

Education and Culture in the Age of Globalisation

Adia Chermeleu*

1. Sciences of Education and Philosophy of Education

The reflection on the relationship between education and culture is part of this very report and is presented in many studies dealing with the unprecedented changes we assist during the last decades and the type educational programmes and policies are trying to face the challenges of the present-day world. Since 1996, UNESCO has launched an international programme to rethink education as related to sustainability, programme printed in 1999 by the United Nations Organization for education, science and culture, which shows that education, the most important “force of the future”, can offer viable solutions to many uncertainties and crises the humanity has to face.

The growing importance of the complementarity relation between education and culture derives from the evolution of the concept of science of education and the trans-disciplinary vision they assume. Seeing that, at the end of the 19th century, Ferdinand Buisson imposed pedagogy as “the only and true science of education”, in an attempt to demarcate education from the drifts of uncertainty and sterile ideological debates (1887, p. 2238, apud Meirieu, 2003), there followed a period at the beginning of the 20th century, where, under the influence of the great psychologists, psychopedagogy was considered a science of education. Most of the theoreticians soon realized that only the conjunction between psychology and pedagogy is not enough to understand the complexity of the elements with a role in the educational act and in the personal development of the educable. This is how they discovered the importance of psychoanalysis, of sociology, anthropology, linguistics and communication sciences or of history and economics which allowed a more complex and lucid approach of an “impossible trade”, as Freud used to call education (Meirieu, p.6). The sciences of education were object of a relatively recent university institutionalization, which did not mean the replacement of pedagogy, but the abandonment of normative speculations for the use of positive studies and, within humanist sciences, the delimitation and organizing of a research field oriented towards the comprehension of the educative fact (Ferry, 2003). In such context, between 1967-1970, the first departments of “sciences of education” were created, reuniting around the concept of education, specialists from already established scientific subjects, in a construction calling them to clarify important details in the educative realities, while pedagogy was left the role to design strategies and make the relation between finalities and means effective. In the new architecture, “the sciences of education represent the assembly of the subjects which study, from different, but complementary, perspectives, found in a coordination report, the existence, operation and evolution conditions of

* Associate professor, Department of Educational Sciences, West University of Timisoara
e-mail: adia.chermeleu@e-uvt.ro

education situations and facts” (Mialaret, 2011, p.69). The fecund dialogue between pedagogy and the other sciences of education generated a philosophic reflection searching for educative solutions for various economical, social or political issues specific to the present-day world. For Leif, philosophy of education is a “reflection on the purposes and means of education, on the teaching methods and, possibly, on the institutions applying them” (1996, p.356), while for O. Reboul, it is an ethic reflection on the values underlying the educative act (2004). Starting with Jean Jacques Rousseau’s work (Scheau, 2012, p.81-89) and to present-day, there seems to be no other field, but education, where the philosophical perspective on general ideas proved to be so necessary, the specialist in the sciences of education has always been in a state of reflection and self-reflection, as long as they consider that “any pedagogy is completion of philosophy” (François, M’Obame, 2009, p.1).

Edgar Morin, the most famous theoretician of transdisciplinarity, synthesized the main cultural, antagonist and complementary processes, which manifested from the end of the 20th century, processed to be taken into account by the education of the 21st century (2002): the planetary opening of arts, literature and philosophy; the standardization and, homogenization and degradation of the idea of production and creation diversity, besides the dialogic character of such relations; the development of a planetary folklore and the manifestation of transnational currents, meetings, new diversities, syntheses; getting back to the sources and regeneration of singularities. All such tendencies, accentuated by the Internet and by the other communicational technologies prefigure the amplification of antagonisms between the concentric, bureaucratic organization of cultural production, on the one hand, and the need for originality, creativity, uniqueness of the cultural product. The changes followed by the educational policies occur slowly, medium and long term, and therefore, we shall remind some *fundamental requirements* of education, in Edgar Morin’s philosophical vision (1999), very current requirements, in our opinion: the avoidance of approximation, of the error and illusion, specific to human knowledge, by cultivating and developing lucidity, cerebral dimensions and understanding mechanisms, both psychic and cultural which make error appear in the knowledge process. The supremacy of fragmental knowledge, operated by the enclosure of subjects, encloses the capacity of the human spirit to place knowledge in a context and assembly. The essence of human being consists of, everybody knows it, the complex unity of its physical, biological, cultural and historical dimensions, treated separately by the classical approach of the teaching subjects. The education and teaching are summoned to restore such unit, by the inter- and trans-disciplinary approach of human condition at planetary level. Scientific discoveries offered the humanity a series of certainties, during the 20th century, but it was science which revealed the various fields of uncertainty which educational systems cannot ignore, on the contrary, the unpredictable needs to be integrated in the education act. An “education of comprehension” assumes the “study of incomprehension, in its depths, manifestation and effects methods”, which may lead to understanding the causes of racism, xenophobia and despise to some people. We admit, in the requirements of the education formulated by Edgar Morin at the beginning of this century, a ethic anthropology of the human species, as dimension of the educative act, at all levels, without understanding by it moral lesions, but the need of developing a set of intercultural competences, able to lead to the awareness of a will of “planetary citizenship”.

