



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

On-Line Papers – Copyright

This online paper may be cited or briefly quoted in line with the usual academic conventions, and for personal use. However, this paper must not be published elsewhere (such as mailing lists, bulletin boards etc.) without the author's explicit permission.

If you copy this paper, you must:

- include this copyright note.
- not use the paper for commercial purposes or gain in any way.
- observe the conventions of academic citation in a version of the following:

Robertson, S.L. (2012) *Teachers' Work, Denationalisation, and Transformations in the Field of Symbolic Control: A Comparative Account*, published by the Centre for Globalisation, Education and Societies, University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1JA, UK at:
<http://susanleerobertson.com/publications/>

Teachers' Work, Denationalisation, and Transformations in the Field of Symbolic Control: A Comparative Account

Susan L. Robertson

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

Forthcoming in J. Levin, T. Seddon and J. Ozga (eds) *World Year Book of Education 2013*.

Abstract

Currently there is unprecedented attention being directed at the 'quality' of school teachers in education systems around the world and the part they might play in developing globally competitive knowledge-based economies. Yet teachers' work has historically been organised at the national and sub-national scales. In this chapter I examine the ways in which the national and sub-national are now being enrolled as important sites for globalisation through an exploration of two political projects, the OECD's *Teaching and Learning International Survey* (TALIS) and the World Bank's *SABER-Teacher*. Drawing on Bernstein's (1990, 2000) concepts of 'field of symbolic control', 'classification' and 'framing', as conceptual resources for identifying shifts in the nature of power and control, I chart the nature and extent of the denationalisation of teachers' work, the consequences for teachers as professionals, and how these processes might be contested. I show the ways in which the invocation of a global imaginary of shared risk and future, the emergence of trans-boundary relations, the relationally inter-connected nature of globalising teacher learning, and new forms of private authority, are contributing to the denationalisation of education and a transformation in the field of symbolic control over teacher policies and practices.

Introduction

Currently there is unprecedented attention being directed at the 'quality' of school teachers in education systems around the world, and the part they should play in developing globally-competitive knowledge-based economies (cf. OECD, 2001, 2004, 2005, 2009; Bruns et al, 2010; World Bank Group, 2011; Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2010a, 2010b; Barber and Mourshed, 2007; Mourshed, Chijioke and Barber, 2010; MacBeath, 2012). In a series of short videos featuring 'performers' and 'reformers' in education, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), in collaboration with global education consultancy firm, Pearson Education, profile various aspects of what they regard as 'successful' teacher policies in countries as diverse as Singapore, Finland, Poland and Brazil. Yet closer scrutiny of the 'key facts' which are presented for these countries (for instance, the % GNP spent on education, teaching time, the presence of standards and accountability systems) suggests there is little in common regarding shared practices, raising questions about precisely what lessons to be learned by whom.

The global consultancy firm, McKinsey & Company sells its own version of what makes a top performing system and the part that teachers play in this. In two reports released in 2007 and 2010 on the best performing school systems, they point to studies conducted in the US arguing that: "...the performance gap between students assigned three effective teachers in a row, and those assigned three ineffective teachers in a row, was 49 percentile points" (Barber and Mourshed, 2007: 12). This leads the McKinsey & Company authors to conclude that; "...the main variation in student learning at school is the quality of the teachers" (ibid), and from there propose a significant injection of teacher professional development. The World Bank, too, has made equally strong claims regarding what they describe as the poor accountability of teachers in education systems, and the consequences this has for education and development. Their solution? The implementation of policies which reshape the conditions of teacher employment to include payment by results and shorter term contracts.

This explosion in teacher policy commentary and initiatives has led one observer to note that, finally, teachers have made it onto the education policy agenda (Novoa, 2010). This new visibility for teachers ought to be welcomed, especially as in many countries teachers confronted limited opportunities to place their concerns on the table. This is because of the dominance of neo-liberal policies which, beginning in the 1980s: (i) silenced teachers through arguments for school choice to overcome 'provider capture' (cf. Buchanan and Tulloch, 1962; Buchanan and Wagner, 1977; Chubb and Moe, 1990); (ii) placed learners, standards and accountability at the heart of the education enterprise (Muldergig, 2008; Sahlberg, 2007; Hursh, 2005); (iii) curtailed teacher's professional discretion and devalued teacher's expertise (Cochran-Smith, 2006); (iv) limited the role of teacher unions (Stevenson, 2007); and (v) demonised teachers through negative media representations (Goldstein, 2011). Low income countries have faced their own problems with ensuring quality classroom teachers; for instance in Sub-Saharan HIV-AIDS has significantly reduced the numbers of teachers available to teach (Bennell, 2005), whilst Education for All policies have expanded access for learners and large classes for teachers (GMR, 2009). Such policies have particularly created new challenges in recruiting and retaining high quality teachers within the system (cf. Zeichner, 2003; Compton and Weiner, 2008; MacBeath, 2012).

However, in making teachers visible it is evident this is no straightforward case of rehabilitation. To begin, teachers appear as both villains and heroes in this new unfolding education policy drama: villains, as they are regarded as having failed students and their learning; heroes, as they are

positioned as single-handedly (albeit with strong stage direction from the international agencies) able to turn around ailing international student performance scores and as a consequence set national economies in the path to economic growth. Making teachers visible means modernising teacher policies and practices to realise top-performing students fit for knowledge-based economies (OECD, 2005; Bruns et al, 2011).

Yet it is the significantly expanded activity of a small group of international agencies, global education consulting firms, and corporate philanthropic foundations, in the reframing and implementing of teacher policy agendas and governance tools that is particularly striking and at the heart of this chapter. Not only does this signal a recalibration in the relationship between national governments and global agencies over the determination of teacher policy, but it raises the equally important question of how best to understand such developments within wider processes of globalisation. Like others in this collection, I will be drawing upon the work of Saskia Sassen (2003, 2006) and her arguments around the denationalisation of processes deep inside national territories and institutional domains; processes which often ignored in many accounts of globalisation in favour of the more obvious. As she argues: “When the social sciences focus on globalisation, it is typically not on these types of practices and dynamics but rather on the self-evident global scale” (Sassen, 2003: 2), such as the role of the International Monetary Fund, or the rise of the World Trade Organisation. By denationalisation, Sassen is seeking to capture the ways in which processes which are “...localized in national, indeed subnational settings ...involve transboundary networks and formations connecting multiple local or ‘national’ processes and actors, or involve the recurrence of particular issues or dynamics in a growing number of countries” (Sassen, 2003: 1-2). Furthermore, not only are national states being transformed as they confront new geographies of globalising power, but there are “...new emergent privatised forms of authority for governing a range of specialised domains, and the circulation of private utility logics deep inside the public domain” (Sassen, 2006: 224).

