The **Centre for Globalisation, Education and Societies** is based at the University of Bristol and is coordinated by **Professor Susan L. Robertson**.

Researching Global Education Policy: Angles In/On/Out…

Susan L. Robertson

Centre for Globalisation, Education and Societies
University of Bristol, UK

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with *researching* global education policy. This is not a straight-forward task, particularly in the area of education policy studies. To begin with, it involves going beyond accounts of the global as 'outside/exogenous' that acts upon, and shapes, education policymaking on what is described as the 'inside/endogenous', or 'local'. This way of seeing reinforces a view of the global as abstract, homogeneous, structural, and without agents or agency, whilst the local is concrete, diverse, agentic and imbued with democratic notions of bottom-up legitimacy however tenuous or thin in reality.

What is increasingly clear is that to understand our changing social worlds, new epistemic paradigms are needed. For instance, researching global education policy means making visible methodological statist and nationalist assumptions of policy studies more generally, and the ways in which these assumptions continue to influence education policy analyses in particular (Robertson et al. 2008). It also involves us asking about the policy process itself, particularly when it is no longer only, or primarily, the nationally-located state engaged in the making (and regulating) of policy and its implementation. And if this is the case, what then are the implications for thinking about policy as political, contested and public.

Yet invoking the need for a new epistemological paradigm, as opposed to articulating the basic elements entailed, are very different things, and the challenges are huge. How best to capture the complexities of education projects, policies and programmes that are now increasingly dispersed over what were once tightly managed boundaries around units of social life? How to generate analyses of the moments and movements of education actors and policies (and their varying forms - ideationally, materially, institutionally) across time and in space, that take into account policies as '…a complex, uneven and asymmetrical set of multi-layered cross-cutting processes and nodes of interaction?' (Cerny 2001, p. 397). Or, how to better understand the process of education policymaking and its implementation when it involves a range of actors who are geographically dispersed, engaged in diverse governance activities, involving different accountability communities? And if education policy continues to be the '*authoritive allocation of values'* as Prunty (1984, p. 42) reminded us more than two decades ago in his political framing of policy, then questions of *authority,* as well as *whose* values are represented, *how, where, when,* and the relationships between competing sites of power (state, private), continue to be important ways of understanding education policy analytically, including when it invokes, and involves, the global in new ways.

Rather than engage in a major review of the extant literature in the education policy field, my entry point into the challenges posed above is to engage with methodological accounts of global education policy being advanced by a group of critical education scholars working in international development contexts (see, Steiner-Khamsi 2004; Sobe and Ortegon, 2009; Vavrus and Bartlett, 2006; Bartlett and Vavrus, 2011; Carney 2009, 2011). These writers challenge 'orthodox' comparative and international education approaches, and are engaged in a lively debate around different aspects of global education policy. A range of concepts have emerged to describe these processes; from 'borrowing and lending' to 'transfer', 'circulation', 'pipes' and 'mobilities'. Their challenge is to advance ways of 'seeing' and studying education policies transnationally which are theoretically and empirically sensitive to the specificities of space, time and sociality, without giving ground to what Marginson and Mollis call 'ultra-relativism' (2001, p. 588).

This chapter will therefore proceed in the following way. I will begin with some brief comments on different ways of understanding the global in education policy. I then review contributions by Steiner-Khamsi (2002, 2004), Sobe and Ortegon (2009), Vavrus and Bartlett (2006, 2011), and Carney (2009, 2011). These authors advance new ways of researching these global processes. My engagement with their work is intended to stimulate a dialogue with, and generate notes toward, a critical account which I hope is helpful for researching global education policy.

Locating the 'Global' in Education Policy

The question of how the 'global' features in education policy and how we might come to know the global in researching global education policy, is dependent on how we understand each of the constituent elements - the 'global', 'education' and 'policy', and the relationships between them. I will be arguing that the global features in education policy in somewhat different, through related, ways; as a 'condition of the world', 'discourse', 'project', 'scale', and 'means of identifying the reach of particular actors'. As a *condition of the world*, this signals an ontological shift – a world that has profoundly changed as a result of neo-liberalism as an organising project, the advance of new technologies, the blurring of boundaries between national territorial states, and so on. As a *discourse* in education policies, the global is invoked as a particular imaginary, often tied to ideas like a 'global knowledge economy', 'global village', 'global social justice', and so on. As a *project* in education policy, it is to propose, and set into motion by extending out into 'global' space, particular ways of framing 'education' problems and their desirable/preferred solutions (such as privatization,

decentralisation, 'Education for All', quality, and so on). As *scale,* it is to register the ways in which platforms for action are constructed—in this case the 'global'— from which particular actors, as global actors, claim the legitimate right to advance ideas, to represent constituencies, or to govern. And finally, the global as *reach* refers to the horizon of action of particular institutions and actors engaged in different aspects of education policy work.

