Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 20

Joseph Zajda *Editor*

Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms

Emerging Paradigms

Springer

Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research

Volume 20

Aims and Scope

The *Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research* series (Vols. 13–24) aims to present a global overview of strategic comparative and international education policy statements on recent reforms and shifts in education globally and offers new approaches to further exploration, development and improvement of comparative education and policy research globally. In general, the book series seeks to address the nexus between comparative education, policy, reforms and forces of globalisation.

The series will present up-to-date scholarly research on global trends in comparative education and policy research. The idea is to advance research and scholarship by providing an easily accessible, practical yet scholarly source of information for researchers, policy-makers, college academics and practitioners in the field. Different volumes will provide substantive contributions to knowledge and understanding of comparative education and policy research globally. This new book series will offer major disciplinary perspectives from all world regions.

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/6932

Joseph Zajda
Editor

Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms

Emerging Paradigms

Springer

Editor
Joseph Zajda
Faculty of Education & Arts, School of Education
Australian Catholic University
East Melbourne, VIC, Australia

ISSN 2543-0564 ISSN 2543-0572 (electronic)
Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research
ISBN 978-94-024-1742-5 ISBN 978-94-024-1743-2 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1743-2

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature B.V.
The registered company address is: Van Godewijckstraat 30, 3311 GX Dordrecht, The Netherlands

To Rea, Nikolai, Belinda, Sophie and Imogen

Foreword

The major aim of *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms: Emerging Paradigms*, which is volume 20 in the 24-volume book series Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research, edited by Joseph Zajda, is to present a global overview of selected scholarly research on the social, cultural and political constructs defining education reforms. Furthermore, the perception of globalisation as dynamic and multi-faceted processes clearly necessitates a multiple-perspective approach in the study of education reforms, and this book provides that perspective commendably. In this book, the authors, who come from diverse backgrounds and regions, attempt insightfully to provide a worldview of current developments in research concerning education reforms and emerging paradigms globally. This book contributes in a very scholarly way to a more holistic understanding of the nexus between globalisation and education reforms.

East Melbourne, VIC, Australia — Joseph Zajda

Preface

Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms: *Emerging Paradigms*, which is **volume 20** in the 24-volume book series Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research, edited by Joseph Zajda, presents a global overview of the nexus between globalisation, ideologies and standards-driven education reforms and implication for equity, democracy and social justice. Globalisation and competitive market forces have generated a massive growth in the knowledge industries that are having profound effects on society and higher educational institutions. One of the effects of globalisation is that the education sector is compelled to embrace the corporate ethos of efficiency, performance and profit-driven managerialism. As such, new entrepreneurial educational institutions in the global culture succumb to the economic gains offered by the neoliberal ideology and governance defined fundamentally by economic factors.

Both governments and educational institutions, in their quest for global competitiveness, excellence, quality and accountability in education, increasingly turn to international and comparative education data analysis. All of them agree that the major goal of education is to enhance the individual's social and economic prospects, which can only be achieved by providing quality education for *all*.

Clearly, these new phenomena of globalisation have in different ways affected the current developments in education and policy around the world. First, globalisation of policy, trade and finance has some profound implications for education and reform implementation. On the one hand, the periodic economic crises (e.g. the 1980s, the financial crisis of 2007–2008, also known as the Global Financial Crisis or GEC in 2008), coupled with the prioritised policies of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (e.g. SAPs), have seriously affected some developing nations and transitional economies in delivering quality education for all. Second, the policies of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the UNESCO, the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) operate as powerful forces, which, as supranational organisations, shape and influence education and policy around the world.

By examining some of the major education reforms and policy developments and merging paradigms in a global culture, particularly in the light of recent shifts in education reforms and policy research, this volume provides a comprehensive picture of the intersecting and diverse discourses of globalisation, education and global competition-driven reforms. The impact of globalisation on education policy and reforms is a strategically significant issue for us all. This volume, as a sourcebook of ideas for researchers, practitioners and policymakers in globalisation and education reforms, provides a timely overview of the current changes in education reforms globally.

East Melbourne, VIC, Australia Joseph Zajda

Series Editor

Joseph Zajda, BA (Hons.), MA, MEd, PhD, FACE, co-ordinates and lectures in graduate courses, particularly MTeach courses (EDFX522, EDSS503 and EDFD546), in the Faculty of Education and Arts at the Australian Catholic University, Melbourne Campus. He specialises in globalisation and education policy reforms, social justice, history education, human rights education and values education. He has written and edited 30 books and over 120 book chapters and articles in the areas of globalisation and education policy, higher education, history textbooks and curriculum reforms. Recent publications include *Third International Handbook on Globalisation, Education and Policy Research* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2020); Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms: Emerging Paradigms (Dordrecht: Springer, 2020); Human Rights Education Globally (Dordrecht: Springer, with D. **Henderson**, 2020); *Globalisation, Ideology and Neo-liberal Higher Education Reforms* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2018); *Globalisation and Education Reforms: Paradigms and Ideologies* (Dordrecht: Springer, http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9789402412031, 2017); *Globalisation and National Identity in History Textbooks: The Russian Federation* (Dordrecht: Springer, with Tsyrlina-Spady and Lovorn, 2017); *Globalisation and Historiography of National Leaders: Symbolic Representations in School Textbooks* (Dordrecht: Springer, with Ozdowski, 2017); *Globalisation, Human Rights Education and Reforms* (Dordrecht: Springer, with Rust, 2016); and *Globalisation and Higher Education Reforms* (Dordrecht: Springer). He is Editor and Author of the *Second International Handbook on Globalisation, Education and Policy Research* (Springer, 2015, http://www.springer.com/education+%26+language/book/978-94-017-9492-3, (2014)); 'The Russian Revolution' (2014) in G. Ritzer and J. M. Ryan (Eds.) *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization Online*; 'Ideology' (2014) and 'Values Education' (2008 and 2014) in D. Phillips (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy* (Thousand Oaks: Sage); and *Schooling the New Russians: Transforming Soviet Workers to Capitalist Entrepreneurs* (Melbourne: James Nicholas Publishers).

He is the Editor of the **twenty-four-volume** book series Globalisation and Comparative Education (Springer, 2013&2021).

He edits the following journals below:

https://www.jamesnicholaspublishers.com.au/curriculum-and-teaching/ Editor, *Curriculum and Teaching*, volume 34, 2020
https://www.jamesnicholaspublishers.com.au/education-and-society/ Editor, *Education and Society*, volume 37, 2020
https://www.jamesnicholaspublishers.com.au/world-studies-in-education/ Editor, *World Studies in Education*, volume 20, 2020

His works are found in 445 publications in 4 languages and some 10,500 university library holdings globally.

He is the recipient of the 2012 **Excellence in Research Award** of the Faculty of Education, Australian Catholic University, which recognises the high quality of research activities and particularly celebrates sustained research that has had a substantive impact nationally and internationally. He was also the recipient of the **Australian Awards for University Teaching** in 2011 (Citation for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning, **for an innovative, influential and sustained contribution to teacher education through scholarship and publication**) and the Vice Chancellor's **Excellence in Teaching Award** at the Australian Catholic University, Melbourne Campus. He was awarded an ARC Discovery Grant (with Monash University) for 2011–2015 for a comparative analysis of history national curriculum implementation in Russia and Australia ($315,000). Also, he was elected as **Fellow** of the Australian College of Educators in June 2013).

He completed (with Professor Fred Dervin, University of Helsinki) the UNESCO report *Governance in Education: Diversity and Effectiveness – BRICS countries* (Paris: UNESCO (2020)).

Faculty of Education and Arts
Australian Catholic University
Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Joseph Zajda

Editorial by Series Editors

Volume 20 is a further publication in the Springer book series Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research, edited by Joseph Zajda.

Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms: Emerging Paradigms, the 20th book in the 24-volume book series Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research, edited by Joseph Zajda (Series Editor), sets out to analyse the nexus between ideology, the state and education reforms globally. It presents a global overview of the nexus between globalisation, ideologies and standards-driven education reforms and implication for equity, democracy and social justice. Globalisation and competitive market forces have generated a massive growth in the knowledge industries that are having profound effects on society and higher educational institutions. One of the effects of globalisation is that the education sector is compelled to embrace the corporate ethos of the efficiency, performance and profit-driven managerialism. As such, new entrepreneurial educational institutions in the global culture succumb to the economic gains offered by the neoliberal ideology and governance defined fundamentally by economic factors.

A compendium of the very latest thinking on the subject, this book is, like others in the series, a state-of-the-art sourcebook for researchers, practitioners and policymakers alike. Not only do the chapters offer a timely analysis of current issues affecting education policy research globally, but the work also contains ideas about future directions that education and policy reforms could take. By doing so, it provides a comprehensive picture of the intersecting and diverse discourses of globalisation and policy-driven reforms in education.

This book draws upon recent studies in the areas of globalisation, education reforms and the role of the state. It explores conceptual frameworks and methodological approaches applicable in the research covering the state, globalisation and education reforms, critiques the neoliberal ideological imperatives of current education and policy reforms and illustrates the way such shifts in the relationship between the state and education policy affect current trends in education reform outcomes. Individual chapters critically assess the dominant discourses and debates on education and policy reforms. Using diverse comparative education paradigms, from critical theory to historical-comparative research, the chapters focus on globalisation, ideology and democracy and examine both the reasons and outcomes of education reforms and policy change.

The book explores the ambivalent and problematic relationship between the state, globalisation and education reform discourses. Using a number of diverse paradigms, ranging from critical theory to globalisation, the authors, by focusing on globalisation, ideology and education reforms, attempt to examine critically recent trends in the political, social, economic and educational constructs that affect the nature of education reforms.

When discussing the politics of education reforms, and role of the state, and dominant ideologies defining policy priorities, we need to go beyond the technicist and business-oriented model of education, which focuses on accountability, efficiency and performance indicators. Why? Because, apart from the dominant human capital and rate of return, driving efficiency, profit and performance indicators, there are other forces at work as well. From the macrosocial perspective, the world of business, while real and dominant, is only one dimension of the complex social, cultural and economic world system. At the macro-societal level, we need to consider the teleological goal of education reforms. Are we reforming education systems to improve the quality of learning and teaching, academic achievement and excellence, and do we hope to change our societies, creating the 'good society'?

At the level of critical discourse analysis, we need to consider dominant ideologies defining the nature and the extent of political and economic power, domination, control, the existing social stratification and the unequal distribution of socially and economically valued commodities, both locally and globally. They all have profound influences on the directions of education and policy reforms. Many scholars have argued that education systems and education reforms are creating, reproducing and consolidating social and economic inequality.

This book offers a synthesis of current research findings on globalisation and education reforms, with reference to major paradigms and ideology; analyses the shifts in methodological approaches to globalisation, education reforms, paradigms and their impact on education policy and pedagogy; critiques globalisation, policy and education reform; and suggests the emergence of new economic and political dimensions of cultural imperialism. Such hegemonic shifts in ideology and policy are likely to have significant economic and cultural implications for national education systems, reforms and policy implementations. This book also evaluates discourses of globalisation, cultural imperialism, global citizenship, human rights education and neoliberal ideology. It is suggested there is a need to continue to analyse critically the new challenges confronting the global village in the provision of authentic democracy, equality, social justice and cross-cultural values that genuinely promote a transformative pedagogy. There is also a need to focus on the crucial issues at the centre of current and ongoing education reforms, namely, global citizenship, human rights education, social justice and access to quality education for all, if genuine culture of learning, and transformation, characterised by wisdom, compassion and intercultural understanding, is to become a reality, rather than policy rhetoric.

In addressing the topic globalisation, ideology and politics of education reforms, some authors like Joseph Zajda critique and evaluate a neoliberal and neoconservative education policy reforms globally. He discusses meta-ideological hegemony and paradigm shifts in education and analyses globalisation processes impacting on education and policy reforms, both locally and globally, designed to promote economic competitiveness, national identity and social equity through education reforms. He also analyses standards-driven and outcomes-defined policy and argues that the meta-ideological hegemony and paradigm shifts in education have produced a new economic, social and political dimension of cultural imperialism. Such hegemonic shifts in ideology affecting policy are likely to have significant economic and cultural implications for national education systems, reforms and policy implementations.

Both Stefan Johansson and Risto Rinne analyse the consequences of international large-scale assessments (ILSA), which have been criticised for spreading isomorphic ideologies. As Johansson argues, the results of ILSAs have a substantial impact in the media, in discussions of policy educational policy, as well as in public debate. Rinne also analyses the unintended consequences of governance of education at a distance through assessment and standardisation to the changes of national and local agents. Vince Wright critiques PISA as an instrument of the OECD and suggests that it needs to provide better information to participating countries about the strengths and weaknesses of students in relation to the assessment frameworks; to be more transparent about its methods, including the items used, and how measurement error is calculated; and to broaden the assessment focus to include a broader range of competencies.

Holger Daun discusses globalisations, meta-ideological hegemonies and challenges from populism in education and argues that the globalised meta-ideology is hegemonic in that it determines the discourse and that education is first and foremost for making countries economically competitive and modern. He suggests that *global hegemonic meta-ideology* and ideological adaptations towards this meta-ideology have taken place in many places in the world in education.

Michael Lee and S. Gopinathan argue that both Singapore and Hong Kong have been ranked top (first and second) in international rankings such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Progress in International Reading Literacy Study. They provide a critical review of education policies and reforms in both Singapore and Hong Kong to see how they can be refined and adjusted in order to cope with the challenges facing both education systems.

Joseph Zajda discusses current and dominant models employed in teaching values education in schools and offers researchers, teachers and students with an insight as to why values education should be incorporated in classroom teaching. It is suggested that values education, in addition to focusing on moral education, is connected to democracy, active citizenship education, social justice and human rights education. Brendan Hyde makes a significant contribution to the refinement of theories of knowledge and to their usage in qualitative research in education to bring about improved learning and teaching to contribute positively to the betterment of societies in a globalised world. Yvonne Vissing, on the other hand, analyses how for-profit honour societies target vulnerable students around the world. Many such organisations are run under different names by the same individuals. The government does not monitor or penalise them for their exploitative activities. Diane Brook Napier offers reflections on selections of Mr. Mandela's words, with reference to their relevance for the path taken for educational reform and transformation in general in South Africa.

The authors focus on major and dominant discourses defining education reforms: *globalisation*, *social change*, *democracy* and *ideology*. These are among the most critical and significant dimensions defining and contextualising the processes surrounding the politics of education reforms globally. Furthermore, the perception of globalisation as dynamic and multi-faceted processes clearly necessitates a multiple-perspective approach in the study of education reforms. In this book, the authors, who come from diverse backgrounds and regions, attempt insightfully to provide a worldview of current developments in research concerning education reforms both locally and globally. The book contributes in a very scholarly way to a more holistic understanding of the nexus between globalisation, ideology and education reforms.

We thank the anonymous international reviewers who have reviewed and assessed the proposal for the continuation of the series (volumes 13–24) and other anonymous reviewers who reviewed the chapters in the final manuscript (book 20).

Contents

Contributors

Holger Daun (University of Stockholm) is Professor of International and Comparative Education. He has been supervising many MA students and some 20 PhD students. He has also been leading several international research projects (e.g. Globalization, State, Market, Civil Society and Educational Change; Globalization; and Changing Educational Governance; and Islamic Educational Institutions around the World). He is on the editorial board of several international education journals. He has published some 10 books and many articles internationally, among them *School Decentralization in the Context of Globalizing Governance: International Comparisons of Grassroots Response*s (Dordtrecht: Springer/Kluwer, 2006); *Nation-building, Identity and Citizenship Education: Cross-cultural Perspectives* (edited with J. Zajda & L. J. Saha, Dordtrecht: Springer, 2008); and *Handbook of Islamic Education* (edited with R. Arjmand, Dordrecht: 2018).