2. Anthropology serving education

Along history, education evolves depending on the cultural transformations occurring in our society, especially economical and technological. The school phenomena, individual or group, cannot be isolated from the cultural context they occur in, without the risk of major semantic deformations. Anthropology, mainly cultural anthropology, allows the exploration, understanding and evaluation of such transformations. A pretty new branch of anthropology, *the anthropology of childhood*, finds its place in the sciences of education, conjugating methods and knowledge from other sciences, like development and teaching psychology, with its own orientations: symbolic representation of childhood, rituals, analysis of caring practices in elementary education, family and social insertion methods of the child (Delalande, 2009, p.104). The recent structuring of clinical psychoanalytic orientation research in the sciences of education highlighted the contribution of anthropology to understanding the great issues of the human forever. As for example, *the rites of passage* (Arnold Van Gennep), with all they assume psychically and anthropologically, are determined by the specificity of knowledge and the relation with the company at a certain point (Bonnet, Selim, 2011). The linguistic anthropology studies come to support education by analyzing the relationship between the development and language and the identity construction. Education anthropology appeared in the United States of America in the 60s, tightly connected to sociolinguistics, seems to be the “branch with the most important development” (Anderson-Levitt, 2006, p.7). In Europe, it has known various orientations: the philosophical anthropology in Germany and in the eastern countries, the ethnography of education in the UK and in France, (inter)cultural anthropology in Switzerland etc. Beyond terminology, all such directions and branches of anthropology define the *tautological relationship* between education and culture and the way specialists in the entire world are trying to support the educative act. Compared education cannot be dissociated from cultural anthropology, where it borrowed from the methods and spirit, which may synthesise in two words: *relativism and globalism* (de Landsheere, p.64). On the other hand, any educational system is the direct expression values of which, understood as normative sub-layer of cultures and major differentiation criteria. In an outstanding book, Margaret Mead proved that not even a genius can manifest but within a specific cultural context (Mead, 1964). The reflections on the education-culture relationship, which proliferated in the second half of the 20th century, identified at least three normative faces which determine this relationship: *socio-cultural context, process and finality* (Brameld, 1957). As related to the socio-cultural context, it has already been theorized by Émile Durkheim who insisted upon “the collective action and thinking methods”, a social reality influencing, in one way or another all the individuals, theory confirmed and refined up to present. The sociocultural transformations have an effect on finalities, *ideals* which every education system is striving to materialize. The formulation and strategies to reach ideals differ from one culture to another. Some theoreticians drew attention on the “weakening” of the ideals, by reasoning and heterogeneity, and more, the technologizing process and its “idealization” determined a greater importance to the process than to its finality

(Brameld, 1957). However, beyond the aforementioned tendencies, in a complex society, no cultural generalization is valid. Without understanding the values which define a heterogeneous society, the description of a culture and, especially, of an educative system, is missing real articulation (Bonneuil, Fressoy, 2013). Even if education is tributary to other subjects as well, what seems to be more and more pertinent is the need of the teams of educationalists and anthropologists to work together in order to fulfil the educational ideal specific to each and every culture.

The entire humanity is being currently engaged in the quickest *transformation process* of its history, process due in a good extent, to the scientific and technological progress from the latest decades. The scope and rhythm of such processes brought, philosophically and anthropologically, to a new vision on time and space, to multiplying acculturation phenomena, which had the effect, on the one hand, *the tendency of planetary unification in the field of education*, but also the generation of cultural crises, accentuation phenomena of the schism, of confusion and feeling of insecurity. All such tendencies were synthesised in the metaphor of “liquid society” of the sociology Zygmunt Bauman (2013), whom we owe one of the most original and critical interpretations of postmodernism from the perspective of uncertainty. By “liquid modernity”, Bauman understands the fragmented existence method of the postmodern man, for whom “consumerism represents the unique horizon of a *“self-made” life*. Even if Bauman’s vision may be reproached a sort of Manichaeism by the deep rupture it operates between “solide” societies and the current, “liquid” society, he still gets credit to have drawn attention that “we are living in a society which requires its members to adapt to the specificity of contemporaneous culture (libertate incertă) without every offering them the means they need: beyond important psychological disorders, this situation generates inedited social inequality types” (Tabet, 2013, p.3). On the other hand, we cannot deny the benefits of the informational societies and the unprecedented access to culture, postmodernity made possible. A historical view, from the perspective of cultural anthropology, helps us understand that man permanently created new types of cultural expression, “all different, apparently, all such types of thinking express the idea of continuity in the evolution of *Homo sapiens*” (...) In essence, “the fluidization process of a solid body does not mean necessarily its destruction, the liquid shapes having such extraordinary capacity to cancel distances, to create connection bridges amongst the human beings and thinking methods” (Chermeleu, 2013, p.29). The society of knowledge we are living in has not exhausted its resources, it still has a lot to offer. It’s up to us to answer the question the new paradigm indicates: “What are the cultural ways laid in front of *homo digitalis*, a fragmental and poor culture or a democratization of the access to science and education?” (Chermeleu, 2013, p.22).