For teachers whose work and workplaces have historically been sub/nationally organised, it is important we examine the complex ways these scales are important sites for globalisation. Specifically, I will be exploring the ways in which the invocation of a global imaginary of shared risk and future, the emergence of new forms of transboundary relations, the relationally and interconnected nature of globalising teacher learning, and new forms of private authority, are characteristics of the globalising of teacher policies and practices. In order to examine the pattern and scope of these processes my analysis will be diachronic and synchronic. By diachronic I mean an historical approach that aims to register epochal changes. To this end, I brief look back to an earlier phase of the global governance of teachers’ work – 1960s-1990 – and the role of global agencies such as the International Labor Organization (ILO), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the World Bank in this. By synchronic, I mean an examination of two political projects, the OECD’s *Teaching and Learning International Survey* (TALIS) launched in 2007, and the World Bank’s *SABER-Teacher*, launched in 2010 and the ways in which they seek to enrol national and sub-national sites in the globalising of teacher policy. Through the use of Bernstein’s (1990, 2000) concepts of ‘field of symbolic control’, ‘classification’ and ‘framing’, as conceptual resources for identifying shifts in the nature of power and control, I chart the nature and extent of the denationalisation of teachers’ work, the consequences for teachers as professionals, and how these processes might be contested. Finally, I wish to say something about my own positioning in this paper; as an English-speaking, Anglo-Saxon. The danger here is to offer a western northern reading of the world of teacher policy, and in doing so, over-read and over-determine their global influence. This is neither my intention, nor, I hope, the main outcome, though I recognise the dangers. Rather, I hope to direct attention to processes that are under-studied because they are

being strategically rescaled and reframed, and to highlight the ways in which globalisation projects and processes are necessarily contingent, empirically dependent, and open to contestation.

The (Global) Governing of Teachers' Work – A Diachronic Account

Governing is a pedagogical relationship both in the broadest of senses of “a fundamental social context through which cultural reproduction-production takes place” (Bernstein, 2000: 3), and, in its more narrow sense, of a pedagogical practice involving teachers and learners. Dale (2008: 1) makes a similar point when he says that “...very basically, education is always part of what I call ‘the social contract’, the political goals of the wider society, its hegemonic project, to use a different terminology. I shall refer to the way education is organised to make its contribution to the social contract as the ontology of governance...[] and that governance always has a pedagogic element”. Governance as pedagogy refers to the consequences of the nature and form of the governance of education for identities and their social relations (op. Cit: 5). In examining the policies and programmes of the global agencies with regard to teachers and their work, we can also see a concern for governing in both these senses.

Three theoretical concepts from the work of Bernstein will be used to develop my analysis transformations in the governing of teachers in national territorial spaces (see also Robertson, 2012). These are the concepts of ‘field of symbolic control’, ‘classification’, and ‘framing’ (Bernstein, 1990, 2000). By ‘field of symbolic control’, Bernstein (1990: 134-35) means those agents and agencies who specialise in discursive codes which they dominate. In the case of teachers work, we can place here those agents and agencies who shape teacher policies and regulate teacher practices through the ways in which they determine what is thinkable and doable. I will be arguing that the denationalisation of teachers’ work reflects a recalibration in power relation over the discursive codes in the field of symbolic control.

Bernstein (2000) refers to the what, who, and how of governing using the concepts of ‘classification’ and ‘framing’. By ‘classification’ Bernstein (2000: 6) means ‘the what and who’ of the social division of labour; for instance, the qualified teacher, assistant teacher, Headteacher, Ministry official, and so on. Each of these categories has a particular identity, voice, and consciousness produced through governing. ‘Framing’ (Bernstein, 2000: 12) is concerned with who controls what; in other words, whether the transmitter as opposed to the acquirer (who) has control over the criteria for realising particular practices (what). For instance, do teachers (as acquirers) claim professional expertise and therefore the right to determine the rules for realising classroom practices, or do the transmitters (such as the national state or international agencies) strongly frame teacher policies in turn limiting the possibilities for interpretation and enactment? These three concepts by Bernstein will be used as a means for looking at whether or not we can detect changing relations of power and control regarding teachers, the state, and international agencies over teachers and their work over time and space, and what this means for politics and democratic accountability.

Mundy (2007) argues two mechanisms of global governance were key in the post World War II period: ‘education as development’ as a goal for modernising societies, and ‘standard setting’. These two mechanisms were aimed at promoting nation-state-building projects in the post World War II period: supporting the expansion and development of education in newly developed states of the south (via UN Declaration of Human Rights and the mandate of United Nations Education SCO), and coupling these emerging states’ trajectories to the developmentalist timeline of modernisation and its *telos* modernity (Ferguson, 2007: 188). The international organisations thus helped to structure a normative understanding of what educational development should be (levels, inputs,

processes), and in tandem with bilateral agencies and a weak international federation of teacher unions and associations, sought to spur the development of education globally, modelled on the western world.

So what was the role of the global agencies with regard to teachers during this period? The World Bank's attitude was largely framed by their approach to financing education for development beginning in the early 1960s. From the start, the Bank's interest in financing education was viewed with a great deal of scepticism, not only as it represented a departure from work being carried out by the Bank, but also because it was viewed as a debilitating form of consumption, if not "a bottomless pit" (Jones, 2007: 32-33). The Bank was soon guided in its decisions about education by the new economics of education, and in particular the view that education could be seen as an investment opportunity in 'human capital'. By way of contrast with the World Bank, UNESCO argued that education and culture mattered, and that education should be mobilised to foster a unifying global culture. UNESCO, therefore, took a much wider view of education for development. To this end, UNESCO tactically supported the promotion of human rights, and championed the 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and fundamental education in an effort to drive up levels of literacy. UNESCO thus came to be associated with an explicit normative project in education around the idea of 'universality'. It was also an important standard-setting arm of the United Nations (Jones and Coleman, 2005: 53).

As standard setter, UNESCO was able to develop considerable expertise in education, with education planning a particular strength. With Bank funding it also set up a statistics branch—the UNESCO Division of Statistics—used to inform education development activities around the right to education. The main objective here was to provide Member States with internationally comparable data in order to help them plan and develop national education and literacy programmes (Cusso and D'Amico, 2005: 202). And whilst the fundamental assumption was that the rest of the world would develop using a western model of education, national states and their teachers were encouraged to emulate other systems. As Cusso and D'Amico (2005: 200) argue, UNESCO tended to respect the diversity of national education systems, and did not publish rankings of countries based on statistical indicators, although technically these would have been possible. The locus of power and authority continued to lay with the Westphalian state (Sassen, 2006).