S. Gopinathan (National University of Singapore) was Professor of Education and Vice-Dean (Policy) of the Centre for Research in Pedagogy and Practice at the National Institute of Education in Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. He was Dean of Foundation Programmes in the same institute. He is Adjunct Professor at Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore. He has served on various MOE review committees and was a Resource Specialist for the Government Parliamentary Committee on Education. His research interests span teacher education, professional development, higher education, values and citizenship education, and education development. He has been a consultant with the World Bank, UNESCO and several universities including the University of Bahrain, Hong Kong Institute of Education and the University of Brunei. He also helped establish the Emirates College for Advanced Education (UAE), the Bahrain Teachers College and the Sampoerna University's School of Education in Jakarta, Indonesia. His 100 plus research publications are a key reference to policy and practice in Singapore education.

Brendan Hyde is a Senior Lecturer, Education (Pedagogy and Curriculum), at the Melbourne Burwood Campus of Deakin University with research interests in phenomenology, transformative learning and how children's spirituality can be nurtured through education. He has held previous academic positions at Australian Catholic University and at BBI – The Australian Institute for Theological Education in Sydney, where he was the Academic Dean. Brendan is a member of the Australian College of Educators, an Honorary Senior Research Fellow of Federation University Australia and a Fellow of the Centre for the Theology of Childhood (Denver, Colorado, USA). From 2009 until the end of 2017 Brendan was a co-editor of *International Journal of Children's Spirituality*, a peer-reviewed academic journal that provides a multicultural and interdisciplinary forum for those involved in research and development of children and young people's spirituality. He is the author of *Children and Spirituality: Searching for Meaning and Connectedness* and co-author of *The Spiritual Dimension of Children's Lives* (both published through Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London and Philadelphia) as well as numerous academic articles in peer-reviewed journals. (Email: Brendan.hyde@deakin.edu.au)

Stefan Johansson is senior lecturer and researcher at the University of Gothenburg, Department of Education and Special Education. His research interests centre on questions regarding the validity of International Large-scale Assessments (ILSA's). In his previous publications, he has utilised ILSA data to address use and consequences of ILSA, cross-country achievement differences and the role of teacher competence and SES for student achievement. (Email: stefan.johansson@gu.se)

Michael H. Lee (The Chinese University of Hong Kong) teaches in the Department of History in the Chinese University of Hong Kong. He formerly served as Instructor in the Department of Educational Policy and Administration of the Hong Kong Institute of Education and Research Associate in the Comparative Education Policy Research Unit of the Department of Public and Social Administration, City University of Hong Kong. His publications cover education reforms, comparative education, privatisation in education and globalisation. (Email: michaellee@cuhk.edu.hk)

Diane Brook Napier is a Professor of Comparative and International Education, University of Georgia, USA. Her research focuses on education and globalisation, postcolonial reform, deracialisation, language, migrants and refugees, environmental justice, and teacher training. She has conducted research extensively in her native South Africa, also in Namibia, Botswana, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Somalia, Kenya, DR Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba and the UAE. (Email: dnapier@uga.edu)

Risto Rinne is a Professor of Education and Vice-Dean in the faculty of Education and Head of the Department of Education and of the Research Centre of Lifelong Learning and Education (CELE) at the University of Turku, Finland. He is also the director of *The Finnish Multidisciplinary Doctoral Training Network on Educational Sciences (FinEd) and the doctoral programme 'Educational Policy, LLL and*

*Comparative research on Education' (*Koulutuspolitiikan, elinikäisen oppimisen ja vertailevan koulutustutkimuksen tohtoriohjelma KEVEKO). He is a member of the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters and has published over 500 scientific publications. (Email: Rinne@utu.fi)

Vince Wright is an educational consultant and was, until recently, Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education and Arts at the Australian Catholic University (Melbourne Campus). He specialises in Mathematics Education with a special focus on effective teaching of mathematical concepts such as algebra, multiplication and division, rational number and proportional reasoning. His interest also extends to the politics of curriculum change and assessment within a globalisation theoretical framework. He has 25 years of experience as a curriculum developer and teacher adviser. He has been developing mathematics resources for teachers and students in his native country, New Zealand. (Email: vince.wright.3.14@gmail.com)

Joseph Zajda (Australian Catholic University, Melbourne) is Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education and Arts at the Australian Catholic University (Melbourne Campus). He specialises in globalisation and education policy reforms, social justice, history education and values education. He has written and edited 42 books and over 120 book chapters and articles in the areas of globalisation and education policy, higher education and curriculum reforms. Recent publications include: Zajda, J. (2018). *Globalisation and education reforms: Paradigms and ideologies.* Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9789402412031; Zajda, J. (2017). *Globalisation and National Identity in History Textbooks: The Russian Federation*. Dordrecht: Springer; Zajda, J. Tsyrlina-Spady, T. & Lovorn, M. (2017) (Eds.). *Globalisation and Historiography of National Leaders: Symbolic Representations in School Textbooks.* Dordrecht: Springer; Zajda, J. & Ozdowski, S. (2017). (Eds.), *Globalisation and Human Rights Education* Dordrecht: Springer; *Russian Revolution* (2014). In G. Ritzer & J. M. Ryan (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization Online*; Zajda, J. (2014). Values Education. In D. Phillips (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. He is also the editor of the 24-volume book series *Globalisation and Comparative Education* (Springer, 2009 & 2021). He edits *World Studies in Education, Curriculum and Teaching,* and *Education and Society* for James Nicholas Publishers. His works are found in 445 publications in 4 languages and some 10,500 university library holdings globally. He was awarded an ARC Discovery Grant (with Monash University) for 2011–2015 for a comparative analysis of history national curriculum implementation in Russia and Australia ($315,000). Joseph was elected as Fellow of the Australian College of Educators (June 2013). (Email: joseph.zajda@acu.edu.au)

Chapter 1
Globalisation and Education Reforms: Emerging Research Issues

Joseph Zajda

Abstract The chapter analyses current emerging research trends in education reforms around the world. The chapter critiques and evaluates a neo-liberal and neoconservative education policy reforms globally. It discusses meta-ideological hegemony and paradigm shifts in education. It analyses globalisation processes impacting on education and policy reforms, both locally and globally, designed to promote economic competitiveness, national identity and social equity through education reforms. The chapter critiques standards-driven and outcomes-defined policy. The analysis of education policy reforms, and the resultant social stratifications in the global culture, demonstrates a complex nexus between globalisation, ideology and education reforms – where, on the one hand, democratisation and progressive pedagogy is equated with equality, inclusion, equity, tolerance and human rights, while on the other hand, globalisation is perceived, by some critics at least, to be a totalising force that is widening the inequality, and the socio-economic status (SES) gap and cultural and economic capital between the rich and the poor, and bringing power, domination and control by corporate bodies and powerful organisations.

Keywords Assessment · Assessment frameworks · Comparative education · Education policy · Education quality · Global standardization of academic achievement · Globalization · Governance of education international large-scale assessments · Knowledge competencies · OECD · PIRLS · PISA · Policy impact

---

J. Zajda (✉)
Faculty of Education & Arts, School of Education, Australian Catholic University, East Melbourne, VIC, Australia
e-mail: joseph.zajda@acu.edu.au

J. Zajda (ed.), *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms*, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 20,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1743-2_1

The Changing Nature of Education Globally

Globally, cultural, economic and technological exponential-like growth have raised the value of education as a desirable commodity, and, consequently increased the importance of ensuring that students have access to high-standards and quality education for all. Education reforms tend to be largely political in nature. Political ideologies guiding education reforms range from conservative and neo-liberal to progressive and emancipatory. Nations like USA, China, India, and Russia wish to be major players on the world's stage, economically and politically. All striving for competitive advantage globally. To maintain the edge of competitiveness and dominance in the political, economic and cultural sense, they need to have education addressing these aspirations. Current education reforms need to be examined at the curriculum level, policy level and vocational level.

At the curriculum level, the focus of current reforms is on improving knowledge and skills in literacy and numeracy, as well as in science, civics and history. However, in the USA, in particular, teachers are under pressure to improve standards in literacy and numeracy. As a result, teachers are compelled to spend many hours working in these areas, at times neglecting other subjects:

> …teachers spend many hours a day trying to teach, especially in schools with low test scores, throughout elementary and sometimes middle school. Reading and math have taken over the curriculum in many schools, to the exclusion of subjects like history and science. (Wexler 2018, https://www.forbes.com/sites/nataliewexler/2018/04/09/three-mistakes-we-need-to-fix-if-we-want-education-reform-to-succeed/#1a5ad7b77592)

At the policy level, the politics of education reforms continue to target standards, assessment, accountability, and excellence and quality education for all. As Petrilli (2018) puts it:

> Together, *today's* standards, assessments, and accountability systems provide a clear message to our elementary and middle schools: Your job is to get students on track for college, career, and citizenship by building the knowledge and skills, year by year, they will *need* to succeed (Petrilli 2018, https://www.educationnext.org/where-education-reform-goes-here/

At the vocational level, education reforms aim to prepare students for fulfilling and rewarding career. Duncan and Spellings (2018) suggest that education should prepare students for career, citizenship, college and an upward economic and social mobility:

> An educated populace, versed in civics, trained to reason and empowered to act is what safeguards our democracy. Equitable access to education—our greatest force for economic mobility, economic growth and a level playing field for all—is what underwrites the American meritocracy. (Duncan and Spellings 2018, https://www.washingtonpost.com/)

It is difficult to imagine another time in history when globalisation has had a greater cultural, economic, technological and political impact on educational systems. The increased importance of the knowledge industry, innovations in information and communication technologies, and a strong orientation toward the market economy, and global competitiveness affect every sector of education globally. At the same time, globalisation has acquired a new meta-ideology, or the *global hegemonic meta-ideology* that carries strong elements of Western ideologies. In critiquing globalisation and its impact on education, we need to know how its 'ideological packaging' affect education practices around the world. As Carnoy and Rhoten (2002), wrote, there was a need to assess a possible nexus between globalisation, ideology, education reforms, and their impact on schooling, and standards-driven outcomes:

> In assessing globalization's true relationship to educational change, we need to know how globalization and its ideological packaging affect the overall delivery of schooling, from transnational paradigms, to national policies, to local practices. (Carnoy and Rhoten 2002, p. 3)

One of the most significant macro-social policy responses of the education sector, both locally and globally, to the market forces and competitiveness, are the competitiveness-driven reforms, or reforms due to shifting demands for jobs, skills, commodities and emerging markets. Globally, neo-liberalism in higher education policy reforms has been characteristic of capitalist societies (Zajda and Rust 2016). The politics of education reforms both locally and globally, reflect this new emerging paradigm of accountability, globalisation and academic capitalism, performance indicators and standards-driven policy change. As a result, the divided and highly elitist and stratified education sector, by means of their hegemonic structures, legitimises social inequality. Hence, equity-driven policy reforms in education, in the climate of neo-conservatism, are unlikely to succeed. One of the effects of globalisation is that the education sector, having modelled its goals and strategies on the market-oriented and *entrepreneurial* business model and standards-driven curriculum, is compelled to embrace the corporate ethos of the competitiveness, efficiency, accountability and profit-driven *managerialism*. Recent changes in the world economy have resulted in at least *four* responses of the education sector to market forces and increased competitiveness:

- Competitiveness-driven reforms (reforms due to shifting demands for skills, commodities and markets)
- Finance-driven reforms (reforms in public/private sectors, budgets, company income, cuts in education spending)
- Market force–driven reforms for dominance globally
- Equity-driven reforms (reforms to improve the quality of education and its role as source of upward social mobility) to increase equality of *economic opportunity* for students.

Gobalisation and Neo-liberalism in Education Reforms

The ascent of a neo-liberal and neoconservative education policy, globally, which has redefined education and training as an investment in human capital and human resource development, has dominated education reforms since the 1980s. The literature relating to human capital theory demonstrates that education consistently emerges as the prime human capital investment. Human capital refers to "the productive capacities of human beings as income producing agents in the economy" (Zajda 2008, p. 45). Human capital research has found that education and training raises the productivity of workers by imparting useful knowledge and skills; improves a worker's socio-economic status, career opportunities and income (Becker 1964, 1994; Schultz 1971; Levin 1987; Carnoy 1999; Saha 2005; Zajda 2007, 2015a, b) and plays a significant role in driving overall economic performance. In general, neo-liberalism in higher education policy reforms focuses on "meeting the needs of the market, technical education and job training, and revenue generation" (Saunders 2010, p. 54).

Globalisation, policy and the politics of current higher education reforms suggest new economic and political dimensions of neo-liberalism, and a new dimension of cultural imperialism. As the UNESCO's humanistic model for education, so influential in the 1960s, was weakening, "the economic and techno-determinist paradigm of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) was gaining in prominence" (Zajda 2010, p. xvi). Such hegemonic shifts in ideology and policy were likely to have significant economic and cultural implications for the Australian higher education system, reforms and policy implementations. Forces of globalisation, manifesting themselves as a neo-liberal and bourgeois hegemony, tended to legitimate an "exploitative system" (McLaren and Farahmandpur 2005), and have contributed to the ongoing neo-liberal globalisation of the higher education sector in Australia. This is characterized by a relentless drive towards performance, global standards of excellence and quality, globalisation of academic assessment (OECD, PISA), global academic achievement syndrome (OECD, World Bank), global academic elitism and league tables for the universities (Zajda 2008, p. 3, 2015a, b). The latter signifies both ascribed and achieved status, the positioning of distinction, privilege, excellence and exclusivity. In higher education policy documents in the OECD, the World Bank, and Australia, policy reforms appear to be presented as a given, and as a necessary response to economic globalisation and global competitiveness.

Forces of globalisation, manifesting themselves as a neo-liberal and bourgeois hegemony, tended to legitimate an "exploitative system" (McLaren and Farahmandpur 2005), and have contributed to the ongoing neo-liberal globalisation of the higher education sector. This is characterized by a relentless drive towards performance, global standards of excellence and quality, globalization of academic assessment (OECD, PISA), global academic achievement syndrome (OECD, World Bank), global academic elitism and league tables for both secondary schools and the universities (Zajda 2014). The latter signifies both ascribed and achieved status, the positioning of distinction, privilege, excellence and exclusivity. In higher education policy documents in the OECD, the World Bank, and elsewhere, policy reforms appear to be presented as a given, and as a necessary response to economic globalization and global competitiveness (Zajda 2018).

Standards-Driven and Outcomes-Defined Policy Change

One of the effects of economic forces of globalisation is that educational organisations, having modelled its goals and strategies on the entrepreneurial business model, are compelled to embrace the corporate ethos of the efficiency, accountability and profit-driven managerialism (Zajda 2018) Hence, the politics of education reforms in the twenty-first century reflect this new emerging paradigm of standards-driven and outcomes-defined policy change (Zajda 2015a, 2016, 2018). Some policy analysts have criticized the ubiquitous and excessive nature of standardization in education imposed by the EFA framework (Carnoy 1999; Torres 1998).

> Whether one focuses on their positive or negative effects, at the bottom line, there was an agreement that the policies and practices of educational development had converged along the consensus built at the multilateral forum. (Carnoy 1999)

Globalisation and the competitive market forces have generated a massive growth in the knowledge industries that are having profound effects on society and educational institutions. In the global culture, the university, as other educational institutions, is now expected to invest its capital in the knowledge market. It increasingly acts as an entrepreneurial institution. Such a managerial and entrepreneurial re-orientation would have been seen in the past as antithetical to the traditional ethos of the university of providing knowledge for its own sake (see also Sabour 2015; Zajda 2015a). It can be said that globalisation may have an adverse impact on education. One of the effects of globalisation on education in all spheres, is that it is compelled to embrace the corporate ethos of the efficiency and profit-driven managerialism. This is particularly evident in higher education. The new entrepreneurial university in the global culture succumbs to the economic gains offered by the neo-liberal ideology (Zajda 2015b).

