



Editorial

Volume 88 article summary



Three themes seem to characterize articles in volume 88: gender, socio-economic status and COVID. With respect to *gender*: it is often assumed that equality of gender roles is one of the characteristics of progress and that schooling tends to advance gender equality. Two articles in volume 88 suggest that it is not so simple. In their article on textbooks in Kazakhstan titled: “‘The Fearful Khan and the Delightful Beauties’: The Construction of Gender in Secondary School Textbooks in Kazakhstan”, Naureen Durrani et. al. point to the fact that gender quality was a characteristic of textbooks under the Soviets but following independence, newly-designed textbooks in Kazakhstan ‘entrench gender power relations, construct dominant masculinities and enact emphasized femininities, producing gender hierarchies’. In the article titled: “Does School Effectiveness Benefit Boys and Girls? Evidence from Ethiopia, India and Vietnam,” Lydia Marshall and Rhiannon Moore point out that gender effects are not unidimensional; that girls have lower attainment and attend less effective schools in India but the opposite is true in Vietnam.

It is common to find that a child’s *socio-economic status* (SES) is associated with academic achievement in school. The debate has not questioned whether this was true but rather why it differs from one context to another. Thirty years ago it was discovered that by comparison to the quality of the school, the effects of SES were dominant in high-income countries but not in low-income countries (Heyneman and Loxley, 1983). More recently it has been discovered that the effect of SES effects differs significantly among high-income countries (Heyneman, 2016). The question of why arises in the article by Minseok Yang and Ho Jun Lee titled: “Do School Resources Reduce Socioeconomic the Achievement Gap? Evidence from PISA 2015.” They discover that ‘privileged students receive more academic benefits from high quality teachers than their disadvantaged peers’ and that this conclusion is even more prevalent in the non-OECD countries. This implies that our ability to separate school and out-of-school effects may differ by country.

On a similar theme is the article by James Urwick titled: “Dimensions of Inequality in Children’s Literacy and Numeracy in Uganda: Evidence from a Household-Based Survey.” It is discovered that the differences in reading and numeracy skills at primary school age can be explained by household characteristics, differences in regional poverty, household technology and preschool experience.

The topic of *COVID effects* is raised by two articles. In one titled: “Tracing Students’ Mathematics Learning Loss During School Closures in Teachers’ Self-Reported Practices”, Cigdem Haser, Oguzhan Dogan and Gonul Erthan find that teacher’s practices influenced the degree of mathematics learning loss. The students of teachers who had received

special training focusing on the learning loss problem had students with fewer learning loss problems.

The quantification of learning loss has been addressed in an IJED special issue edited by Reuge et al. (2021).¹ One article in volume 88 also addresses the issue. Titled: “Estimation of the Basic Learning Loss and Learning Poverty Related to the COVID-19 Pandemic in Mexico,” Felipe Hevia, Semana Vergara-Lope, Anabel Velasques-Duran and David Martin del Campo find that the learning loss ranges between 0.45 and 0.34 of a standard deviation in reading and between 0.82 and 0.62 of a standard deviation in math. In essence, they suggest that the ‘learning poverty’ due to COVID-19 in Mexico has increased by 25% in reading and by 29% in mathematics.

As in other sectors, corruption has been a serious issue in education but it has been suggested that as a social problem, corruption in education is worse because it sets the wrong example for young people and it abrogates one of the purposes of public education which is to generate a responsible citizenry (Heyneman, 2004; 2020). An article authored by Prince Agwu et. al., titled: “‘Miracle Examination Centres’ as Hubs for Malpractice in Senior Secondary School Certificate Examination in Nigeria: A Systematic Review of Drivers and Interventions,” illustrates this point. The authors discover businesses which design false secondary school certificates using illegally obtained examination results. The essence of what they uncover ‘undermines academic integrity and country-wide development’. The paper focuses policy attention to strengthen the influence of the ‘proximate drivers’ – parents, community-based groups, school owners, principals, teachers and fellow students.

