The Multiple Influences on Non-formal Instructional Practices in Rural Mozambique: Exploring the Limits of World Culture Theory

Abstract: This article presents findings from 12 months of ethnographic observations of non-formal adult education classes offered by an internationally-funded nonprofit, referred to in this paper as Comunidades de Poder (or CDP). The primary objective of this article is to examine the various contextual factors that influence CDP teachers' instruction and to explore the applicability of world culture theory as a framework that can explain these phenomena. This article finds that CDP teachers' classroom practice was more heavily influenced by teachers' personal experiences in teacher-centered formal classrooms than by their training in Freirean pedagogy. It also finds that world culture theory has limited applicability in explaining these phenomena, as it fails to account for changes in world culture over time and the role of power in its dissemination. This article argues that a modified version of the theoretical construct of the *educational project* may account for these areas in which world culture theory is insufficient.

Amid the height of central Mozambique's rainy season, the sun fought its way through on this particular Thursday, with light dancing in on the wall of the community center in Inyaya. Felicia, a middle-class nurse in her mid-50s, was leading a discussion on how to purify water using a solution made from locally available resources. The 33 participants were all adult residents of Inyaya, a community predominantly occupied by subsistence farmers.

The curriculum used by Felicia to facilitate this discussion had been written by the author of this article, a North American anthropologist of education who was hired by Comunidades de Poder (or CDP), an internationally-funded nonprofit, to write a series of non-formal adult education lessons in various subjects (including health and hygiene, nutrition, home improvement, sanitation, home-based care for the sick, income generation, etc.) based in Freirean thematic codes (i.e., pictures, skits or other media meant to stimulate conversation on a given topic). As Paulo Freire himself recommended (1970 [though Freire was pretty sparse in his methodological suggestions]), these codes were based in participant observation in Inyaya and other similar participating communities. They were also based in a Freire-inspired curricular framework known as FAMA, developed by a prominent North American literacy organization. This framework utilized a series of questions that build upon one another to promote discussion

of what community members can do to improve their lives relative to the principle addressed in the Freirean code.

All of these contextual cultural elements could have influenced the way in which Felicia taught this particular class. However, as this article will illustrate, several of these factors are particularly helpful in explaining the origins of her teaching style. Ward Goodenough (1976) once famously stated that "we are all 'multicultural,'" or that all of us as educators and researchers are subject to a number of different cultural influences that are reflected in the way we think, feel and act. Building upon this observation, the primary research question orienting this article is: How do the contextual cultural influences experienced by CDP instructors help to explain observed interactions between instructors and participants in CDP's adult education classes?

The second research question guiding this work is a theoretical one: what implications do these contextual cultural influences have for world culture theory, as a theoretical framework that attempts to explain why and how educational ideas and models spread throughout the world? Given the continued prominence of world culture theory within the comparative education literature, both due to the assertions of its adherents (Ramirez 2006; Baker and LeTendre 2005) and its critics (Anderson-Levitt 2003; Carney, Rappleye and Silova 2012), this article will explore the degree to which world culture theory holds the same explanatory power for ethnographic data collected in localized spaces as it does when applied to large data sets (LeTendre, Baker, Akiba, Goesling and Wiseman 2001; Baker and LeTendre 2005).

Through the use of fieldnotes from 12 months of these CDP adult education classes and interviews with the instructors of those classes, I will argue that while some impact of their Freirean training was evident in the way they structured their lessons, CDP instructors'

pedagogical practice during this time was primarily influenced by their own experiences in teacher-centered classrooms, resulting in CDP classes typified predominantly by unequal, teacher-centered classroom practice. I will then use these findings to argue that while world culture theory correctly asserts that particular models of schooling and teaching do spread globally in significant ways, what neo-institutionalist scholars call "world culture" (Baker and LeTendre 2005) is more accurately described by Lesley Bartlett's (2003, 2010) construct of the *educational project*. I will further argue that this study clearly demonstrates the possibility for *temporal* and well as *spatial* dimensions to such educational projects, as the teaching practices of CDP program instructors reflect the influence of various educational projects which held global dominance at different periods of time.

To make this argument, I will first contextualize this study within the larger discussion of cultural influences on educational practices, a conversation which in recent years in comparative education scholarship has been heavily influenced by world culture theorists and their critics[1].

Conceptual Framework

Writing About Global Culture Flows in the Context of World Culture Theory

As will be seen shortly, several of the strongest influences on CDP instructor teaching practices (especially CDP instructors' own experiences in mass schooling, which exposed them to teacher-centered instruction) could be described as belonging to a theoretical construct which comparative sociologists have called *world culture*. World culture theory first emerged in the 1970s as a theoretical framework meant to explain the spread of mass schooling throughout the world. Early pieces in this literature (particularly Meyer, Ramirez, Rubinson, and Boli-Bennett

---

[1] Indeed, only within the last year two edited volumes (Steiner-Khamsi and Waldow 2012; Verger, Novelli and Altinyelken 2012), one special issue of *Comparative Education* edited by Jürgen Schriewer (2012) and two prominent articles in the *Comparative Education Review* (Carney et al. 2012; Vavrus and Bartlett 2012) have been written on the topic of global flows of culture and their influence on educational practices in various contexts.

1977) assert that the spread of mass schooling was driven more by an increasingly global "world system" than by the individual characteristics of regions or nations. According to world culture theorists, this increasingly "world culture" is based in Western liberal myths and ideals (of the individual, of the role of the state, of human rights, and so forth), which have over time become a global "norm" through their isomorphic influence (Ramirez and Boli 1987).

Within the larger world culture literature, the influence of world culture on teaching practices in particular classrooms has been most directly addressed by LeTendre et al. (2001) and David Baker and LeTendre (2005). While previous world culture scholars primarily focus on isomorphism in educational structures, LeTendre et al. (2001) further assert that there is "strikingly little cross-national variation" in teaching practices and the asserted perceptions and beliefs of teachers about those practices (8). According to this line of scholarship, the push of Western ideals of schooling has led not only to increasingly similar school systems around the globe, but to increasingly analogous classroom-level pedagogies.

One problem with early incarnations of world culture theory (Meyer et al. 1977) is that they assumed some degree of universality in how these isomorphic influences would be implemented in any given localized context. This assumption of universality and lack of recognition of the agency of local participants has been sharply problematized by anthropologists and ethnographers of education, who have noted extensively the ways in which these global isomorphic influences have been hybridized locally[2]. As a result, more recently work utilizing world culture theory has responded to this criticism (Meyer, Boli, Thomas and Ramirez 1997) by utilizing a construct heavily drawn on in neo-institutionalist work since the 1970s and 80s (e.g.

---

[2] Each of the chapters in Anderson-Levitt's (2003) edited volume *Local Meanings, Global Schooling: Anthropology and World Culture Theory* provides a compelling ethnographically-driven account of this dynamic in a different local context. Through a global comparative analysis of the spread of learner-centered education, and its problematic implementation in four lower and middle-income countries, Schweisfurth (2013) also puts forward persuasive evidence supporting the same general claim. For a broader theoretical argument, see also Tikly (2001).