Globalisation, Marketisation and Quality/Efficiency Driven Reforms

Globalisation, marketisation and quality/efficiency driven reforms around the world since the 1980s have resulted in structural and qualitative changes in education and policy, including an increasing focus on the “lifelong learning for all”, or a “cradle-to-grave” vision of learning and the “knowledge economy” in the global culture. Governments, in their quest for excellence, quality and accountability in education, increasingly turn to international and comparative education data analysis Zajda 2018). All of them agree that the major goal of education is to enhance the individual’s social and economic prospects. This can only be achieved by providing quality education for *all*. Students’ academic achievement is now regularly monitored and measured within the ‘internationally agreed framework’ of the OECD’s Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). This was done in response to the growing demand for international comparisons of educational outcomes (OECD, *Education policy outlook 2015: making reforms happen*). Yet, not all schools are successful in addressing the new academic standards imperatives, due to a number of factors, both internal and external. Cohen, for instance, attributes failure of education reforms in the USA due to fragmented school governance and the lack of coherent educational infrastructure.

To measure levels of academic performance in the global culture, the OECD, in co-operation with UNESCO, is using *World Education Indicators* (WEI) programme, covering a broad range of comparative indicators, which report on the resource invested in education and their returns to individuals (OECD 2016 *Education at a Glance* – OECD *Indicators*).

The both validity and reliability of PISA data has also been the subject of much debate. The test design in PISA is based on matrix sampling where each student is administered a subset of items from the total item pool. For example, as Johansson (2018), demonstrates, in PISA 2018, there were nearly 250 questions in the pool for the reading domain. Each student receives a test form or booklet comprising of four 30-min clusters, assembled from two subject domains. In 2018, reading was the core subject and two clusters in every test form comprised reading items. For countries taking reading math and science there were 36 test forms and different groups of students answered these (but only one). The items in the test forms are overlapping to certain degree (Johansson 2018).

Berliner (2018) questions PISA's test validity. He is concerned with the quite substantial differences between national raw scores and the scaled scores (plausible values) in PISA 2015. Wright also argues that PISA, as an instrument of the OECD, 'needs to provide better information to participant countries about the strengths and weaknesses of students in relation to the assessment frameworks, be more transparent about its methods, including the items used, and how measurement error is calculated, and broaden the assessment focus to include a broader range of competencies'. For instance, Araujo et al. (2017) acknowledge that the ambitious agenda of PISA to assess students' application of reading, mathematics, and science to challenging real-world contexts leaves the developers vulnerable to criticism. For example, the 2018 PISA framework for mathematics (OECD 2019) requires that students formulate situations mathematically, employ mathematical concepts, facts, procedures and reasoning, and interpret, employing and evaluating the results in context (p. 77). Seven mathematical processes are highlighted, communication, mathematization, representation, reasoning and argumentation, problem solving strategies, using language, and using mathematical tools. The complex framework is a mathematics educators dream. However, the challenge is whether it is possible to assess such complex outcomes in constrained test environments, particularly with multi-choice items. As Wright argues, PISA data, given the complexity of creating comparable assessments across over 65 nations, 'need to be interpreted with caution coupled with the ambitious frameworks created by PISA itself':

> It is inevitable that many questions are asked about the reliability and validity of the tests. Critique about margins of error, representativeness of sampling, comparability of translations, use of a single dimension Rasch Scale to rank nations, and narrowness of content, suggest that results from PISA need to be interpreted with caution.

Even if PISA, and other large-scale assessments, meet the criteria for perfect knowledge, would it be safe to assume that the players in educational policy act rationally?. In discussing the merits of PISA for educational policy, Schleicher and Zoido (2016) state:

> …that is why PISA does not venture into telling countries what they should do, but its strength lies in telling countries what everybody else around is doing and with what success. (Schleicher and Zoido 2016, p. 384)

Globalisation, Educational Social Stratification and Social Inequality

Increasingly, schools, both locally and globally, are striving towards academic and cultural elitism. They project and market themselves in terms of distinction, academic excellence, and privilege. It has resulted in the divided schools: the elitist and academically performing schools, and other schools, resulting in educational social stratification. The need to address economic and social inequalities was discussed by Dervis (2007), who argued that globalisation has changed the world economy by creating "winners" and "losers":

> Globalization has fundamentally altered the world economy, creating winners and losers. Reducing inequalities both within and between countries, and building a more inclusive globalization is the most important development challenge of our time … Addressing these inequalities is our era's most important development challenge, and underscores why inclusive development is central to the mission of the UN and UNDP. (Dervis 2007)

In his informed critique of the human capital discourse, and its use in the logic of rates of return, or the impact of the quantity of education on earnings, Klees (2016) demonstrates that human capital theory and its connection between education and productivity is defined and driven by the ideology of meritocratic capitalism, and neo-liberal ideology, where its 'rewards are more or less deserved' (Klees 2016, p. 259). Consequently, it has been fashionable since the 1980s, to use the human capital and skills discourses to 'blame individuals', rather than social structures and organisations, for lack of education and job opportunities:

> …for their lack of 'investment' in human capital, for their not attending school, for their dropping out of school, for their not studying the 'right' fields, for their lack of entrepreneurship. (Klees 2016, p. 259)

The very ideology of capitalism, conveniently legitimated by human capital theory, could never solve social inequality and poverty, because greater economic equality, employment and social justice are not the goals of capitalism. Capitalism, driven by the profit-maximisation incentive, makes social inequality, lack of full employment and endemic poverty inevitable (Bowles and Gintis 1976; Wallerstein 1984; Klees 2016).

Rizvi (2017) also suggests that the current discourse of educational reforms, driven by a neo-liberal ideology, has resulted in the intensification of 'social inequalities' (Rizvi 2017, p. 10). He argues that globalisation while bringing 'great benefits to most communities', at the same time reinforces inequalities:

> Global mobility of people, ideas and media has brought great benefits to most communities, but clearly in ways that are uneven and unequal. (Rizvi 2017, p. 12)

One of the effects of globalisation is that the higher education sector, having modelled its goals and strategies on the market-oriented and *entrepreneurial* business model, which reflects neo-liberal ideology, is compelled to embrace the 'corporate ethos of the efficiency, accountability and profit-driven managerialism' (Zajda 2015a, b). This necessarily produces both socially and economically stratified societies and education systems.

The dimensions of inequality and implications for social justice are due to the impact of privatisation/marketisation, and the rising inequity in the availability of funds among local education/regional authorities, because of differentiated economic and social differences between rich and poor regions. Regional inequalities in educational funding have an adverse effect on access to quality education. Some poorer rural regions are socially, economically and educationally disadvantaged, with little access to high-quality education. Current government policy of supporting best-performing schools, based on National examination results in secondary schools, will continue to have an 'adverse effect on access to quality education for all in those regions' (Dervin and Zajda 2020, p. 7).

From a critical theory perspective, globalisation has contributed to a new form of entrenched inequality and social stratification between the rich and poor economies (Milanovic 2005a, b, Milanovic 2006). The dimensions of social inequality are essentially due to the impact of capitalist economy, privatisation/marketisation, and the rising inequity in the availability of funds among local education/regional authorities, because of differentiated economic and social differences between rich and poor regions. Regional inequalities in educational funding have an adverse effect on access to quality education. Some poorer rural regions are socially, economically and educationally disadvantaged, with little access to high-quality education. Current government policy of supporting best-performing schools, based on National examination results in secondary schools, will continue to have an 'adverse effect on access to quality education for all in those regions' (Dervin and Zajda 2020, p. 7).

The above critique of globalisation, policy and education reforms suggests new economic, social and political dimensions of cultural imperialism (see Zajda 2015a). Such hegemonic shifts in ideology, affecting policy are likely to have significant economic and cultural implications for national education systems, reforms and policy implementations.

Conclusion

The above analysis of education policy reforms, and the resultant social stratifications and inequality in the global culture, demonstrates a complex nexus between globalisation, ideology and education reforms – where, on the one hand, democratisation and progressive pedagogy is equated with equality, inclusion, equity, tolerance and human rights, while on the other hand, globalisation is perceived, by some critics at least, to be a totalising force that is widening the socio-economic status (SES) gap and cultural and economic capital between the rich and the poor, and bringing power, domination and control by corporate bodies and powerful organisations (Milanovic 2006). Hence, we need to continue exploring critically the new challenges confronting the global village, in the provision of authentic democracy, equality, and social justice that genuinely promote an empowering and transformative learning and pedagogy. We need to focus on the crucial issues at the centre of current and on-going education reforms, namely equity, social justice and human rights, if genuine culture of learning, and transformation, characterised by wisdom, compassion, equality, and intercultural understanding, is to become a reality, rather than a policy rhetoric (Zajda and Ozdowski 2017).

References

Araujo, et al. (2017). Do PISA data justify PISA-based education policy?. *International Journal of Comparative Education and Development*. Retreived from https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJCED-12-2016-0023/full/html

Becker, G. (1964). *Human capital*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Becker, G. (1994). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berliner, D. (2018). PISA is simply another standardized test. In S. Lindblad, D. Pettersson, & T. S. Popkewitz (Eds.), *Education by the numbers and the making of society. The expertise of international assessments*. New York/London: Routledge.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Carnoy, M. (1999). *Globalization and educational reform: What planners need to know?* Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Carnoy, M., & Rhoten, D. (2002). What does globalization mean for educational change? A comparative approach. *Comparative Education Review, 46*(1), 1–9.

Dervin, F., & Zajda, J. (2020). *Governance in education: Diversity and effectiveness* (Report to UNESCO on governance in education). Paris: UNESCO.

Dervis, K. (2007). Inclusive globalization. In *Making globalization work for all* (United Nations development Programme annual report). New York: UNESCO.

Johansson, S. (2018). Do students' high scores on international assessments translate to low levels of creativity? *Phi Delta Kappan, 99*(7), 57–61. https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721718767863

Klees, S. (2016). Human capital and rates of return: Brilliant ideas or ideological dead ends? *Comparative Education Review, 60*(4). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307622047_Human_Capital_and_Rates_of_Return_Brilliant_Ideas_or_Ideological_Dead_Ends

Levin, H. (1987). Work and education. In G. Psacharopoulos (Ed.), *Economics of education* (pp. 146–157). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2005). *Teaching against global capitalism and the new imperialism*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
Milanovic, B. (2005a). *Worlds apart: Global and international inequality 1950–2000*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Milanovic, B. (2005b, April). Can we discern the effect of globalization on income distribution? Evidence from household budget surveys. *World Bank Economic Review, 1*, 21–44.
Milanovic, B. (2006). Global income inequality. *World Economics, 7*(1), 131–157.
Milanovic, B. (2016). *Global inequality: A new approach for the age of globalization*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
OECD. (2016). *Education at a glance*. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2016_eag-2016-en
Rizvi, F. (2017). *Globalization and the neoliberal imaginary of educational reform*. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000247328
Sabour, M. (2015). The impact of globalisation on the mission of the university. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Second international handbook of globalisation, education and policy research*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9789401794923
Saha, L. (2005). Cultural and social capital in global perspective. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *The international handbook of globalisation and education policy research* (pp. 745–755). Dordrecht: Springer.
Saunders, D. (2010). Neoliberal ideology and public higher education in the United States. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 8*(1), 42–77.
Schleicher & Zoido. (2016). The policies that shaped PISA, and the policies that PISA shaped. In *The handbook of global education*. Wiley Online Library. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118468005#page=395
Schultz, T. (1971). *Investment in human capital*. New York: Free Press.
Torres, C. A. (1998). Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world. *Comparative Education Review, 42*(4). Retreived from https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/447522?journalCode=cer
Wallerstein, I. (1984). *The capitalist world-economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wexler, N. (2018). *Three mistakes we need to fix if we want education reform to succeed*. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/nataliewexler/2018/04/09/three-mistakes-we-need-to-fix-if-we-want-education-reform-to-succeed/#1a5ad7b77592
Zajda, J. (2007). Credentialism in the 21st century: The importance of qualifications. *Educational Practice and Theory, 29*(2), 61–79.
Zajda, J. (2008). Globalisation and implications for equity and democracy in education. In J. Zajda, L. Davies, & S. Majhanovich (Eds.), *Globalization, comparative and policy research: Equity, access and democracy in education* (pp. 3–13). Dordrecht: Springer.
Zajda, J. (2010). Globalisation, ideology and education policy reforms. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Globalisation, ideology and education policy reforms* (pp. xiii–xxii). Dordrecht: Springer.
Zajda, J. (2014). Globalisation and neo-liberalism as educational policy in Australia. In H. Yolcu & D. Turner (Eds.), *Neoliberal education reforms: A global analysis* (pp. 164–183). New York: Taylor & Francis/Routledge.
Zajda, J. (2015a). Globalisation and its impact on education and policy. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Second international handbook of globalisation, education and policy research* (pp. 1–13). Dordrecht: Springer.
Zajda, J. (2015b). Global trends in education and academic achievement. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Second international handbook of globalisation, education and policy research* (pp. 105–125). Dordrecht: Springer.
Zajda, J. (Ed.). (2016). *Globalisation, ideology and politics of education reforms*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9783319195056

Zajda, J. (2018). *Globalisation and education reforms: Paradigms and ideologies*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9789402412031
Zajda, J., & Ozdowski, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Globalisation and human rights education*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/generic/search/results?SGWID=5-40109-24-653415-0&submit=Submit&sortOrder=relevance&searchType=EASY_CDA&searchScope=editions&queryText=Joseph+zajda
Zajda, J., & Rust, V. (Eds.). (2016). *Globalisation and higher education reforms*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9783319281902

Chapter 2
Analysing the (Mis)Use and Consequences of International Large-Scale Assessments

Stefan Johansson

Abstract When insights are shared across borders, similarities in structures, polices, pedagogies and curricula can emerge. One global force is international large-scale assessments (ILSA), which have been criticized for spreading isomorphic ideologies. At the same time, ILSA data may have the potential to legitimize informed decisions, now covering long-term trend databases from many school-systems. Further, IEA encyclopedias, papers presented at IEA and PISA research conferences, and a growing volume of academic publications all point to numerous studies that draw on international assessment datasets to explore issues of pedagogy and classroom practice. Given the rigorous test administration of ILSA's, the data generated has the potential to provide nuanced snapshots of characteristics of different school-systems, provided that is that the data are used with caution. But are data used with caution? The current chapter discusses the use and possibilities of ILSA data and how results on ILSA's impact education and policy reforms world-wide.

Keywords Assessment · Comparative education · Education policy · Globalization · International large-scale assessments · PISA · Consequential validity · Policy impact

International Large-Scale Assessments and Their Aims

Why are we testing so many students in so many countries in so many subjects? The history of international large-scale assessments goes back more than half a century and the initial aims of the testing programme will be discussed below. The

S. Johansson (✉)
Department of Education and Special Education, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden
e-mail: stefan.johansson@gu.se

J. Zajda (ed.), *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms*, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 20,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1743-2_2

International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) was founded in 1958 with the aim of studying educational achievement and its determinants in different countries. One of the objectives was that countries could learn from the experiences of others and avoid developments that had been shown to produce unsatisfactory results. By collecting data researchers could analyze differences and similarities around the globe through an educational laboratory (Husén 1979; Walker 1976). The first IEA study, First International Mathematics Study, (FIMS64) was conducted in 1964, and in 1970–1971 the six-subject survey (SSS) was conducted, the latter including three populations and six subjects. Such an extensive project has not been carried out since then, although in recent years the number of international assessments has increased. After the SSS, there was a rather low level of activity within IEA until the 1990s. The notable exception was the Second International Study in Mathematics and Science (SIMS80 and SISS84). The TIMSS 95 study marked a new phase in the development of the international large-scale assessments (ILSA) of IEA (Gustafsson 2008). This phase was characterized by a less marked researcher scrutiny. The aim of the studies also shifted away from an explanatory focus towards descriptive purposes. This trend is evidenced in the national and international reports that are produced, where nowadays the emphasis is more on reporting descriptive outcomes than analyzing the factors behind them. Instead, large databases are made available for secondary analyses.

Another international organization carrying out large-scale studies is the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Founded in 1961, OECD was initially an international economic organization comprising 34 countries with the aim of stimulating economic growth and world trade. The organization consists of highly developed countries that regularly meet to share policy experiences, seek answers to common problems, identify good practices, and to coordinate the domestic and international policies of its members. In more recent decades the aim and scope of OECD have been expanded. In 2000, OECD launched its Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), which covers several subject domains, including mathematics, science and reading for 15-year old's. In each wave, one area forms the major domain, while the other two are minor domains, represented by a smaller number of items. PISA testing is conducted every third year in all OECD countries, along with many associate countries. In 2018, about 80 countries and economies participated in PISA.

