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Abstract
This paper has three parts. The first sketches the evolving notions of mathematical and statistical literacy. The second presents the twin research programmes of Ethnomathematics and Critical Mathematics Education. The third part considers education in mathematical and statistical literacy in Flanders secondary schools. Attainment outcomes in Flemish schools show marked differences when analysed by native language and, separately, for immigration status, even when controlled for social and economic status. We claim that these data demonstrate the significance of two levels of Bishop’s five-level analysis and indicate the practical and political importance of research into Ethnomathematics and Critical Mathematics Education.
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Introduction
The main purpose of this article is to present a study of attainments in mathematics and statistics of 15-year-old pupils in Flanders secondary schools –in some ways a typical Western school context – and to show that unequal outcomes can indicate a problem that probably is connected to the cultural and societal background of the learner. Although pupils from distinct social groups have the same institutional opportunities, as we will explain later, they do not result in equal outcomes across those groups. Before elaborating on the specific case we will first present the theoretical frame of our analysis in which we will discuss the relation between education, human rights and social justice.

The method used for our purpose is literature review of both theoretical work and empirical research. The first literature review concerns theoretical investigations on the relation of education and human rights, the social and cultural context of mathematics, mathematical...
practices and mathematics education, and finally on the concepts of social justice within the field of mathematics education. A second literature review concentrated on empirical research on mathematics and statistics outcomes of 15 year old pupils as analysed by the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (OECD, 2004, 2005). For the interpretation of mathematics and statistics outcomes of 15-year-old pupils in a Flanders secondary schools, we used the analysis of empirical data at a national level (De Meyer, Pauly & Van de Poele, 2004; De Meyer, Warlop & Van Camp, 2013). In the following section we will start by sketching the notions of mathematical and statistical literacy and the relation with human rights.

**Mathematical and Statistical Literacy, and Human Rights**

The content of these two literacy-concepts has evolved in the decades since they were first introduced. The difference between mathematics and statistics is beyond the purpose of this paper, and in any case their literacy-concepts have evolved in similar ways. We include both concepts in the analysis is because the empirical data as collected by PISA (OECD, 2004, 2005) assessed the outcomes of mathematics and of statistics under the umbrella of ‘mathematical literacy’.

Although the initial notion of statistical literacy was exclusively related to the technical dimension of statistics (Haack, 1979), in the nineties it broadened in an attempt to include the kinds of statistical skills that people need in everyday life (Evans, 1992). As an example of this shift, we refer to Wallman’s (1993) statement in her Presidential Address to the American Statistical Association:

> Statistical literacy is the ability to understand and critically evaluate statistical results that permeate our daily lives–coupled with the ability to appreciate the contributions that statistical thinking can make in public and private, professional and personal decisions (1993, p. 1).
In this broad conception of statistical literacy, people should be able to understand and critically evaluate everyday statistical information. That will benefit every person in professional life, in personal life and as a critical citizen. We can observe the same reasoning concerning mathematical literacy. Ten years after Wallmann’s declaration (1993), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development offered this definition (OECD 2004):

Mathematical literacy is an individual’s capacity to identify and understand the role that mathematics plays in the world, to make well-founded judgments and to use and engage with mathematics in ways that meet the needs of that individual’s life as a constructive, concerned and reflective citizen (OECD 2004, p. 37).

This is very similar to the descriptions of statistical literacy. Again, one can observe the claim that mathematical literacy benefits the individual. It is a handy tool for a rich, a critical and a constructive role in contemporary society. Our society is increasingly defined by mathematical discourses. Each individual thus has an interest in being able to understand this mathematized world, if only to criticise it.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights asserts a right to education, and stipulates “education is key to social and economic development […] achieved by providing education for all. (UNESCO, 1948, art. 26). It is, presumably, through the activity of mathematically and statistically literate citizens that mathematics and statistics education can hope to contribute to the social and political goals expressed in the UN and UNESCO (1948) declarations.

Both of these UN and UNESCO declarations are compatible with the view that mathematics and statistics are value-free, culturally neutral technical tools. Indeed, this view may be one source of confidence that education in mathematics and statistics can support social and political progress. However, in recent decades researchers have explored the suggestion that mathematics education is socially embedded, and comes laden with culture and values. This
complicates the optimistic picture presented in the quoted declarations. It may mean that pursuit of the progressive goals of these declarations may require more than simply teaching the same curriculum to everyone in the same way. It is to these complications that we now turn.