Meyer and Scott 1983), namely Karl Weick's (1976) notion of "loose-coupling," which asserts that while increasingly homogenizing global educational trends exist, they are not always directly reflected in micro level structures (Ramirez 2012). As Stephen Carney et al. (2012) state, this to a certain degree neutralizes the arguments of critics of world culture theory and brings much of the discussion to an impasse, as the theory's "willingness to acknowledge local processes of enactment...means that it is too easily able to accommodate its critics...[as] what was once a lively debate has thus fallen into a comfortable set of complementarities about educational convergence" (367).

However, in this article I assert that are still several topics currently debated by world culture theorists and their critics that merit greater examination, and do so utilizing ethnographic data from a non-formal educational program in Mozambique. In the tradition of both world culture theorists and their critics, I fully recognize the influence of globally spread teaching models on teaching practices in localized spaces. However, the data presented here problematize current world culture theory in two primary areas. First, while the existent world culture literature has emphasized the *spatial* spread of mass schooling, there has not been much recognition of *temporal* changes in the "world culture" that is being spread at any given historical moment. As will be asserted hereafter, it is precisely CDP teachers' predilection for the teacher-centered pedagogy they experienced as students in Mozambique's mass schooling expansion efforts of the 1970s and 80s that causes them to be wary of Freirean methods or any other form of learner-centered pedagogy, a progressive teaching orientation currently spreading throughout the world (Schweisfurth 2013; Vavrus and Bartlett 2012, 2013) as arguably one element of current "world culture." Second, the emphasis placed by many world culture theorists on the similarities in practices across contexts resultant from "world culture" over specific

contextual variations can oversimplify the reality that there are multiple globally present educational models at any given time being supported and pushed by different global actors with varying degrees of power and influence. The appeal of world culture theorists to "loose-coupling" (Weick 1976) as an explanation for local heterogeneity in implementation does not sufficiently explain why neo-institutionalist explanations for the spread of educational policies and ideas fail to recognize the role of power in that spread (Anderson-Levitt 2012), and often seem to reify ideas as spreading in and of themselves separate from individuals and institutions (Meyer et al. 1977).

I will argue that what Baker and LeTendre (2005) have called "world culture" can more comprehensively be described using Bartlett's (2003, 2010) notion of an *educational project*, or a "cultural and sociopolitical [initiative] accomplished by [an alliance] of social actors, including actors in institutions, with different material resources, who engage and mobilize [an ideology] as codified in [pedagogy] and educational [philosophy]" (2010, 52). Specifically, I will argue that "world culture" represents the educational project that is globally dominant at a specific time due to the significant power held by those social actors that support it. As these dominant educational projects change over time as a result of adjustments in global power dynamics and currently accepted "best practices," I will differentiate between two types of globally dominant educational projects: *previously dominant educational projects* and *currently dominant educational projects*. As will be explored more fully hereafter, the teacher-centered teaching model most commonly accepted among CDP teachers is a reflection of a *previously dominant educational project* that was commonly accepted at the time those teachers were themselves students in Mozambican formal schools.

However, in the context of CDP, other educational projects are likewise noticeable in the teaching practices of CDP instructors. Foremost among these is the pedagogy of Brazilian educator Paulo Freire, which is not traditionally associated with world culture—rather, it is what Bartlett (2003) would call a counter model to world culture, or a "significant politicized educational project" (184) that contests the *currently dominant educational project*. Before continuing, it is crucial to first provide an introduction to Freire's educational project, and how it manifests itself in a CDP context.

Freirean Pedagogy

The term "Freirean" typically refers to any activity, educational endeavor or program that bases its work in the pedagogical and theoretical work of Paulo Freire (1967, 1970, 1981; Freire and Macedo 1987).[3] Freire advocated for classes and educational programs that based themselves in the lived experiences of participants, worked against the common extant authoritative power dynamic between teachers and students, and promoted community-driven action for social change relative to local problems that result from larger systemic social maladies.

The particular Freirean framework used by CDP program instructors in the classes observed for this study was called FAMA, and had been designed for use in Freirean adult literacy classes by the North American nonprofit ProLiteracy (Curtis 1990). In this model, classes were begun through the use of a Freirean "code," typically a picture, piece of music, skit, or game that referred to or depicted the dominant theme to be discussed within a given class. This was then followed by four distinct phases of questions, represented by the acronym FAMA (referring to Fact, Association, Meaning, Action). The purpose of such a discussion was to lead

---

[3] This list is very introductory, and meant to bring focus on several of Freire's most prominent and widely-read texts. For a more extensive look at Freire's work, begin with Barreto (1998); Freire (1978, 1979a, 1979b, 1983, 1996, 1997a, 1997b, 2000a, 2000b, 2001a, 2001b), Freire and Faundez (1985); Freire and Shor (1986); Gadotti (1994); Gadotti, Freire and Guimarães (1995), Roberts (2000).

either individuals or classes to decide upon a course of action to address the underlying social problem represented by the code. The phases of FAMA, their purposes, and examples of questions related to each section are detailed in Table 1.

Setting and Methods

Setting

For this article, I am drawing on a 12-month ethnographic study of the non-formal adult education programs sponsored by CDP in rural Mozambique. The undertaking of this study was one of my job responsibilities as an employee for CDP, who wished me to not only design their curriculum but conduct ethnographic research in the communities in which it was implemented so as to monitor its reception. While this was the first time I had written a curriculum, I had been hired by CDP due to my previous experience as a Freirean adult educator in northeastern Brazil, my fluency in written and spoken Portuguese, my familiarity with the FAMA method, and my extensive background leading ethnographic research projects in Brazil and the United States.

CDP's non-formal adult education program focused on small rural communities of around 200 families, and included weekly classes and goal programs meant to incentivize the adoption of behaviors which were intended to substantially improve the health, sanitation and living standards of participating communities (including classes in such areas as water purification, latrine building, malaria prevention and treatment, starting a small business, and so forth). The CDP administrators that hired me had read Freire and had some experience with FAMA specifically as a pedagogical method, and saw both as an effective way to organize their program in terms of curriculum. However, their commitment to Freirean pedagogy was effectively limited to their commitment to the FAMA method, which several of them had used and found effective in previous organizations.

The core data for this article came from ethnographic research on weekly community classes in three CDP-sponsored communities, which I refer to as Oshossi, Mutango, and Inyaya. The fieldnotes from these communities were chosen for this article because these sites began participation in CDP programming just before or just after my arrival, making my fieldnotes from those communities much richer and more extensive than those I have for other communities that entered the program later.

The weekly classes in each of these communities were taught by CDP's program instructors, all of whom were responsible for several of the curricular areas focused on by CDP. All five of these individuals had extensive experience in other development programs and organizations similar to CDP working in their various content areas (i.e. the health program instructor had worked previously as a nurse, the child development program instructor had worked in child nutrition at the national Ministry of Health, and so forth). However, for the most part this experience was administrative or technical, and only one program instructor had any previous experience teaching.

When I arrived in Mozambique, these program instructors were already teaching weekly community classes in Oshossi and Mutango that were focused on sharing basic information from their various content areas (such as how to purify water), but there was no curriculum in place guiding their instruction and they had been given no previous training in pedagogical practices. It was my job to create this curriculum based in Freirean principles and train these program instructors in the FAMA teaching methodology, which I had been trained in previously.