This can be seen in the ILO/UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers, which was adopted on 5th October 1966 (ILO/UNESCO 2008: 8). In 146 paragraphs divided into 13 sections, the Recommendation set out the rights and responsibilities of teachers, including international standards for their initial preparation and further education, recruitment, employment, teaching and learning conditions, security of tenure, disciplinary procedures, participation in education decision-making, and so on.

...[T]eaching should be regarded as a profession: it is a form of public service which requires of teachers, expert knowledge and specialised skills, acquired and maintained through rigorous and continuing stud...teachers should enjoy academic freedom in the discharge of professional duties to include the choice and selection of teaching materials...and that their salaries should reflect the importance to society of the teaching function... (2008: 8).

However, these guidelines were to be the basis of a 'national' dialogue between teachers and national educational authorities and unions regarding teaching as a profession, in turn shaping national laws and practice. As a global Recommendation (unlike a Declaration), it was neither subject to national ratification and nor did it have national signatories. In Bernstein's (2000) terms, it was strongly classified in that it held a view of teachers with distinctive claims to identity and authority.

However, it was weakly framed in that national settings (teachers, unions, education departments) were able to significantly shape, and realise, their own conceptions of the good teacher. Connell (2009: 215-16) points out that in the post-war period (until the 1990s), it was possible to identify a range of different conceptions of the good teacher around the globe; from the developmental state model in Australia where direct bureaucratic control was exercised over teachers, to indirect forms of rule over teachers to be found in countries like the United Kingdom (Lawn and Grace, 1987). A burst of other possibilities emerged in the 1960s and 70s for teachers as professionals, such as the reflexive practitioner, the critical pedagogue, the teacher as scholar, and so on. These experiments were the outcome of strong currents of humanist, progressive, and civil rights interests which were advanced throughout the 1960s and 70s not only in the so-called developed economies, but more widely. However, by the early 1970s, these progressive currents were soon challenged by the stalling of economic growth, the worst economic crisis since the 1930s (Hobsbawm, 1994; Harvey, 2005), and the later advance of neo-liberalism as a political project.

Neoliberalism and the Governance of Teachers

The advance of neo-liberalism as a counter-hegemonic project, and its subsequent materialisation in globally-facing competition-states, reorganised public sectors to operate like quasi-markets, new forms of private authority, the construction of an education services sector open to trade, and an expanded agenda for international agencies, both challenged the transformed public sector education systems, and important features of teachers' work and workplaces (Smyth et al, 2000; Robertson, 2000; Connell, 2009; Compton and Weiner, 2008; Ball, 2007). By the early 1990s, it was possible to see deep and far reaching changes to teachers' work and in their workplaces in those countries that had fervently embraced market liberalism. Not only was the basis of teachers' professional expertise challenged, but those within the system were faced with an escalating set of demands around accountability, standards and performance. The net effect was to discourage high quality applicants from entering teaching, or once in the system, to quicken their exit.

I do not want to imply that neo-liberalism was an inevitable, or uncontested, political project. Rather, as Peck (2010) shows, there were major differences amongst neo-liberals; between the idealist Chicagoans (led by Hayek, later to become the Chicago School led by Friedman) and the more pragmatic, European ordo-liberals. These differences centred on where to draw the line between the state and the market (Peck, 2010: 67). For as Peck (2010: 65) argues, neo-liberalism's curse has always been that it can live neither with, nor without, the state. The problem for liberal economists was how to deal with the fact that competitive free markets nevertheless tend to create monopolies, and that it is only the state who is able to legitimately introduce and regulate the conditions for competition. This did not stop the Chicago School from enthusiastically embracing the free market (arguing for minimal regulation by the state) as a means of organising social and economic life. The ordo-liberals preferred a more humanist form of the market, rooted in an understanding that the full capacities of the market could only be realised through their embedding in a robust legal and social order. These distinctions within neo-liberalism are important, for we will see when we look at governing teachers' work, that whilst, for example, the World Bank Group tends to view education problems and their solutions within a free market framework, the OECD's is predominantly an ordo-liberal outlook in that it keeps open a role for the state in managing the market.

However, as we will also see with the neoliberalisation of teachers' workplaces, neo-liberal projects tend to 'fail forward' (Peck, 2010: 6). What Peck means by this is that the manifest inadequacies of

neo-liberalism tend to result in further rounds of neo-liberal intervention, of de- and re-regulation, of flows, backflows, and undercurrents, aided by flanking mechanisms that create layerings and over-layerings (Peck, 2010: 17). As a consequence, the actually existing worlds of neo-liberalism are “...not pristine spaces of market rationality and constitutional order; they are institutionally cluttered places marked by experimental but flawed systems of governance, cumulative problems of social fallout, and serial market failure” (Peck, 2010: 31).

Teachers have and continue to live in these ‘actually existing’ worlds of neo-liberalising education systems that were being transformed by the “different vectors, movements, and oscillations” (Peck, 2010: xvii) of neo-liberal projects and flanking mechanisms, including choice, vouchers, charters, devolved governance, global rankings, privatisation, public-private partnerships, management-by-audit, self-management, and scenarios for the future reorganisation of education—the list goes on. Teachers also experienced a range of neo-liberal social interventions, and were confronted with their failures and fallout: reduced teacher wages, difficulties recruiting teachers, significant attrition from the teaching profession, under-chosen schools leading to closure, high stress teaching and learning environments, and high stakes testing (Zeichner, 2007: 495; MacBeath, 2012).

From early 2000 onward the OECD had become increasingly concerned with the emerging issues within the teaching profession, and their implications for pupil performance and the realisation of competitive knowledge economies. Yet their response was not to put neoliberalism on notice, but to argue that teachers’ work and workplaces needed to be renovated so as to generate 21st Century Schools learners. In a series of reports, the OECD (2005, 2007) pointed to major problems such as teacher shortages, teachers without teaching qualification, high teacher turnover rates, and poor teacher professional development. By 2007, the OECD had launched a major governing project, the *Teaching and Learning International Survey* (TALIS)—a data-gathering and benchmarking project on teachers around the world which now joins the OECD’s *Program of International Student Assessment* (PISA) as an instrument for governing teachers, students, and national education systems. By 2010, the World Bank had launched its own teacher assessment and accountability instrument, SABER-Teacher, placing it into competition with the OECD and the ILO/UNESCO Recommendations for Teachers. In the following section, I review these two new governing projects, arguing that the OECD and the World Bank have used the crisis in teachers work and workplace as a means legitimate its increased power in the field of symbolic control. Whilst these technologies of rule are still in their infancy, the OECD has had some experience in finessing the nature of the discursive codes over time. Given, too, that the World Bank is likely to face increased hostility because of their unrelenting commitment to Hayekian/Friedmanite neoliberalism, on the one hand, and crude representation of teachers as lazy and ineffective, on the other, this may well strengthen the influence of the OECD in the field of symbolic control.