The entanglement of social justice and mathematics and statistics education

Since the middle of the nineteen-eigtiess it has been generally accepted among educational researchers that mathematics and statistics education is socially embedded and this in several layers (Gutiérrez & Boero, 2006; Lerman, 2006; Gates, 2006). Alan Bishop (1985) developed a scheme for the analysis of the social structure of this educational process. He distinguishes five significant levels of analysis, going from a macro perspective (culture) to a micro perspective (the individual). The first of these is the cultural level, which shows how the development of mathematical ideas is embedded in culture. For example, the ideal of pure mathematics emerged in a German academic context, while at the same time in France it was considered valuable for mathematics to be closely associated with engineering and natural science (Hacking 2014; Ferreirós 2016). The second, the societal level, investigates the influences of institutions other than schools and colleges with stakes in mathematics education. Some of them are formally concerned with education, e.g. the ministry of education, but many are not e.g. businesses that require mathematically literate employees but do not train them in mathematics. The third level is the institutional level. Research at this level looks for the influences within school systems to attain the targets of the mathematics curriculum. Topics at this research level are e.g. the influence of school culture or the instruction language of the learning process. With the fourth level we enter the classroom. Most important research at the pedagogical level concerns the didactics of mathematics education. Finally Bishop (1985) points to the individual level as a research domain of the
sociological study of mathematics education. The focus at this level is on the learner from a social perspective.

Research on the fourth (pedagogical) and the fifth (individual) levels is mostly practiced by Social Psychology and Cognitive Science. We will not go into detail about these research fields because they are in general already better known. Such research is mainly presented at conferences such as Psychology of Mathematics Education (PME) and the International Congress on Mathematical Education (ICME). Research topics in this area concern the social motivation for studying mathematics, the fear of mathematics, the fear of success (preferring not to succeed academically in order to be socially successful and accepted by adolescent peers), teachers’ perception of pupils, learning styles of pupils, self-concept of the learner, social cognition, social interaction in the learning process, etc. (Coessens, François, & Van Bendegem, 2012).

Research on the first three (socio-cultural) levels is mainly done within the research field of Ethnomathematics and Critical Mathematics Education, mostly focussing on the cultural, the societal and the institutional level. Gerdes’ (2001) definition of Ethnomathematics refers to it as ‘the study of mathematical ideas and activities as embedded in their cultural context’.

Ethnomathematics originated in a post-colonial context, where an imported Western mathematics curriculum stands in contrast to local or indigenous mathematical practices. The research programme on Ethnomathematics has its roots in São Paulo, Brazil. Ubiratan D’Ambrosio—a mathematician and philosopher of mathematics education—is considered the intellectual father of Ethnomathematics. Since then it has spread all over the world. The notion of Ethnomathematics evolved from an exotic meaning of the concept—as the mathematical practices of non-literate people—to the general concept of mathematical practices of all people, including academic Western mathematics (Gerdes, 2001; François & Van Kerkhove, 2010). From this more general perspective mathematics is seen as a human
practice, which emerges and develops within a socio-cultural context. The development, transmission and distribution of mathematical knowledge, including academic Western mathematics, is a dynamic process, embedded in time and culture. The challenge for the ethnomethodological approach is not just to pay more attention to other traditions and cultures, but also, importantly, to take ‘the other’ as given, rather than pressing their practices into fictitious categories (e.g. exotic, primitive, indigenous) that stand in opposition to our ‘regular’ or ‘normal' Western practices (Said, 1995).