There are many similarities between PISA and IEA studies such as samples with clearly defined populations, similar instruments, data collection processes, and psychometrical methods, and the implementation of rigorous quality control measures (Olsen 2005). Further, the studies have cyclic designs with a focus on measuring trends. Both organizations also provide country rankings, sometimes referred to as league tables, which attract substantial public attention when the results are launched. Although public attention may vary across countries, in many countries both IEA and OECD studies receive significant coverage in both the media and in policy debate.

Even though there are many similarities between the studies carried out by IEA and OECD, the organizations are different with respect to background and purpose. While the IEA, at least initially, aimed to provide research data for educational research, the OECD explicitly aims to impact policy and policy-making (Olsen 2005; Meyer et al. 2018). The OECD has developed new policy techniques to promote neoliberal ideas, performativity and management culture. According to Ball (2010) such ideas become increasingly important and vital for the governing of education in most European countries. OECD also issues data-based reports that describe how different countries can develop their school-system. Further, while the IEA studies focus on curriculum-defined knowledge and skills, the OECD studies attempt to capture competencies that are important (in the view of OECD experts) in adult life and for life-long learning (Lockheed and Wagemaker 2013).

ILSA's, like PISA, are standardized tests. But in comparison to other national tests and SATs they have a particular focus on the nations' average test-score as well as analyses of subpopulations such as groups with differing social background. Within the PISA consortium, for example, measurement organizations such as the ETS and ACER provide their expertise. PISA has thus employed some of the most acknowledged measurement people in the world. Still, there are validity issues with the tests, which, to large degree are inevitable when constructing a common test for so many countries in the world. One issue relating to validity is that questions are claimed to be context dependent and may be interpreted differently between different countries in the world. Likewise, some questions show differences for girls and boys. It is challenging to judge whether the differences in achievement are related to students' ability levels or if they a depending on different interpretations of the test items, however, there are aids to analyze this, such as Differential Item Functioning (DIF) analysis. In the case of PISA, the focus is on OECD countries and questions are constructed with a focus on these countries. Some 30 associate countries are also taking the tests and their culture and context may be somewhat different from the OECD countries. ILSA organizers, however, tries to avoid much of the cultural bias that can occur. Representatives from all participating countries come together discussing the item pool as well as the assessment of the items. Items producing cultural bias are likely to be removed.

Even though IEA's and OECD's studies are comparative in nature, it should be noted that the main focus is not to compare *all* countries' performances. Several decades ago, one of the founding fathers of IEA concluded that the IEA-project by no means had the objective to compare students' performances in all different countries. Diverse cultures, varying economies, as well as different epistemological beliefs all make it difficult to compare achievement across the range of different countries (Husén 1979). In spite of cautions about comparing test scores and rankings PISA results are informing policies in various countries (see, Klemenčič and Mirazchiyski 2018). One such example is put forward by Gorur and Wu (2014) who asked for a more nuanced analysis of ILSA results, before these should inform policy. Their example is situated in Australia's top five ambitions. However, based on a more detailed reading of the results Gorur and Wu show that the results vary very much across different regions of Australia. The averages the rankings displayed were consequently of little use for informing policy decisions. Average scores obscure far more than they reveal the authors concluded.

Despite increased popularity of ILSA's in terms of number of studies and public attention, they have met a fair amount of criticism, from different angles and perspectives. One line of criticism mainly concerns the issues of the measurement. This includes both conceptual and technical aspects of the tests. The item format in TIMSS has been criticized (see for example, Schoultz, Säljö & Wyndhamn) as well as the scaling procedures and reporting of test-scores in PISA (Kreiner and Christensen 2014). The ILSA's' validity is however not only challenged for issues regarding item content and construct. Indeed, it has been argued that several consequences of ILSA's are not associated with the measurement per se. One claim about ILSA's is that they steer learning in different ways and at different levels of the school system. For example, in response to low algebra results in TIMSS, a country that did not place much emphasis on algebra prior to the 2000 may introduce mathematics reforms, increase the time for math in school, and increase the importance of algebra in the mathematics syllabus. Such behavior would imply that ILSA's are 'steering at a distance'. Thus, if ILSA results are fed back into the nations' policy-making process, this may lead national educational systems to develop similar models for schooling, thereby causing a trend of convergence in educational policy and practice among different countries. While this may be desired by some, critics could argue that such convergence may hamper creativity and uniqueness of single educational systems, which often are a stated goal in the acts of human rights in different countries.

Some Views on ILSA Tests, Their Scores and Their Consequences

The number of research studies performed by academic scholars and others on ILSA data is vast, and increasing over time. ILSA data may be a powerful tool for policymakers, in that they can legitimize and delegitimize school-reforms (Pettersson 2008). Since news and research findings travel fast it is perhaps increasingly important to nuance the findings with an eye on validity. In the following, I will sketch some examples using and evaluating ILSA's. Among others, I will point to aspects of the content, the constructs, and the consequences of ILSA's. One reason for undertaking such investigation is that these aspects are crucial in modern validity theory. The current mainstream view of validity is that it is based on an integration of any evidence that bears on the interpretation or meaning of test scores. Further, the boundaries of validity go beyond the meaning of tests scores to include relevance, utility values and social consequences (Kane 2006; Messick 1989).

Furthermore, I want to nuance research findings, because, for example, perceived truths are sometimes shallow at best and that critiquing claims are not always so straightforward as we might be led to believe. I will begin to review some major findings related to ILSA's which have had high policy impact, thereafter I will explore some critique against test items, some critique against test-score comparisons, and finally some critique against ILSA policy impacts.

ILSA and Their Constructs

In elaborating the construct of knowledge represented by ILSA test items, several scholars have questioned the construct validity of ILSA pointing to the content of the items. For example, it has been argued that the tests do not constitute trustworthy representations of students' knowledge (Schoultz et al. 2001; Serder and Jakobsson 2015; Serder and Ideland 2016). From a sociocultural perspective it is thus not possible to know what the students are responding to in a test situation, for example because "the only clues are pencil marks in the multiple-choice boxes or some inscriptions to open-ended questions" (Serder and Jakobsson 2015, p. 835). Sociocultural theorists believe that it is necessary to create situations in which students' meaning-making of the test questions can be observed and analyzed in order to understand how and why they answer questions as they do. Proponents of ILSA argue that cultural and other differences are 'factored out' via the large pool of questions available in a PISA or TIMSS assessment. Also, they argue that to compare performances, testing needs to be carried out under standardized conditions otherwise the differences may be largely due to different test conditions. Further, the general notion of construct validity (see, Messick 1989; Kane 2006) would not refer to characteristics of single items but rather a set of items to generalize findings to broader constructs. One should also note that in ILSA, the test-scores of the individual students are not in focus. Rather measures of centrality and spread that assume significance so groups can be compared.

Another example put forward by Berliner (2018) relates to test validity. He is concerned with the quite substantial differences between national raw scores and the scaled scores (plausible values) in PISA 2015. By comparing national raw scores and scaled scores Berliner finds that, for example, Slovenia and the US have equal raw scores (for a subset of items and students) but quite different scaled scores and rankings. But, reporting raw scores ignores the differences of ability of subgroups to which the set of items was administered. However, the trustworthiness does not, because comparing raw scores and scaled scores is in fact like comparing apples and oranges. Let me elaborate a bit on the sampling in ILSA's.

The test design in PISA is based on matrix sampling where each student is administered a subset of items from the total item pool. For example, in PISA 2018, there where nearly 250 questions in the pool for the reading domain. Each student receives a test form or booklet comprising of four 30-min clusters, assembled from two subject domains. In 2018, reading was the core subject and two clusters in every test form comprised reading items. For countries taking reading math and science there were 36 test forms and different groups of students answered these (but only one). The items in the test forms are overlapping to certain degree.

Inevitably, the different items of the forms make it inappropriate to use any statistic based on the number of correct responses in reporting the survey results. Differences in total scores, or statistics based on them, among students who took different sets of items may be due to variations in difficulty of the test forms or the level of ability of the group of test-takers. Unless strong assumptions are made, for example, that the different test forms are perfectly parallel, the performance of two groups assessed in a matrix sampling arrangement cannot be directly compared using raw scores.

The reasons for adapting a matrix sampling design are many, but mainly it is a way to enhance the validity of the outcome measure – the national test score. For example, in ILSA's, test forms are kept relatively short to minimize individuals' response burden. This is probably especially important in ILSA's because they are low-stake assessments for the students, i.e., they do not provide any feedback to the student. While the test form of an individual student could suffer from construct underrepresentation for, say, the reading domain, the few responses for each student will form a wide range of content representation when responses are aggregated.

The PISA technical report (OECD 2017) emphasizes that plausible values are not substitutes for test scores for individuals. Since they incorporate student responses to test items and information about their background characteristics of the student in an IRT model scaled scores cannot be used to compare individuals. These, so called plausible values (PVs) are combining the IRT scaling of the test items with a latent regression model using information from the student context questionnaire in a population model. PV's are constructed explicitly to provide consistent estimates of population effects.

ILSA and Consequences

Naturally, many policy makers see the value of investing in education. Education is a good investment for all kinds of reasons; not only for countries' economy but also for the personal well-being and development. However, the economic incitements play an important role as the improvements in educational achievement, as measured by PISA results, has been related to economic growth. In fact, one reason to PISA's policy impact may be the strong statistical claims showing that improvements in ILSA will lead to higher Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth rates (see, for example, Sahlberg 2006; Hanushek and Woessmann 2007, 2015). As the scores of ILSA has been related to economic outputs the interest in raising test scores has gained much interest.

However, how scores on ILSA's relate to economic growth has recently been challenged. In a study by Komatsu and Rappleye (2017a, b) the strong correlation between improvement in ILSA and growth in GDP is questioned. In their study, Hanushek and Woessmann (2015) compared test scores and economic growth over the same period (1960–2000) and showed a strong relationship. But Komatsu and Rappleye (2017a, b) claimed that it is reasonable that it takes a few decades for students to be a part of the work force; improving scores today would consequently not lead to improved GDP in the near future but in a couple of decades ahead. By comparing test scores for one period with economic growth in a subsequent period (1995–2014) the relationship decreased dramatically. While the results of Hanushek and Woessmann (2015) speak for high relation between GDP and PISA results, Komatsu's and Rappleye's results show a modest association between the two measures. The relationship is substantial (R2 = .57) when comparing the scores and growth under the same period while it is rather weak when using a subsequent period (R2 = .10). Though it makes sense that educational achievement should impact economic prosperity to some degree, it is reasonably more complex to determine than by comparing test scores and GDP.

There are many examples of countries that are willing to reform some parts of the school-system after ILSA results. Changes may already be 'in the air' and ILSA results may be the provocation to make the changes. ILSA may also be used to delegitimize decisions which already have been made (e.g., Pettersson 2008). It is important to emphasize that changes in curricula do not happen within a short time span. Already in the wake of the results of the first mathematics survey in 1964 in Sweden, it was discussed that different school reforms did not affect student results. Then it was pointed out that changes were hardly possible to detect from one year to another, rather impact takes decades. It is reasonable to believe that this holds true today as well. Actual knowledge patterns are also influenced by the teachers and their interpretations of the curriculum. Knowledge patterns are also strongly influenced by knowledge traditions for a long time. In the following I will give two examples of impact that ILSA nevertheless has been claimed to have.

On the Relation Between Innovativeness and ILSA Results

Zhao (2012) finds it reasonable to question the value and the significance of educational excellence measured by PISA since high-performing East Asian countries perceive their entrepreneurial capability to be low (Zhao 2012, p. 59). Zhao supports his claims of lacking innovativeness in East Asia with the results of the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) study, which is a survey of perceived entrepreneurial capability in a wide range of countries (Bosma et al. 2012). As a comparison to the GEM scores, Zhao uses the mathematics results of PISA 2009. The comparison is striking. The comparison shows that high-performing countries in PISA, such as Japan, Korea, Singapore and Finland, all have low scores on their *perceived* entrepreneurial capability. At the same time, moderately performing countries like Sweden and USA had fairly high perceived entrepreneurial capability, while a low-performing country such as United Arab Emirates had students who estimates the entrepreneurial capability to be in the top. Zhao (2012) concluded that this relationship indeed can be causal, and that policy reforms intending to increase subject knowledge must be stopped, if not, students' creativity will be seriously harmed. Johansson (2018) thought this pattern rather had to do with the self-reported measured used in GEM rather than with East Asians innovativeness. He studied scores in PISA with scores on academic self-concept in math and found the same pattern as Zhao. Students in low achieving countries assessed the scores to be high in both mathematical ability and entrepreneurial/creative ability, whereas the students in high-performing countries did the opposite. Probably the same pattern would emerge irrespective of the type of self-assessment. There is reason to believe that the test scores are unrelated to the entrepreneurial ability of the East Asian's. A possible explanation of this recurrent paradox may be related to countries response styles to attitude surveys in large-scale cross-national assessments, such as the PISA.

There is more evidence that PISA rankings and innovation do not correlate. Berliner (2018) concludes that entrepreneurship is a better predictor of nation's future economy than is ILSA results. It is also shown that the rank on the global innovation index 2016 and rank on PISA 2015 are poorly related. Without going into detail the global innovation index uses 82 different metrics of innovativeness to determine rankings. The comparison seems relevant at first place, however, using the same line of reasoning as Komatsu and Rappleye (2017a, b) when discussing the results of Hanushek and Woessmann, there is reason to believe that the lagging effects have been forgotten. The possible effect of innovation in a country and its PISA are not on the same time scale. First PISA effects are unlikely when people first enter the labor market. It would be unreasonable to expect any effects students are 15 years old. The global innovation index does not give a clear pattern either however. Examining the results from 2018 we can note Switzerland still in top, followed by Netherlands and Sweden. Singapore are in fifth place now passing the US who are in sixth place. Countries similar to the top countries, and also performing similar in PISA 2015 – Norway, Canada and Austria come first on around 20th place, after nations like China, Hong Kong, Korea and Japan. The impression is that high-performing countries are gaining positions on the innovation index while several rich countries are lagging behind.

On the Changes of Curricula and ILSA Results

Currently, individual countries' strivings to come out at the top of ranking tables seem to have created a homogenizing of school-systems. When insights are shared across borders, similarities in structures, polices, pedagogies and curricula can emerge. Such homogenization may not necessarily be positive. Consequently the 'borrowing' of policies has become one of the main criticisms levelled against ILSA's. According to Spring (2008), world cultural theorists claim that a combination of international tests and the sharing of international research are resulting in a global homogeneity of instructional practices. In this case, and in spite of obvious national differences, such as language, culture and religion, it is concluded that countries become more similar over time—a process often referred to as 'isomorphism' (Wiseman et al. 2013). Borrowing and lending of educational policies are mechanisms of change that are subtle and difficult to chart and analyze. One reason for this is that official descriptions of national educational policy for strategic reasons need not reflect actual practices. Thus, what has been written on paper, does not imply change in actual teaching or achievement. For example, it has been problematic to establish any reliable evidence for that global influences (e.g., ILSA's) would lead to actual convergence in student achievement, or attained curricula. Researchers within the organization of IEA developed a three-level model of the context and components of the school curriculum in order to shed light on the different levels of curricula, which are important for students' learning opportunities (e.g., Keeves 1972; Robitaille and Garden 1989).

At the level of an educational system (the school-system, the educational region, the school district) there is a set of *intentions for the curriculum*. There are goals and traditions. There are impulses from the community of educators that help shape the character of the curriculum. This collection of intended outcomes, together with course outlines, official syllabi, and textbooks forms an intended curriculum. The second level deals with the classroom, the setting in which the content becomes *implemented* or translated into reality by the teacher. The classroom is central to the educational process, because in the classroom that children are introduced to the study of mathematics, for example, and it is where their concepts and attitudes are formed, and it is the teacher who has the responsibility for transmitting this knowledge to students. The final level of this model represents the *attained curriculum*. After a given period of time at school, the student has acquired a body of mathematical knowledge, and acquired certain attitudes toward the subject. Thus, what aspects of the curriculum as intended, say, by a national agency of education and taught by the teacher, are actually learned by the student?