The OECD, World Bank, and Teachers’ Work—A Synchronic Account

In this section I now lay out the basis of a synchronic account of the transformations in teachers’ work. I begin first with OECD who in 2002 launched a major project reviewing teacher policy, drawing in 25 member states who committed substantial resources (OECD, 2005: 3). A final report, *Teachers Matter*, was published in 2005. This placed teachers’ work, and the question of policy to regulate teachers, high on national agendas. Arguing that “[t]his OECD project provides probably the most comprehensive analysis ever undertaken of teacher policy issues at the international level...” (ibid) and that participating countries could learn from each other through “...sharing innovative and successful initiatives, and to identify policy options for attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers...” (ibid)—the report was a reaction to wider issues surrounding teacher

recruitment (image and status of teachers), the composition of the workforce (growing discipline issues amongst male students, academically weaker students entering teaching), the unequal geographic distribution of good teachers, declining salaries amongst teachers, and a limited incentive structures that might recognise and reward good teachers.

In reviewing the response of Member States to the OECD's *Teachers Matter* policy, Connell (2009: 214) argues that whilst this agenda might suggest that governments might invest more resources into education systems, this was not the reality.

What *has* happened in Australia, as in other wealthy countries, is the construction of an imposing new apparatus of certification and regulation for teachers. Statutory institutes have been created, and given the task of defining minimum standards for entry into school teaching; and the way they do this is already impacting on university teacher education programmes. They also have the task of defining more advanced levels of teacher quality—a key point on the Business Council's agenda—and the way they do this is likely to be a powerful influence on schools in the next generation.

Connell (2009: 214) argues an important outcome of the 'Teaching Matters' policy initiative is it refashioned what was meant by the good teacher—to be competent teacher—. Important too was the way 'the good teacher' is reclassified (as the competent teacher) and strongly framed (that is, that the elements that make up the competent teacher are highly specified) by the OECD.

TALIS is the OECD's instrument for promoting a reframing of teacher policy and practice inside national territorial borders. As argued earlier, TALIS emerged out of the OECD's teacher policy project and *Teachers' Matter* report. The OECD states TALIS is the result of collaboration between member states and the OECD. It also has engaged the Trade Union Advisory Council that sits within the OECD, and advises on labour issues. A first round of reporting took place in 2008 on 24 countries (17 OECD countries; 7 non-member countries). A second, more extensive, round of data collected from more than 30 countries/regions will report as TALIS 2013 in 2014. Only Mexico and Chile overlap between the SABER-Teachers and TALIS. Unlike SABER-Teachers which I will elaborate upon shortly, TALIS collects data from teachers and head-teachers regarding their views on their learning environment and working conditions in schools. The questions range over school leadership, mechanisms for the reward of teachers, professional development, and teaching practices and beliefs. The questionnaires are thus translations of policy priorities.

Drawing Bernstein (1990, 2000), we can see that TALIS strongly classifies and frames the good teacher as a competent, continuous learner; from collaborations in teaching to ensure learning from colleagues to engagement professional development, and systems of appraisal and self-development. Taken together, these elements illustrate a shift away from 'education as development' to a 'learning as development' paradigm. But it also gains its power (reach/intensity) from the ways in which competitive comparison can leverage space, time, and a development trajectory. While TALIS is low on hierarchy in that there are no composite figures ranking one country above another, its temporal sequencing (regular data collection/expanded repertoire), its development trajectory, and capacity to link to other ranking technologies such as PISA, give the OECD greater leverage over governing teachers within national territorial boundaries, and in ways that connect teachers to global imaginaries agendas, trans-boundary networks, and new formations (Sassen, 2003, 2006). Its level of buy-in by member and non-member states (with the US joining TALIS 2013), and capacity to legitimate itself by arguing that the unions have been central to the

process via the Trade Union Advisory Council¹ to the OECD (OECD, 2008), suggests fewer frictions than those confronting the World Bank's SABER-Teacher programme. That Education International (EI), which emerged out of the two opposing federations in 1993 (now representing 400 unions, 170 countries and 30 million teachers), has been drawn into the creation of this global mechanism via the TUAC, also highlights the ways in which EI could be seen as incorporated into the global governance agendas for teachers on terms that are being driven by the OECD.

The OECD project 2008 *Teaching and Learning International Survey* (TALIS) was spearheaded by the OECD's Indicators and Analysis Division (IAD), under the direction of Andreas Schleicher. TALIS is also a collaboration between member-states of the OECD, and non-members. The first round of TALIS data collection took place in 2008 on 24 countries (17 OECD countries; 7 non-member countries). A second, more extensive, round of data is being collected from more than 30 countries/regions to be reported as 'TALIS 2013' in 2014. TALIS 2008 reports on data collected from 20 teachers teaching lower secondary school (level 2 of the 1997 revision of the International Classification of Education—ISCED 97) in 200 schools for each country participating in the survey. In the first design of the survey, options were presented to the participating countries, which included surveying a representative sample of teachers of 15 year olds who took part in PISA 2006—the Program of International Student Assessment (PISA) also run by the IAD (OECD 2009: 20).

In order to see the 'who' and 'what' of classification and framing, we need to look at the TALIS survey instruments as particular kinds of pedagogic devices. Broadly, TALIS 2008 collects data on: (1) the role and functioning of the head teacher; (2) how teachers' work is appraised and the feedback they receive; (3) teacher professional development; and (4) teachers' beliefs and attitudes about teaching. First, we can see the shift to 'learning as (individual) development' through their focus with various kinds of learning: ongoing professional learning, self reflection, feedback, and so on. We can also see from the discussion of the indices in the Annex (OECD, 2009: 268-275) the pedagogic principles at work. Teachers are asked to respond to a series of questions, for instance around teachers' beliefs, indicating how strongly (1 = strongly disagree; 4=strong agree) they agree with the statement. In relation to teacher beliefs, there are 2 opposing indices: direct transmission (the implication here is a bad teacher) or constructivism (the implication here is a good teacher). Here the OECD (2009: 269) states: "In short, constructivist beliefs are characterised by a view of the teacher as a facilitator of learning with more autonomy given to students whereas a direct transmission view sees the teacher as the instructor, providing information and demonstrating solutions". In other words, the competent teacher facilitates the learning of the pupil through 'making knowledge', whilst direct transmission approaches to learning are conceptualised as 'taking knowledge'. That teachers are likely to need a combination of pedagogies depending on what needs to be taught is not thinkable in this framing.

