



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

International Journal of Educational Development

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ijedudev

IJED Volume 91 article summaries

Over the last two years, schools have been closed for long periods of time. Government authorities have tried to compensate by instituting on-line learning. The techniques and technologies have varied because of differences in experience, equipment student age and capability. But how much has learning been affected by the transition to remote learning? We know that with the transition to digital learning loss is inevitable. But by how much? In their article titled: “The Potential Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Learning,” authors Luis Monroy Gomez Franco, Roberto Velez-Grajales and Luis Lopez-Calva estimate the learning loss in Mexico making two assumptions. The first is that the remote learning has been effective up to its potential; the second is that remote learning has been ineffective. Under the first assumption, the learning loss in Mexico is estimated over the long run to be the equivalent of an entire school year. Under the second assumption, the short-term learning loss is estimated to be one year, and the longer-term learning loss is estimated to be the equivalent of two years.

In the last two years the International Journal of Educational Development has received 116 manuscripts related to the impact of COVID-19 on education. We have published 15 of them. At the end of the summary of articles in volume 91, we will comment on what they have taught us and the implications.

Of the other articles in volume 91, seven focus on inequality with respect to gender, socio-economic status, and disability. In the article titled: “Climbing the Academic Ladder: Chinese Women Academics Seeking Recognition on the Way to Become Professor,” authors Li Bao and Xiaoming Tian find that women are underrepresented and (like academic professional women everywhere else) face the dilemmas in how to allocate time between career and their roles in the family. In the article titled: “Is the Proportion of Female STEM Teachers in Secondary Education Related to Women’s Enrollment in Tertiary Education STEM Programs,” authors Olga Victoria Dulce-Salcedo and Dario Maldonado find that female STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) teachers in secondary school help boost the rate of women’s participation in STEM at the tertiary level. In the article titled: “Region-wide Initiative to Expand Girl’s Enrollment in Primary Education in Niger: A Case of Collective Impact for Educational Development,” Takao Maruyama, Akiko Kageyama and Nobuhiro Kunieda find that female enrollment increases when local communities, education officials, and other ‘actors’ act consistently to support them.

Socio-economic status (SES) remains a major influence on who attends university. However, in the article titled: “On the ‘Income Advantage’ in Admissions and Course Choices: Evidence from the University of the Philippines System,” authors Sarah Lynne Salvador Daway-Ducanes, Elena Pernia, and Vincent Ramos discover that income advantage, with those from wealthy backgrounds over-represented,

differs by subject. It remains true in general course of study but not in Science and Technology fields. Why this is the case is not clear. Perhaps the nature of the science and technology fields, more closely relying on quantitative elements, may be freer of cultural influences.

Is SES immutable? Is it a characteristic with which one is born? Ye Liu, Winqin Shen, and Ying Huang discover that some elites create their own levels of prestige and social advantage. In their article titled: “Building Halos: How Do Chinese Elites Seek Distinction through (mis) Recognizing Studying Abroad?” they find that Chinese elites construct a ‘triple halo’ of (i) elite secondary schools, (ii) Peking University and (iii) Ivy League universities to ‘signal their superiority by gradually narrowing the circle of ‘us’ and excluding aspirational ‘others’.

In terms of disability, the article titled: “University Access Policies for Persons with Disabilities: Lessons from Two Chilean Universities,” Eugenia Victoriano and Ernesto Trevino study institutional policies and the experiences of both faculty and students to discover that there are both admission policy ‘facilitators’ and ‘barriers’, diosyncratic to each institution. In terms of visual impairment, the article titled: “Inclusive Education for Children with Visual Impairments in SubSaharan Africa: Realizing the Promise of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities,” Guy Le Fanu, Elena Schmidt and Bhavisha Virendrakumar reiterate the fact that children with visual impairments are not yet able to access education as the Convention on Human Rights requires.

