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...That's when a woman in New York...

...a man in Hobart...

...a child in Oslo

...a canary in Milan

...an old lady in Peru, a dolphin off the coast of Madagascar...

...all share the same anxiety and the same despair for the same reason at the same time...
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Education policy and globalization
Policy definitions

Policy is the ‘authoritative allocation of values’ (Easton, 1953).


‘[E]ducation policy analysis can no longer sensibly be limited to within the nation state – the fallacy of methodological territorialism … policy analysis must also extend its purview beyond the state and the role of multinational agencies and NGOs to include transnational business practices’. (Ball, 2012: 93); add philanthropies.
Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard and Henry (1997, pp.24-25):

‘In summary, then, we would stress that policy is much more than a specific policy document or text. Rather, policy is both process and product. In such a conceptualisation, policy involves the production of the text, the text itself, ongoing modifications to the text and processes of implementation into practice’.

Ball (1994, p.10):

‘Policy is both text and action, words and deeds, it is what is enacted as well as what is intended. Policies are always incomplete insofar as they relate to or map on to the ‘wild profusion’ of local practice’.

Policy; discourse, text, enactment.
Policy and Globalized Discourses


• Rizvi and Lingard (2010) make a distinction between the ‘space’ of global education policy discourses, the ‘space’ of policy production and the ‘place’ of policy implementation or enactment.

• Brennan (2006): space/place distinction with the former more abstract, the meaningless of distance and the latter more local, more concrete; Spatial turn in contemporary theory.
Beyond the place/space binary towards multiple geographies of power and policy

• ‘Place as local and space as global constitute ‘master categories’ that have dominated much of the research on the impact of globalization on local communities and places’ (Larsen and Beech, 2014, p.197).

• ‘…much globalization research has focused on how the national has mediated the global. In either case, the emphasis is on the global and the national (or local) with the latter conceptualised implicitly as a ‘place’ influenced by outside forces’ (Larsen and Beech, 2014, p.197);

• Globalization the ‘context of context’ (Peck et al., 2010).

• Need to move beyond this binary of place/space, local/global, national/international to understand the multiple geographies of power and policy within which schools and school systems are located; especially re text/discourse distinction in policy research.
New spatialities of globalization
Globalization and Education Policy: beyond ‘methodological nationalism’

- ‘Common world educational culture’, modernity (Meyer and colleagues, Stanford).
- Rescaling and rescaling of statehood and policy production (Brenner, in education, Dale and Roberson).
- The topological turn: multiple spatialities (Amin, Lury).
- Global education policy field: globalization as global infrastructures (Bourdieu, Sassen, Spivak, Lingard, Rizvi and Lingard, Lingard and Rawolle).
Common World Educational Culture: Stanford University, John Meyer and colleagues.

- Development of national education systems (schools, universities) can be explained by universal models of education, state and society (world models), not by specific national factors (Dale, 2000, p.428) – global policy convergence; cf modernity.

- Nation-states as embedded in world society, consisting of nation-states; institutional isomorphism e.g. the state, schools, universities.

- Linked to modernity: belief in: ‘the freedom of the human being’; ‘the human capacity to reason’; ‘the intelligibility of the world’ and ‘its amenability to human reason’ (Wagner, 2012, p.4); claim to universality of such knowledge; western modernity.

- Multiple modernities; multiple epistemologies (e.g. Connell, 2007).

- Dale (2000): juxtaposes CWEC with what he calls a ‘globally structured agenda for education’ (GSAE); a political economy approach.

- **Multiple globalizations**: what usually spoken about (neoliberal economy, weak state, liberal democracy, rule of law): political, globalization supported by G7; other globalizations; cf globalization from above and from below.

- De Sousa Santos (2006) adds power and geopolitics to equation: globalization a process definition: ‘is a set of unequal exchanges in which a certain artefact, condition, entity or local identity extends its influence beyond its local or national borders and, in so doing, develops an ability to designate as local another artefact, condition, entity or identity’ (de Sousa Santos, 2006, p.396).

- Globalization is always the ‘globalization of a particular globalism’ (p.396); ‘globalization produces localization’ (p.396); English.