But there is an important ontological and epistemological anchor which is central to the OECD's pedagogical project; that of constructivism. A central tenet of constructivism is that reality does not exist independently of the subjects who seek it. In other words, there is no other independent, pre-existing world (Olssen, 1996: 275). And as Olssen comments, "...it is not for the constructivists the objective world that limits or constrains what can be experienced or known" (ibid: 279). Constructivism as an epistemology thus presents all kinds of issues for teachers and assessment, particularly when we might see it as the teacher's duty to structure learning environments that

¹ The Trade Union Advisory Council (TUAC) to the OECD was formed in 1948 as the trade union advisory committee to the European recovery programme, the Marshall Plan. When the OECD was finally established in 1962, morphing out of the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation, the TUAC continued its work of representing unions in industrialised countries (affiliates come from 58 national trade unions) (OECD, 2008).

facilitate the process of learning, which the society (and not the student) regards as having the greatest robustness. However, the attraction of constructivism for the OECD is that it fits with the ontology of neo-liberalism, of liberalism's concern for the individual. Teachers engaged in direct transmission are described as 'those who demonstrate the correct way to solve a problem', and who believe 'a quiet classroom is generally needed for effective learning'. The constructivist (read competent) teacher believes 'the role of the teacher is to facilitate students' own enquiry', and 'thinking and reasoning processes are more important than specific curriculum content'. In other words, the teachers' pedagogic practices that are presumed to materialise the competent learner for a knowledge-based economy places limits the acquisition of scientific or disciplinary knowledge. It can be argued, therefore, that a constructivist teacher pedagogy, with its over-emphasis on agency and 'social knowledge' as opposed to 'disciplinary' or 'scientific knowledge' (Rata, 2011: 2), links the wider political project of neoliberalism to the emerging social base of production— the permanent, uncritical, learner for the competitive knowledge economy. More importantly, a constructivist teacher' pedagogy does not provide the resources for learners that might enable them to engage in critical reflection and political critique.

There is also a further contradiction facing the authority of the OECD and its claim to expert knowledge on teacher policies, pedagogies and successful education systems. The starkest counter evidence is presented by the case of Finland. In the OECD's PISA rankings, Finland ranks number one for student performance. However, the key elements the OECD proposes for teacher policies and high performing schools are absent in Finland. More than this, Finland is also a high-growth economy, leading ex-World Bank staffer, Pasi Sahlberg (2007, 2010, 2011), to argue that successful economies such as Finland are successful precisely as they have completely different teacher policies to those favoured by the OECD. Finnish teachers spend fewer hours in class teaching than the OECD average, have considerable personal autonomy, are not engaged in formal systems of teacher evaluation, and do not receive merit pay. This has caused the OECD to alter its 'lesson learning' strategy through deploying the expertise of Pearson Education—the world's largest education firm (Ball, 2012: 124-28) in marketing education products and services. A series of 'successful performer' videos (including Singapore, Poland, Ontario/Canada and Brazil) each carry rather different stories about how to build high performing schools (Pearson Foundation, 2012). However, this has the effect of weakening the strength of the classification of 'high performing schools' because the rules for realisation are made more open regarding which message the acquirer wants to take. This presents the OECD with a paradox in that it cannot fully control the outcomes of its own pedagogic practices. Added to this, evidence from its data gathering activities (the place of Finland on PISA/Finland does not deploy any of the tools of the global reform movement) causes a weakening of the insulation that keeps the category of successful school/good teacher/high student performer in place.

The World Bank has also advanced a strong agenda around modernising the school arguing that this is important for the development of knowledge-based economies. The World Bank Report, *Lifelong Learning for the Global Knowledge Economy* [LLGKE] (2003) sets out the account of the kinds of challenges knowledge economies present for education and training systems. Schools and teachers pose particular problems for the Bank, in large part because teachers are seen as unionised and resisting change, and education systems are viewed as steeped in an organisational model of development that limit its capacity to respond to the wider challenges posed by globalising knowledge economies. The Bank's redesign of education favours a Hayekian free market model. However, it is also mindful its earlier attempts at privatisation in the 1980s were particularly controversial. It has instead turned to Public-Private-Partnerships (PPPs) as an umbrella for advancing an agenda around state-funded vouchers and private sector provision (Lewis and Patrinos 2012).

In their 2011 report, *Making Schools Work* (Bruns et al, 2011), the Bank dedicates a lengthy Chapter Four (more than 60 pages) to the challenge of teacher accountability. A key argument is that education policymakers wishing to recruit, or 'groom', great teachers to raise the overall levels of learning amongst pupils confront the reality of education systems where there are weak or no incentives to alter performance. The Report states: "The vast majority of education systems are characterised by fixed salary schedules, lifetime job tenure, and flat labour hierarchies, which create rigid labor environments where extra effort, innovation and good results are not rewarded" (p. 142). Criticising the years of service/credential basis or teacher salaries and promotion they argue: "The clear implication of available research is that most schools are recruiting and rewarding teachers for the wrong things, failing to encourage the capacities and behaviours that contribute most directly to student learning results, and unable to sanction ineffective performance" (p. 143). A further issue emerges: the levels of expenditure on education and the percentage of this allocated to teacher salaries.

Developing countries today spend an average of 5% of GDP on education, and many countries are on track to increase this. The impact of this investment on their subsequent economic growth hangs largely on how they use the 4 percent of GDP (80 percent of total education spending) that goes to pay teachers. In a growing number of countries, the drive to improve student learning outcomes is translated into creative and sometimes radical policy reforms aimed at changing the incentives for teachers (p. 143).

The solution? Teachers should be paid, not by formal recognition of qualifications, or type of service, or geographic location; rather, they should be placed on contracts for specified periods of employment, with pay tied to student performance, thus establishing a link between teachers' employment conditions and accountability for results. Yet there is considerable variation amongst teachers in influencing learning, and many causes for this, ranging from teacher style to organisational issues, class size, and wider social and economic factors, a point that the OECD work on teachers recognises (OECD, 2005). Pinning teacher pay to student performance establishes a link that suggests it is possible to distil that dimension of teacher performance that makes a difference, and that teachers are in control of this.