Other articles in volume 91 focused on issues of educational management. In the article titled: “Understanding the Interactions Between Multiple Actors in Network Governance: Evidence from School Turn-around in China,” Yuan Tao describes three patterns of network governance. Government-led governance can be done through domination, accommodation, or facilitation. School-led governance can be done by being an obedient follower, a reserved implementor, or a conscious striver. A Third party-led governance can be done by being a government representative, a self-interested leader, or a supportive partner. In their article titled: “Decentralization and School-Based Management in Columbia: An Exploration (using systems thinking) of the Full-Day Schooling Program,” Juan David Parra Heredia finds that school autonomy works, but it works differently in different regions justifying, in some instances, the need for re-centralization.

Because universities have such divergent functions and objectives it is difficult to assess and compare managerial performance across institutions. However, An Hoai Duong attempts to use the ‘Malmquist Index method’ to compare private and government universities in Vietnam and finds that private universities perform better than their public counterparts.

Every educational institution uses prior educational performance to assess the degree to which a particular candidate would be a good

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2022.102601>

Available online 27 April 2022

0738-0593/© 2022 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

student. But some education institutions focus on skills which can be acquired outside of schools. Should prior learning out of schools be recognized in the process of admission? In the article titled: "Promoting the Recognition of Prior Learning in the Context of Development Cooperation: The Case of Bangladesh," Markus Maurer and Mohammad Manboob Morshed argue that the 'recognition of prior learning' (RPL) should be used as a criterion for advancement in vocational training in addition to, or even a replacement, for their record in formal schooling.

When a student drops out of a school program, it is costly both to the student and the program. Dropout prevention is mainly focused on individuals who demonstrate signals that they are struggling and may soon leave a program. But is that the best way to intervene? In their article titled: "Negative Teacher-Student Relationships are Associated with School Dropout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Longitudinal Study in Chile," Dante Contreras, Luis Gonzalez, Samuel Lascar and Veronica Lopez discover a different approach to reaching potential dropouts. Instead of focusing on individual students, they measure universal school policies which emphasize relationships within classrooms and find that it may be more effective than programs focused on individual students.

1. Summary

The pandemic has had catastrophic effects in many sectors, organizations and social relationships. But its effect on the education system has been profound and profoundly important. At one stage in 2020, nine out of ten of the world's children were excluded from face-to-face learning. And though the technologies were able to maintain some of the regular momentum of normal schooling, it is widely concluded that digital learning has not been able to replace face-to-face learning without significant problems.

However, what the pandemic has stimulated is a flood of excellent research. The research we have received seems to fall into four categories, and we have tried our best to publish the most outstanding examples of each. The first category concerns issues of how, when, and on what basis there is justification for opening and closing schools. These are represented in articles by Reuge et. al (2021); Avanesian, Mizunoga and Amaro (2021); Carr, Jilani-Hyler and Murry (2021); and Hawk et al. (2021).

The second category concerns issues of digital learning. These issues can be found analyzed in articles by Reuge et. al (2021); Hossain, 2021; Silwa, Saienko and Kowalski (2021); Selvaraj et al. (2021); and Lennox, Reuge, and Benavides (2021).

The third category involves the degree of learning loss due the school closure. Learning loss issues can be found analyzed in articles by Ardington, Willis, and Kotze (2021); Conto et. al (2021); Kaffenberger, 2021; Sabates, Carter and Stern (2021); Shiraz et. al (2021); Hevia et. al (2022); Haser, Dogan and Erhan (2022); as well as the article available here in volume 91 described above by Gomez-Franco, Velez-Grajales and Lopez-Calva.

There is a fourth category of issues, of which to date we have received no candidate manuscript. This involves the issues of how to transition large portions of the student population who have suffered low or large learning losses. Do educational authorities ignore the fact that students have less cognitive facilities than what would have been the case had COVID not closed schools? Do they simply allow them to re-

enter and ignore the fact that there are significant cognitive and emotional changes from the student population of two years ago? Or do educational authorities take on the challenge directly and create creative 'boot camp' opportunities for the students to make up for learning losses and re-enter the system capable of handling the necessary curricular requirements and so minimize the economic and social costs of the pandemic experience. The IJED will especially be on the lookout for manuscripts in the fourth category.