For the first two months I was in Mozambique, I gave bi-weekly half-day trainings in FAMA to these program instructors. These trainings typically began with simple descriptions of the FAMA method and modeled lessons given by me. The majority of the time would then be

spent having program instructors give sample lessons and practice formulating generative themes and questions that fit the FAMA framework. As these trainings were occurring at the same time that program instructors were teaching classes, sample lessons typically focused on the classes that program instructors were going to deliver that week in CDP's sponsored communities. After two months, trainings were cut back to once a month and served primarily as "refresher" courses and opportunities to prepare upcoming lessons. After six months, training ceased due to the increasingly busy schedule program instructors had teaching in each village[4].

In these trainings, what was primarily modeled as "Freirean" was the use of a Freirean thematic code and the use of the FAMA steps as outlined in Table 1, as these were the elements of Freirean pedagogy to which CDP administrators were most committed. However, drawing upon my own previous experience as a literacy instructor in a Freirean adult education nonprofit in Northeastern Brazil, I also spent a good deal of time emphasizing the democratic teaching philosophy upon which these methods were based: that is, that CDP instructors should primarily function as facilitators of dialogue through the use of FAMA questions, and that participants themselves should provide their own answers and solutions to community problems. While this fell somewhat in tension with the pre-set curricular goals which CDP had established for each lesson, I emphasized regularly during the training that participant feedback should be valorized and that community-proposed solutions should be given priority even if they did not fit neatly with CDP's pre-set curricular goals. This approach was also approved by my superiors, who saw CDP's curricular goals more as general guidelines than firmly established outputs.

Ethnographic Methods

---

[4] Unfortunately, further ethnographic description of these trainings is not possible, as I was directing them myself and unable to take detailed fieldnotes of them through participant observation.

Within their sponsored communities, CDP offered the aforementioned non-formal adult education classes, as well as weekly goal-setting home visits conducted by CDP staff based on behaviors incentivized within those classes, adult literacy classes and youth programs. Over a 12-month period, I observed each of CDP's weekly non-formal adult education classes in all three communities and came along with CDP staff on their weekly goal-setting home visits, often interviewing participants and staff at length about their perceptions of the program. In total, this article draws on observations of and fieldnotes on/from 42 such classes and 28 interviews, 10 with CDP field staff and 18 with community participants.

All of my classroom observations (conducted after the manner outlined by Spradley [1980]) were documented through my hand-written fieldnotes (written in Portuguese), and roughly half of them were also audio recorded. These recordings I later transcribed. I then translated my hand-written notes and transcriptions into English, typically one to two weeks after each class[5]. The interviews I conducted were semi-structured interviews done after the manner outlined by Spradley (1979) and Rubin and Rubin (1995). These interviews were similarly audio recorded, and then transcribed and translated into English, typically within several weeks of being conducted. Every month, I coded my most recent interviews and observations according to dominant themes that were arising within the data[6]. Twice during the 12-month period of data collection, I re-coded all observations and transcriptions, to allow for the emergence of new trends and new codes within the larger set of fieldnotes.

Discourse Analysis Methods

---

[5] As a fluent Portuguese speaker who has worked in Portuguese-speaking countries for over four years and taken three years of university-level coursework in Portuguese, this transcription and translation process was time-consuming but feasible without outside assistance.

[6] This fieldnote-writing model is extensively outlined in the work of Emerson, Fretz and Shaw (1995).

Throughout this article, I will utilize transcripts and fieldnotes of the conversational interactions between CDP program instructors and participants in their classes as the basis for many of my assertions. My methodology in reviewing these conversational interactions will be based in critical discourse analysis, which I here use to examine the implicit meanings and assumptions inherent in conversational interactions and thus reveal the larger ideologies and social structures that inform them (Fairclough 2001; Gee 1999; Phillips and Jorgenson 2002; Van Dijk 2001). I am particularly interested in the implicit meanings that are communicated through conversational interactions between CDP instructors and participants, as these interactions reflect and reveal the relations of power between these actors.

As of yet, critical discourse analysis has been rarely utilized in the studies presented in the *Comparative Education Review*. In 2010, Frances Vavrus and Maud Seghers introduced critical discourse analysis as a framework and methodology to this journal through their study of the principle of "partnership" as reflected in policy documents prepared by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund analyzing conditions in Tanzania (Vavrus and Seghers 2010). The present article represents a continued interest in the applicability of this methodological framework to comparative research.

While critical discourse analysis has been used to draw meaning from various data sources (including texts, journals and speech acts), I here use it to explore the hierarchical teacher-student relationships existent in CDP classroom settings. While the use of transcriptions such as those included here are perhaps more common in studies that utilize conversation analysis, a similar methodological form that is often less critical in its orientation (Wooffitt 2005), close reading of transcribed material has been used in other studies utilizing critical discourse analysis that similarly aim to reveal the power differentials inherent in speech acts in

educational settings (Rocha-Schmid 2010; Chitera 2011). The present article in part aims to show how this technique of applying critical discourse analysis to classroom discussions, relatively common in educational research in the U.S. (Seo 2009; Van Sluys, Lewison and Flint 2006), can be similarly useful in comparative settings.

Teacher Educator as Ethnographer: Ethical Considerations

As I was an employee of CDP at the time this study was conducted, and I was also a teacher educator that served as the direct supervisor of the CDP teachers I was observing in this study, a number of ethical considerations had to be taken into account through the process of planning this research, conducting it, and then analyzing the data and writing up my findings. First, there is the question of my loyalty as a researcher given that the organization I was researching was also my employer at the time of this study. Luckily, the CDP administrator that oversaw my study had been trained in qualitative research through his own graduate education, and he consistently encouraged me to portray what was true whether or not it was flattering. While I understandably knew that my superiors within CDP would be most pleased with positive results, their consistent message to me was that honesty was more important than flattery and that they wanted to know truthfully how well their teachers were responding to my training sessions on Freirean teaching methods. I felt no pressure to modify my results for appearance's sake, as will be seen later on[7]. These results have been shared with CDP prior to this article's publication.

Second, there is the question of the validity of my data, given that I was observing CDP teachers as their superior. I was also a university-educated White North American outsider, a positionality that includes several indices of power (on the basis of race, social class, education

---

[7] That is, the results of my training efforts were hardly flattering, as little evidence of Freirean training was manifest in my observations of CDP classrooms

and nationality) that inherently separated me from CDP's local Mozambican staff[8]. As a result, my presence could have led them to teach differently than they might have done had I been absent. While this is a reality of ethnographic research that I could not avoid, efforts were made at every step of data collection and analysis to make note of how the classes I was observing might have been modified by my presence.

Third, there is the question of my own biases as a Freirean educator evaluating the effects of a training protocol in which I was personally invested. After all, as a Freirean educator committed to social justice, I had a strong desire to see CDP teachers adopt more dialogic methods that would create more equal relationships between teachers and students. I was personally interested in observing CDP classes in order to see how well my trainees were adapting what I had taught them. However, as noted by Souto-Manning (2010), a fellow Freirean educator who conducted ethnographic research of her own students in a teacher education program, one can be committed to transformative pedagogical work and still conduct rigorous ethnography within the space in which one conducts that work, if one's political position (and the potential ramifications of such) are made explicit throughout the study. In that spirit, despite my desires to see "good" Freirean practice in CDP classrooms, my methods of participant observation (utilizing audio recordings as well as fieldnotes, as described above) were sufficiently rigorous that I could not deny trends that arose in the data, even when they were the opposite of what I might have wanted to see as a teacher educator.