The question of teacher's pay structures and incentives linked to quality and outcomes is a major issue on policy agendas, with sharp differences of opinion and preferred research evidence between commentators. Charter Schools in the US have provided an interesting 'laboratory' for generating evidence, as teachers employed by Charter Schools typically work on very different contracts to those in the public sector, and viewed by the Bank as worthy of emulation. Charter School teachers are on individually negotiated contracts, they are non-unionised, and not tied to tenure. Johnson and Landman (2000) studied the experiences of teachers in six deregulated schools in the US—two state-sponsored charter schools, two in-district charter schools, and two public school-based management schools—all located in Boston and serving similar groups of students. Based on interviews with teachers and principals, supplemented by document analysis and informal observations, they concluded that the most autonomous schools—charter schools—are not necessarily the schools that enterprising teachers favour. Teachers in these schools voiced concerns about important features of their workplace—the scope and definition of their responsibilities, their role in school design and governance, their right to raise complaints and resolve problems, and assurances of job security and predictable pay. A longitudinal study of pupil performance in Charter Schools released in 2010 (CREDO, 2010) suggests that student outcomes are not necessarily likely to be better, despite the fact that many of the teachers in these schools are on untenured contracts. The CREDO study offers a group portrait that shows wide variation in performance. The study

reveals that though 17 % of Charter Schools nationwide provide superior education opportunities for their students; 50% have results that are no different from the local public school options; and 37 %, deliver results that are significantly worse than had these students remained in traditional public schools.

This led Harvard academic Susan Moore Johnson to argue for a different set of proposals around teacher salary structures that are not tied to student outputs but, rather, a career-based plan aimed at teacher development (Johnson and Papay, 2010). Interestingly, in a presentation by the Finnish Ministry of Education to an OECD meeting in Japan in 2011, the Director General pointed out that though Finland scores the highest on the OECD's PISA studies, and where their results are regarded as attributable to the quality of their teachers, teachers have less class time than the OECD average, have considerable professional autonomy, and teachers have a post-graduate degree. However, as the Director General pointed out, the Finnish system *does not* (their emphasis) use teacher evaluation, merit pay, census-based standardised tests, or ranked schools (Sahlberg, 2011; see also Grek, 2009).

Despite this kind of evidence, the World Bank's Education Sector Strategy 2020 Report (2011) notes that over the next decade, the Bank will be further developing a System Assessment and Benchmarking for Education Results (SABER) programme that will generate comprehensive information on education policies across the world. The basic contours of this knowledge driven development model has already been established by the Bank, and, indeed, represented a significant component of Bank funding to education over the period 1998-2009.

The objective of the World Bank's SABER-Teachers project launched in 2010 is to collect quantitative data on teacher policies, to synthesise the results, and to use these for decision-making in improving education (World Bank, 2011). SABER-Teachers strongly classifies the 'good teacher' (defined by 10 core policy goals), and uses strong framing rules by specifying 10 core teacher policy areas, the specific questions to be asked in each of these areas, and evaluative/moral developmental trajectory—'latent', 'emerging', 'established', 'mature'—to determine the extent to which the rules for realisation of the competent teacher are in place. Detailed questions about the terms and conditions of teachers' labour include: "Is participation in professional development compulsory? What is the burden of teacher compensation? What labor rights do teachers enjoy?" and "Are there monetary sanctions for teacher absenteeism?" These are surely political and economic questions around the use and exchange value of teachers' work, as well as signalling a growing level of surveillance over teachers and their time at work. There is also a strong moral and therefore cultural project at work as a result of the comparisons that will be made between countries, and between teachers. Countries will be compared with each other and will be able to learn from each other, whilst the evaluative/moral developmental trajectory provides both direction and levers for change. The focus is argued to be on the 'facts' of policy rather than teachers' 'experience' of policy—yet teachers will experience the outcomes of the changes that will ensure, and live in the worlds, that emerge as a result.

A diverse array of countries (13) were involved in the first round of SABER-Teachers data collection in 2010—from Chile and Djibouti, to Egypt, Guatemala, and New Zealand. Whilst some of these countries are recipients of Bank aid, countries such as New Zealand have in the past been assigned the status of a laboratory for World Bank structural adjustment policies (Peck, 2010). A range of logics is at work as to who signs up to the project, and why. Yet, it also raises a wider set of issues for the Bank regarding its longer term capacity to govern teachers globally. Its dependence on client states (rather than member states), its thinned legitimacy as a result of wider concerns over the Bank's activities in education, a commitment to market-liberalism in education which is not

welcomed in many countries, its evident dislike of teacher unions and embrace of individual incentives, concerns over the link between aid and outcomes, and potential competition with the OECD's instruments may limit the geographical reach of this instrument, at least as a mechanism of global governance. Yet, where it is able to link aid to changes in policy concerning teachers, it will likely have major effects on the sector, including undesirable ones.

The World Bank's SABER-Teachers project (World Bank, 2011) uses strong classification of the 'good teacher' (defined by 8 core policy goals), and strong framing in terms of specifying 10 core teacher policy areas, as well as an evaluative/moral developmental trajectory— 'latent', 'emerging', 'established', 'mature'—to determine status and direction for change. Countries will be compared with each other, whilst the evaluative/moral developmental trajectory provides both direction and levers for change. Key sample questions are provided to illustrate different teacher policy dimensions; for instance: "What is the burden of teacher compensation?" "What labor rights do teachers enjoy?" and "Are there monetary sanctions for teacher absenteeism?" The focus will be on the 'facts' of policy rather than teachers' 'experience' of policy. The Bank will also use its own organisational structures and consultants to gather data (World Bank 2011: 27), giving it significant control over the ongoing use and refinement of the system.

Teachers' Work, Denationalisation and Transformations in the Field of Symbolic Control

In this chapter I have argued that the global governance of teachers' work is not new in that it is possible to identify strongly classified, but weakly framed, mechanisms of governing in national and sub-national territorial states through standard setting and education development agendas over the period 1960-1990. This is entirely consistent with arguments made by writers like Sassen (2006: 12) who point out that in the post World War 2 Bretton Woods period, we witnessed significant processes of extending beyond the boundaries of the national state. However this extension, broadly referred to as 'internationalisation', tended to reinforce, rather than weaken, national territorial boundaries. The processes that emerged from the 1980s onward, broadly referred to as globalisation, are however radically different. Nevertheless as she also argues, "...the critical capacities for international governance and operations were developed in that process, which eventually become relogged into novel global assemblages" (Sassen, 2006: 12).

Similarly, with regard to teachers' work; the post-war technologies of governing have now been transformed into 'learning as development' whilst statistics are now used as a means of compiling, comparing, learning and performing what it means to be a globally successful school and teacher. And despite UNESCO's hesitation regarding comparing countries using statistics, it has also moved further in the direction being promoted by the OECD and the World Bank; of 'competitive comparison' (Robertson, 2012).