These ways of understanding the global in education are not meant to be exhaustive. Rather, they are meant to indicate the rather different ways in which the global features, and from there the different methodologies we might deploy in researching the global in education policy. For instance, the global as discourse suggests we use some form of discourse analysis, whilst the global as reach, or spatial extension, suggests ways of understanding education policies, such as mobility or spatial theories, to capture movements from one point of origin (local) through space to be fixed/altered/ in a new locality, or place. Whatever approach to research we might use, I will be suggesting that it is important to view concepts like the global and the local as relational. In other words, we mustn't essentialize particular actors, such as the World Bank Group, located in Washington, USA, as *always being* global. There are many activities of the Bank as an institution that are local, such as 'in-house' organisational policies. It is when the Bank's policies are promoted in distant locations that we might view the Bank's activity as global. This leads us to suggest that rather than see the global as operating in some stratosphere – up there - that we see them as *places* made up of a range of spatial relationships – some global, some local and so on.   This then is suggestive of place as topological; as;

> …a meeting place' of a whole series of complex networks and social relations. Its boundedness is understood not as forming a simple enclosure but as being permeated by the multiple relations that stretch across the globe. The specificity of place is not linked to a place-based identity, for places are traversed by unequal relations of power and struggles to contest these relations (Massey 1994, p. 155).

Importantly too, as Peck and Theodore (2010) and Sobe and Ortegon (2009, p. 63) argue, our approaches to the global need to be attentive to the ways in which movement involves reciprocal, reversible and multiple vectors, forming dense, overlapping webs of relationships.

And what of 'education'? And policy? It is clear that education as a sector, teaching as a profession, and learning as a means of regulation/emancipation, has been radically transformed; the outcome of political projects, like neo-liberalism, that have cut deep into the social fabrics of societies and sought to remake them. The division of labour in education that characterised post-war societies has

been subject to major efforts, or policies, to unpick deeply embedded and institutionalised relationships, and to insert new ways of doing education. Not only has the global been invoked as the reason for policy, but education policies have been advanced by actors at new scales, such as the global, the regional, or local, in order to develop very different education sectors, teachers and learners. Finally, policy is both a medium as well as a message system. It is also a process. As medium, policies may take different forms, dependent on what kind of policy arenas we are looking at. As a message system, policies are ideational. They have at their heart a set of ideas (values) about what the education as a social institution and set of practices should look like, including who is taught what, how, etc, and how these practices to be governed. With new actors in the education sector (such as for profit firms), with different kinds of aspirations (such as making a profit, realising a different kind of learner), means of accounting (such as shareholders), and scalar horizons, this demands new ways of thinking about and researching education policy. As a process, policies are never 'one off' and discrete events. Rather policies are social practices that unfold over time, and in space. Untangling these analytically and empirically, with what tools, are clearly challenges we face in doing research.

Angles In/On: Researching the Global in Education Policy and International Development

As noted earlier, my intention is not to offer an exhaustive 'review' of different research approaches to global education policy in international development. Rather it is to use the work of a small group of critical education researchers engaged in a range of education development sites and projects, as angles in/on global education policy with the intention of looking at how they are approaching these challenges.

The global as policy movement

Gita Steiner-Khamsi's (2002, 2004) work engages explicitly with the *movement* of education policies from one locality to another – that is, 'transnational borrowing and lending' (2004, p.1) – and in the process becomes 'global'. As she notes, in much of the literature, what motivates the movement of education policies from one location to another is the (normative) view that we can learn from elsewhere. Stepping aside from this more lesson-learning stance, Steiner-Khamsi proposes an analytical way forward; to focus on the 'why', 'how' and 'who' in the transfer of education policies. Whilst noting that this concern might be regarded as 'old hat' (Steiner-Khamsi 2004, p. 4), she points

out the 'global', as the 'out-there education policy trend', is now being mobilized by a new 'semantics of globalisation' (Steiner-Khamsi 2004, p. 5) to legitimate the adoption of particular education policies to 'problems in-here'. These policies are not just discourses; rather they are real, and must be understood—not just as something borrowed—but as discourses that enter into local circuits that are then 'adapted, modified and resisted' (Steiner-Khamsi 2004, p. 5). In other words, these policies are discourses that have real effects, though quite what these effects are cannot be known (only imagined) in advance. Drawing on cases that are presented in her 2004 edited book, Steiner-Khamsi offers some answers to the question of 'why' policies are moving from one location to another: for example, the 'certification' (or legitimation) of changes in one locality will reference an 'external' set of social practices; the export of policies and programmes as part of an emerging trade within the education sector; the territorial practices of organizations who operate trans-nationally – 'leaving their mark'; when returns to investments in education are dependent on economies of scale – hence forms of going global; or as certain kinds of technologies (rankings) able to accelerate change. Why are global policies taken up in particular locations? A range of possibilities are presented: for example, referential networks operating in different locations who take up ideas because there is as shared outlook, or because they are part of a *similar* professional network, and so on. Steiner-Khamsi's methodological move is to focus on social networks, and network analysis, and these are clearly promising ideas and ways of viewing the movement of education policy. For example, from the late 1990s onward, a small network of global education policy entrepreneurs has been highly influential in advancing the World Bank's version of Public Private Partnerships in education (see Verger 2011). However, as Verger observes, there are clear limits in this network advancing their PPP's agenda; limits that arise because of wider structural agendas (or what Peck and Theodore [2010 p. 174] call a 'context of contexts'; see also Dale and Robertson, 2011), because of contestation within the Bank about the proper engagements with the private sector, the suspicion of client countries about Bank agendas, and so on. The issue therefore with social network analysis is not that it is not valuable, but it is not enough. And underplaying the structural, or purposeful intermediation, by default tends toward an overly agency/actor account. In doing so, it risks obscuring the complexity of the connections and inter-crossings that engender certain cultural forms and social patterns, and not others (Sobe and Ortegon 2009), on the one hand, and the deeper forms of hegemony that limit ways of seeing, doing and going on in this world.