Findings

As stated previously, the primary finding of this study was that CDP teachers were more influenced in their classroom practice by their own early experiences as students in teacher-

---

[8] This elevated positionality made the development of a Freirean curriculum, based in local community knowledge, especially challenging. However, following Freire's (1970) advice to base such curricular work in rigorous ethnographic fieldwork, the construction of such a curriculum was feasible.

centered classrooms than by their more recent Freirean training. While I initially began this study with a particular interest in the pedagogical actions of CDP instructors due to my position as their trainer, over time community participants' answers to FAMA questions also revealed themselves to be quite intriguing, given the teacher-centered classroom dynamics that those answers displayed. The following sections will provide examples of several common participant responses to the various phases of CDP's FAMA framework that illustrate this teacher-centered classroom dynamic. This will begin with a particularly illustrative vignette from a community class that provides rich examples of such responses.

An Afternoon in Mutango

This particular class was led by a program instructor I'll call Anastacia, who was responsible for CFP's Sanitation and Child Development programs. Anastacia previously worked in several governmental ministries in Maputo, and had little previous background in teaching: a history that might help explain the didactic and rote manner in which her classes were conducted[9]. Below is a transcript taken from an audio recording of a class she facilitated on the importance of using a well-built latrine, taught in Mutango on February 8th. This class corresponds to one of CFP's curricular goals: that all participants build and use a sturdy latrine that doesn't contaminate their water supply. This is the first time this class was taught in this community, but many community members had already been taught these principles informally through their home goal-setting visits from CFP field staff. The Freirean code that preceded this discussion was a short skit in which a man was using his latrine which had collapsed because it was built of flimsy materials, and he had fallen inside[10].

---

[9] While all of the instructors observed in this study were somewhat rote in their teaching techniques, this was perhaps most clearly visible in Anastacia's classes.

[10] For differentiation, Anastacia's questions and comments are italicized while community participant responses are in regular font. Script lines are numbered for easier reference later on.

1: *In our neighborhood, has anything like this happened before?*
2: [No response]
3: *I would like it if you all would tell me, what is the solution so that*
4: *we can have latrines that last longer than this one?*
5: [Pause]
6: We could make improved latrines, made out of cement.
7: *So what do we lack that's keeping us from having improved*
8: *latrines?*
9: Resources, improved conditions.
10: *Is there any other way we could do this?*
11: [Pause]
12: I don't know, could you tell us?
13: *Well, you could use CFP's agriculture program to earn money,*
14: *and buy cement. You could also complete your goals through*
15: *CFP, which will get you three sacks of cement after one cycle.*
16: *With three sacks of cement, we could make 150 blocks, and we*
17: *could make an improved latrine, even with our current financial*
18: *conditions.*
19: [Pause]
20: *Once we have these blocks, how deep should we make our latrine?*
21: [Pause]
22: As deep as possible without hitting water.
23: *2-3 meters, at least. How many meters should it be from our*
24: *house?*
25: When you don't have much land, as far as possible.
26: *Ideally, 10 meters. How many meters from the well?*
27: 20-30 meters. It should be away from the river, too, not just the
28: well.
29: *What can happen if the well and the latrine are near each other?*
30: The water will get contaminated.
31: *When we keep using the latrine, how does it get?*
32: Dirty. We need to clean it.
33: *How should you clean it?*
34: [No response]
35: *If it is made out of cement, wash it with water and soap. If it's*
36: *made out of mud thatch, you can sweep it out.*
37: We use ash to clean, too, as soap is expensive.
38: *That's OK, you can use that.*

At the beginning of the conversation, Anastacia followed the FAMA steps of the

curriculum she was using, beginning with a Fact/Association type open-ended question (Line 1:

"Has anything like this happened around here before?"). When that solicited no response, the

tone of her voice in the recording (combined with her particular word choice) reflected growing

exasperation (Line 3: "I would like all of you to tell me"), and she then moved quickly to the end of the FAMA curricular chronology (I would infer due to her nervousness, audible in the recording and noted in my fieldnotes—an especially understandable emotional state in this context, as Anastacia was a relatively new employee at the time of this visit, and I was recording her class), asking an Action question meant to solicit input regarding how the community should move forward (Lines 3-4: "What is the solution so that we can have latrines that last longer?"). That triggered the desired answer, that community members make improved latrines with cement (Line 6), thus meeting CFP's curricular goal for the lesson.

However, her follow-up question (about how to gain such latrines, lines 7-8) did not trigger the answer she hoped for (Line 9), causing her to repeat the question (Line 10: "Is there any other way we could do this?"). A slight pause seemed to imply that participants did not want to answer incorrectly (as the previous participant seemed to have done, their comment being dismissed in Line 10), and finally one participant asked whether she could tell them what to do (Line 12). Anastacia was more than happy to oblige, explaining how all participants could make an improved latrine through participation in one of several of CFP's programs (Lines 13-18).

Anastacia then asked some very specific questions to make sure that participants knew the "correct" manner in which to build and maintain a latrine (Lines 20-38), correcting or adding to community member responses. For example, in terms of depth, it should not only be "as deep as possible" as one community member stated (Line 22), but "2-3 meters, at least" (Line 23); in terms of distance from one's house, it should not only be "as far as possible" given your conditions (Line 24), but "ideally, 10 meters" (Line 26). When community participants added valuable input (e.g. that one's latrine should be away from rivers, not just wells [Lines 27-28]), it was ignored (Note no response to this information in line 29). When participants provided the

correct rote response (e.g. if latrines are near wells, water will get contaminated [Line 30]; if we use latrines, they get dirty and need to be cleaned [Line 32]), the discussion moved forward, as the arrival of the correct response implied that no further discussion was required.

As the lesson nears the end, Anastacia asked how latrines should be cleaned (Line 33)—feeling unsure of the correct response, community members didn't respond (Line 34), causing Anastacia to provide the answer she expected (Lines 35-36). When that answer was problematized and an alternative solution was suggested (i.e. soap is too expensive, and ash can work as a substitute [Line 37]), Anastacia seemed to hesitantly approve it (Line 38, a long pause and change in tone is noted in the recording), ending the discussion.

Given the tone of Anastacia's lesson, it can be seen that participants were to an extent "punished" verbally by her when their answers were not what was expected. As illustrated in the vignette, answers that deviated from what the teacher expected to hear could be ignored, rejected or grudgingly approved, reflecting the unstated authority of the instructor. In an educational setting in which such a teacher-centric conversational flow is typical pedagogical discourse, I argue through the fieldnotes shared below that participants were highly motivated to provide the answers that instructors were seeking.

Providing the Expected Answer

In all documented community classes, there were some responses from community participants that were exactly or nearly exactly the same as the responses suggested in CDP's curriculum. For example, in a class on preventing diarrhea given by Felicia on September 15 in Oshossi, the following exchange occurred during the Action phase of the discussion:

1: *What do we need to do to avoid diarrhea in our homes?*
2: Treat our water.
3: Wash our plates well.
4: *When a person gets diarrhea very quickly, what should you do before*

5: *taking them to the hospital?*
6: Give them some lemon juice, maybe with a little salt or garlic.