From the late 1990s onwards, we can see a significant transformation in the field of symbolic control, with the global agencies strongly classifying and framing conceptions of the good teacher to be realised in national education settings. In particular the statistical capabilities and augmenting projects of the OECD's Indicators and Analysis Division has placed it in a unique position to advance this project. However, the OECD's recent collaboration with the global education consulting firm, Pearson Education, will also inject significant funds and new forms of private authority into what was an intergovernmental set of relations and projects. UNESCO, the OECD, World Bank Group, and ILO, all now collect, manage, evaluate, and represent, statistical data on teachers' work. These newer mechanisms of global governance now sit alongside the ILO/UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Teachers passed in 1966—yet they encourage different kinds of conversations and

engagements precisely as they have different logics of intervention as well as spatial and temporal politics.

In drawing upon my analysis of in the previous sections, we can discern four distinct, though not disconnected, denationalising processes at work which are reconstituting the field of symbolic control over the governance of teachers. Concretely, these denationalising tendencies have the potential to further recalibrate the power and control of the global agencies, though I will argue that this process is both uneven, and contested. These processes include the invocation of a global imaginary of both shared risk and a shared future; the emergence of new forms of transboundary relations which further erode the national; the relationally interconnected nature of global teacher learning, and the rise of new forms of private authority that sits beyond national spaces of representation and democratic accountability.

To begin, the invocation of 'risk' - of not having a 'modernised' teacher workforce fit for the 21st Century, where teachers' use of properly weighed evidence and facilitate the social knowledges of the students in ways that make a difference to the performance of every student - is linked to the project of realising 'world class' education systems for a globally competitive knowledge-based economy. That each country's investments in education and its teachers is about a future to be imagined, materialised and managed by global agencies like the OECD and the World Bank, aims to stand as the necessarily legitimation for why power and control should be relocated. Furthermore, this shift is not behind the backs of national governments. Rather, (some) national governments have signed on, funded, as well as facilitated, the collection of data, though clearly somewhat nervous about what different data-sets might reveal, and how these might be managed politically. Yet we also see here too the limits placed on agencies, such as the World Bank, in having the capability to realise its ambition of controlling teachers through its determination of teacher policies. The Hayekian/Friedmanite neoliberal ideology that has shaped the worldview of its key advisors, a small epistemic community of economists of education, has never been able to exert the kind of influence on national governments that it would like (Mundy and Menashy, 2012). That this is the case, and that there are differences of view within Bank over its policies and practices, could be politically exploited by critics.

Second, denationalisation processes are given direction, velocity and effect through the ways in which new, trans-boundary, relations between teachers, teacher policy advocates, and continuing professional development providers are created and reinforced. Processes of reboundarying, or rebordering, are both the object and outcome of political projects aimed at weakening existing borders and their enclosed social activity and social relations (Robertson, 2011). Neoliberalism, as a political project, has had at its core objective the selective elimination of boundaries around the movement of goods, services and finances at the level of the nation. Linking together systems, teachers, and students, across national divides through large data-sets, breaks down national statistical and accounting systems. The global specification of what statistics to be collected, how, when, in what time frames, as opposed to composing global statistics from national data bases, is an example here. Similarly, drawing teachers into global narratives, video resources, and opportunities for more global learning, reworks the nationally-bounded nature of teachers' work and the notion of the good teacher.

Third, the relationally interconnected nature of globalising teacher learning in national settings through competitive comparison (Robertson, 2012) undermines the notion of a national or a sub-national workforce. Competitive comparison's reach as a global tool is enabled by the ways in which hierarchical space, temporal rhythms, evaluative trajectories and scale are mobilised as complex modalities of power. As a powerful spatial framer and lever for allocating status, it pitches one

country and its teachers against another in terms of a global hierarchical ordering of performers and underperformers. Through ratcheting up the temporal dimension to comparison, such as regular cycles of data collection, a new horizon for performance is targeted. This uses a horizontal place for comparison – over time - where one can learn to do better the next time, and the time after (or not), whilst keeping sufficient tension within the system. An evaluative/moral dynamic provides the basis of judging where a country lies on each teacher policy area—from ‘not present’, to ‘fully developed’, as we can see in the World Bank’s work. Countries and teachers are to learn from this evaluative element about how to more properly act in ways specified by this framing of the good teacher. Embedding the governing strategy in national, regional and global projects, in turn amplifies its effects, and therefore power. These global governing technologies are manifestations of a transformation in the field of symbolic control, in turn shifting sovereignty and authority away from the national and the teacher, to the global and global actors. Yet, at the same time, these projects are neither uniform in their classification and framings, nor likely materialisation in teacher practices.

Finally, a key outcome of this new denationalising global dynamic is the ways in which the field of symbolic control is opened up to new forms of private authority, such as private consulting firms, corporate philanthropists and consultants. However, they exercise significant power in the reshaping teachers’ work in the absence of public accountability mechanisms. The OECD argues that Education International, the global teacher education union, has given its approval to the development of TALIS. Yet, how is Education International accountable in any democratic way to the classroom teachers that it is representing? What processes are in place for nationally-located teachers to represent their claims and issues? And what of McKinsey & Company, or Pearson Education, whose responsibilities are to their shareholders and not teachers? Ironically teachers are visibly absent as professionals who have expertise, despite their noted visibility.

The denationalisation of teachers work that is currently underway has resulted in the globalising of nationally-oriented capabilities aimed to shift the weight of gravity in the field of symbolic control in the direction of global agencies such as the OECD and the World Bank. Like all political projects, however, the outcomes will always be contingent, contested and open to transformation. That we can too easily see the frictions, fissures, and failures in cohering logics at the level of discourse, let alone practice, suggests that these projects might well be stalled as much by their evident hubris as well as the air of nervousness that seems to be present with the rapid growth of private authority in these processes. However what is important is enrolling classroom teachers in these debates. There is a lot to play for, and a lot to be lost. For if teachers are central to the learning and lives of students, helping teachers develop the capabilities to make a big global noise about a very big global issue is high priority. This is particularly as the kinds of teacher knowledge proposed, and working conditions, are deeply depoliticising.

References

- Barber, M. and Mourshed, M., (2007) *How the World’s Best-Performing Schools Come out on Top*, McKinsey & Company.
- Bennell, P. (2005) The impact of the AIS epidemic on teachers in Sub-Saharan Africa, *Journal of Development Studies*, 41 (3), pp. 440-66.
- Bernstein, B. (1990) *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse: Class, Codes and Control*, London and New York: Routledge.