Like network theory in general, with its eschewal of hierarchy (and scale theory), social network theory tends to assume a flat ontology of social sites. And in flattening out space, we also do not see the ways in which key actors concerned with education policy, the state and non-state actors (such

as the World Bank Group [WB], the European Commission [EC], the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD]), all mobilise hierarchy as a means of legitimating rule. In other words, as Amin and Thrift observe: '…those concerned with the politics of regulation and governance associated with globalization are right to note the very real and felt contest of jurisdiction between local, national and global state and non-state organisations' (2002, p. 396). What is important, however, is not to view scales as fixed, but as mutable; they are produced and reproduced by socio-economic processes and political struggles, with education policies selectively and strategically advanced to do precisely some of this kind of work. In other words, global education policies may well move along social networks, but they are also mobilised by social networks, as well as hierarchically organised actors—such as the state and non-state actors—to advance projects of governing and rule.

The vertical case

If hierarchy can be shown to be ontologically important in social space, then to what extent does Vavrus et al's. (2006, p. 95) 'vertical case' help us understand global education policy. Their approach is epistemological; that is, it is animated by a concern about *what* can be known about the world, and *how*. They are also particularly interested in comparison as a methodology; what can be known about specific localities which is in turn part of larger structures, forces and politics.

They argue that epistemologically, the aim of the vertical case is to; '…grasp the complexity of the relationships between the knowledge claims among actors with different social locations as an attempt to situate local action and interpretation within a broader cultural, historical, and political investigation'. They are particularly concerned with the importance of 'context', but unlike case studies whose context is regarded as 'local' and 'situated', their context extends out to 'take account of historical trends, social structures, and national and international forces that shape local processes at this site" (Vavrus et al. 2006, p. 960). In other words, their extended view of context includes 'the global'.

Bartlett and Vavrus (2011) argue that the vertical case makes three important contributions. First, it insists on simultaneous attention to the micro, meso, and macro-levels to enable 'vertical comparison'. Second, it emphasizes the importance of historically-situating processes under consideration to enable comparing across time in what they call 'transversal comparison'. Third, it emphasizes the importance of comparing how similar processes unfold in distinct locations in space – or 'horizontal comparison' (Bartlett and Vavrus, 2011, pp. 1-2). In looking at Learner Centred

Pedagogy (LCP) in Tanzania and Kenya using the vertical case methodology, horizontal comparison with other sites suggests there is a common semantic clustering of codes at work in the policy arena; for instance, there are strong discourses around 'secondary education for all', investments in technology, and the need for a particular kind of pedagogy in secondary education to advance a competitive knowledge-based economy.

The strength of their vertical case is to move beyond what Bartlett and Vavrus (2011) call 'policy discourse', to developing the links between the production of policy discourses and the ways in which they are appropriated and practiced, and the relationships between these newer discourses and older, more deeply embedded, ones. In the case of Tanzania and LCP, they are able to detect an older 'socialist discourse' with its focus on education for self-reliance with a newer discourse that emphasizes competition, individualism and authority. They also show that the differences between Tanzania and Kenya in terms of LCP, and between different schools in each national setting (horizontal comparisons), is mediated by different training experiences; the outcome of different levels of engagement with the global economy.

There is a great deal of value in their approach for doing global education policy research – particularly ways of undertaking 'transversal' and 'horizontal' comparisons, and what links, over-lappings, and asymmetries we can see as a result. By drawing attention to the multilayered and cross-cutting processes and modes of interaction—some recent and others less so—they provide us with a strong sense of both present and past, and of the complexities of what it means to refer to 'situatedness', or what Polanyi (1944) refers to as 'embeddedness'.

However, the implicit assumption in the idea of 'vertical comparison' is that the global is equated to the macro, and structural; a social force that the local (or micro) must face. Here we have an unhelpful pitting of structures (as global/macro) against agents (as local/micro). Yet I have argued earlier following Massey (1994), places are made up of actors with local and global horizons of action. The question here for education policy analysis ought to be; whose values are allocated, how, and with what outcomes for education as a sector, teachers and learners. That we have a way of viewing the 'global' is simultaneously lived, concrete and local is important for it emphasises locality and place as a meeting point for complex networks and social relations that stretch out into global space.

Finally, we need a way of finessing how we talk about different things in the social worlds we are studying; for the moment they tend to be caught in a micro-meso-macro 'catch-all' when actually what we are doing is referring to rather different things; such as hierarchy and rule, or structures

and agents, or the global and the local, or the abstract and the concrete, and so on. These are clearly a different order of concepts to the idea of the macro as level of abstraction and where the abstract is necessarily derived from objects, structures, and mechanisms (Sayer 1984, p. 140).

Scopic systems and the global

In a rather different contribution Sobe and Ortegon (2009) draw attention to the work of Knorr Cetina (2008) and her problematisation of networks for understanding currency markets. Knorr Cetina's argument is the ideas of the network does not capture the totality of what is at play, including the significance of heightened moments of reflexivity when multiple forms of information are presented simultaneously, then aggregated, articulated and projected, and in doing so, give it new meaning. She refers to these processes as 'scopic systems'; that is, '…ways of seeing the global that tends toward a single collective' (Sobe and Ortegon, 2009, p. 58). Sobe and Ortegon make use of this suggestive idea to think of the way in which education, both historically and in the present, has been projected globally, as well as projecting globality. They point to International Expositions and World Fairs held in the late 19th Century as an example of the ways in which objects were placed together, classified and then evaluated against a notion of an unfolding future given forward momentum by assumptions of progress and modernity. In this very moment, the world is presented as a singular world (Sobe and Ortegon, 2009, p. 61).