- Two modes of production of globalization: ‘globalized localisms’ and ‘localized globalisms’ (p.396): ‘core countries specialize in globalized localisms, whole peripheral countries only have the choice of localized globalisms’ (p.397); GERM (Sahlberg, 2011).
Rescaling of governance in education

- Still assumes a ‘territorial and geopolitical definition of space’ (Larsen and Beech, 2014, p.191: ‘nation-state’ as unit of analysis, but ‘nation-state’ not merely national today, but networked with IOs (e.g. OECD, World Bank, UNESCO).

On rescaling Robertson et al. (2006: 232) observe:

‘The shift from national to postnational is reflected in the change of scale of governance of education – from national to either or both supranational and subnational – and the shift from state to [postnational] regime is reflected in the changes in the configurations and coordination of educational governance, from assumed state monopoly over all aspects to a bewildering range of possibilities in which regulation seems to be the only necessary element for a state monopoly, though … even that cannot be assumed’.
Rescaling of governance in education

- **Imposition**: e.g. conditionality of say World Bank loans.
- **Harmonisation**: e.g. common polices in some domains, European Space for Higher Education, Bologna; Gulf Cooperation Council.
- **Dissemination**: e.g. technical knowledge, ‘best practice data-bases’, ‘magistrature of influence’ (Lawn and Lingard, 2002).
- **Standardisation**: e.g. in schooling, PISA, TIMSS, PIRLS, Shanghai Jiao Tong Rankings, bibliometric measures, citation indices etc.
- **Installing interdependence**: e.g. problems that need international cooperation to ‘solve’ problems (climate change, MDGs, EFA, SDGs, educational hubs, twinning arrangements).
Amin (2002, p.395) proposes topological conception of globalization:

- ‘[A]n energized network space marked by, first, the intensification of mixture and connectivity as more and more things become interdependent (in associative links and exclusions); second, the combination of multiple spatialities of organization and praxis as action and belonging at distance become possible; and third, the erosion of the ontological distinction between place and space as ‘placement’ in multiple geographies of belonging becomes possible’.

- ‘…the reconfiguration of the spatiality of social relations [is] a central aspect of contemporary globalization’ (p.389); school systems located in multiple geographies/spaces; also located within multiple geographies/spaces of power and policy.'
A topological analytics

- In topology, location matters less than relation.
- Power exercised by ‘reaching into’ the politics of regions and localities in an attempt to steer and constrain agendas… bridg[ing] the gap erected by the physical barriers of distance’ (Allen & Cochrane, 2010, p. 1075).
- Power-topologies are ‘not so much positioned in space or extended across it, as compose the spaces of which they are a part’ (Allen, 2011, p. 284).
- Lury et al., (2012, p.5): ‘Topology is now emergent in the practices of ordering, modelling, networking and mapping that constitute culture, technology and science’.
- A Post-Euclidean geometry.
PISA-Based Tests for Schools

Aims to provide school-level data to facilitate school improvement.

Results comparable with main PISA data.

Funded by US philanthropic organisations and supported by America Achieves.

Trialled in 2012 in US, UK and Manitoba.

Officially launched in April 2013.

CTB/McGraw Hill the first US administrator.

Allows schools to differentiate performance from national and system results.

Allows OECD to have greater policy influence at sub-national levels.
# PISA Tests for Schools

## MATHEMATICS (PISA 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your School</th>
<th>Schools in the United States</th>
<th>Schools in Shanghai-China</th>
<th>Schools in Mexico</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td><strong>Your School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 10% of schools perform above this point
- 25% of schools perform above this point
- 50% of schools perform above and also below this point
- 25% of schools perform below this point
- 10% of schools perform below this point
- 25% of schools perform above this point
- 50% of schools perform above and also below this point
- 25% of schools perform below this point
- 10% of schools perform below this point
An emergent global education policy field


• Social structures consists of multiple fields, each with specific logics of practice, overarched by a field of power (Bourdieu, 1980).

• Field describes a structured social space that is not geographical in character, today need to stretch to take in the global, e.g. global economy, global education policy field, and constructed by agents (Bourdieu, 2003).

• The habitus of elite policy actors is significant to the constitution and functioning of the global education policy field and the national vernacularization of global educational policy discourses emanating from the global field; cross-field effects.