When this class occurred, program participants in Oshossi had already received the same

class once before[11]. Several community leaders in Oshossi (as well as other communities) also

had received copies of the CDP curriculum, and had a chance to peruse it. This was reflected in

participant responses: all community member answers to questions (Lines 2, 3, 6) were

suggested potential responses listed in the curriculum, which community members had learned

during the previous class and through reinforcement of those same principles during CDP field

staff's home follow-up visits. Participants were simply repeating the answers they had

previously been taught were correct.

Similarly, on October 31 in Mutango, Rosemarie taught a class on waste disposal.

Within that class, the following exchange occurred:

1: *Why shouldn't we put our garbage near the door?*
2: Rats and mosquitoes come.

In this example with Rosemarie, the community in question had received the same lesson

at least once before, and participant responses reflected the prescribed answers from Rosemarie's

previous lesson on waste disposal (Line 2). Again, given the repeated emphasis on the core

principles of CDP's curriculum, not only through classes but CDP's weekly home visits,

questions that seemed to be requesting a "correct" answer (Line 1: Why shouldn't we put our

garbage by the door?) did indeed elicit the previously taught answer.

Responding with Silence

Given the preponderance of direct questions that seemed to imply particular responses,

often in monitored classes participants were silent following such questions, presumably out a

---

[11] There were roughly 25 planned classes in the curriculum, with two classes being given in each weekly visit—once all the classes were given in each community, the same 12-week cycle would occur again.

desire to not want to answer incorrectly. It should be noted that in all classes, as is common within classrooms, some regular participants commented more frequently than their peers, which might provide a simple explanation for why classes were at times more silent (that is, if frequent commenters were absent). While I was able to note that being the case in a number of my fieldnotes, I took note on most occasions regarding which participants were present, particularly those that spoke most frequently, and most of the vignettes included in this section occurred in settings in which frequent commenters were also present, and also stayed silent. For instance, on November 18 Rosemarie taught the previously mentioned class on waste disposal in Inyaya, and the following discussion followed:

> 1: *How do we bury garbage?*
> 2: [No response]
> 3: *You put a little bit of dirt on top.*
> 4: *What about grass? Is grass also a waste problem?*
> 5: [No response]
> 6: *What problem does grass cause?*
> 7: [No response]
> 8: *It brings snakes, pests. It is a form of garbage, too, and we should cut it*
> 9: *down.*

As this is the first time this class was taught in Inyaya, and it was taught two weeks after CDP had begun working in this community, participants (even those who spoke up often and seemed to have all the "right" answers in these non-formal adult education classes) had not yet been taught the "proper" response to these questions. As a result, presumably because they did not want to give the wrong answer or appear foolish, participants instead remained silent.

Anderson-Levitt (2002) states that "professional knowledge does not exist in a void. It rests on understandings and values that teachers share with lay people, which I have called 'classroom cultures'" (57). Building upon this, many of my fieldnotes of CDP classes seem to show that CDP participants understood (or at least learned over time) the classroom culture of "right" answers established by CDP instructors, and as a result reacted appropriately (that is,

with no response) when they did not know the right answer. The fact that this "classroom culture" could be learned over time through experiences with CDP seems to be reflected in the cited fieldnote from Rosemarie's class, in which she followed up on these silences by providing the answer she would give in their situation (lines 3, 8-9). This practice easily reinforces the perception that there is a "right" answer.

The Negligible Influence of Freirean Training

What is interesting about this teacher-centered pedagogical model is that it goes against the student-centered goals and rhetoric that undergird the Freirean FAMA framework used by CDP, as well as the goals of non-formal education more generally. As previously stated, while CDP had general curricular goals for each lesson (e.g. that participants would build latrines that would not contaminate the water supply) and in some cases provided examples of possible answers, they did not have concrete, set expectations for the fulfillment of that goal (e.g. that participants build latrines out of cement, a particular pre-set distance from the river and a particular pre-set distance from the well, and so forth). The insertion of such concrete, formalized outputs by CDP program instructors, and the rejection of suggestions that fell outside those outputs, was quite unexpected.

It is important to note that CDP instructors did generally follow the FAMA framework for discussion, utilizing a Freirean code and then following the basic FAMA pattern of questioning. What was surprising was that this framework was then added upon with questions and comments that implied power differentials and a sense of instructional authority.

Teachers' Beliefs - Why Do They Teach This Way?

These findings, repeated in my fieldnotes over many months, led me to wonder: Why did CDP instructors teach in such a teacher-centered manner, after each of them had participated in

at least 6 months of fairly regular training in FAMA techniques? Granted, efforts to change pedagogical practice through teacher education are always complex and challenging, whatever the pedagogical focus of such training (Clift and Brady 2005; Grossman 2005). Nonetheless, the persistence of such teacher-centered practice in the face of pedagogical training that purposefully pushed a contrary ideology led me to want to better understand the reasons for this phenomenon. When I asked Felicia (7/1) this question, she sheepishly admitted that, while she thought FAMA was a wonderful idea, she felt it didn't work as well as more direct instructional approaches, appealing to her own experience in formal schools.

> When I was in school, things were very clear—the teacher told you what you needed to know, and you needed to remember that. Though not many of them have, some of these community people have been to school, too, and that's what they're used to—we are used to the teacher telling us what is right, so that we can remember it. In these classes, I've had student get mad at me when I use the FAMA questions, asking them what I think they should do, because they want to be told what to do, that's why they came to class! And now when I do more of this style, when I tell them what the answers are, what they should be doing, they feel more comfortable, and I feel more comfortable. It works, or I wouldn't do it. (Felicia, 7/1)

Antonio (6/19) also appealed to his own experience in schools as his reason for using teacher-centered pedagogy. As he states, "When I ask these open-ended questions and no-one answers, I feel uncomfortable—sometimes we get these long, long silences in class when we ask the FAMA questions, and we don't have time to sit there all day. When I tell them what the lesson says to do, as all my teachers have done for me throughout my whole life, then we are clear on what to do, and we can move forward" (6/19).

Both Antonio and Felicia identified the root of their comfort with teacher-centered pedagogy as coming from their own experiences with this teaching style during their own school years. They also noted that participants seemed uncomfortable with open-ended FAMA questions, as well, and appealed to teacher-centered pedagogy as being "clear" and "more

comfortable" for both teacher and student. This sentiment is echoed in similar statements by Adriano (6/25), Rosemarie (6/28) and Anastacia (7/2), who also expressed a greater comfort in a pedagogical model that privileges the teacher as the source of relevant knowledge. This comfort with teacher-centered pedagogy among CDP instructional staff makes sense in light of how instructional cultures tend to form. As Anderson-Levitt (2002) puts it, "although teachers create something personal out of what they know, very little of the knowledge on which they draw is idiosyncratic, that is, unique to one person. Rather, they dip into a common well for ideas; they create new ways of teaching within relatively narrow constraints" (p. 6). In this case, one of the "common wells" from which CDP instructors drew their knowledge of "good" pedagogy was their own lived experience in postcolonial Mozambican classrooms, which was shaped by a then-dominant educational project (Bartlett 2003, 2010) typified by teacher-centered practice. The following section will draw on the available literature on postcolonial schooling in Mozambique to illustrate why the dominant educational project of that time period encouraged such teacher-centered pedagogy.