If in fact nations are borrowing educational policies, comparing educational systems, and setting educational benchmarks based on recommendations from an international agenda, one would expect to see an increased similarity in students' responses on international educational assessments over time. In other words, an increasingly similar curriculum should produce an enhanced similarity between international responses to assessment items that are intended to measure curriculum. In that country-level trend data is available in ILSA's these seem therefore well suited to investigate whether there is a trend towards convergence or curricular harmonization. As the effects of global processes previously have been hard to study empirically, the ILSA's provide a unique approach to study how educational policies developed across countries and over time.

Johansson and Strietholt (2016) investigated if countries converge with respect to their patterns of knowledge in mathematics subdomains, aiming at framing the larger question about a trend towards isomorphism in countries' curricula. The results showed little evidence for a convergence at global level, however, there was compelling evidence that tradition and culture is a strong force when it comes to students' content knowledge. Similarities in culture and language seem to have great impact on the knowledge patterns since countries within same region/culture/language clustered in many occasions. Furthermore, there seem to be a general trend emerging, in that many countries do not have any pronounced strengths or weaknesses in later TIMSS; they perform fairly similar in all subdomains. This might express that students in these countries had the opportunity to learn the tested content, and that the link between the intended, implemented and attained curricula is strong. However, the countries without relative strengths and weaknesses perform quite differently in absolute terms. Some of the countries are among the top performers and some are among the low performers. If the intended curricula overlap substantially across all these countries, there is likely something else that differs (teacher instruction, school resources, etc.) to a great deal since the variation is significant among these countries.

Another interpretation of the trend towards less pronounced strengths and weaknesses may be that certain countries are "teaching to the test" (see, for example, Biggs 1999) to higher degree than others. The concept of teaching to the test could subsume desirable as well as undesirable behaviors, and the tests in TIMSS should be aligned to the curriculum goals. It seems anyway reasonable that the focus on the tests in ILSA's, such as TIMSS varies across countries, thus the ILSA results are more high-stake for certain countries, than for others (c.f., Grek 2009). In recent past, some countries' performances, including Singapore's, have become more focused on algebra and geometry, previously performing evenly in the four subdomains.

Conclusion

Based on performances on ILSA's countries act in different ways. One action may be school-reforms like curriculum change and decentralization of school-systems. Thereby, the consequential validity of the ILSA's has been questioned. Within a validity framework, it is merely not enough to evaluate the validity of, for example, single items in ILSA's. Their subject constructs, relation to curricula in the assessments of IEA, their purpose and impact are factors on different levels that have to be considered when approaching the unified concept of validity. From the literature it can be concluded that several researchers have identified threats to the validity of ILSAs (e.g., Berliner 2018; Baker and LeTendre 2005; Zhao 2012). The literature is both vast and diverse, and ILSAs have been criticized for various having types impact – from the simplification of the school-debate and concept of knowledge, to the travelling of policies across nations. Without doubt, the results of ILSAs have a substantial impact in the media, in discussions of policy educational policy, as well as in public debate (Carvalho and Costa 2015; Nóvoa and Yariv-Mashal 2003). However, there seems to be a need for empirical studies addressing ILSA's long-term effects on globalization in education.

The ways in which global processes impact on educational systems around the world is a contentious issue, and there is no clear resolution in sight. The arrival of the Internet a couple of decades back, increased global traveling, and international trade all have influence on us and bring with them an enormous transformative potential on national cultures. Even though criticized, perhaps one of the greatest benefits as regards ILSAs are the benefits associated with the production of data generated from the numerous studies undertaken, constituting a comparative element comprising up to 60 educational entities. Data have a longitudinal component at the country level, which facilitates opportunities to investigate causal effects of the impact of different reforms in different countries. One might wonder, therefore, if not analyses based on ILSA data should guide policy initiatives, what else should?

References

Baker, D., & LeTendre, G. (2005). *National differences, global similarities: World culture and the future of schooling*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Ball, S. J. (2010). New voices, new Knowledges and the new politics of education research: The gathering of a perfect storm? *European Educational Research Journal, 9*(2), 124–137. https://doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2010.9.2.124.

Berliner, D. (2018). PISA is simply another standardized test. In S. Lindblad, D. Pettersson, & T. S. Popkewitz (Eds.), *Education by the numbers and the making of society. The expertise of international assessments*. New York/London: Routledge.

Biggs, J. (1999). What the student does: Teaching for enhanced learning. *Higher Education Research & Development, 18*(1), 57–75. https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436990180105.

Bosma, N., Wennekers, S., & Amorós, J. (2012). *Global entrepreneurship monitor: 2011 extended report: Entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial employees across the globe*. London: Global Entrepreneurship Research Association.

Carvalho, L. M., & Costa, E. (2015). Seeing education with one's own eyes and through PISA lenses: Considerations of the reception of PISA in European countries. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 36*(5), 638–646. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2013.871449.

Gorur, R., & Wu, M. (2014). Leaning too far? PISA, policy and Australia' 'top five' ambitions. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 36*(5), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2014.930020.

Grek, S. (2009). Governing by numbers: The PISA 'effect' in Europe. *Journal of Education Policy, 24*(1), 23–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930802412669.

Gustafsson, J.-E. (2008). Effects of international comparative studies on educational quality on the quality of educational research. *European Educational Research Journal, 7*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2008.7.1.1.

Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2007). *Education quality and economic growth*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2015). *The knowledge capital of nations: Education and the economics of growth*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Husén, T. (1979). An international research venture in retrospect: The IEA surveys. *Comparative Education Review, 23*, 371–385.

Johansson, S. (2018). Do students' high scores on international assessments translate to low levels of creativity? *Phi Delta Kappan, 99*(7), 57–61. https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721718767863.

Johansson, S., & Strietholt, R. (2016). Konvergieren Leistungsprofile in Mathematik? Evidenz aus fünf IEA Studien. In R. Strietholt, W. Bos, H.-G. Holtappels, & N. McElvany (Eds.), *Jahrbuch der Schulentwicklung. Band 19 – Daten, Beispiele und Perspektiven*. Weinheim Basel: Beltz Juventa.

Kane, M. (2006). Validation. In R. Brennan (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: American Council on Education and National Council on Measurement in Education.

Keeves, J. P. (1972). *Educational environment and student achievement*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.

Klemenčič, E., & Mirazchiyski, P. V. (2018). League tables in educational evidence-based policy-making: Can we stop the horse race, please? *Comparative Education, 54*(3), 309–324. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2017.1383082.

Komatsu, H., & Rappleye, J. (2017a). A new global policy regime founded on invalid statistics? Hanushek, Woessmann, PISA, and economic growth. *Comparative Education, 53*(2), 166–191. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2017.1300008.

Komatsu, H., & Rappleye, J. (2017b). A PISA paradox? An alternative theory of learning as a possible solution for variations in PISA scores. *Comparative Education Review, 61*(2), 269–297. https://doi.org/10.1086/690809.

Kreiner, S., & Christensen, K. (2014). Analyses of model fit and robustness. A new look at the PISA scaling model underlying ranking of countries according to Reading literacy. *Psychometrika, 79*(2), 210–231. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-013-9347-z.

Lockheed, M., & Wagemaker, H. (2013). International large-scale assessments: Thermometers, whips or useful policy tools? *Research in Comparative and International Education, 8*(3), 296–306.

Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3rd ed., pp. 13–103). New York: American Council on Education/Macmillian.

Meyer, H. D., Strietholt, R., & Epstein, D. Y. (2018). Three models of global education quality and the emerging democratic deficit in global education governance. In M. Akiba & G. K. LeTendre (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of teacher quality and policy*. New York: Routledge.

Novóa, A., & Yariv-Mashal, T. (2003). Comparative research in education: A mode of governance or a historical journey? *Comparative Education, 39*(4), 423–438.

OECD. (2017). *PISA 2015 technical report*. Paris: OECD.

Olsen, R. V. (2005). *Achievement tests from an item perspective. An exploration of single item data from PISA and TIMSS studies, and how such data can informm us about students' knowledge and thinking in science*. PhD dissertation, University of Oslo.

Pettersson, D. (2008). *Internationell kunskapsbedömning som inslag i nationell styrning av skolan* [International knowledge assessments: an element of national educational steering]. PhD dissertation, Uppsala University.

Robitaille, D. F., & Garden, R. A. (1989). *The IEA study of mathematics II. Context and outcomes of school mathematics*. Pergamon: Oxford.

Sahlberg, P. (2006). Education reform for raising economic competitiveness. *Journal of Educational Change, 7*(4), 259–287. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-005-4884-6.

Schoultz, J., Säljö, R., & Wyndhamn, J. (2001). Conceptual knowledge in talk and text: What does it take to understand a science question? *Instructional Science, 29*(3), 213–236. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1017586614763.

Serder, M., & Ideland, M. (2016). PISA truth effects: The construction of low performance. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 37*(3), 341–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2015.1025039.

Serder, M., & Jakobsson, A. (2015). "Why bother so incredibly much?": Student perspectives on PISA science assignments. *Cultural Studies of Science Education, 10*(3), 833–853. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-013-9550-3.

Spring, J. (2008). Research on globalization and education. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(2), 330–363. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308317846.

Walker, D. A. (1976). *The IEA six subject survey: An empirical study of education in twenty-one countries*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Wiseman, A. W., Astiz, M. F., & Baker, D. P. (2013). Comparative education research framed by neo-institutional theory: A review of diverse approaches and conflicting assumptions. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 44*(5), 688–709. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2013.800783.

Zhao, Y. (2012). Flunking innovation and creativity. *Phi Delta Kappan, 94*(1), 56–61. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171209400111.

Chapter 3
The Unintended Consequences of Governance of Education at a Distance Through Assessment and Standardization

Risto Rinne

Abstract Governance of education is in transition and education quality represents one key discursive justification for diverse reforms. Transnational actors and commercial interests play a central role in the reform movements. Using data as a technology of governance, quality assurance and evaluation (QAE) is an essential tool for reinforcing central control while at the same time allowing more autonomy to the local actors and agents and creating the need for new experts and data infrastructures. Globalization has been described as resulting in the rescaling of politics and policy, further complicated by the rise of a new mode of governance at a distance through QAE techniques and evaluation data, and the consequent reshuffling of the position of the nation-state and local space. It rests on the provision and translation of information about subjects, objects and processes and brings new limits and possibilities for agents. The new architecture of governance relies on the production and mobility of data. The expanding practices of evaluation produce knowledge about education, which may allow the nation-state to extend its capacity to govern across territory and into the classroom through standardization, commensuration, transparency and comparison and have severe unintended consequences to the behavior of educational agents. Simultaneously, states are increasingly incorporated into the global accountability regime that helps the "national eye" to govern with the "global eye". Places are the locus where all scales conflate, from the supra-national through to the national and local. There, the educational system becomes "real schools" embedded into a web of multi-scalar and multi-actor relations. The degree of freedom of agents in defining and implementing strategies, taking decisions and accessing resources, relies on those relations, but is never fully determined by them nor straight carry out the intended aims. Most reforms are changing the situations, but also influenced by various educational policies, interest groups, the working of the economy, public meanings, and ways of conceiving the specific issues, evaluation

R. Rinne (✉)
CELE (Center for Research on Lifelong Learning and Education) and Department of Education (TuDe), University of Turku, Turku, Finland
e-mail: Rinne@utu.fi

J. Zajda (ed.), *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms*, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 20,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1743-2_3

results and other factors. This applies to all aspects, from teacher training, how to handle educational disadvantage or the involvement of other actors. This chapter analyzes the unintended consequences of governance of education at a distance through assessment and standardization to the changes of national and local agents.

Keywords Assessment · Education quality · Globalization · Governance of education · Global standardization of academic achievement

Introduction

Governance of education is in transition and education quality represents one key discursive justification for diverse reforms. Transnational actors and commercial interests play a central role in the reform movements (Kotthoff and Klerides 2015). Using data as a technology of governance (Grek et al. 2011), quality assurance and evaluation (QAE) is an essential tool for reinforcing central control while at the same time allowing more autonomy to the local actors and agents, and creating the need for new experts and data infrastructures (Lawn and Segerholm 2011).

Globalization has been described as resulting in the rescaling of politics and policy (Lingard and Rawolle 2011), further complicated by the rise of a new mode of governance at a distance through QAE techniques and evaluation data, and the consequent reshuffling of the position of the nation-state and local space. It rests on the provision and translation of information about subjects, objects and processes and brings new limits and possibilities for agents (cf. Hansen and Flyverbom 2014). The new architecture of governance relies on the production and mobility of data (Ball 2016; Clarke 2012). The expanding practices of evaluation produce knowledge about education, which may allow the nation-state to extend its capacity to govern across territory and into the classroom through standardization, commensuration, transparency and comparison and have severe unintended consequences to the behavior of educational agents. Simultaneously, states are increasingly incorporated into the global accountability regime that helps the "national eye" to govern with the "global eye" (Nóvoa and Yariv-Mashal 2003).

Places are the locus where all scales conflate, from the supra-national through to the national and local. There, the educational system becomes "real schools" embedded into a web of multi-scalar and multi-actor relations. The degree of freedom of agents in defining and implementing strategies, taking decisions and accessing resources, relies on those relations, but is never fully determined by them nor straight carry out the intended aims. Most reforms are changing the situations, but also influenced by various educational policies, interest groups, the working of the economy, public meanings, and ways of conceiving the specific issues, evaluation results and other factors. This applies to all aspects, eg. from teacher training

(Cramer et al. 2012), how to handle educational disadvantage (Gideonse 1993; Cramer et al. 2012: 97–98) or the involvement of other actors (du Bois-Reymond et al. 2012; Dale et al. 2012; Kazepov et al. 2015).

In this chapter I analyze the unintended consequences of governance of education at a distance through assessment and standardization, to the changes of national and local agents.

In section "Globalisation, supranational organisations and governance at a distance" I first present some facts of the context of context of national education by describing the influence of the globalization, international organisations and the new system of governance of education at a distance. In section "Room for nation-states: opportunity structures as possibilities" I take to the discussion the narrowing room for the nation states to operate and the national and institutional opportunity structures. In section "Metrics and measurement" I concentrate to analyse the more and more important questions of the metrics and measurement and section "Standardization" the standardization of educational space. At the end of this chapter I go deeper to the widening use of evaluation and assessment as well as indicators in section "Assessment and indicators of education" before I conclude my chapter with conclusions in section "Conclusions".

Globalisation, Supranational Organisations and Governance at a Distance

The globalization and Europeanisation, of educational policy involve not only language, concepts, classifications and preferences per se but entangle in their webs a shared sequence of new cultural and political myths, sagas and beliefs, produced in a new space of meanings that swear allegiance to communality and progress. Affected by those myths, our collective understanding of education as a whole and its relationship to concepts like equality and social justice, or economy and culture is reshaped (Lawn and Lingard 2002, 299–303; Sultana 2002, 1995; Pereyra 1993; Rinne et al. 2002; Simola et al. 2002; Dale et al. 2016).

The OECD has become one of the major agents of the internationalising, globalising and thus converging education policy processes (Taylor et al. 1997; Ozga and Lingard 2007). While it is primarily concerned with economic policy, education has taken on increasing importance within that mandate of OECD. Founded in 1961, the OECD has taken on an enhanced role as a policy actor, as it seeks a niche in the post-Cold War globalising world in relation to other IOs and supranational agencies (Rinne et al. 2004; Henry et al. 2001). To this end, it has developed alliances with other IOs such as UNESCO, the European Union (EU) and the World Bank to actively promote its policy preferences. (Grek 2009, 24–25)

Unlike the EU, OECD does not have the legal instruments, nor the financial levers to actively promote policy-making at the national level of member nations. Compared to e.g. the World Bank, which has 'power' over nations of the through policy requirements and funding and loans OECD is weaker. Through rankings such as the ‘Education at a Glance’ reports, the International Adult Literacy Survey (IALS) and its Indicators in Education project it with the World Bank have become massive and impressive. Through PISA and national and thematic policy reviews, OECD’s educational agenda has become significant in framing policy options in the constitution of a global policy space in education (Grek 2009, 25).