3. Artistic and cultural education in front of the challenges of globalization

Maybe more than anytime, the place of art and culture, the individual and collective artistic practices, the international exchanges and common educative projects becomes structuring elements, allowing the discovery together of other

types of expression, as manifestation of diversity. The deep anthropological mutations crossing our societies led to the loss of various benchmarks: decomposition of family, unemployment, disinvestment or over-investment of religion, dissolution of borders, identity crises, loss of the feeling of security by the exacerbation of xenophobic and racist manifestations, rediscussing territories, migration are challenges the artistic and cultural education may represent a possible answer in a period of milestones. "Coherence and pertinence of a well designed artistic and cultural education claims for a balance and complementariness amongst these three aspects" (Carasso, 2010, p.8). Perceived as a step of important socialization in the development of knowledge, of conducts and values, the school, in its enlarged meaning, becomes a social cohesion and value and positive attitude promotion institution, by better knowing their own culture and other cultures, by understanding and observing cultural specificity of the Other. Most of the programs including current studies integrate the development of *intercultural competences*, at all levels, current challenges of globalization generally lead to the need, in higher and adult education, to pass to another stage, considered a difficult ideal, by developing a *transcultural competence*. It means the "insourcing of their own values and capitalization the other cultures. Transcultural competence includes as well the capacity of cultural mediation. Becoming a cultural mediator means accepting to get involved in situations of pressure and conflicts, in order to better manage the transactions of meaning and identity complexities, mistakenly defined or erroneously designed" (Lussier, 2006, p.8). The globalization process is defined in the specialty literature by several transformations with repercussions in all social fields: growth of commercial trades by opening savings, the key role of the great multinational and transnational companies in worldwide organization of production, acceleration of worldwide circulation of capital and instantaneous transmission of the information (Basilico, 2005, p.5). In such context, we consider that as a part of the worldwide public good, as factors of maximum importance for the durable development of the human being: the surrounding environment, health, education, knowledge (including the notion of culture and patrimony), information, peace and security. The mondialization of the communication techniques, which enabled the globalization of economic markets, led to the creation of an international community, but also of a standardization process in all the fields.

Some specialists in the sciences of communication and sociolinguistics draw attention that such opening of the world is not a value per se nor leads necessarily to the democratization of the world, but represents, first of all, a need of the worldwide economics which crates, most of the times, new inequalities and discriminations. In Dominique Wolton's vision (2016), the globalization process created two types of mondialization, by the informational technological ideology, according to which, the quicker and more interactive the networks, the more performing communication, when, it is actually the other way. As related to human and social communication, comprehension does not depend on the performance of communication. Mutual understanding needs time, which is "precisely the opposite to the performance of functional communication and communication technique which highlight speed. Culture is precisely the opposite of functional communication, as it leads to the identification and respect of differences" (Wolton, p.61). The standardization of the ways of life at planetary level is not enough in order to create a *common culture*, the people identify starting from the symbols and representations referring to *shared values*, which

solidify the feeling of appurtenance, not of lifestyles. Understanding the complex effects of globalization, both beneficial, and harmful, assumes an increased effort from all the factors which contribute to the educational act, as a condition of applying the democratic project and a universalist vision. By a brief historical and transversal vision, these lines are only *issue of debate* of a large and extremely present topic. This volume of the Magazine for Sciences of Education, dedicated to the relationship between *Education and Culture*, is an invitation to reflect onto the two major concepts and onto the ways they might contribute to the fulfilment of the current desiderates of the humanity.