Postcolonial schooling in Mozambique

The previous section makes clear that teacher-centered instruction was a relatively common pedagogical form to which all five CDP program instructors were exposed during their time in Mozambican schools. However, despite the lack of available data on the particular classrooms in which Felicia, Antonio, Adriano, Rosemarie and Anastacia studied, it seems prudent to situate this prominence of teacher-centered instruction within the larger field of what is known about postcolonial formal schooling in Mozambique[12].

---

[12] It is important to note that many community participants also participated in postcolonial formal settings to varying degrees, an experience that could have also informed CDP classroom dynamics. However, such an exploration is beyond the scope of the present study.

Before Mozambique gained independence from Portugal in 1975, native Mozambican students in the Portuguese colonial school system were treated like second-class citizens and teachers often utilized a punitive, authoritarian pedagogical model in which students were expected to keep quiet and model what they were taught (Chimbutante 2011; Newitt 1995; Saul 1979)[13]. As will be seen, this teacher-centric pedagogical model nonetheless was likely part of CDP program instructors' formal school experience, as it continued to be prominent in the formal schools set up during the postcolonial socialist administration of Samora Machel and his successors.

As Tikly (2001) asserts, "education in Africa has been profoundly linked to the politics of the postcolonial state" (166). In the case of the newly independent Peoples' Republic of Mozambique, this meant that education in the 1970s and 80s was involved in a socialist brand of politics that involved pushing for the transformation of Mozambican society (Casal 1991; Machel 1985; Munslow 1983) into a classless and discrimination-free utopia (Egero 1987; Hanlon 1990; Munslow 1983; Urdang 1989). The Mozambican government pushed for this ideal through, among other things, the promotion of universal access to education (Chimbutante 2011; Hodges 1979) and a nation-wide literacy campaign (Nkomo 1986). With support from members of the Soviet Bloc (Müller 2010), this outreach multiplied the number of Mozambican children in school many times over, bringing individuals like Adriano, Felicia, Antonio, Anastacia and Rosemarie into the classroom for perhaps the first time.

However, the Mozambican postcolonial educational project that included this mass schooling push did not involve similar large-scale innovations or trainings in pedagogy. As most educators and other skilled professionals left the country after the revolution (Marshall 1985),

---

[13] Those interested in further historical exploration of schooling in Mozambique under Portuguese colonialism should consult the thorough work of Antoinette Errante (1998, 2003).

those that remained were very young and often inexperienced (Errante 1994). The socialist government undertook a radical curricular overhaul that was focused on eliminating class barriers and, interestingly, incorporated some Freirean pedagogical principles (Gerdes 1985). However, a lack of resources and trained personnel meant that this new model was implemented in a very limited number of schools (Marshall 1985; Searle 1981). For most students in Mozambique's newly spreading mass schooling system, their daily pedagogical reality was one based in old colonial textbooks and the teacher-centered instructional models with which teachers were familiar from their time teaching in colonial schools (Errante 1994). These findings in previous studies, along with the fact that all five CDP program instructors (who come from various regions throughout Mozambique and represent an age span of more than 15 years) were familiar enough with a teacher-centered pedagogical approach to find it comfortable, suggests that teacher-centered instruction was a significant part of the postcolonial educational project (Bartlett 2003, 2010) enacted in formal school settings throughout the country in the 1970s, 80s and 90s.

Discussion

World Culture Theory

So what implications do these findings have for world culture theory? The teacher-centered pedagogy of CDP instructors seems largely driven by their experience in mass schooling (the origin point of world culture theory [Meyer et al. 1977]). And yet, this teacher-centered approach conflicts with more recent worldwide trends, particularly a growing global enthusiasm for learner-centered pedagogy (Schweisfurth 2013; Vavrus and Bartlett 2012) which some world culture theorists attribute to the spread of "world culture" (McEneaney and Meyer 2000). As a result, it seems that it is ironically CDP instructors' experience with one historical

manifestation of an increasingly global "world culture" that has led them to discount another more recent "world culture." This implies that world culture is not an unchanging whole of ideas and practices determined by rationality alone, but rather a dynamic set of norms and accepted wisdom that has evolved and changed across different times and places. What used to be "modern" and most emblematic of the Western-style rationality that typified "world culture" (Berger, Berger, and Kellner 1974) at the time CDP instructors were experiencing mass schooling is now no longer globally accepted as "best practice," and thus no longer "world culture" as it currently manifests itself. This implies that world culture has a *temporal* as well as *spatial* dimension, as the educational models being financially supported and encouraged by multilateral organizations and other actors change over time. As a result, there is the possibility of multiple historically situated "world cultures," representing different eras within the history of international education development in which the rhetoric and policy regarding best practices has changed, with various different ideas dominating the policy conversation in different time periods.

Anderson-Levitt (2012) supports this by noting that the term "world culture" represents a socially constructed reality. Rather than seeing this "world culture" as a reified entity unto itself that exerts social influence on its own (a critique also levied by Carney et al. 2012), Anderson-Levitt (2012) asserts that "world culture" is created just as any other degree or form of "culture" is formed, through processes of meaning-making undergone by particular communities in particular spaces.

This social situatedness of world culture does not in any way challenge its validity as a cultural form that is worthy of study. Rather, such situatedness forces us as scholars to open our research to a wider landscape of cultural flows that influence localized teaching and learning, of

which what I here call "world culture" is only one. That said, what I am here referring to as world culture is arguably a particularly powerful cultural flow, as those actors involved in its production and spread tend to hold more social, cultural and economic capital than those that promote more localized cultural forms and flows.

Given these concessions, it is somewhat problematic to refer to the historically situated models of best practices discussed here as "world culture," as this represents a rather radical redefinition of world culture from how it is used by its proponents. Rather than representing a package of Western liberal ideals and structures that are isomorphically spreading throughout the world and becoming a global standard (Ramirez and Boli 1987), this new definition of "world culture" asserts that there have been multiple historically and contextually situated "global standards" that have been defined and incentivized in their worldwide spread by different actors over time. As a result, so as not to confound terms, I argue that these historically situated "global standards" are better understood as being *educational projects* (Bartlett 2003, 2010), or "durable (but not permanent) constellations of institutions, financial resources, social actors, ideologies, discourses, pedagogies, and theories of knowledge and learning that shape the way people think about schooling and its purpose" (2010, 52). In the case of this article, the push for mass schooling supported by the Mozambican government in the 1970s and 80s has been shown to have been commonly associated with a teacher-centered style of pedagogy that had been held over from the colonial period. This pedagogical style, associated with a historically situated educational project, continues to have resonance in CDP educational programs as CDP program instructors feel a comfort with that teaching style that is reflected in their classrooms to this day.