- Bernstein, B. (2000) *Pedagogy, Symbolic control, and Identity: theory, research, critique*, (Revised Edition), Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (2009) *Working with Teachers to Develop Fair and Reliable Measures of Effective Teaching*, Seattle, USA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.
- Bruns, B. Filmer, D. and Patrinos, H. (2011) *Making Schools Work: New Evidence on Accountability Reforms*, Washington: The World Bank Group.
- Buchanan, J. and Tullock, G. (1962). *The Calculus of Consent*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Buchanan, J and Wagner, R. (1977) *Democracy in Deficit*, New York: Academic Press.
- Compton, M. and Weiner, L. (2008) *The Global Assault on Teachers, Teaching and their Unions*, New York: Palgrave.
- Connell, R. (2009) Good teachers on dangerous ground: toward a new view of teacher quality and professionalism, *Critical Studies in Education*, 50 (3), pp. 213-229.
- CREDO, (2010) *Multiple Choice for Charter Schools*, Stanford: University of Stanford.
- Cusso, R. and D'Amica, (2005) From development comparison to globalization comparison: towards more normative international education statistics, *Comparative Education*, 41 (2), pp. 119-216.
- Dale, R. (2008) *Educational governance as ontology and pedagogy: new approaches to the impasse of educational reform for democracy and the social justice*, GES Working Paper, University of Bristol, August.
- Ferguson, J. (2007) *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Gewirtz, S. Ball, S. and Bowe, R. (1995) *Markets, Choice and Equity in Education*, Basingstoke: Open University Press.
- EFA Global Monitoring Report (2009) *Overcoming Inequality; Why Governance Matters*, Paris: UNESCO.
- Grek, S. (2009) Governing by numbers: the PISA 'effect' in Europe, *Journal of Education Policy*, 24 (1), pp. 23-37.
- Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1994) *Age of Extremes: the Short Twentieth Century, 1914-1991*, London: Abacus.
- Hursh, D. (2005) The growth of high stakes testing in the USA: accountability, markets and the decline of educational equality, *British Educational Research Journal*, 31 (5), pp. 605-22.
- ILO/UNESCO (2008) *The ILO/UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers (1966), and The UNESCO Recommendations concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel (1997) with a Users Handbook*, Paris: UNESCO.
- Johnson, S. and Papay, J. (2010) *Redesigning Teacher Pay: A System for the Next Generation of Educators*, Washington: Economic Policy Institute.
- Johnson, S. M. and Landman, M. (2000) Sometimes bureaucracy has its charms: the working conditions of teachers in deregulated schools, *Teachers College Record*, 100 (1) pp. 85-124.

- Jones P. and Coleman, J. (2005) *The United Nations and Education: Multilateralism, Development and Globalisation*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Jones, P. (2007) *World Bank Financing of Education: Lending, Learning and Development*, 2nd Edition, London and New York: Routledge
- Lawn, M. and Grace, G. (1987) *Teachers: The Culture and Politics of Work*, East Sussex, UK: Falmer Press.
- MacBeath, J. (2012) *Future of Teaching Profession*, Brussels: International Education.
- Mourshed, M. Chijioke, C. and Barber, M., (2010) *How the World's Most Improved Systems Keep Getting Better*, McKinsey & Company.
- Mundy, K. (2007) Global governance, educational change, *Comparative Education*, 43 (3), pp. 339-357.
- Mundy, K. and Menashy, F. (2012) *The World Bank and the Private Provision of K-12 Education: History, Policies, Politics*, Draft report for the Private Education Research Initiative, Open Society Institute.
- Novoa, A. (2011) Travelling, not arriving; an intellectual journey, in R. Sultana (ed.) *Educators of the Mediterranean...Up Close and Personal: Critical Voices from South Europe and the MENA Area*, Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- OECD (2008) *Labour and the OECD: the Role of the TUAC*, Policy Brief, Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2009) *Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments: First Results from TALIS*, OECD: Paris.
- OECD (2011) OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) TALIS 2013, Paris: OECD [at http://www.oecd.org/document/40/0,4746,en_2649 – last accessed 7th October, 2011].
- OECD, (2005) *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers*, Paris: OECD.
- Olssen, M. (1996) Radical constructivism and its failings: anti-realism and individualism, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 44 (3), pp. 275-95.
- Peck, J. (2010) *Constructions of Neoliberal Reason*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robertson, S. (2000) *A Class Act: Changing Teachers' Work, Globalisation and the State*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Robertson, S. (2005) Re-imagining and rescripting the future of education: global knowledge economy discourse and the challenge to education systems. *Comparative Education*, 41 (2), pp. 151-170.
- Robertson, S. (2011) The new spatial politics of (re)bordering and (re)ordering the state-education-citizen relation, *International Review of Education*, 57, pp. 277-297.
- Robertson, S. (2012 - forthcoming) Placing teachers in global governance agendas, *Comparative Education Review*, 56, (4), pp.
- Rata, E. (2011) The politics of knowledge in education, *British Educational Research Journal*, iFirst, pp. 1-22. [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2011.615388>

- Sahlberg, P. (2007), Education policies for raising student learning: the Finnish approach, *Journal of Education Policy*, 22 (2), pp. 147-71.
- Sahlberg, P. (2010) Rethinking accountability in a knowledge society, *Journal of Educational Change*, 11 (1), pp. 45-61.
- Sahlberg, P. (2011) *The Finnish Advantage: Good Teachers*, presentation to OECD Japan Government Seminar, Tokyo, June 28-29.
- Sassen, S. (2003) Globalization or denationalization? *Review of International Political Economy*, 10 (1), pp. 1-22.
- Sassen, S. (2006) *Territory, Authority, Rights*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Smyth, J. Dow, A. Hattam, R. Reid, A. and Shacklock, G. (2000) *Teachers' Work in a Globalizing Economy*, London and New York: Falmer.
- Stevenson, H. (2007) Restructuring teachers' work and trade union responses in England: bargaining for change, *American Educational Research Journal*, 44 (2) pp. 224-51.
- UIS (2006) *Teachers and Educational Quality: Monitoring Global Needs for 2015*, Montreal: UNESCO.
- World Bank (2003) *Lifelong Learning for a Global Knowledge Economy*, Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (2011a) *Learning for All: Investing in People's Knowledge and Skills to Promote Development, Education Sector 2020 Strategy Report*, Washington: The World Bank Group.
- World Bank (2011b) *SABER – Teachers, Objectives, Rationale, Methodological Approach and Products*, Washington: The World Bank Group.
- Zeichner, K. (2003) The adequacies and inadequacies of three current strategies to recruit, prepare and retain the best teachers for all students, *Teachers College Record*, 105 (3), pp. 490-519.