Even though Ethnomathematics is a critical research program and a critical practice regarding mathematics education, in literature it is still distinguished from so-called Critical Mathematics Education (Vithal & Skovsmose, 1997). Critical Mathematics Education originated within a Western high-tech society (Denmark), and it defines a number of suppression types and stereotyping, for example suppression based on class and gender (Atweh, Forgasz & Nebres, 2001; Burton, 2003). Burton (2003) and Sriraman (2008) provide an interesting overview of research from the perspectives of critical theory, feminist theory and social justice. Vithal & Skovsmose (1997) insist on the differences between these research programmes. Increasingly, however, there is research lying ‘between’ the two, e.g. research on the stereotyping of specific groups in non-Western societies. The gender issue which originates from the research field of Critical Mathematics Education—and thus from a Western context—is an intriguing example. There is growing interest in gender issues in non-Western contexts. Meanwhile, Australia (Vale, 2010), the United States (Paek, 2010) and Iceland (Steinthorsdottir, Dadisman, Robertson & Steinthorsdottir, 2010) have shifted their focus to the ‘boy-problem’. Looking at the overview of international trends of gender differences in mathematics achievements, Ma (2010) firstly concludes that gender differences are small in magnitude and that they are limited to a small number of countries. Secondly there is no longer an exclusively male predomination in mathematics. Although there are
more gender differences in favour of boys than girls, there is a growing number of countries
revealing significant differences in favour of girls (Blömeke & Kaiser, 2010).
The program of Critical Mathematics Education and (the extended notion of)
Ethnomathematics agree that pupils should have equal access to education and to
mathematical and statistical literacy. This notion of mathematics for everyone is an expression
of pedagogic optimism and egalitarianism1 Specifically; this approach takes parity of
outcomes as the criterion of equality, rather than equality of opportunity (Hirtt, Nicaise & De
Zutter, 2007; Roemer, 1998). We will adopt this criterion in our analysis.
In the following section we present a case of mathematics and statistics outcomes of 15-year-
old pupils in a Western school context. We selected a specific case to show that unequal
outcomes can indicate a problem that probably is connected to the cultural and societal
background of the learner. Although pupils have the same institutional opportunities
(Bishop’s level 3), they do not result in equal outcomes.

A practical implication: the case of the Dutch-speaking community of Belgium
In this case we consider mathematics and statistics education in Flanders secondary schools,
based on the results of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)
international comparative research.2 PISA conducts its survey on a three-year cycle, starting
in 2000. In each round, one domain is taken as the main subject. In this study, we consider the
empirical data from the PISA 2003 and 2012 surveys because their focus was on
mathematical literacy (including statistical items). The principal aim of the OECD/PISA
assessment is to look ‘at young people’s ability to use their knowledge and skills in order to
meet real-life challenges rather than how well they had mastered a specific school curriculum’
(OECD 2005, p. 9). In other words, PISA assumes the same broad notion of mathematical
literacy that we encountered above.

1 For alternatives to this mood, see Gardiner (2004) and Simeonov (2016).
2 We will from now one speak in terms of mathematics education since statistics is part of the mathematics
curriculum and the results reflect both mathematical and statistical literacy.
Looking at the 2003 results, we make two observations. First, the results between European countries are very different—even when those counties are near neighbours with similar educational systems. Second, even within one national context the results can indicate a big gap between high and low achievers. In the following paragraph we will pursue the second observation by examining the example of the Dutch-speaking community of Belgium. In this example, a high average for mathematical literacy hides significant differences within the country. Table 1 presents the average scores of secondary school pupils for mathematical literacy.
Table 1 Average scores on mathematical literacy for secondary education learners. PISA-2003 results (Adapted from De Meyer, Pauly & van de Poele, 2004, p.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vlaanderen</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongkong</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>(4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>(1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nederland</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>(3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>(4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>België</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>(2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macao-China</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwitserland</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Zeeland</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>(2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsjech. Rep.</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJsland</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duitst. Gem.</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denemarken</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankrijk</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zweden</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oostenrijk</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duitsland</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ierland</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow. Rep.</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franse Gem.</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noorwegen</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polen</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongarije</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>(2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanje</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letland</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veren. Staten</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ. Fed.</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italië</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>(3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griekenland</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>(3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servië</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkije</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesië</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>(3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunesië</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilië</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>(4.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Dutch-speaking community of Belgium (Vlaanderen) (553) is, together with Hong Kong (550) (although there is no statistical significance) at the top of the international ranking. The Dutch-speaking community of Belgium is well ahead of its neighbours e.g. The Netherlands (538), the German-speaking community of Belgium (515), France (511) Germany (503) and the French-speaking community of Belgium (498). The table shows the figures for Belgium together with the scores of the Dutch-speaking community of Belgium (Vlaanderen), the French-speaking community of Belgium (Franse Gem.) and the German-speaking community of Belgium (Duitst. Gem.).