While Bartlett (2003, 2010) has provided an essential tool in her theorization of the educational project, this study makes clear the particular role of two phenomena in shaping

educational projects at the global level that has as of yet remained under-theorized: power and the passage of time. First, with regards to power, while all educational projects are associated with particular institutions and social actors, some have more resources and influence than others (Anderson-Levitt 2012); thus, what neo-institutionalists or world culture theorists refer to as world culture I instead call a *dominant educational project*[14], or the package of ideologies, discourses, pedagogies and theories of knowing and learning that is currently accepted and pushed by prominent institutions and social actors such as the World Bank, UNESCO and the prominent bilateral funding agencies (like USAID, DFID and so forth). Second, with regard to the passage of time: since the mid-20th century and the rise of the development industry, the prominent actors in that industry have promoted various packages of ideologies, discourses, pedagogies and learning theories. I propose that, to highlight the temporal nature of a given dominant educational project, the educational project being supported by the World Bank and other global players at the present moment be referred to as the *currently dominant educational project*, and those that represent the accepted wisdom of previous time periods be referred to as *previously dominant educational projects.* While the theorization of these terms deserves more attention than what is possible in this article, the data presented here makes clear that in Mozambique, a teacher-centered pedagogical form associated with a *previously dominant educational project* is ironically interfering with the implementation of pedagogies more closely aligned with the learner-centered pedagogies (McEneaney and Meyer 2000) associated with the *currently dominant educational project*. This initial theorization provides a means of understanding and analyzing how changes in global best practices can result in overlapping and interacting educational projects representing the accepted wisdom of various time periods.

---

[14] Bartlett's (2003) analysis of Freirean education as a non-dominant, contesting educational project is an excellent first step into the exploration of the role of power in educational projects. I here am building further upon that foundation.

Conclusion

Through this article I've argued that during 12 months of observations, CDP instructors' pedagogical practice was shown to be heavily teacher-centered, with the instructor maintaining a position of authority and participants acquiescing to that authority. While training in Freirean pedagogical practices did lead instructors to frame their discussions in the FAMA framework, that was the extent of its influence. When participants' responses did not fit what instructors were expecting, CDP staff members reverted to their previously learned teacher-centered ways of teaching.

That said, these five CDP program instructors had no previous background in pedagogy or classroom teaching. More seasoned teachers, especially ones that had gone through a teacher education program of greater length, could have employed Freirean pedagogy very differently if placed in the same situation. This article is thus not intended as an argument against the utility of Freirean teacher training.

What this article does, however, is compellingly and clearly display the nuanced and complicated ways in which educational projects are displayed in instructional practice. CDP instructors' training and their personal experiences in educational settings were heavily influenced by exposure to various historically dominant educational projects. These projects were then reflected in CDP instructor's teaching practice in conflicting and overlapping ways.

With respect to the larger world culture debate, I recognize that what is commonly called "world culture" represents a social reality that affects teaching and learning in many social locations (including rural Mozambique). However, I argue that world culture theory's inability to account for changes in "world culture" over time and the role of power in its spread and influence are significant handicaps that limit its theoretical utility.

In sum, this study highlights how educational projects, whether they represent the dominant "world culture" or other counter models (Bartlett 2003) like Freirean pedagogy, interact and manifest themselves in CDP teachers' pedagogical practice. While this study does not completely refute the pertinence of world culture theory, it contests this theory's current inability to address issues of power and change over time. The terms *currently dominant educational project* and *previously dominant educational project*, as introduced in this text, allow for a more nuanced exploration of what others scholars have labeled "world culture." That is, these terms recognize the temporal and spatial limitations of global influences, as well as the role of power in expanding their outreach. These theoretical constructs provide a rich basis for further research in comparative education. Comparative historians might explore the changes in dominant educational projects over time, from the beginnings of the development industry in the mid-twentieth century to the present day. Comparative ethnographers can build upon the present work by studying the ways in which various educational projects interact and are contested in other localized spaces. More specifically, the recognition of power in these constructs could provide an effective framework for ethnographic studies of the social settings in which dominant educational projects are formed, such as the World Bank, UNESCO and other prominent multilateral institutions. Whether employed in these directions or others, these new theoretical constructs facilitate further recognition of the potential variability that can go unrecognized within "world culture."

References

Anderson-Levitt, Kathryn M. 2002. *Teaching Culture: Knowledge for Teaching First Grade in France and the United States*. Hampton Press.

Anderson-Levitt, Kathryn M., ed. 2003. *Local Meanings, Global Schooling: Anthropology and World Culture Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Anderson-Levitt, Kathryn M. 2012. "Complicating the Concept of Culture." *Comparative Education* 48(4):441-454.

Baker, David, and Gerald LeTendre. 2005. *National Differences, Global Similarities: World Culture and the Future of Schooling*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Barreto, Vera. 1998. *Paulo Freire para Educadores*. São Paulo: Arte e Ciência.

Bartlett, Lesley. 2003. "World Culture or Transnational Project? Competing Educational Projects in Brazil." In *Local Meanings, Global Schooling: Anthropology and World Culture Theory,* ed. K.M. Anderson-Levitt. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bartlett, Lesley. 2010. *The Word and the World: The Cultural Politics of Literacy in Brazil*. New York: Hampton Press.

Berger, Peter L., Berger, Brigitte, and Hansfried Kellner. 1974. *The Homeless Mind.* New York: Random House.

Carney, Stephen, Rappleye, Jeremy, and Iveta Silova. 2012. "Between Faith and Science: World Culture Theory and Comparative Education." *Comparative Education Review* 56(3): 366-393.

Casal, Adolfo Y. 1991. "Discurso Socialista e Camponeses Africanos: Legitimação Politica-ideologica da Socialização Rural em Moçambique (FRELIMO, 1965-1984)." *Revista Internacional de Estudos Africanos* 14/15:35-76.

Chimbutante, Feliciano. 2011. *Rethinking Bilingual Education in Postcolonial Contexts*. Bristol: Short Run Press.

Chitera, Nancy. 2011. "Discourse Practices Produced in Preparing Mathematics Teacher Educators for a Multilingual Classroom: A Critical Discourse Perspective." *Educational Research* 2:1456-1464.

Clift, Renee T. and Patricia Brady. 2005. "Research on Methods Courses and Field Experiences." In *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education*, eds. M. Cochran-Smith and K.M. Zeichner. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Curtis, Lynn. 1990. *Literacy for Social Change*. Syracuse, NY: New Readers Press.

Egero, Bertil. 1987. *Mozambique, a Dream Undone: The Political Economy of Democracy, 1975-84*. Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.

Emerson, Robert M., Fretz, Rachel L., and Linda L. Shaw. 1995. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Errante, Antoinette. 1994. *The School, the Textbook and National Development: Colonial and Post-revolutionary Primary Schooling in Portugal and Mozambique, 1926-1992 (Volumes 1 and 2)*. PhD dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Errante, Antoinette. 1998. "Education and National Personae in Portugal's Colonial and Postcolonial Transition." *Comparative Education Review* 42:267-308.

Errante, Antoinette. 2003. "White Skin, Many Masks: Colonial Schooling, Race, and National Consciousness among White Settler Children in Mozambique, 1934-1974." *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 36:7-33.

Fairclough, Norman. 2001. "Critical Discourse Analysis as a Method in Social Scientific Research." In *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*, eds. R. Wodak and M. Meyer. London: Sage.