• The shared policy habitus of global and national elite policy makers is constituted as a reflection of and a contribution to the creation of the global education policy field and its logics of practice.
Global education policy field


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Globalizing bureaucrats (the state fraction): Senior policy makers</th>
<th>Globalizing professionals (the technical fraction): Policy technicians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both are engaged in ‘commensurative work’ (Espeland, 2002), complemented by a global imaginary (Strathern, 1997) that enables measurement, monitoring and comparison of educational practices and outcomes within the global field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data

International policy actors

INT Policy Maker

Policy makers

NAT/INT Policy Maker

NAT Policy Maker

INT Policy Technician

Policy technicians

National policy actors

acara

Queensland Government Education Queensland

BOSTES

Board of Studies Teaching & Educational Standards NSW

Department for Education
New modes of educational governance
Network/heterarchical governance

• Transition from New Public Management to network governance.
• Move from government to governance; ‘change in the form and modalities of the state’ (Ball and Junemann, 2012, p.1).
• ‘In the world of network governance, government is understood to be located alongside business and civil society actors in a complex game of public policy formation, decision-making and implementation’ (Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004, p.25); stretched globally.
• ‘Heterarchy is an organisational form somewhere between hierarchy and network that draws upon diverse horizontal and vertical links that permit different elements of the policy process to cooperate (and/or compete)’ (Ball and Junemann, 2012, p.138).
• ‘privatisation of education policy community’ (Mahony et al., 2004); involvement of edu-businesses and philanthropies; authority of state diminished/different?(Shamir, 2008).
• ‘[E]ducation policy analysis can no longer sensibly be limited to within the nation state – the fallacy of methodological territorialism … policy analysis must also extend its purview beyond the state and the role of multinational agencies and NGOs to include transnational business practices’ (Ball, 2012: 93).
Globalization, network governance and policy as numbers

- ‘Data production and management were and are essential to the new governance turn; constant comparison is its symbolic feature, as well as a distinctive mode of operation’ (Ozga, 2009, p.150).

- Nikolas Rose (1999): Numbers, statistics, rankings, comparisons, data – central to state functioning since the rise of the nation-state in 18 the century; Enhanced significance in context of neo-liberal globalisation & government to governance turn.

- Desrosieres (1998, p.8): ‘As the etymology of the word shows, statistics is concerned with the construction of the state, with its unification and administration’.

- Porter (1995): ‘quantification is a technology of distance’.

- Governance turn, ‘audit society’, ‘evaluative state’: enhanced significance of data and numbers in governance.

- Rise also of ‘evidence-based (informed) policy’ world wide (Wiseman, 2010).
New policy actors in education
New policy actors in education

- International organisations (intergovernmental and non-govermental)
- Regional organisations
- Edu-businesses, EdTech companies, edupreneurs
- Philanthropists
Case 1: Data infrastructures and *Systems Interoperability Framework (SIF)*: new policy actors, network governance

- New policy actors: edu-businesses, EdTech companies, philanthropists, OECD.
- New spatialities and new geographies of power, politics and policy.
- Network governance.
The Global Education Industry

• Verger, Lubienski and Steiner-Khamsi (2016) - define GEI – refers to the ways edu-businesses with for-profit motives and new philanthropies heavily involved in all aspects of education today from agenda setting through to provision of goods and services; also OECD using this nomenclature.

• GEI as a field (Verger et al., 2016): Education as a sector for investment and profit making on a global scale: $4.3 trillion in value, 2014; growth areas primary and secondary schooling; Pearson 2012 Annual Report – ‘education will be the biggest growth industry of the 21st century’(p.8).

• GEI enabled and shaped by restructured state and approaches to policy making; new modes of network governance on a global scale (Ball and Junemann, 2012; Ball, 2012).
Conditions for GEI’s Emergence and Expansion

1. **Globalization of the economy** and human capital construction of education, national economic competitiveness, increased demand and supply of education, global flows.

2. **Commodification of schooling as** a positional good for families.

3. **Financialization of the education sector.**

4. **Changes in the governance of education globally** (restructured state, new accountability mechanisms, testing, comparison etc).

