based on the texts presented in the seminars and the group discussions. Outlining this panorama, even though it is a part of research in comparative education developed in several universities, made it possible to identify some approximations and distances between the materials presented in the discipline and the texts selected by graduate students.

These concerns and reflections about the role of Comparative Education for educational development, mainly as a research methodology, based on the material explored,
pointed to the need for specific knowledge, which requires focusing on the analysis of comparative studies, a fact that may allow characterize it in the relationship of construction of knowledge with the world, with oneself and with the other, as well as its challenges, limits and possibilities in the contribution of measures that enable contemporary educational advances.

The data found, in addition to reaffirming that this field of study, its definitions, limitations and possibilities constitutes, even though it has a considerable theoretical collection, an area to be explored, especially regarding understanding the paths of the Comparative Education method, the which require studying the social phenomena, the limits and possibilities outlined by the theoretical options that the researcher adopts.

In conclusion phase, it can be inferred that this is a field still in development, and possible of much study and research. Considering relevant the offer of the discipline in this focus, and in particular its development focused on the attention and analysis of works with emphasis on epistemological, theoretical, methodological and conceptual aspects of comparative education. This fact allows us to infer that it is a strategy to strengthen and qualify research and academic activities, attributing methodological rigor to comparative studies and greater security for researchers and readers.
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