Since Belgium is a federal state with three language communities (the Flemish, the Walloon and the very small German community) and educational matters are under the control of these language communities, national figures on mathematics education are subdivided into the averages of the language communities of Belgium. They have authority to decide on their own educational system and structures, and they develop the curriculum that will be enforced by the parliament of the respective language community.
This is the main reason why language community represents Belgian national figures. The figures from 2012 show almost exactly the same pattern. The figure for the Dutch-speaking community of Belgium decreased slightly from 553 to 531. The first six positions are all taken up by Asian countries (with scores ranking from 631 to 538). The following five countries are ranked with a score of 536 to 523 (without statistical significance); the Dutch-speaking community of Belgium is one of them with a score of 531. The Dutch-speaking community of Belgium is still ahead of his neighbours e.g. The Netherlands (523), the German-speaking community of Belgium (511), France (495) Germany (514) and the French-speaking community of Belgium (493). The figure for Belgium (the average of the three language communities) is 515. The Dutch-speaking community of Belgium is still top of the European countries. Six Asian countries dominate the international top (four Chinese provinces plus Singapore and Korea),

Without going into the advantages and disadvantages of international comparative research (such as PISA or TIMMS), we will use the figures to demonstrate that the success (of some countries) is not the full story. Behind the Flemish success story there are hidden differences and gaps. By presenting these figures in more detail, we will show how these differences and gaps are related to cultural background, language and socio-economic status. From this observation we will argue for the relevance of Ethnomathematics and Critical Mathematics Education as research programmes that investigate the relation between mathematics education and culture, language and socio-economic status. To this end, we present figures that describe the relation between pupils’ origins and their scores for mathematics (Figure 1) and the differences between native and non-native speaking pupils in the different countries of the PISA 2003 research (Figure 2).

In Figure 1, the variable ‘origin of pupils’ divides into three categories:

1. native students (students and parents are born in the land of test taking): red line
2. the first-generation students (students but not parents are born in the land of test taking): blue dot

3. immigrants (not born in the land of test taking): green dot

Figure 1 Mathematics performance and impact of immigration

Note. Adapted from De Meyer, Pauly & Van de Poele, 2004, p. 32.

Note. The abbreviations stand for the following countries: Serbia (SER), Russian Federation (RUS), United States (USA), Luxembourg (LUX), French Community (BFR), Austria (OOS), Sweden (ZWE), Denmark (DEN), France (FRA), German-speaking Community (Bdu), Germany (DUI), Australia (AUS), New Zealand (NZL), Macao-China (MAC), Canada (CAN), Switzerland (ZWI), Belgium (BEL), Liechtenstein (LIE), Netherlands (NED), Hong Kong China (HKC) and Flanders (VLA).

Note. The three groups of pupils are: Autochtoon = Dutch-speaking native pupil (red line), Eerste generatie = First generation (blue dot), Immigrant = Immigrant (green dot).

Looking at the results one can observe that the Dutch-speaking community of Belgium is at the top for the degree of inequality between natives and first-generation students. The difference is, on average score 122 points. Note that e.g. the difference between boys and girls (not in this figure) is 15 score points in favour of boys. The smaller difference between the immigrants (compared with the first generation students) is explained by a group of children who live in the Netherlands (and are therefore registered as immigrants). These families have a high socio-economic status (SES) index because they are children from wealthier families (Hirtt, Nicaise, De Zutter 2007, p. 35).
The figures from 2012 show a similar pattern. The Dutch-speaking community of Belgium is still at the top for the degree of inequality between natives and first-generation students. Based on the 2012 report, an additional analysis was added to control for the SES of pupils. After control for SES variables, the gap decreases from 97 points to 86, which means that SES can explain a small part of the observed differences. A considerable difference between natives and immigrants remains.

Figure 3 PISA-2012 Mathematical Literacy of 15–years old pupils at Flemish schools. Difference in score between Dutch native pupils and pupils with migration background (before and after control for Socio-economic status).

Note. Adapted from De Meyer, Warlop & Van Camp, 2013, p. 110.

