

Michel Vandebroek
Head of Department

E Michel.Vandebroek@UGent.be
T +32 264 62 89

FPPW
Dunantlaan 2
B-9000 Ghent
Belgium

www.ugent.be

DATE

09 October 2019

PAGE

1/3

OUR REFERENCE

Report on the visit to CIDTFF 9-10 September 2019 Michel Vandebroek

The visit consisted of

- A presentation of the work realised by CIDTFF
- A lecture
- A discussion on possible collaborations

1. CIDTFF

The different teams of CIDTFF presented their work. I was quite impressed by the broad scope of research and innovation activities taking place in the 3 groups (Languages discourse and identities; Science, technology and innovation; and Policies, evaluation and quality). In relation to my field of expertise, the projects ProCHILD, TEDS and Kamilala, as well as the work conducted in the field of Multiliteracies and early childhood quality, were particularly interesting, as well as the exploration of social impact of research.

It would be interesting to further develop the discussion on social impact and to explore the relations between science communication and social impact, as these two concepts do not necessarily entirely overlap.

Another point of attention in the presentation is the place of parents in discussion on multiliteracies (e.g. in the Kamilala project). Of course, it is a valuable ambition to question the taken for granted assumptions on multilingualism, – considering that prejudices in this field are also emotionally driven – as there is a huge question about how to do so. It can be argued that passing on research information will not suffice. Also, regarding the LoCALL project one could wonder how the relations with parents and parental points of views are embedded in the project.

2. The lecture

I delivered a lecture on evidence-based education, raising the question as what evidence can be counted as valid. This question relates to the societal and ethical responsibility of the researcher in defining the research questions. Methodological choices should be the result of such explicit choices, rather than preceding them. Therefore, I argued, we cannot establish a hierarchy of research methodologies in the educational field.

3. Brainstorm on common work

We discussed differences and communalities in reciprocal work. From the discussion, it appears that the different research groups in CIDTFF are not entirely familiar with each other's work and may benefit from discussing a shared vision and mission.

This does not mean that all members need to share a common paradigm or similar research methodologies, but working on a common vision and exploring different standpoints and perspectives may be useful. A possibility of further cross-cultural work could be to work with vignettes that can help to question what is all too familiar (making the familiar strange, by making the strange familiar). This could be a way of exploring the anxieties of professionals with regard to diversity, multilingualism, parent participation, ...

We also discussed the possibility of organising methodological as well as epistemological seminars as part of the doctoral schools or for the researchers of CIDTFF. This could include presentations of research cases and discussions with opponents. Question that can be dealt with include: what is democratic research, should all research be democratic, and what would that entail for the academic freedom? Who benefits from our research? What coherence is necessary? What social impact do we strive for?

DATE

09 October 2019

PAGE

3/3

OUR REFERENCE

Fout! Verwijzingsbron niet gevonden.

One possibility that was more concretely discussed was the possibility of a two-day seminar comprehending one day with researchers and one day with PhD students. The first day could deal with epistemological questions and values, while the second day could be case presentations with opponents. The second day could include an epistemological and methodological master class for PhD students.

Ghent, 9 October 2019



Michel Vandenbroeck