5. **Emergence of an evidence-based (-informed) policy paradigm.**

6. **Technology and learning.**

   (Verger, Lubienski and Steiner-Khamsi, 2016, pp.6-11)

**Underplaying of significance of data infrastructures in growth and expansion of GEI.**
Data infrastructures and ‘extrastatecraft’

• Keller Easterling (2014): extrastatecraft: linked to work of private businesses in creation of infrastructures of various kinds that are central to functioning of contemporary nation-state, but also to global modes of governance.

• ‘… infrastructure is now the overt point of contact and access between us all….’ (Easterling, 2014, p.11).

• Extrastatecraft: ‘As a site of multiple, overlapping, or nested forms of sovereignty, where domestic and transnational jurisdictions collide, infrastructure space becomes a medium of what might be called extrastatecraft – a portmanteau describing the often undisclosed activities outside of, in addition to, and sometimes even in partnership with statecraft’ (Easterling, 2014, p.15).

• Extrastatecraft as important mode of commercialization and privatization.

• Standards: the language or ‘currency’ of international organisations (ISO) and multinational and transnational corporations (p.18).
SIF: Systems Interoperability Framework

- February, 1999: Bill Gates of Microsoft launched SIF standards at USA School Administrators’ Annual Conference; development & led by Microsoft and supported by 18 additional software companies and the US Software and Information Industry Association (SIIA) (Sellar, 2017); Gates argued 2006 necessity for school systems to create ‘digital nervous systems’: SIF Association formed in UK; 2009 in Australia; cf Gates’ broader involvement in corporate reform agenda of schooling (Hursh, 2016).

- In the USA, SIF standards, first released November, 1999, more developed version in 2003 and US federal Department of Education joined the development efforts (network governance).

- Education Ministers agreed to accept and develop an Australian SIF specification, 2009.

- 2015: The Access 4 Learning (A4L) community was launched internationally, and comprises SIF Associations in the USA, UK and Australia.

- A4L now asserts that SIF constitutes ‘the most comprehensive data model and mature infrastructure interoperability framework in use globally in education’ (A4L, 2015).
National Schools Interoperability Program (NSIP) in Australia

• Intergovernmental Council in Education created NSIP: endorsed an Australian SIF specification in 2009.

• NSIP supported by all State and Territory schooling systems, Federal department, and all Catholic and Independent School systems.

• NSIP: work overseen by a steering group comprising Chief Information Officers of each system: supports data sharing, aggregation and synchronization of data.

• Operational work done by a small group in a Melbourne office.

• NSIP closely aligned with SIF AU – the Australian SIF Association affiliated with A4L; SIF AU 38 - members (13 government bodies, 9 Catholic and independent school bodies, 16 commercial providers).

• This standardisation work: network governance; specific policy context of new national curriculum and national testing (move to online) facilitated by and enables SIF.
SIF definition, Australia

- Definition provided on NSIP website and jointly prepared by SIF Association AU (Ed Tech companies) and NSIP.
- ‘The Systems Interoperability Framework, widely known as SIF, is an international specification for the exchange of school data. The SIF Association is made up of education providers and software vendors who have a common interests in having software applications interact and share data. Globally there are 102 vendor organisation members and 1,082 end user members of the SIF Association’.
- Network governance.
OECD and GEI

- Verger et al., (2016): the OECD has adopted the concept of a GEI.
- First global summit organised by OECD on GEI held in Helsinki, October, 2015; September, 2016 summit, Jerusalem.
- Participants: OECD personnel, Education Ministers or their representatives, tech focused edu-businesses (EdTech Industry Network, EduCloud Alliance, Learn Capital, Intel Corporations, Samsung Electronics, Academics, Education International representatives).
- Summit discussion topic: ‘Schools need a physical and digital infrastructure through which improved teaching and learning products can be delivered’.
- Summit Notes from Rapporteurs: ‘There was a very strong consensus among the participants that forward-looking education policies require a very close co-operation between industry, schools and authorities’. Network governance at global level endorsed by OECD – Andreas Schleicher’s after-dinner speech.
Data infrastructures and significance of SIF

• ‘Contemporary infrastructure space is the secret weapon of the most powerful people in the world precisely because it orchestrates activities that can remain unstated but are nevertheless consequential’. (Easterling, 2014, p.15)
Case 2: PISA for Schools – PISA-based Tests for Schools