Language of instruction has been a focus of debate for many years. Psychologists and linguists argue that it is more effective to teach in a local language; economists, political scientists and policy analysts point to the cost of materials, training and political complexities of having to choose among a multitude of local languages all present in the same classroom (Heyneman, 1980). In a paper by Bert van Pinxteren titled: “Language of Instruction in Education in Africa: How New Questions Help Generate New Answers,” the topic is reviewed once again. The proposed conclusion, however is unambiguous: ‘over the next decade or so, a transition to using African languages more at all levels of education will become unavoidable’.

How do policies transfer from one country to the next? Some might suggest that the transfer is stimulated by international organizations such as the World Bank. Olivia Carr has tracked the spread of compulsory education policies and comes to a slightly different conclusion. In her paper titled: “Promoting Practices: Explaining the Adoption of

¹ The special issue contained eleven papers, each is summarized in Reuge et. al. (2021).

Compulsory Schooling Laws in Africa” the author finds that ‘compulsory schooling can be predicted primarily through common linguistic and historical ties between countries, rather than through other variables theorized to be important.’.

Refugees are an international problem in all regions. But when people flee armed conflict or natural disaster and take refuge in another country, what rights do migrant children have to attend local schools? In the paper titled: “No Right to Read: Regulatory Restrictions on Refugee Rights to Formal Education in Low and Middle-Income Host Countries,” authors Kendra Dupuy, Julia Palik, and Gudrun Ostby find that some countries have progressive legal frameworks which allow refugee children to attend local schools, whereas other countries prohibit or severely restrict them from attending local schools. They point out that only 68% of the children of refugees are able to attend primary school. In a comparison of Uganda and Bangladesh, countries at opposite ends of the permission spectrum are described in detail.

Many have argued that making education free overwhelms schools, leads to a decline in quality and a hemorrhaging from the public to private schools (Oketch et al., 2010). However, one article titled: “Should School Fee Abolition Be Comprehensive? An Evaluation of Mozambique,” authors Vy Nguyen and Elizabeth King point out that when a country carefully plans the transition from fee to free primary education the adverse impact can be attenuated.

It is common sense to assume that armed conflict would have deleterious effect on attending school. But is it uniform? Or are there circumstances in which the effects are less severe? In a paper titled: “Armed Conflict, Education Access and Community Resilience: Evidence from Afghanistan, NRVA Survey 2005 and 2007,” Yuji Utsumi finds that there is a significant reduction in school attendance due to armed conflict, but

that this reduction can be mitigated where there have been financial contributions to education from members of the local community.

Do domestic scholarship programs have the intended effect? In the paper titled: “Targeted Scholarship for Higher Education and Academic Performance: Evidence from Indonesia,” authors Tri Mulyaningsih et. al. find that local scholarship programs positively impacts performance particularly with marginalized students.

References

- Heyneman, S.P., 1980. Instruction in the mother tongue: the question of logistics. *J. Can. Int. Educ.* 9 (2), 88–94.
- Heyneman, S.P., 2004. Education and corruption. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 24 (6), 638–648.
- Heyneman, S.P., 2016. The Heyneman/Loxley Effect: Three Decades of Debate. In: McGrath, S., Gu, Q. (Eds.), *Routledge International Handbook on Education and Development*. Routledge, Oxford, pp. 150–168.
- Heyneman, S.P., 2020. Corruption in the Education Sector. In: Graycar, A. (Ed.), *Handbook on Corruption, Ethics and Integrity in Public Administration*. Macmillan, New York, pp. 129–138.
- Heyneman, S.P., Loxley, W., 1983. The effect of primary school quality on academic achievement across 29 high- and low-income countries. *Am. J. Sociol.* 88 (6), 162–194.
- Oketch, M., Mutisya, M., Ngware, M., Ezih, A.C., 2010. Why are there proportionally more poor pupils enrolled in non-state schools in urban Kenya in spite of FPE policy? *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* Vol. 30 (1), 23–32.
- Reuge, N., Jenkins, R., Brossard, M., Soobrayan, B., Mizunoya, S., Ackers, J., Jones, L., Taulo, W.G., 2021. Education response to the COVID-19 pandemic: a special issue sponsored by UNICEF. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 87, 102485.

Stephen P. Heyneman
Vanderbilt University, 1739 Hudson Road, Cambridge, MD, United States
E-mail address: s.heyne@vanderbilt.edu.