As we demonstrate in Figure 2, the language at home also plays a major role in mathematics performance.
Figure 2 PISA-2003 achievements for mathematical literacy. Difference between native speakers and non-native speakers

Note. Adapted from De Meyer, Pauly & Van de Poele, 2004, p. 33.
Note. Histogram = % of non-native pupils; red line = Mathematics performance of native pupils; dot = Mathematics performance of non-native pupils.

The histogram represents the percentage of non-native speakers. The boxplot (vertical lines) represents the differences between the achievements of native (red line) and non-native (red circle) speaking pupils. The figures indicate the score of mathematical literacy. In the case of the Dutch-speaking community of Belgium (Vlaanderen), the histogram indicates that the Dutch-speaking community of Belgium has an average of 3.3% of non-native speaking pupils. The score on mathematical literacy for native speaking pupils is 569 (red line), for non-native speaking pupils 450 (red circle) which makes a giant gap of 119 between native and non-native speaking pupils.

The figures from 2012 show the same pattern. In 2012, the proportion of non-native pupils increased from 3.3% in 2003 to 7% in 2012 and the gap between native and non-native speaking pupils is 118 points. Again, for the 2012 figures, a SES control was added to the report. After control for SES variables the gap decreases from 118 points to 78, which means...
that SES can explain part of the observed differences although a considerable difference between native and non-native speaking pupils persists.

Figure 4 PISA-2012 Mathematical Literacy of 15–years old pupils at Flemish schools. Difference in score between Dutch native pupils and non-native pupils (before and after control for Socio-economic status).

Note. Adapted from De Meyer, Warlop & Van Camp, 2013, p. 115.
Note. The figure after the country indicates the % of non-native pupils.

Our analysis of PISA figures and the conclusion that the educational system of the Dutch-speaking community of Belgium reflects social inequality is confirmed by the recent UNICEF report on how inequality affects children in high-income countries (UNICEF, 2016). The report ranks 41 EU and OECD countries according to inequality of income, educational achievement, self-reported health and life satisfaction. Denmark is at the top of the table with
the lowest inequality among children. Israel ranked lowest across all domains. Belgium follows at the ranking of the lowest for the domain of educational achievement. The educational system of the Dutch-speaking community of Belgium confirms social inequality. This inequality already starts at primary education and it increases in secondary and higher education (Groenez, Van den Brande & Nicaise, 2003; Hirtt, Nicaise, De Zutter, 2007). The Dutch-speaking community of Belgium can be called the champion in mathematical literacy but at the same time the champion in inequality.

**Discussion**

In this paper we focused on the interrelation of mathematics and statistics education and social justice. We noted that the aspirational documents of transnational bodies (UN & UNESCO) link mathematics and statistics education to human rights, and to the ability to participate as full citizens. In the theoretical part of the paper we first argued that mathematics and statistics and indeed mathematics and statistics education are socially embedded. With Bishop (1985) we argued that this field is and can be studied from different socio-cultural levels. Second, we presented two research domains: Ethnomathematics and Critical Mathematics Education. Both research domains deal with the same concern, namely, mathematical and statistical literacy for all and equality of educational outcomes, and both offer resources for understanding phenomena at Bishop’s levels one to three.

In the empirical section, we presented the case of Flanders secondary mathematics education. We selected a social perspective from the cultural level (the immigrant status of pupils) and one from the institutional level (pupils’ native languages). As the results show we can see an inequality based on these socio-cultural variables, even when controlled for SES. This corroborates the analytic value of two of Bishop’s five levels of analysis, since measurable effects are discernible at those two. That these effects occur at the cultural and institutional levels indicates the relevance of the research into mathematics education at precisely those
levels carried out within the Critical Mathematics Education and Ethnomathematics. This is a significant result because it is easy to multiply distinctions, propose taxonomies a priori and invent analytical grids. Such schemes (including Bishop’s five-level model) require empirical corroboration to show that their categories correspond to discernible phenomena in reality. We conclude that even those educational systems with the highest scores have to evaluate their systems on the basis of equality. The research programmes of Ethnomathematics and Critical Mathematics Education can be of great value for this equality assessment and offer good practices to close the gap between high and low achievers keeping in mind that mathematical and statistical literacy is a basic right for all pupils.
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