Similarly, today there are a burgeoning array of scopic systems that gather together, place in hierarchies, and project globally, a singular education world—from the OECD's Programme in International Student Assessment (PISA), or their Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS), to global university rankings (Shanghai Jiao Tong, Times Higher, U-Multi-Rank), the World Bank's Knowledge Assessment Methodology (KAM) (Robertson 2009), and the recently launched SABER system to assess and rank school and teacher performance globally (Robertson, 2011). What is significant about these scopic systems, argues Sobe and Ortegon (2009, p. 62) is '…the extent to which they function like an array of crystals that collects and focuses light on one surface'.

Yet what is important to note is that scopic systems in global education policy take *fragments* (partial understandings) of knowledge about complex education processes, yet present them as a *fractal* (a smaller versions of a whole). In doing so, the complexity and diversity of education systems, and their need for diverse policies to diverse issues, also disappears.

Fractals (as disguised fragments) act as a proxy, shorthand, and lever for education policy problems. Their power as levers of policy reside in their capacity to project a singular solution to an imagined single problem (competition, efficiency, world class), and in doing so, diversity is produced as absent. Scopic systems in education are also forms of power in that they simultaneously *frame* education problems, offer a *desired* re/solution, project *outward* with considerable spatial extension, reinforce new social practices over time because of further rounds of data gathering and projection, and tap into *emotions* (shame, pride) that change behaviour –deep inside national territorial states (Robertson 2011). These are powerful systems, which both state and non-state actors have mobilised as a new means for governing education systems. They are key sites of global education policy, both as project, projection, and propagation. What is important for ongoing research into global education policymaking is discerning the different array of actors and interests involved in scopic systems, the values that are being advanced, the ways in which authority to govern is generated, and whether and how the processes are open to, and visible to, wider publics and public debate.

Policyscapes and the global as 'optique'

To study global in international development, Steve Carney (2009, 2011) has suggested the concept of 'policyscapes'. Using what he describes as an optique of globalisation, Carney advances 'an experiment in method' to derive accounts of the *experiences* of different countries in the *production* of globalisation. In doing so, he aims to focus attention on the constitutive moment of globalisation in particular places which he argues are being deterritorialised as a result of global processes. What is central, Carney argues, is the need to theorise the dynamics of space, and bring to the fore the specificities of education, and the implementation of education policy in particular places.

Carney's experiment is to study three places in one global space; Denmark, Tibet/China and Nepal to 'present some of the lived consequences of these entanglements' (Carney 2009, p. 6) in global education reform. As he argues: 'This interest in the entangled and co-produced experience of global education reform is lacking in many recent analyses of education policy.' Drawing from the work of Tsing (2005), Carney explores the 'friction' of global connectivity between these imagined worlds, in which "…heterogeneous and unequal encounters" share "…new arrangements of culture and power" ' (Carney 2011, p. 7). In a context of globally-shared visions for education, and with the advance of neo-liberal political projects privileging the market, new localities are emerging as; '…the embodiment of the practices that make certain de-territorialised displays of identity' (Carney 2011,

p.8). In other words, localities are being reconfigured as global educational policies, institutional fabrics, and other social relationships, move over national territorial boundaries.

However, though Carney aims for an approach that he describes as 'mutually constitutive and dialectically constructed' (Carney 2011, p.7), he does not go far enough because of the limitations imposed by this particular conceptualisation of globalisation; one that tends to privilege, and thus fetishise, flows, motion, instabilities and uncertainty, without attending to the *new ways* in which processes of fixity, reterritorialisation, rebordering, and reordering, are at work (cf. Robertson 2011).

Given Carney's (and by implication, Bartlett and Vavrus, 2011) debt to Appadurai, it is important we look more closely at Appadurai's anchoring ideas. In a series of works, Appadurai (1996) popularised the idea of global flows, along with his locution 'scapes' (as in 'ethnoscapes', technoscapes, mediascapes, ideoscapes and financescapes); as '…different streams or flows along which cultural material may be seen to be moving across national boundaries' (1996, pp. 45-46). Scapes were therefore a means of superseding standard geographical thinking advanced by the nation state. It was also a way of also capturing what he saw to be the multiple, chaotic, and disjunctive nature of flows, and the distributions and results of processes at any given time.

Whilst recognising there have always been flows in the past, Appadurai insists the present is radically different. As he says; '…globalisation has shrunk the distance between elites, shifted key relations between producers and consumers, broken many links between labor and family life, obscured the lines between temporary locales and imaginary national attachments…' and '…broken the monopoly of autonomous nation states over the project of modernization' (1996, pp. 10-11). And if the past was 'placed' and 'localistic', the present is now a 'placeless locality of flows'. These transformations are the outcome of new information technologies and the speed of transport, as well as the deep rupturing of modernity, its signs, and centres of power. For Appadurai this opens the space for a new global imagination, drawing its energy, vitality and creativity from the unpredictable outcomes from 'disjunctures' between flows, and from the possibilities enabled by the faster pace of new technologies and the accelerated speed of transport.