IOs cannot be understood as “mere epiphenomena” of impersonal policy machinery. Rather they are also seen as purposive actors who, “armed with a notion of progress, an idea of how to create a better life, and some understanding of the conversion process”. They have become the “missionaries of our time” (Barnett and Finnemore 1999, 712). This raises the question – why and how OECD has been transformed to one of the most powerful agents of transnational education governance? According to Sotiria Grek this question has been contributed substantially by Kerstin Martens (2007, 42) in answering that it is “comparative turn …a scientific approach to political decision making”, which has been the main driver of the success. Through OECD’s statistics, reports and studies, it has achieved “a brand which most regard indisputable; OECD’s policy recommendations are accepted as valid by politicians and scholars alike” and there seems to be no need questioning beyond the label of “OECD” to justify the authoritative character of the knowledge, facts and interpretations contained therein. The role of the OECD is the leader of “the orchestration of global knowledge networks”. (Grek 2009, 25)

The OECD has “created a niche as a technically highly competent agency for the development of educational indicators and comparative educational performance measures”. The data defined and collected by OECD on education is contributing to the creation of a governable space of comparison and commensurability: “the European Education Space” (Novóa and Lawn 2002; Grek 2009, 26). These developments reflect policy convergence around what Brown and his colleagues (1997, 7–8) define as a new educational policy consensus:

> The new consensus is based on the idea that as the ‘walled’ economies in mid-century have given way to an increasingly global economy, the power of national government to control the outcome of economic competition has been weakened … Indeed the competitive advantage of nations is frequently redefined in terms of the quality of national education and training systems judged according to international standards. (Grek 2009, 26)

Policy instruments like indicators and the whole audit and performance-monitoring nexus have become a “significant element of the shift from government to the governance of national education systems through new institutional forms” (Grek 2009, 27). The purpose of this all is:

> orienting relations between political society (via the administrative executive) and civil society (via its administered subjects) through intermediaries in the form of devices that mix technical components (measuring, calculating the rule of law, procedure) and social components (representation, symbol). (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007, 6)

The OECD has filled the niche of comparative evaluations in relation to education policy in terms of various kinds of indicators like in Education at a Glance and PISA. (Grek 2009, 27)

Patrick Le Galès (2004, 243) defines governance substantially as:

> […] a coordination process of actors, social groups and institutions that aims at reaching collectively defined and discussed objectives. Governance then concerns the whole range of institutions, networks, directives, regulations, norms, political and social uses as well as public and private actors which contribute to the stability of a society and a political regime, to its orientation, to its capacity to lead, to deliver services and to assume its legitimacy

The changes in governance due to the new steering tools, usually used by the expert community, has been widely noted. The ideas of "steering at a distance" are helpful to understand that the principles of calculability and measurability, usually used at the private sector, originating from economics, were increasingly transferred to fields previously regulated by old bureaucratic statutes and professional norms, usually located in the public sector. Rose (1999, 152) refers to the new governing technology based on accountability and assessment to which the public sector is subjected as "governance at a distance". (Rinne and Ozga 2011, 67)

Education quality represents one key discursive justification for diverse ongoing reforms of education. Using data as a tool of governance (Rose and Miller 1992), quality assurance and evaluation (QAE) is a tool for attempting to reinforce central control at a distance while allocating more autonomy to the local actors, and simultaneously creating the need for and relying on new experts and data infrastructures (Lawn and Segerholm 2011). Governing at a distance rests on the provision and translation of information about subjects, objects and processes to the centers of calculation and power (Hansen and Flyverbom 2014). (Piattoeva et al. 2018)

Scholars use the concept of governance at a distance to refer to the modes of governance in which "formal prescription is absent, indirect or enmeshed in a complex way with more or less voluntary commitment to accountability, that is, submission of organisations and individuals to external performance measurement that is often combined with (self)-evaluation" (Rinne and Ozga 2011, 66). It relies on those at the centre having information about persons and events in periphery or distant from them (Miller and Rose 1990). The concept of governance at a distance then emphasises how behavior of the governed actors is directed by the processes of collection and use of information and data by the authorities, who seek to conduct the actions and behaviour of those who are the targets of these data. However, this form of governance does not replace the traditional bureaucratic hierarchical governance, but rather complements it. Governance at a distance may be seen as reconciling "decentralised action (subsidiarity, self-responsibility) with centralized assessment (standardization) to facilitate exchange and valuation in the vast spaces and to make long distance control something the actors aim to achieve by pursuing their interests" (Rottenburg and Engle Merry 2015, 22; Piattoeva et al. 2018).

Governance at a distance necessitates "calculations at one place to be linked to actions at another not through direct imposition, but through assembling and connecting different actors and agencies into a functioning network". These heterogeneous actors can represent as well producers as users of data. The actors, however, may also carry diverse, even opposite perceptions and interests, reflecting the heterogeneous background networks that constitute them. (Piattoeva et al. 2018)

Room for Nation-States: Opportunity Structures as Possibilities

In national education systems and policies there are the social facts, the already existing circumstances, which include and frame the possibilities for present and future actions, with some of them more powerful and significant than others. They are called the "opportunity structures". Opportunity structures are varying from country to country and we should investigate and take into account those "national forms of discursive opportunity structures." (Dale et al. 2016)

Opportunity structures "shape conceptions of what is desirable (or undesirable), possible, feasible, etc. through existing assumptions about, or ways of talking and thinking about, or acting, what it might be possible, desirable, feasible to do in particular areas of activity". They limit ideas of the possible, proscriptively rather than prescriptively. They frame "conceptions of the desirable and the undesirable, the possible and the impossible, the attainable and the unattainable". More broadly, they can be seen as collections of norms, rules, institutions, conventions, practices and discourses which restrict or enable different sets of actors in determining and executing the actions and the behavior they intend to pursue. (Dale et al. 2016)

The nature and significance of opportunity structures has been well captured by Colin Hay (2002, 380–381; cited in Dale et al. 2016):

> … selective of strategy in the sense that, given a specific context, only certain courses of action are likely to see actors realise their intentions. Social, political and economic contexts are densely structured and highly contoured. As such they present an unevenly distributed configuration of opportunity and constraint to actors. They are, in short, strategically selective, for whilst they may well facilitate the ability of resource- and knowledge-rich actors to further their strategic interests, they are equally likely to present significant obstacles to the realisation of the strategic intentions of those not similarly endowed.

There rise up significant issues around the nature and significance of national discursive opportunity structures and their profound importance in shaping education policies and practices. This also raises important scalar issues despite the puzzling resilience of nations in the context of welfare states (Barbier 2008, 2).

The nation has to be seen as "the space" or the "bounded sphere" and the basis of the national policies and "political culture" is a kind of "historic amalgam of national discursive traditions as well as heir to institutional forms and frameworks". The education policy is strongly framed: "systems are anchored in territorial, material and linguistic determinations that cannot easily be circumvented, let alone dispensed with". This clearly points to national cultural assumptions, as a clear and indispensable, because "education systems are taken as the key repository of that culture basis of the determinations on which education policy rests". (Barbier 2008, 2; cited in Dale et al. 2016)

As Stephen Ball elegantly puts it:

> National policy making is inevitably a process of bricolage: a matter of borrowing and copying bits and pieces of ideas from elsewhere, drawing upon and amending locally tried and tested approaches, cannibalising theories, research, trends and fashions and not

> infrequently flailing around for anything at all that looks as though it might work. Most policies are ramshackle, compromise, hit and miss affairs, that are reworked, tinkered with, nuanced and inflected through complex processes of influence, text production, dissemination and, ultimately, re-creation in contexts of practice. (Ball 2007, 44; 1998, 26)

We should understand, that "such bricolage is neither random, nor uniform in its composition and effects are themselves framed by national and local opportunity structures" (Dale et al. 2016).

Institutional opportunity structures (IOS) mean "the deeply ingrained conceptions about how education systems 'work', how they get things done, the set of rules, conventions, sedimented practices through which the system is administered." IOS "sets limits to, and frames, but does not wholly control or shape current or future policies and practices…and these in turn set key limits to states' capacity to shape policy and set limits to what could or should be done." (Dale et al. 2016)

The IOSs also modify the broader discursive opportunity structures in particular ways, especially as it reflects and embeds conceptions of the nation(al) as it is expressed through arrangements for formal education. As Fox and Miller-Idriss (2012, 544) write: "Nationhood operates as an unselfconscious disposition; it underwrites people's choices without becoming a self-conscious determinant of those choices." It is at the level of the institutional framing of education that many aspects of the relationships between nation, school, and child are formed. (cited in Dale and Parreira do Amaral 2015)

Metrics and Measurement

The importance of data circulation has led researchers to call for a new sociology of numbers and quantification of education that would pay attention to how numbers are being "mobilized, circulated, consumed and contested" (Gorur 2015, 13). The flexibility, stability and combinability of numbers, in contrast to a written or spoken word, are said to enable them to transcend contexts and find governmental roles in new institutions, and often for purposes other than the original ones (cf. Rose and Miller 1992; Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007; Hansen and Mühlen-Schulte 2012).

The principles of calculability and measurability, originating from economics were increasingly transferred to fields previously regulated by old bureaucratic statutes and professional norms. Organizations that had previously been non-profit-making, for example universities and hospitals, began to be reshaped into little companies, the output of which was then evaluated and measured by different indicators. Rose (1999, 152) refers to the new governing technology based on accountability and assessment to which the public sector is subjected directly as governance at a distance. With the new governing technology "abstract spaces were made material through physical redesign of organizational space and then embodied in new national and supranational designations, new budget clauses, new evaluation indicators, new success curves and the whole of new public management (NPM) culture." (Rinne and Ozga 2011; Rinne et al. 2018)

Every new space subjected to assessment and measurability summons its population to evaluate and measure themselves, to translate their activities into measurable and economic language in order to maximise efficiency and income, cut waste and reorganize inefficient activities. Arbitrary rule thus becomes tamed, liberalized and acknowledged as neutral and objective calculation and evaluation (Rose 1999, 152–154; Rose and Miller 1992). According to Rose, this is how we have moved into the "Audit Society". (Cf. Rinne 2001, 107; Rinne and Ozga 2011)

Michael Power (1999, 2003) has developed the concepts of the "global inspectorate" and "audit society" further. In his view, audits have conspicuously replaced the confidence that rulers and governments used to feel towards the wisdom and competence of professionals and expert authority. Power sees this taking place both in schools, hospitals, universities and, more generally, in private enterprise. Power observes that evaluation in a way entails "control of controls" and "rituals of verification". (Rinne and Ozga 2011)

Romuald Normand (in press) has characterized three concurring trends in metrics for education policy. First is classification, by "bringing things closer and ordering the world", which makes educative facts intelligible and builds a truth of representation which shapes and guides politics, based on "knowledge produced by statistics and data collection". Secondly there are large scale experiments, which allow building statistical series to "qualify and classify populations according to different features and variables, and to prepare post-Welfare State politics." Metrics serve to build large banks of data on 'what works'" whose algorithmic treatments are considered sufficient to establish evidence-based reformist proposals". Third, standardization is a policy through which, based on metrics, "the universe of practices is harmonized and subjected to standards or 'best practices', disregarding cultural and contextual differences".

Radhika Gorur (2015) wants to emphasize, that the measurement is a productive rather than descriptive activity. There are two aspects to this productivity. One is that once a measurement is in place it acts upon the world by changing understandings and behaviors. The other is that it is an investment on "a character of calculability". According to Gorur (2015) we ought not to see measurement as just imperfect descriptions but as world-making processes. Critiquing them is not just an epistemological exercise, but a political and ontological one. Citing Oakes (1986, 39) Gorur (2015) wants to emphasize, that "we cannot be unaware of the political pressure resulting from the mere existence of a set of indicators".

It is an aphorism that "we don't just measure what we value, but that we come to value what we measure" (Gorur 2016, 602). Globally, education reform appears in the "grip of a contagion and promotes competition, standardisation, test-based accountability and school choice in the service of a frenzied scramble to raise test scores and rankings." Many other important values such as collaboration, personalisation, trust-based professionalism and equity of outcomes are by this process neglected. (Gorur 2016)

OECD's knowledge-based regulation tools attempt to promote orthodox professional practice and increased standardisation of professional formation and development. The strength and power of these tools lies in its apparently objective nature, in the attractiveness of the space of negotiation and debate that it creates, where experts, policy makers and other knowledge-brokers meet and position themselves, and in its capacity to define the terms of that engagement. (Rinne and Ozga 2013, 97)

According to Pons and Van Zanten (2007) the steering tools have three main elements: (i) they reflect particular world visions that represent the agenda setting capacities of particular interests (ii) they represent a particular and politically oriented set of beliefs concerning legitimate policy in a given domain and (iii) they represent a wide and growing network of actors who are constantly drawn in to the process of intelligence-gathering, audit and meditative policy-making. (cited in Rinne and Ozga 2013, 97; Rinne et al. 2018)

Comparisons across diverse school systems, which include countries with vastly differing economies, histories, cultures, goals, ambitions and social, political situations is especially problematic for PISAs bid to develop internationally comparable indicators and measures of behaviour. To make such comparisons possible, students, test items and testing and scoring processes had to be strictly standardised and abstracted on several levels in order to render them comparable (Gorur 2016, 603; 2011). Gorur claims, that the individual student, in all his or her complexity, is lost. The complex anxieties and excitements, and the goals and dreams and motivations and interests of 15-year-olds are passed by. (Gorur 2016, 2011)

Standardization

This world of ours is saturated with standards. They penetrate to all spheres of human life. Standards are not only ubiquitous, they are also normative. They create ideals and norms and normalities, but also the "less-than-ideal" and the abnormalities. "They produce social norms and encourage conformity to the ideal and dictate how things ought to be. They restrict decision-making possibilities, set parameters and narrow choice." Standards also often incorporate standards of ethics, the breach of which may have legal and moral implications and sanctions. Standards (Gorur 2013, 132–133).

> codify collective wisdom about what is acceptable in a given situation, and, explicitly or implicitly, what is not. This may create tension between individual autonomy and the codes of behaviour set by anonymous, distant others, removed from the immediate context by space, time and perhaps understanding. Standardisation is feared by some on the grounds that it promotes mechanistic behaviour, devalues tacit and professional knowledge and attacks our very humanism by voiding idiosyncrasy, individuality, creativity, intuition and emotion.