- New policy actors: philanthropies, edu-businesses, not-for-profit organisations, OECD, individual schools, local school systems.
- New spatialities and geographies of power, politics and policy.
- Network governance.
Actors and context of PISA for Schools

- US philanthropic foundations (rise of ‘philanthro-capitalism’); the rise of comparison as a mode of governance.
- America Achieves (not-for-profit education advocate).
- The US main PISA sample only aggregates at the national level (cf. the UK and Australia) → limited subnational measures and limited policy usage.
- School and district-level educators in the USA who wished to participate in the main PISA sample (and couldn’t).
PISA for Schools

Piloted in US, UK and Manitoba (Canada) during 2012; Spanish pilot completed in 2014.

Full US deployment from 2013; UK and Spain from late 2014.

Voluntary but fee-based → schools pay US $11,500.

Voluntary publication of data and report by the school.

Assessment frameworks are equivalent to ‘main’ PISA.

Three domains (R, M, S) equally represented.

Contextual questionnaires (student and school).

Equated to existing PISA scales and proficiency levels.

Student sample: 75 students (but as few as 48).

Enables school-to-system (national, international) comparisons; possible school-to-school also.
PISA for Schools reports

**Figure A** - Your school’s mean performance in reading, mathematics and science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>READING</th>
<th></th>
<th>MATHEMATICS</th>
<th></th>
<th>SCIENCE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean perf.</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>S.E. 14.3</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>S.E. 13.8</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>S.E. 12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S.E.: Standard error.

**Figure 1**: The mean performance in reading, mathematics and science at *your school*

(Source: OECD, 2012b, p. 13)

**Figure B** - Levels of proficiency of students at your school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>READING</th>
<th></th>
<th>MATHEMATICS</th>
<th></th>
<th>SCIENCE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Levels 5 and 6)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>S.E. 2.1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>S.E. 3.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>S.E. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate levels</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>S.E. 3.8</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>S.E. 5.3</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>S.E. 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below baseline level</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>S.E. 3.2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>S.E. 4.7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>S.E. 2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S.E.: Standard error.

**Figure 2**: The distribution of student performance in reading, mathematics and science at *your school*

(Source: OECD, 2012b, p. 14)
Globalising local school performance: new spatialities of policy
School = schooling system?

Figure 5.6 - How students at your school compare with students from selected countries and economies in mathematics in PISA 2009

Mathematics
Your School

Performance
Selected Countries

- Shanghai-China
- Singapore
- Finland
- Korea
- Canada
- Japan
- Germany
- Poland
- United States
- Portugal
- United Kingdom
- Mexico
- Brazil

Mean score on the PISA mathematics scale

700
650
600
550
500
450
400
350
300
PISA for Schools actors and networks

**Oversight:** The OECD (+ PGB for initial approval only)

**Item design:** Australian Council for Educational Research
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**Test provision and data analysis:** CTB/McGraw-Hill and Northwest Evaluation Association (USA); Instituto Nacional de Evaluación Educativa (Spain); National Foundation for Educational Research (UK)

**Funding:** Bechtel Group Foundation; Bloomberg Philanthropies; Carnegie Corporation of New York; Craig and Barbara Barrett Foundation; Kern Family Foundation; National Public Education Support Fund; Rodel Foundation; Stuart Foundation; William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
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In/conclusion

- How we define, conceptualise, theorise policy carries implications for how we understand, theorise and research policy enactment.

- Think of policy as discourse and texts, think of policy processes and practices, from implementation to enactment in context of globalisation: some discursive convergence, but path dependence still ensures vernacularisation of policy and policy practice in nations.

- Illustrated ‘new spatialities’ associated with globalisation: network governance and new policy actors across the education policy cycle: strengthened role of international organisations (OECD), philanthropists, edu-businesses – significance of data and datafication.

- Schools/school systems today situated locally, nationally and globally, situated in multiple spaces of power and policy with the seeming overcoming of the ontological distinction between place and space (rethinking global/national/local relationship).

- Implications for provision of high quality and socially just education for all?
Thank you: r.lingard@uq.edu.au