References

- Ardington, Cally, Willis, Gabriella, Kotze, Janeli, 2021. COVID-19 learning losses: early grade reading in South Africa. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 86 (102480) (March).
- Avanesian, Garen, Mizunoga, Suguru, Amaro, Diogo, 2021. How many students could continue learning during COVID-19- caused school closures? *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 84 (102421) (July).
- Carr, Olivia, Jilani-Hyler, Nadia, Murry, Greg, 2021. Identifying factors related to school closures due to COVID-19 in the Middle East and North Africa. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 88 (102523) (January).
- Conto, Carolina Alban, Akseer, Spogmai, Dreesen, Thomas, Kamei, Akito, Mizunoya, Suguru, Rigole, Annika, 2021. Potential effects of COVID-19 school closures on foundational skills and country responses for mitigating learning loss. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 87 (102434) (November).
- Haser, Cigdem, Dogan, Oguzhan, Erhan, Kurt, 2022. Tracing student mathematics learning loss during school closures in teachers' self-reported practices. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 88 (102536) (January).
- Hawk, William, Frederick, Spielberg, Ressler, Everett, Aguilar, Rita, 2021. Ethical considerations in deciding when to reopen schools. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 83 (102398) (May).
- Hevia, Felipe, Vergara-Lope, Samana, Velasquez-Duran, Anabel, Calderon, David, 2022. Estimation of the fundamental learning loss and learning poverty related to the COVID-19 pandemic in Mexico. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 88 (102515) (January).
- Hosain, Mobarak, 2021. Unequal experience of COVID-19-induced remote schooling in four developing countries. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 85 (102446) (September).
- Kaffenberger, Michelle, 2021. Modelling the long-run learning impact of the COVID-19 learning shock: actions to (More than) mitigate loss. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.*
- Lennox, Janet, Reuge, Nicolas, Benavides, Francisco, 2021. UNICEF's lessons learned from the education-response to the COVID-19 crisis and the reflections for education policy. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 85 (102429) (September).
- Reuge, Nicolas, Jenkins, Robert, Bossard, Matt, Soobrayan, Bobby, Ackers, Jim, Mizunoya, Suguru, Jones, Linda, Taulo, Wongani Grace, 2021. Education response to COVID-19 pandemic: a special issue proposed by UNICEF-editorial review. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 87 (No. 102485) (November).
- Sabates, Ricardo, Carter, Emma, Stern, Jonathan, 2021. Using educational transitions to estimate learning loss due to COVID-19 school closures: the case of complementary basic education in Ghana. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 82 (102377) (April).
- Selvaraj, Ambika, Radhin, Vishnu, Ka, Nithin, Benson, Noel, Mathew, Aran, 2021. Effect of the pandemic-based online education on the teaching and learning system. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 85 (102444) (September).
- Shiraz, Chakera Angrist, de Barros, Noam, Andreas, Bhula, Cumisky, Radhika, de Stefano, Chris, Floretta, Joseph, Kaffenberger, John, Piper, Michelle, Benjamin, Jonathan, Stern, 2021. Building back better to avert a learning catastrophe: estimating learning loss from COVID-19 school shutdowns in Africa and facilitating short term and long-term recovery. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 84 (102397) (July).
- Silwa, Slawomir, Saienko, Volodymyr, Kowalski, Miroslaw, 2021. Educating students during a pandemic in the light of research. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 87 (102504) (November).

Stephen P. Heyneman*
Vanderbilt University, 1739 Hudson Road, 21613 Cambridge, MD, United States

* Correspondence to: Vanderbilt University, 1739 Hudson Road, Cambridge, Maryland, 21613 United States.
E-mail address: s.heynean@vanderbilt.edu.