To ensure conformity, standards are often institutionalized processes involving different kinds of certification and formalisation. The more successfully the standards are mobilised and institutionalised, the less visible and noticeable they become. Many standards are thoroughly interwoven into the very fabric of our everyday lives, operating upon us in ways we scarcely recognize them. (Gorur 2013)

There is going on a huge invasion of politics of standardization. Standardization allows to build uniformity in time and space by creating common standards and establishing political control at a distance on work and communities of practice. Standardisation helps the State and public authorities to compare and rank individuals and groups and to create a common language shared by professionals, policymakers and evaluators. Standards rely on a form of classification and measurement that defines limitations and exclusions in shaping the policy. They are based on scientific and expert knowledge, which give them legitimacy. "Their technicity prevents challenges and controversies, particularly when they involve a strong mobilisation of expertise in time and space". Standardization is a strong policy instrument of power and coercion that effectively replaces traditional rules of authority, hierarchy and bureaucracy. Standards are grounded in the name of modernisation and modernity and claimed to promote "new Reason". (Normand in press)

Standards may be called as the "recipes for reality" (Gorur 2013, 133). Standardisation renders the test easily adaptable to different times and spaces and thus to expansion. For example with the expectation of expanding into more than hundred nations, PISA is entering the space of middle- and low-income nations with a modified version called PISA for Development (PISA-D). By detaching children from around the world from their contexts,

> Standardising them and converting them into numbers, the OECD is able to create sophisticated calculations, identify problems, and suggest solutions and policy advice with extreme specificity. Performance can be disaggregated on the basis of gender, migration status, social capital, location and other dimensions. Specific areas for intervention can thus be isolated. With each round of the survey producing more information, trend data create patterns of growth and decline. This is the type of calculus that 'centres of calculation' can perform from afar, sitting in a distant office, with the numbers providing a synoptic overview of the entire phenomenon, if at the expense of detail (Gorur 2011, 2016, 603)

The value of a "synoptic view" is that it is available "at a glance" and provides easily absorbed and easily represented information. PISA's league tables, on which 15-year-old children from distant and diverse parts of the world are "all gathered and organised into obedient rows and columns on a single spatio-temporal frame are a perfect example of such a synoptic view". (Gorur 2011)

The interesting phenomenon, which Radhika Gorur (2016) calls the "Seeing like PISA" is not just about the influence of PISA on national policies. Rather, it is about a particular set of approaches and understandings that are epitomised by PISA. Seeing like PISA means standardisation, the narrowing field of vision focused on literacy and numeracy outcomes, abstraction, and the generation of standardised templates and protocols to guide practices.

As Gorur (2016, 612) writes:

> If the cocktail of a narrow vision, widespread standardisation and abstraction, an exclusively fiscal view, a depleted curriculum, deprofessionalised teachers and market driven accountability systems which are currently in evidence continues unchecked, we can only

> speculate on the effects this will have not only on the economy, but also on the moral, intellectual and ethical fibre of society.

Assessment and Indicators of Education

It seems that in the knowledge-based economy the supranational evaluations and rankings by numbers have very strong effects on discourses on educational policies. Especially PISA results are mentioned several times separately as pointing out by knowledge and numbers the bad and good qualities of educational systems and rankings among the countries without taking in to account the contexts. (Parreira do Amaral and Rinne 2015)

This age can be called not only age of governance by numbers but also age of "Governance by Indicators". Major intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) such as the World Bank, UNESCO and the OECD produce a vast range of new indicators each year. Quantification has been ramped up to such an extent that we even have indicators for such intangible things as quality of life and happiness. Indicators developed by the OECD include global statistics on energy investment, 'Skills for Jobs' indicators, 'Green Growth Indicators', 'Trade Facilitation Indicators' and the several other widely used education, health and economic indicators. Their annual At a Glance series includes Entrepreneurship at a Glance, Education at a Glance, Health at a Glance, Government at a Glance and Society at a Glance. (Gorur 2017, 260)

Indicators are different from mere statistics in many significant ways. They are carefully selected statistics specifically designed to inform policy makers about the state of the education system. They raise up policy agendas, anticipate policy questions and provide information for policy decisions. They often combine data from multiple sources, including data specifically collected within certain regulated, purpose-built frameworks to facilitate comparison (Gorur 2015):

> Uniquely different from the usual policy-related statistical analysis, statistical indicators are derived measures, often combining multiple data sources and several 'statistics' that are uniformly developed across nations, are repeated regularly over time, and have come to be accepted as summarizing the condition of an underlying complex process. (Smith and Baker 2001, 141; cited in Gorur 2015)

All the international large-scale assessments (ILSAs) aim explicitly to influence policy and by that to policy-makers', teachers' and pupils' behavior. One way they to do this is through reports and presentations targeted directly at policymakers and government officials. Another way is by disseminating information in the public domain through a range of media outlets. (Hamilton 2017, 281)

The ever-widening reach of ILSAs has the potential to assemble new educational realities and publics:

> This is not only directly through national policy reforms but also through the ways in which ILSAs enter public discourse and shape common sense understandings of what is valuable in education, what are the legitimate goals of education, who teachers and students are,

> what they should be doing and how it is possible to compare and know about the achievements, practices and agent's behavior in different educational systems. International agencies and national actors alike are investing heavily in the creation of this new reality. (Hamilton 2017, 282)

Research has documented several "knowledge networks" which have been formed in relation to ILSAs (see e.g. Grek 2010; Morgan 2007; Ozga et al. 2011). These networks include numerous private and public interest groups and publics: advocacy groups, policymakers, research bodies, commercial organisations, academics and what is important ultimately teachers, parents, students and the general public. Each of these groups has their own interests and priorities which shape their responses to ILSA findings.

There is no simple answer to the question, how ILSA is translated into policy reforms. There are important insights into the factors at play and the potential role of the media. Interested parties and publics emerge to actively manage the interpretation and circulation of survey results according to their own goals and priorities. Thus, even where the media coverage is substantial, interpretations of the findings and policy uptake are uncertain and the tangible policy reform is not guaranteed.

As Hamilton (2017, 290) writes, the high status accorded to statistical expertise which is not available to ordinary citizens

> has its own logic and momentum. Lay publics are rendered incompetent by ILSAs and the complex survey data that have to be conveyed to them are seen torequire translation into simpler, easy to understand content and forms. Specialised journalist and researcher training is developing to meet the demands of datification of policy and public discourse and is part of a spreading discourse of expertise with numbers to new sites.

The analysis of ILSAs affect to the educational environments seem clear regardless of whether measured outcomes of student learning improve.

> These effects are produced along the way as publics and institutions learn to think about and compare their achievements in particular domains. In doing so, they channel political and policy imagination and action. The media and public discourses are entangled in this process which may 'disorganise' existing education systems in unintended ways as much as reform them along the recommended lines of international agencies." (Hamilton 2017, 290)

Conclusions

Globalization has been described as resulting in the rescaling of politics and policy (Lingard and Rawolle 2011). This is complicated by the rise of a new mode of governance at a distance through QAE techniques and evaluation data, and the consequent positioning of the nation-states and local spaces. This all rests on the provision and translation of information about subjects, objects and processes and brings new limits and possibilities for agents and their behavior (cf. Hansen and Flyverbom 2014). The new architecture of governance relies on the production and mobility of data (Ball 2016; Clarke 2012).

The globalization and Europeanisation, of educational policy involve not only language, concepts, classifications and preferences per se but “entangle in their webs a shared sequence of new cultural and political myths, sagas and beliefs, produced in a new space of meanings that swear allegiance to communality and progress”. At the same time, affected by those myths, our collective understanding of education as a whole and its relationship to concepts like equality, and social justice, or economy and culture is reshaped (Lawn and Lingard 2002, 299–303; Sultana 2002; 1995; Pereyra 1993; Rinne et al. 2002; Simola et al. 2002; Dale et al. 2016).

Among other international organisations (IOs), the OECD has become one of the major agent of the internationalising, globalising and thus converging education policy processes (Taylor et al. 1997; Ozga and Lingard 2007). While it is primarily concerned with economic policy, education has taken on increasing importance within that mandate of OECD, as it has been reframed as central to national economic competitiveness within an economistic human capital framework and linked to an emerging ‘knowledge economy’. The OECD has filled the niche of comparative evaluations in relation to education policy in terms of various kinds of indicators like in Education at a Glance and PISA. (Grek 2009, 27)

Although there has been also criticism towards the ideas of “governance at a distance” as a general note, it is helpful to understand that the principles of calculability and measurability, usually used at the private sector, originating from economics, have been increasingly transferred to fields previously regulated by old bureaucratic statutes and professional norms, usually located in the public sector. (Rinne and Ozga 2011, 67)

In national education systems and policies there are the social facts, the already existing circumstances, which include and frame the possibilities for present and future actions, with some of them more powerful and significant than others. They are called the “opportunity structures”. They should be taken into account. (Dale et al. 2016)

The nation is “the space” or the “bounded sphere” and the basis of the national policies and “political culture” is a kind of “historic amalgam of national discursive traditions as well as heir to institutional forms and frameworks”. There are heavy historical bounds and the national education policy is strongly framed: “systems are anchored in territorial, material and linguistic determinations that cannot easily be circumvented, let alone dispensed with”. (Barbier 2008, 2; cited in Dale et al. 2016)

The principles of calculability and measurability, originating from economics were increasingly transferred to fields previously regulated by old bureaucratic statutes and professional norms. Organizations that had previously been non-profit-making, for example universities and hospitals, began to be reshaped into little companies, the output of which was then evaluated and measured by different indicators.

Romuald Normand (in press) has characterized three concurring trends in metrics for education policy. First is classification, by “bringing things closer and ordering the world”, which shapes and guides politics, based on “knowledge produced by statistics and data collection”. Secondly there is the development on a large scale experiments, which allow for building statistical series, used by experimental psychologists and economists to "qualify and classify populations according to different features and variables, and to prepare post-Welfare State politics." Metrics serve to build large banks of data on 'what works'" whose algorithmic treatments are considered sufficient to establish evidence-based reformist proposals". Third, standardization is a policy through which, based on metrics, "the universe of practices is harmonized and subjected to standards or 'best practices', disregarding cultural and contextual differences".

There is going on a huge invasion of politics of standardization. Standardization undoubtedly allows to build uniformity in time and space by creating common standards and establishing political control at a distance on work and communities of practice.

It is an aphorism that "we don't just measure what we value, but that we come to value what we measure" (Gorur 2016, 602). Is it so, that the local and the national context as well as the individual student and all his or her complex behaviour is lost? Are the complex social, cultural and political circumstances as well as the anxieties and excitements, and the goals and dreams and motivations and interests of 15-year-olds passed by? Have we standardised the whole complexity of national and local social facts as well as complexity of student? Have they simply become part of a yield or outcome measure? (Gorur 2016, 2011).

The development of governalisation by numbers and indicators and the management of efficiency has parallels with the current New Public Management (NPM). They share similarities in providing experts and policy-makers with new opportunities, change relationships with local and national authorities and convert professions to new ways of thinking and accountability through standards. "They both use Taylorist mechanisms (like quality assurance procedures) and incentives (like performance-related pay) to pressure and surveil education professionals" (Ball 2003; Normand in press).

This age can be called not only age of governance by numbers but also age of "Governance by Indicators". Major intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) such as the World Bank, UNESCO and the OECD produce a vast range of new indicators each year. Quantification has been ramped up to such an extent that we even have indicators for such intangible things as quality of life and happiness. The 2000s can be described as a decade of "obsession with performance indicators and the triumph of comparative psychometry" (Gorur 2015). The launch and expansion of PISA reflects the rising importance of student attainment indicators.

Inevitable this world of ours is saturated with standards. They penetrate to all spheres of human life. Different kinds of evaluations, assessments, audits and quality assurance measures are all built upon an infrastructure of standards. Standards are not only ubiquitous, they are also normative. They create ideals and norms and normalities, but also the "less-than-ideal" and the abnormalities. "They produce social norms and encourage conformity to the ideal and dictate how things ought to be. They restrict decision-making possibilities, set parameters and narrow choice." Standards also often incorporate standards of ethics, the breach of which may have legal and moral implications and sanctions. (Gorur 2013, 132–133)

References

Ball, S. J. (1998). Big policies/small world: An introduction to international perspectives on education policy. *Comparative Education, 34*(2), 119–130.

Ball, S. J. (2003). *Class strategies and the education market: The middle classes and social advantage*. London: Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (2007). Big policies/small world: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy. In B. Lingard & J. Ozga (Eds.), *The RoutledgeFalmer reader in education policy and politics* (pp. 36–47). London/New York: Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (2016). Following policy: Networks, network ethnography and education policy mobilities. *Journal of Education Policy, 31*(5), 549–566.

Barbier, J. C. (2008). *La Longue Marché vers l'Europe sociale*. Paris: PUF.

Barnett, M. N., & Finnemore, M. (1999). The politics, power and pathologies of international organisations. *International Organization, 53*(4), 699–732.

Brown, P., Halsey, A. H., Lauder, H., & Stuart Wells, A. (1997). The transformation of education and society: An introduction. In A. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, & A. Stuart Wells (Eds.), *Education culture economy society* (pp. 1–44). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clarke, J. (2012). The work of governing. In K. Coulter & W. R. Schumann (Eds.), *Governing cultures: Anthropological perspectives on political labor, power and government* (pp. 209–231). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cramer, C., Horn, K.-P., & Schweitzer, F. (Eds.). (2012). *Lehrerausbildung in Baden-Württemberg. Historische Entwicklungslinien und aktuelle Herausforderungen*. Jena: IKS Garamond.

Dale, R., & do Amaral, M. P. (2015). Discursive and institutional opportunity structures in the governance of educational trajectories. In M. P. do Foixo Amaral, R. Dale, & P. Loncle (Eds.), *Shaping the futures of young Europeans: Education governance in eight European countries* (pp. 23–41). Bristol: Symposium Books.

Dale, R., do Amaral, M. P., Amos, K., Treptow, R., Barberis, E., & Kazepov, Y. (2012). *Governance of educational trajectories in Europe. Comparative report high level governance* (GOETE working paper). Bristol: University of Bristol. http://goo.gl/ZrEKKI.

Dale, R., Kazepov, Y., Rinne, R., & Robertson, S. (2016). Scales, discourses and institutions in the governance of educational trajectories in Europe. In A. Walther, M. P. do Amaral, M. Cuconato, & R. Dale (Eds.), *Governance of educational trajectories in Europe: Pathways, policy and practice* (pp. 55–74). London/New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

du Bois-Reymond, M., Altinyelken, K., Stauber, B., Svab, A., Ule, M., Živoder, A., & do Amaral, M. P. (2012). Governance of educational trajectories in Europe. In *Comparative analysis case studies* (GOETE working paper). Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

Fox, J. E., & Miller-Idriss, C. (2012). Everyday nationhood. *Ethnicities, 8*(4), 536–576.

Gideonse, H. (1993). The governance of teacher education and systemic reform. *Educational Policy, 7*(4), 395–426.

Gorur, R. (2011). Policy as assemblage. *European Educational Research Journal, 10*(4), 611–622.

Gorur, R. (2013). The invisible infrastructure of standards. *Critical Studies in Education, 54*(2), 132–142.

Gorur, R. (2015). Producing calculable worlds: Education at a glance. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 36*(4), 578–595.

Gorur, R. (2016). Seeing like PISA: A cautionary tale about the performativity of international assessments. *European Educational Research Journal, 15*(5), 598–616.

Gorur, R. (2017). Statistics and statecraft: Exploring the potentials, politics and practices of international educational assessment. *Critical Studies in Education, 58*(3), 261–265.

Grek, S. (2009). Governing by numbers: The PISA 'effect' in Europe. *Journal of Education Policy, 24*(1), 23–37.

Grek, S. (2010). International organisations and the shared construction of policy 'problems': Problematisation and change in education governance in Europe. *European Educational Research Journal, 9*(3), 396–406.

Grek, S., Lawn, M., Lingard, B., Ozga, J., Rinne, R., Segerholm, C., & Simola, H. (2011). National Policy Brokering and the construction of the European education space in England, Sweden, Finland and Scotland. In J. Ozga, P. Lahrer-Dalsen, C. Segerholm, & H. Simola (Eds.), *Fabricating quality in education. Data and governance in Europe* (pp. 47–65). London/New York: Routledge.

Hamilton, M. (2017). How international large-scale skills assessments engage with national actors: Mobilising networks through policy, media and public knowledge. *Critical Studies in Education, 58*(3), 280–294.

Hansen, H. K., & Flyverbom, M. (2014). The politics of transparency and the calibration of knowledge in the digital age. *Organization, 22*(6), 872–889.

Hansen, H. K., & Mühlen-Schulte, A. (2012). The power of numbers in global governance. *Journal of International Relations and Development, 15*(4), 455–465.

Hay, C. (2002). *Political analysis: A critical introduction*. Houndmills: Palgrave.

Henry, M., Lingard, B., Taylor, S., & Rizvi, F. (2001). *The OECD, globalisation and education policy*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Kazepov, Y., Robertson, S., & Rinne, R. (2015). Space, scale and the governance of youth trajectories and transitions in Europe. In M. P. do Amaral, R. Dale, & P. Loncle (Eds.), *Shaping the Futures of Young Europeans – Education governance in eight European countries* (pp. 43–65). Oxford: Symposium Books.