References:

- Anderson – Levitt, K. (2006). Anthropologie de l'éducation: pour un tour du monde, *Éducation et Société*, 17, 7-27.
- Basilico, S. (2010). *Redéfinir le Patrimoine culturel à l'heure de la globalisation*. Retrived from: [:https://archivesic.ccsd.cnrs.fr/sic.00490004](https://archivesic.ccsd.cnrs.fr/sic.00490004)
- Bauman, Z. (2011). The role of the intellectual in liquid modernity . *Theory, Culture & Society*. XXVIII, 3.
- Bonneuil C. Fressoz, J.-B. (2013). *L'autre histoire de l'Anthropocène. L'événement Anthropocène*. La Terre et nous. Paris :Seuil
- Bonnet, M., Selim, M. (2011). *Anthropologie et psychanalyse*. Séminaire de l'Association Française des Anthropologues (AFA), séance inaugurale: Démarche clinique d'orientation psychanalytique en sciences sociales et humaines". Paris
- Brameld, T. (1957). *Cultural Foundations of Education: An Interdisciplinary Exploration*
- Carasso, J.-G. (2010). *Art, Culture et Éducation quels enjeux?*. Retrieved from: <https://www.editions-attribut.fr/Art-culture-et-education-quels>
- Chermeleu, A. (2013). De la technoculture vers les mutations de l'anthropologie digitale, in Claude Martin et Mirosława Malinowska (Dir.), *La société de l'information. Perspective européenne et globale*, Studia Ekonomiczne, Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Katowicach, p.21-31.
- Delalande, J. (2009). Pratiquer l'anthropologie de l'enfance en sciences de l'éducation : une aide à réflexion, in A. Vernioux (dir.), *40 ans des sciences de l'éducation*. Caen : PUC. P. 103-112.
- Ferry, G. (2003). *Le trajet de la formation : les enseignants entre la théorie et la pratique*. Paris : l'Harmattan
- Hatchuel, F. (2007). *Savoir, apprendre, transmettre*. Paris : La Découverte Poche
- Landsheere (de), G. (1966). *Anthropologie culturelle et éducation comparée*. Retrived from:: http://orbi.ulg.be/bitstream/2268/89340/1/De-Landheere_1966_anthro.pdf
- Leif, J., Biancherie, A. (1996). *Philosophie de l'éducation. Tome 1, Pédagogie générale*. Paris : Delagrave
- Lussier, D. (2006). *Intégrer le développement durable d'une , « compétence interculturelle » en éducation : un enjeu majeur de la mondialisation*. Montréal: Université McGill, Canada, Retrived from:: http://www.com.ulaval.ca/fileadmin/contenu/afi/doc_pdf/colloc_2006/III-9_Denise_LUSSIÉ.pdf
- Mead, M. (1964). *Continuities in Cultural Evolution*. New Haven : Yale University Press

Meirieu PH. *Sciences de l'éducation et pédagogie*. Retrieved from:

<http://meirieu.com/COURS/pedaetscienceseduc.pdf>

Mialaret, G. (2011). *Le nouvel esprit scientifique et les sciences de l'éducation*. Paris : PUF

Mihăilescu, V. (2009). *Antropologie. Cinci introduceri*. Iași : Editura Polirom

M'Obame, M. J. F. *Sciences de l'éducation et philosophie de l'éducation*. Retrived from: [http://www.fractale-formation.net/dmdocuments/Sciences de l education et philosophie de l education.pdf](http://www.fractale-formation.net/dmdocuments/Sciences_de_l_education_et_philosophie_de_l_education.pdf)

Morin, E. (2002). *Éducation et culture*. Retrived from: http://www.intelligence-complexite.org/fileadmin/docs/0201morin_culture.pdf

Morin, E. (1999). *Les sept saviors nécessaires à l'éducation du futur*. UNESCO Retrived from: [:http://www.agora21.org/unesco/7savoirs](http://www.agora21.org/unesco/7savoirs)

Perrenoud, PH. (2001). *Vendre son âme au diable pour accéder à la vérité : le dilemme des sciences de l'éducation*. Université de Genève.

Retrived from : https://www.unige.ch/fapse/SSE/teachers/perrenoud/php_main/php_2001/2001_08.html

Reboul, O. (2004). *La philosophie de l'éducation*. Paris : PUF. QSI ? no. 2441

Scheau, I. (2012). Influențe ale concepției despre educație la Rousseau asupra pedagogiei contemporane. *Revista de Pedagogie, LX, .2*, p. 81-89.

Tabet, S. (2013). Zygmunt Bauman et la société liquide. In *Sciences humaines. Reprendre sa vie en main*, 254, 1-4.

Wolton, D., Benedetti, A. (2016). *Communiquer c'est vivre*. Paris : Cherche-midi

Wolton, D. *La communication enjeu de deux mondialisations*. In *Enjeux et défis de la globalisation*. Retrived from: www.bibliotheque.auf.org/doc_num.php?explnum_id=728. P. 53-63