Appadurai extends his argument for 'disjuncture' through the concept of 'deterritorialisation'; as a process in the actual world *and* a conceptual break with a past constructed from the tightly bound containers of home and social life located within nation states. Processes of deterritorialisation now permit diaspora-based ethnic politics to be communicated across the globe, enabling, in turn, the diffusion of mediascapes and ideoscapes *beyond their narrow places into global networks*. Most importantly, deterritorialisation makes the normal functioning of nation-states problematic and

contingent, since their prime cultural challengers are transnational ethnic movements (Appadurai 1996, pp. 39-40).

However, there are a number of issues with Appadurai's account of globalisation which also then features in Carney's globalisation optique. Appadurai's project is to advance a more dynamic, contingent, and less static, reading of contemporary social and political life by emphasizing movement, flows, disjunctures and the disappearance of borders. However he now veers in the opposite direction, so that power is now amorphous, history is obscured, there is an under-developed conception of the present, and there are no boundaries that order difference (Heyman et al. 2009). And whilst Carney is concerned to see power as 'frictions' using the work of Anna Tsing (2005), these are only the more visible manifestations of power (as productive). A more complex view of power would lead us make search for absences (Santos, 2004) as well as to focus on those events that generate events, or as Stephen Lukes (1974) describes it, the third face of power, or 'rules of the game' that determines hegemonies.

A sympathetic reading of Appadurai's work suggests that the focus on movement and radical rupture tends to typify early work on globalisation. More recently, scholars (Harvey 2000, 2005; Mittelman 2004) have pointed to the duality of change and continuity making up the transformation of the world order. For example, if we look at the global education policy landscape, we can detect longer standing claims about education as a public good and public sector encountering more recent claims about education as a market, a private good and a services sector.

Secondly, Appadurai's understandings of transnationalism, as the extension outward from a particular locality into global networks, and whose horizons of action are now global, broadly aligns with Santos' (2004) understanding of globalisation. However Santos goes further than this 'node on a global network' understanding by arguing globalisation can be understood as a localism that acquires for itself universal hegemonic status, so that all other contenders are deemed local. This way of thinking about globalisation help us to work with a more complex view of power; as not only positionality in a network (Sheppard 2002), but where some localisms secure sufficient power and reach, including through scopic systems, which enable them determine the rules of the game.

Thirdly, Appadurai's transnational network metaphor of globalisation places it above, and not on, the terrain that is also occupied by a range of actors, including the national territorial state, sub-national actors, and so on. The local and place are now dislodged by the global; as the key category in a hierarchy of categories to understand social life. In other words, he moves from the rejection of the localised and bounded to an opposite extreme. Several problems follow from this. The first is

that the researcher is invited to see the world through a global optic that ontologically flattens space. Second, by viewing the world as having no boundaries; '…the global exists as a space that is neither here nor there; it has no distributed patterns, and has no internal relations reproducing convergence or differentiation. It is simply a space that is everywhere' (Heyman et al. 2009, p 136). Ironically this encourages a homogenous view of social life, despite intending the opposite. In other words, this way of seeing the world encourages us to bypass a fundamental *effect* of flows; how they constitute, reproduce and reconstitute social life.

Fourthly, Appadurai conceptualises the present (as global) and flows, whilst borders as realities disappear. This leads to his adoption of deterritorialisation as a key organising concept. Deterritorialistion is the name given to the problematic wherein a territory loses its significance and power in everyday social life. The effect here, however, is to conceptually end up in the same place as Kenichi Omhae's (1990) 'borderless world', or Thomas Friedman's (2005) 'flat earth'. And as Ó Tuathail (1999, p. 140) argues, '…discourses of deterritorialisation tend to ascribe a unique transcendency to the contemporary condition, defining it as a moment of overwhelming newness. Such functionally anti-historical notions of deterritorialisation find a variety of different expressions in political, economic and techno-cultural knowledge'. The problem here of course is that these discourses have considerable ideological power and rhetorical force and '…are part of neoliberal ideology in that it strives to denaturalise and delimit the power of the state and naturalise and bolster the virtues of the market' (Ó Tuathail 1999, p. 147).

Angles Out: Notes Towards a Critical Processual Account

In the opening paragraphs of this chapter I posed a series of questions around researching global education policy; questions that have been at the heart of the different angles *in and on* global education policy that I have been exploring. In this section I want to draw these insights together, and look at what more we need to do in order to advance this research agenda. We might call this next move, *angles out*. For instance, whilst social networks give us new insights into how education policies move through space, we need to keep in view sites specific experimentation, purposeful intermediation, mutations, transformations in linked sites, and hierarchical power, such as states, and the production and strategic use of scale that enables the launch of new education actors, projects, policies and practices.

Similarly, whilst the idea of flows as a metaphor helps us to grasp hold of the movement of

education policies around the global, it is clear that we must also be attentive to the new forms of bordering that are also at work. 'Flow speak' tends to '…detach global flows from the material and institutional conditions which underpin global culture' (Bude et al. 2010, p 482). And whilst recognising a new set of dynamics are at work reflected in distinctive developments in contemporary world history (Scholte 2005), it is not possible to imagine a world which is *only* borderless and deterritorialised in that the basic ordering of social groups and societies *requires* categories and compartments (Harvey 2006). More recently, researchers have begun to argue we need to study the other of movement and change; for instance 'stickiness' (along with slipperiness) (Markusen 1996), 'fixity' (along with motion) (Harvey 1999), and 'borders' (along with flows), as correctives. In studies of globalising education policymaking it is critical we see the collapsing of boundaries as accompanied by new bordering processes, giving rise to new ordering practices and subjectivities (cf. Robertson 2011). Sassen (2006) argues that new bordering practices are taking place within a context of dissolving or weakening boundaries. In his paper, 'Europe as borderland', Balibar argues that, far from being at the outer limit of territories, '…these borders are dispersed a little everywhere, wherever the movement of information, people, and things is happening and is controlled – for example in cosmopolitan cities' (Balibar 2002, p. 71). In other words, when we conceive of globalisation as partly enacted at various sub-national scales and institutional domains, we can see a proliferation of borderings deep inside national territories. A focus on such bordering capabilities allows us to see a 'geopolitics of space' easily obscured in the kind of account advanced which assume the mutual exclusivity of the national and the global by the way in which we represent them as discrete hierarchical spaces (Sassen 2006). This has led Amin to argue that:

> I have distanced myself from the territorial idea of sequestered spatial logics – local, national, continental and global – pitted against each other. Instead, I have chosen to interpret globalisation in relational terms as the interdependence and intermingling of global, distant and local layers, resulting in the greater hybridisation and perforation of social, economic and political life (Amin 1997, p. 133).

In their own ways, the different analytical approaches raise direct and indirect questions about the national state and its role in global education policy. For instance, how is national state power challenged by scopic systems, or networks? And, whose interests are advanced by these representations of education, whose framings count, and with what consequences for fundamental questions that state education policy has historically been asked to account for (social justice, legitimation, issues of redistribution, the state-citizen contract, and so on)? What is entailed in the decentering of the national state? Furthermore, we need to ask of the whereabouts of state power, when education policy is dispersed over scales?

In order to bring to the fore the spatiality of state power, I have found Ferguson et al. (2002) account of the spatiality of the modern nation state particularly helpful. Ferguson et al. (2002, p. 982) argue modern nation states used two sources of spatial imaginary and projection; 'vertical power' and 'encompassment'. Vertical power leads to the idea of the state as an institution 'above' civil society, the community and family. It is a powerful container of social and political life that not only sits above, but also encompasses in a series of radiating circles outward; from the family to the system of nation states. As Ferguson et al. (2002, p. 982 remark, '…this is a profoundly consequential understanding of scale, one in which the locality is encompassed by the region, the region by the nation state, and the nation state by the international community'. Such metaphors are powerful ideas; in relation to the national state, they reinforce a view of the state as possessing higher functions (reason, control, capacity for regulation) which were productive of social and political life.

If verticality and encompassment capture the geometry of state power in the modern nation state, what is the geography of the contemporary state? Theoretical work is still in its early stages, largely as this new geography has not yet stabilised in what Jessop (2002). For the moment let me point to two (somewhat different) lines of work emerging that may prove to be fruitful for the study of the globalisation of education policy. The first focuses attention on the rescaling of the state (Brenner 2004, 2009) which has paralleled the rescaling of capital accumulation. Scales in this work are argued to be sites for political struggle as well as one of their key mechanisms and outcomes (MacLeod et al. 1999; Jessop 2002). As Brenner observes, 'the rescaling of institutions and policies is now conceptualised as a key means through which social forces may attempt to "rejig" the balance of class power and manage the contradictory social relations of capitalism' (Brenner 2009, p. 126). This leads to the question of what post-national statehood might look like, and what might be the implications this for education policy?

Whilst the notion of the post-national in work by Jessop (2002) and Brenner (2009) is argued to be a tendential rather than a substantive concept, both make it clear that it does not mean the national is marginalised, *but that the national itself is being redefined in relation to the other scales*. This kind of account contrasts with Appadurai's approach where, as we have seen, the national/local is absorbed into global networks. Jessop and Brenner's reading of the transformation of state space resonates with a growing body of work in the globalisation of education – where it is possible to see education policies as simultaneously constitutive of new scales that contain newer social actors and relations (such as Europe, the European citizen, the European Higher Education Area, and so on), as well as being platforms from which to advance projects of rule, and projects that concern themselves with the development of globally-competitive education systems and subjectivities.

A rather different kind of analysis of the geography of contemporary state power in modern western neoliberal economies comes from John Allen et al. (2010). They argue that whilst Brenner stretches the language of scale to take account of a new institutional complexity that views multi-scalar power relations as multiple, overlapping, tangled and so on, in their view it does not quite grasp the changing geography of state power. Advancing a *topological* account of state spatiality, Allen and Cochrane draw attention to the state's reconfiguration of hierarchical power (or what Ferguson and Gupta called verticality) and the ways in which a more transverse set of political interactions, or *reach*, holds that hierarchy in place. They stress that it is not *extensivity* of reach that characterises the new geography of state power but *intensivity,* serving to disrupt what is near or far, in turn loosening our sense of defined times and distances. As Allen and Cochrane argue: 'what is politically at stake… is that such an approach is able to show how the state's hierarchical powers have not so much been rescaled or redistributed as reassembled in terms of spatial reach' (2010, p. 1073). Reach here means those arts of governing that enable the state to permeate and penetrate those spaces that hitherto had been unreachable. They add:

> …it is not that state hierarchies have transformed themselves into horizontal networking arrangements, but rather that the hierarchies of decision-making that matter are *institutional* and not scalar ones. …In that sense, the apparatus of state authority is not so much 'up there' or indeed 'over there' as part of a spatial arrangement within which different elements of government, as well as private agencies, exercise powers of reach that enable them to be more or less present within and across …political structures (Allen et al. 2010, p. 1074).