Freire, Paulo. 1967. *Educação como Prática da Liberdade*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo. 1978. *Cartas à Guiné-Bissau: Registros de uma Experiência em Processo*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Freire, Paulo. 1979a. *Educação e Mudança*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Freire, Paulo. 1979b. *Conscientização: Teoria e Prática da Libertação*. São Paulo: Cortez e Moraes.

Freire, Paulo. 1981. *Ação Cultural para a Liberdade e Outros Escritos*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Freire, Paulo. 1983. *Extensão ou Comunicação?*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Freire, Paulo. 1996. *Letters to Cristina: Reflections on my Life and Work*. New York: Routledge.

Freire, Paulo. 1997a. *Professora Sim, Tia Não: Cartas a quem Ousa Ensinar*. São Paulo: Editora Olha d´Água.

Freire, Paulo. 1997b. *Pedagogy of the Heart*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo. 2000a. *Pedagogia da Indignação: Cartas Pedagógicas e Outros Escritos*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP.

Freire, Paulo. 2000b. *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy and Civic Courage*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Freire, Paulo. 2001a. *Política e Educação: Questões da Nossa Época*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora.

Freire, Paulo. 2001b. "Carta de Paulo Freire aos Professores." *Estudos Avançados* 15(42): 259-268.

Freire, Paulo, and Antonio Faundez. 1985. *Por uma Pedagogia da Pergunta*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Freire, Paulo, and Ira Shor. 1986. *Medo e Ousadia: O Cotidiano do Professor*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Freire, Paulo, and Donaldo Macedo. 1987. *Literacy: Reading the Word and the World*. London: Routledge.

Gadotti, Moacir. 1994. *Reading Paulo Freire: His Life and Work. Teacher Empowerment and School Reform*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gadotti, Moacir, Freire, Paulo, and Sérgio Guimarães. 1995. *Pedagogia: Diálogo e Conflito*. São Paulo: Cortez.

Gee, James P. 1999. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Goodenough, Ward H. 1976. "Multiculturalism as the Normal Human Experience." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 7(2): 4-7.

Grossman, Pamela. 2005. "Research on Pedagogical Approaches in Teacher Education." In *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education*, eds. M. Cochran-Smith and K.M. Zeichner. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hanlon, Joseph. 1990. *Mozambique: The Revolution under Fire*. London: Zed Books.

Hodges, Tony. 1979. "Mozambique: The Politics of Liberation." In *Southern Africa: The Continuing Crisis*, eds. G. M. Carter and P. O'Meara. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

LeTendre, Gerald K., David P. Baker, Motoko Akiba, Brian Goesling, and Alex Wiseman. 2001. "Teachers' Work: Institutional Isomorphism and Cultural Variation in the U.S., Germany, and Japan." *Educational Researcher* 30(6):3-15.

Machel, Samora. 1985. *Samora Machel: An African Revolutionary*. Edited by Barry Munslow. London: Zed Books.

Marshall, Judith. 1985. "Making Education Revolutionary." In *A Difficult Road: The Transition to Socialism in Mozambique*, ed. J. Hanlon. Boulder: Westview Press.

McEneaney, Lizabeth H., and John W. Meyer. 2000. "The Content of the Curriculum: An Institutionalist Perspective." In *Handbook of the Sociology of Education*, ed. M.T. Hallinnan. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Meyer, John W., Francisco O. Ramirez, Richard Rubinson, and John Boli-Bennett. 1977. "The World Educational Revolution, 1950–1970." *Sociology of Education* 50: 242–58.

Müller, Tanja R. 2010. "'Memories of Paradise': Legacies of Socialist Education in Mozambique." *African Affairs* 109:451-470.

Munslow, Barry. 1983. *Mozambique: The Revolution and Its Origins*. London: Longman.

Newitt, Malyn. 1995. *A History of Mozambique*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Nkomo, Mokubung O. 1986. "A Comparative Study of Zambia and Mozambique: Africanization, Professionalization, and Bureaucracy in the African Postcolonial State." *Journal of Black Studies* 16:319-342.

Phillips, Louise J., & Jorgenson, Marianne W. 2002. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage.

Ramirez, Francisco O. 2006. "From Citizen to Person? Rethinking Education as Incorporation." In *The Impact of Comparative Education Research on Institutional Theory*, ed. D. P. Baker and A. W. Wiseman. Oxford: Elsevier.

Ramirez, Francisco O. 2012. "The World Society Perspective: Concepts, Assumptions and Strategies." *Comparative Education* 48(4):423-439.

Ramirez, Francisco O., and John Boli. 1987. "The Political Construction of Mass Schooling: European Origins and Worldwide Institutionalization." *Sociology of Education* 60:2–17.

Roberts, Peter. 2000. *Education, Literacy and Humanization: Exploring the World of Paulo Freire*. Westport: Bergin and Garvey.

Rocha-Schmid, Elaine. 2010. "Participatory Pedagogy for Empowerment: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Teacher-Parents' Interactions in a Family Literacy Course in London." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 29:343-358.

Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. Rubin. 1995. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Saul, John. 1979. *The State and Revolution in East Africa*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Schweisfurth, Michele. 2013. *Learner-Centred Education in International Perspective: Whose Pedagogy for Whose Development?* New York: Routledge.

Searle, Chris. 1981. *We're Building the New School!* London: Zed Press.

Seo, Mi-Suk. 2009. "Learning Talk Analysis." *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 47:37-63.

Souto-Manning, Mariana. 2010. *Freire, Teaching, and Learning: Culture Circles across Contexts*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Spradley, James P. 1979. *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spradley, James P. 1980. *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Steiner-Khamsi, Gita, and Florian Waldow, eds. 2012. *2012 World Yearbook of Education: Policy Borrowing and Lending*. New York: Routledge.

Tikly, Leon. 2001. "Globalisation and Education in the Postcolonial World: Towards a Conceptual Framework." *Comparative Education* 37:151-171.

Urdang, Stephanie. 1989. *And Still They Dance: Women, War, and Struggle for Change in Mozambique*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Van Dijk, Teun A. 2001. "Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity." In *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*, eds. R. Wodak and M. Meyer. London: Sage.

Van Sluys, Katie, Lewison, Mitzi, and Amy Seely Flint. 2006. "Researching Critical Literacy: A Critical Study of Analysis of Classroom Discourse." *Journal of Literacy Research* 38:197-233.

Vavrus, Frances and Lesley Bartlett. 2012. "Pedagogies and Epistemological Diversity: Social and Materials Contexts of Teaching in Tanzania." *Comparative Education Review* 56(4):634-658.

Vavrus, Frances and Lesley Bartlett, eds. 2013. *Teaching in Tension: International Pedagogies, National Policies, and Teachers' Practices in Tanzania.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Vavrus, Frances and Maud Seghers. 2010. "Critical Discourse Analysis in Comparative Education: A Discursive Study of 'Partnership' in Tanzania's Poverty Reduction Policies. *Comparative Education Review* 54:77-103.

Verger, Antoni, Novelli, Mario, and Hulya Altinyelken. 2012. "Global Education Policy and International Development: An Introductory Framework." In *Global Education Policy and International Development: New Agendas, Issues and Practices*, ed. A. Verger, M. Novelli and H.K. Altinyelken. New York: Continuum Books.

Weick, Karl E. 1976. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21:1–19.

Wooffitt, Robin. 2005. *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London: Sage.