Drawing on Sassen's (2006) work, and her use of 'assemblage' to signal a new geography of state power, they suggest that different bits and pieces of institutional authority (state/private) are drawn within reach of one another. State hierarchies, together with private agencies, partnerships and supranational institutions may, in that sense, be seen as part of a geographical assemblage of distributed authority in which power is continually being renegotiated Cerny (2001) refers to this newer kind of formation as a "golden pentangle" – contrasting it with the "iron triangle" (state/civil society/economy) of the modern national welfare state period. Public-Private-Partnerships – dense linkages that include state, local forms, transnational organisations, venture philanthropists - are one example of this reworking of institutional boundaries, sectors, and the redistribution and reassembling of authority. However, future work will need to ensure that assemblages are not simply viewed as a coincidental, contingent activity. Rather assemblages will have their own forms of structural and strategic selectivity that produce and reproduce education sectors, forms of labour, learning and subjectivities.

My own conclusion too, in examining the rescaling of education through globalising education policy, is that hierarchy continues to be invoked as a basis of authority and right to rule (for example, the EC's determination to advance a European higher education area in relation to national, sub-national and institutional higher education systems). These assemblages can be viewed as having particular territorial regimes; ones that need to be traced out in detail, including how modes of rule and claims to rights are navigated and negotiated. In education sectors, these include a new array of scopic systems, networks and hierarchical systems, cross-crossing, overlapping and extending out from particular meeting places. As a result, authority and sovereignty is no longer fused with the national scale but rather is unevenly spread. Finally, in the education sector at least, both *extensivity* and *intensivity* characterises the new geography of state power, and that these are not mutually exclusive categories. For example the state's engagement with scopic systems, like league tables, both generate a singular (statistical) representation of social activity as well as a hierarchical ordering to produce a moral judgement about social life; in doing so we can see these two elements working in combination, and with considerable effect.

Concluding Remarks

This chapter set out to explore researching global education policy in ways that aim to avoid the cul-de-sacs that dog many explanations. This is a challenging and ambitious project, and the works reviewed in this chapter have made a significant contribution to. However I have argued there is more to do, and that an account that is *critical, processual* and *relational* might help advance the project further. A critical account is attentive to discursive and material power, and the new forms of uneven spatial development that are the outcome of policy mobility. In arguing for a processual approach, I am wanting to point to the risks, and political consequences, of failing to historicise our accounts of transformations in the education sector, or inadvertently allow ourselves to be seduced by arguments that everything have changed and that now nothing is fixed in either meaning, sites, or sources of power and authority. Rather, our challenge must be to identify, and trace out, the sites, actors, institutions, scales, technologies of rule, and consequences, of the new assemblages of education policymaking and practice which increasingly include private forms of authority mobilised by powerful players. A processual account would be attentive to the new, and different, ways in which points of fixity, bordering, and ordering, are taking place in the education sector, as well as the changing spatiality of state power. And, like Allen and Cochrane, I do not believe that the state is *not* a presence in our everyday lives. Far from it! The state has increasingly acquired for itself a new

range of scales from which to act, as well as new tools and means of governing. In combination, this new spatiality of state power strategically advances educational projects that shape the lives and subjectivities of each of us, albeit it in contested and mediated ways. Our analytic accounts of global education policy must also be *relational* in three senses. First, in a strategic sense, in that policy is advanced in order to secure particular projects and interests. These interests are always in relation to others' interests. Second, flows themselves or 'scapes', may be discrete, but they are not disconnected. They overlap as well as interpenetrate the other. We see this very clearly at the current time with intense financialization of the education section, on the one hand, and the attempt to construct education as a trading sector, on the other. Education finds itself caught in the swirl of other flows, and the object and target for new points of fixity. It is relational in a third sense, and that is policies that are being globalised enter into locations that are themselves circuits of flows anchored in social relations. Global education policy interventions not only generate potential frictions, but might, as Sassen (2006) argues, result in the emergence of 'new logics', and new 'tipping points', in turn altering the nature and shape of the education sector.

By way of a final conclusion, it is worth returning to Prunty's (1984) conceptualisation of education policy as the authoritative allocation of values. In asking what difference does the global make, it is clear that it does. Not only have the sites and sources of authority been dispersed away from the national, but the state itself—and with it education as a public service—has been transformed. This has not been the result of a global steamroller; rather, the complex reworking, re/bordering and re/ordering of education spaces to include a range of scales of action. What are the consequences of these developments, particularly in relation to whose interests are advanced? These are clearly empirical questions and ones that deserve urgent attention.

References

Allen, J. and Cochrane, A. (2010), 'Assemblages of state power: topological shifts in the organisation of government and politics'. Antipode, 42 (5), 1071-1089.

Amin, A. and Thrift, N. (2002), Cities. Oxford: Polity.

Amin, A. (1997), 'Placing globalisation'. Theory, Culture and Society, 14, (2), 123-137.

Appadurai A. (1996), Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalisation, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Balibar, E. (2002), 'World Borders, Political Borders'. PMLA, 117, (1), 71-78.

Bartlett, L. and Vavrus, F. (2011), 'Knowing Comparatively: Vertical Case Studies as an Approach to Policy as Practice', paper presented to CIES, Montreal, 1-5 May.

Brenner, N. (2004), New State Spaces, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brenner, N. (2009), 'Open questions on state rescaling'. Cambridge J of Regions, Economy and Society, 2, (2), 123-139.

Bude, H. and Durrschmidt, J. (2010), 'What's wrong with globalization? Contra-flow speak – toward an existential turn in the theory of globalisation'. European J. of Social Theory, 13, (4), 481-500.

Carney, S. (2009), 'Negotiating policy in an age of globalization: exploring educational policyscapes in Denmark, Nepal and China'. Comparative Education Review, 53, (1), 63-88.

Carney, S. (2011), 'Imagining globalisation: Educational policyscapes', in G. Steiner-Khamsi and F. Waldow (eds), World Yearbook of Education 2012 'Policy Borrowing, Policy Lending'. London and New York: Routledge.

Cerny, P. (2001), 'From "Iron Triangles" to "Golden Pentangles"? Globalising the Policy Process'. Global Governance, 7, (4), 397-410.

Dale, R. and Robertson, S. (2004) Interview with Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Globalisation, Societies and Education, 2 (2), pp. 147-60.

Dale, R. and Robertson, S. (2011), 'Toward a critical grammar of education policy movement', in G. Steiner-Khamsi and F. Waldow (eds), World Yearbook of Education 2012 'Policy Borrowing, Policy Lending'. London and New York: Routledge.

Ferguson, J. and Gupta, A. (2002), 'Spatialising states: toward an ethnography of neoliberal governmentality'. American Ethologist, 29, (4), 981-1002.

Friedman, T. (2005), The World is Flat: a Brief History of the Twenty-first Century. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Harvey, D. (1999), The Limits to Capita, new edn. London and New York: Verso.

Harvey, D. (2006), Spaces of Global Capitalism: Toward a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development. London and New York: Verso.

Heyman, J and Campbell, H. (2009), 'The anthropology of global flows: a critical reading of Appadurai's 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy'. Anthropological Theory, 9, 131-147.

Jessop, B. (2002), The Future of the Capitalist State. London: Polity.

Knorr Cetina, K. (2008), 'Micro-globalization', in I. Rossi (ed), Frontiers of Globalization Research: Theoretical and Methodological Approaches. New York: Springer, pp. 65-92.

Lukes, S. (1986), 'Introduction', in S. Lukes (ed) Power. Oxford: Blackwells, pp. 1-18..

MacLeod, G. and Goodwin, M. (1999), 'Space, scale and state strategy; rethinking urban and regional governance'. Progress in Human Geography, 23, 503-527.

Marginson, S. and Mollis, M. (2001), 'The door opens and the tiger leaps: theories and reflexivities of comparative education for a global millennium'. Comparative Education Review, 45, (4), 581-615.

Markusen, A. (1996), 'Sticky places in slippery space: a typology of industrial districts'. Economic Geography, 72, (3), 293-313.

Massey, D. (1994), Space, Place and Gender. Cambridge: Polity.

Mittelman, J. (2004), Whither Globalisation: The Vortex of Knowledge and Ideology. London and New York: Routledge.

Ó Tuathail, G. (1999), 'Borderless worlds: problematising discourses of deterritorialisation'. Geopolitics, 4, (2), 139-154.

Omhae, K. (1990), The Borderless World. New York: HarperCollins.

Polanyi, K. (1944), The Great Transformation: the Political and Economic Origins of our Time. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Peck, J. and Theodore, N. (2010), 'Mobilising policy: models, methods and mutations'. Geoforum, 41, 169-174.

Prunty, J. (1984), A Critical Reformulation of Educational Policy Analysis. Geelong: Deakin University.

Robertson, S. (2009) 'Producing' the global knowledge economy: the World Bank, The Knowledge Assessment Methodology and Education, in M Simons, M. Olssen, and M. Peters (eds.). Re-reading Education Policies, Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Robertson, S. (2011), 'The new spatial politics of (re)bordering and (re)ordering the education-state-society relation'. International Review of Education, 57, 277-297.

Robertson, S. (2011)'Placing' Teachers in Global Governance Agendas, a paper presented to the CIES Annual Conference, Montreal, 1-5th May.

Robertson, S. and Dale, R. (2008), 'Researching education in a globalising era: beyond methodological nationalism, methodological statism, methodological educationism and spatial fetishism', in J. Resnik (ed), The Production of Educational Knowledge in the Global Era. Rotterdam: Sense Publications, pp. 19-32.

Sassen, S. (2006), Territory, Authority, Rights. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press.

Sayer, A. (1984), Method in Social Science: A Realist Approach. London and New York: Routledge.

Scholte, J-A (2005), Globalization: A Critical Introduction, 2nd edn. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sobe, N. and Ortegon, N. (2009), 'Scopic systems, pipes, models and transfers in the global circulation of educational knowledge and practices', in T. Popkewitz and F. Rizvi (eds), Globalization and the Study of Education. New York: NSSE/Teachers College Press, pp. 49-66.

Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2002), 'Re-framing educational borrowing as a policy strategy', in M. Caruso and H. E. Tenworth (eds), Internationalisierung-Internationalisation. Frankfurt: Lang, pp. 57-89..

Steiner Khamsi, G. (2004), The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending. New York: Teachers' College Columbia.

Tsing, A. (2005), Friction. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Vavrus, F. and Bartlett, L. (2006), 'Comparatively knowing: making a case for the vertical case study'. Current Issues in Comparative Education, 8, (2), 95-103.

Verger, A. (2011), 'Framing and selling global education policy: the promotion of PPPs in education in low-income countries'. Journal of Education Policy, doi: 10.1080/02680939.2011.623242.