Kotthoff, H.-G., & Klerides, E. (2015). Researching governance in education: Synergies and future research agendas. In H.-G. Kotthoff & E. Klerides (Eds.), *Governing educational spaces – Knowledge, teaching, and learning in transition* (pp. 1–11). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Lascoumes, L., & Le Galès, P. (2007). Understanding public policy through its instruments – From the nature of instruments to the sociology of public policy instrumentation. *Governance, 20*, 1–21.

Lawn, & Lingard. (2002). Constructing a European policy space in educational governance: The role of transnational policy actors. *European Educational Research Journal, 1*(2), 290–307.

Lawn, M., & Segerholm, C. (2011). Europe through experts and technologies. In J. Ozga, P. Dahler-Larsen, C. Segerholm, & H. Simola (Eds.), *Fabricating Quality in Education. Data and governance in Europe* (pp. 32–46). London: Routledge.

Le Galès, P. (2004). Gouvernance. In L. Bousssaguet, S. Jacquot, & P. Ravinet (Eds.), *Dictionnaire des politiques publiques* (pp. 242–250). Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.

Lingard, B., & Rawolle, S. (2011). New scalar politics: Implications for education policy. *Comparative Education, 47*, 367–377.

Martens, K. (2007). How to become an influential actor – The 'comparative turn' in OECD education policy. In K. Martens, A. Rusconi, & K. Lutz (Eds.), *Transformations of the state and global governance* (pp. 40–56). London: Routledge.

Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1990). Governing economic life. *Economy and Society, 19*(1), 1–31.

Morgan, C. (2007) OECD programme for international student assessment: Unraveling a knowledge network. *ProQuest*. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.co.uk/citations?user=cSuiBH4AAAAJ&hl=en&oi=sra

Normand, R. (in press) The politics of metrics in education. *A contribution to the history of* the present. Handbook of Education Policies.

Novóa, A., & Lawn, M. (2002). *Fabricating Europe: The formation of an education space*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Boston.

Nóvoa, A., & Yariv-Mashal, T. (2003). Comparative research in education: A mode of governance or a historical journey? *Comparative Education, 39*, 423–439.

Oakes, J. (1986). *Educational indicators: A guide for policymakers*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Ozga, J., & Lingard, B. (2007). Globalisation, education policy and politics. In B. Lingard & J. Ozga (Eds.), *The Routledge-Falmer reader in education policy and politics* (pp. 65–82). London: Routledge.

Ozga, J., Dahler-Larsen, P., Segerholm, C., & Simola, H. (2011). Introduction. In J. Ozga, P. Dahler-Larsen, C. Segerholm, & H. Simola (Eds.), *Fabricating Quality in Education. Data and governance in Europe* (pp. 1–8). London: Routledge.

Pereyra, M. A. (1993). The social participation in the construction of the European dimension in education. *CESE Newsletter, 36*, 7–12.

Piattoeva, N., Gorodski Centeno, V., Suominen, O., & Rinne, R. (2018). Goveranance by data circulation? The production, availability, and use of national large-scale assessment data. In J. Kauko, R. Rinne, & T. Takala (Eds.), *Politics of quality in education: A comparative study on Brazil, China, and Russia* (pp. 115–136). London: Routledge.

Pons, X., & van Zanten, A. (2007). *Knowledge circulation, regulation and governance. Literature review* (part 6). Louvain: EU Research Project, Knowledge and Policy in Education and Health Sectors (KNOW&POL).

Power, M. (1999). *The audit society: Rituals of verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Power, M. (2003). Evaluating the audit explosion. *Law & Policy, 25*(3), 185–203.

Rinne, R. (2001). Koulutuspolitiikan käänne ja nuorten syrjäytyminen [Cuff of education policy and the social exclusion of adolescents]. In A. Jauhiainen, R. Rinne, & J. Tähtinen (Eds.), *Koulutuspolitiikka Suomessa ja ylikansalliset mallit [Education Policy in Finland and Global Models]* (pp. 91–138). Jyväskylä: Finnish Educational Research Association: Research in educational sciences 1.

do Amaral, M. P., & Rinne, R. (2015). Reading discourses in the governance of educational trajectories of youth in Europe. In M. P. do Amaral, R. Dale, & P. Loncle (Eds.), *Shaping the Futures of Young Europeans – Education governance in eight European countries* (pp. 67–86). Oxford: Symposium Books.

Rinne, R., & Ozga, J. (2011). Europe and the global: The role of the OECD in education politics. In J. Ozga, P. Dahler-Larsen, C. Segerholm, & H. Simola (Eds.), *Fabricating Quality in Education. Data and governance in Europe* (pp. 66–75). London/New York: Routledge.

Rinne, R., & Ozga, J. (2013). The OECD and the global re-regulation of teacher's work: Knowledge-based regulation tools and teachers in Finland and England. In T. Seddon & J. S. Levin (Eds.), *Educators, professionalism and politics: Global transitions, national spaces and professional projects* (World yearbook of education 2013) (pp. 97–116). London/New York: Routledge.

Rinne, R., Kivirauma, J., & Simola, H. (2002). Shoots of revisionist education policy or just slow readjustment? The Finnish case of educational reconstruction. *Journal of Education Policy, 17*(6), 643–658.

Rinne, R., Kallo, J., & Hokka, S. (2004). Too eager to comply? OECD education policies and the Finnish response. *European Educational Research Journal, 3*(2), 454–485.

Rinne, R., Xingguo, Z., Kauko, J., Normand, R., Medvedeva, A., & Santos, I. (2018). Changing expertise and the state. In J. Kauko, R. Rinne, & T. Takala (Eds.), *Politics of quality in education: A comparative study on Brazil, China, and Russia* (pp. 91–114). London: Routledge.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992). Political Power beyond the state: Problematics of government. *British Journal of Sociology, 43*(2), 173–205.

Rottenburg, R., & Engle Merry, S. (2015). A world of indicators: The making of governmental knowledge through quantification. In R. Rottenburg, S. E. Merry, S.-J. Park, & J. Mugler (Eds.), *The world of indicators. The making of governmental knowledge through quantification* (pp. 1–33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simola, H., Rinne, R., & Kivirauma, J. (2002). Abdication of the education state or just shifting responsibilities? The appearance of a new system of reason in constructing educational governance and social exclusion/inclusion in Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 46*(3), 237–246.

Simola, H., Ozga, J., Segerholm, C., Varjo, J., & Andersen, V. N. (2011). Governing by numbers. In J. Ozga, P. Dahler-Larsen, C. Segerholm, & H. Simola (Eds.), *Fabricating quality in education: Data and governance in Europe* (pp. 96–106). London/New York: Routledge.

Smith, T. M., & Baker, D. P. (2001). Worldwide growth and institutionalization of statistical indicators for education policy-making. *Peabody Journal of Education, 76*(3–4), 141–152.

Sultana, R. (1995). A uniting Europe, a dividing education? Supranationalism, euro-centrism and the curriculum. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 5*(2), 115–144.

Sultana, R. (2002). Quality education for Tomorrow's Europe. A contrapuntal reading of European Commission documents. In A. Nóvoa & M. Lawn (Eds.), *Fabricating Europe: The formation of an educational space* (pp. 109–130). Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Taylor, S., Rizvi, F., Lingard, B., & Henry, M. (1997). *Education policy and the politics of change*. London: Routledge.

Chapter 4
Crisis in Economic Theory and the Implications for PISA Derived Education Policy

Vince Wright

Abstract In this chapter it is argued that the maxim that association does not mean causality has largely been ignored in the setting of educational policy globally. Many reforms in education globally suggest a faith in the free market derived from neo-classical economic theory. It critiques PISA, as an instrument of the OECD, and suggests that it needs to provide better information to participant countries about the strengths and weaknesses of students in relation to the assessment frameworks, be more transparent about its methods, including the items used, and how measurement error is calculated, and broaden the assessment focus to include a broader range of competencies.

Keywords Assessment · Assessment frameworks · Competencies · Globalisation · Education reforms · Education policy · Large-scale assessments · OECD · PIRLS · PISA

Introduction

Imagine that this claim appears in the media; "Access to the internet has caused a gradual decline in the intelligence of human beings in both developed and undeveloped countries." In support of the claim the reporter cites the Flynn effect. During the twentieth century Flynn (1987, 2012) reported that intelligence internationally increased by a massive 13.8 points in 46 years (1932–1978). The improvement occurred mostly to fluid intelligence, as measured by non-verbal performance, and less to 'crystalised' intelligence, as measured by verbal measures of vocabulary and

V. Wright (✉)
Faculty of Education and Arts, Australian Catholic University (Melbourne Campus), Fitzroy, Australia

J. Zajda (ed.), *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms*, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 20,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1743-2_4

comprehension. However, recent studies report a decline in intelligence over the last three decades (Dutton et al. 2016). The decline is concurrent with rapidly increased access to the internet through personal computers. Of course, the above claim is invalid because association does not imply causation. Calude and Longo (2016) show that positive and negative associations occur naturally in large databases, even when the variables are randomly generated. Most associations are spurious. Only a small proportion are worthy of further investigation. In fact, attempts to suggest cause for the negative Flynn effect give environmental factors as a positive influence on intelligence that has plateaued due to biological constraints. Other factors, particularly dysgenetic fertility, have been promoted as causing the decline in intelligence (Woodley and Meisenberg 2013). The truth is that the Flynn effect is occurring, but the causes can only be the subject of speculation.

Globalisation and Economics

The dominant economic ideology since 1970 has been promotion of open financial markets where capital flows freely in and out of nations. Barriers are removed so international trade is competitive, maintained in a state of equilibrium by supply and demand forces of the free market. Open economies are said to grow three times faster than closed economies (OECD 2010). A meta-analysis by Valickova et al. (2013) suggests that most studies report a positive and statistically significant effect on economic growth from development of the economic sector. In theory, free trade allows nations to exploit their competitive advantage for producing goods and services that they are most efficient and effective at producing. Advantage may accrue from the expertise and creativity of people, availability of cheap labour, geographical positioning, or natural resources like climate, soil, and raw materials. Specialisation makes production more efficient through economies of scale boosting income levels and the standard for living overall. Natural forces of supply and demand mean that monopolies cannot exist, and collaborations among nations are incentivised. What could possibly go wrong?

Benefits of monetarist economic policy are now strongly questioned following repeated shocks such as the Asian financial crisis of 1997, and the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) of 2008. Many individual economies such as Thailand (1997), Argentina (2000), Mexico (1994) and Korea (1997) also experienced severe adversity at times due, at least in part, to liberalisation of their financial markets. Rather than capital flowing into countries with weakening economies to smooth consumption, as predicted by theory, such flows have been pro-cyclical thus worsening economic downturns. Liberalisation of financial markets is associated with inequitable distribution of wealth with little evidence of reduction in poverty for emerging economies (Arestis and Singh 2010). Liberalisation is only associated with genuine economic growth if emerging economies are 'investment ready' and tends to drive consumption rather than infra-structural improvement. Consumption in turn effects the stability of exchange rates making new enterprises hard to establish and maintain.

On the other hand, Ocampo and Stiglitz (2008, p. 23) argue that the reality of the free market has been far from the theoretical view and that the promised economic growth does not materialise. Volatility in financial markets results in 'boom or bust' cycles of behaviour driven by people holding overly pessimistic or optimistic views, that are based more on expectations of future returns or losses rather the actual performance of assets. Many real-world constraints such as exchange rate fluctuations, inequitable credit facilities, short-term bias in lending criteria, timeliness of payment, protectionism, and pessimistic risk management impact on market performance within and among economies. Liberal economists now question the assumptions on which free market theory is based (Stiglitz 2008). In particular, the assumption of perfectly rational decisions made by perfectly informed players in markets seems at odds with real-world behaviour, and findings from psychology that human decision making is based more on belief than rationalism (Lo et al. 2005). Likewise, perfect access to credit only occurs in theory, and people do not have infinite life-expectancy or display inter-generational financial consistency.

The validity of free market economics is best exemplified by the liberalisation of trade among nations, often supported by regional free trade agreements. In theory the advantages of free trade appear obvious; comparative advantage leads to specialisation and increases in efficiency, innovation and economies of scale (Drozdz and Miskinis 2011). This results in greater economic growth for participating countries, leading to higher average incomes and lower unemployment (OECD 2010). However, the advantages can become disadvantages such as unfair competition from large suppliers, inflexibility, environmental degradation, and difficulty in establishing new enterprises. By far, the biggest concern is that free trade creates interdependence and, with it, comes vulnerability particularly for emerging economies. Given the theoretical benefits of free trade the evidence from the real world should be association with economic growth. The problem here is who to believe. Other data show that international trade has flatlined and the slow down began prior to the Global Financial Crisis (Hoekman 2015). By changing the metrics of the traditional gravity equation Baier and Bergstrand (2007) conclude that free trade agreements double trade flows among participating countries, though their original estimate was a four-fold effect. Johnson and Noguera (2016) argue that economists have been over-estimating the effect of trade by using gross production. They suggest that as goods move between nations their value is often multiply counted. Adopting a value-added metric leads to their conclusion that trade content has declined by about 10% in the period 1970–2009. The salutary point here is that measures matter, and economists frequently place unreserved confidence in their mathematical models.

In his elegant summary of the history of modern economic theory, Nobel prize winning economist Paul Krugman portrays the period 1970 – as a resurgence of neo-classical theory (Krugman 2009). As memories of as the great depression (1929–1934) faded, the pervading macro-economic view changed from more interventionist Keynesian theory back to the neo-classical ideology of the free market. Inspired by monetarist theory, emanating from the Friedman school most established economies adopted a minimalist intervention policy, usually restricted to manipulation of interest rates by the central bank. Economic theory tends to be deterministic and causality is often assumed. For example, raising interest rates within an economy is typically assumed to shrink the availability and accessibility of capital, therefore causing a dampening of the economy. A side effect is a flow of overseas currency into the economy, to take advantage of higher rates of return, and this causes an increase in the value of the currency. Increased value makes exports of that economy relatively more expensive, and so on. The chain of causality continues.

Krugman (2009), wrote 1 year after the start of the global financial crisis and in the recent memory of the Asian financial crisis of 1997–1998, and hopes that continued catastrophic failure of free market economic theory will result in a more balanced approach to financial policy. Pure free market theory is more mathematically beautiful than true, he argues, and the assumptions of the perfectly informed rational behaviour of players in markets need to be questioned. It is clear from Krugman's paper that economic theory lacks predictive power, is overly based on theoretical modelling, and experiences paradigm shifts only in reaction to real-world trauma. Colander et al. (2009) strongly support Krugman's view and say that many economists now favour crisis models of economic instability instead of equilibrium models based on narrow, unrealistic restrictions. They argue that macroeconomic theory must be more attuned to the micro-economic mechanisms that underpin it. Yet, pro-free-market economists, especially those associated with the International Monetary Fund, lay the blame for global economic catastrophes at the feet of inadequate regulation of financial institutions, failures of countries to keep economic fundamentals strong and global inaction rather than on the principle of free markets (Kose et al. 2006, 2009; Schmukler 2008). This is analogous to saying that a group of short basketballers would be world beaters if they were taller. Why then should economic theory be trusted as a blueprint for education?

The Influence of Economics on Education

In line with neo-classical economic theory rational actors in free markets require perfect information. Enter large-scale assessments such as Trends in International Mathematics and Science (TIMSS) and Progress in International Literacy Study (PIRLS). With an overt intention of influencing educational policy the OECD, a well-resourced economic collective of developed countries, sponsored international comparative PISA tests in literacy, mathematics and science (Schleicher and Zoido 2016). Perfect information requires perfect measurement, deterministic interpretation, and wide dissemination. PISA is the messenger of Western economics and has sponsored an industry around testing, policy development, and support for educational reform (Auld and Morris 2016; Sjoberg 2015; Lingard and Lewis 2016). The interest in testing, hardly the core business of economists, signals that the performance of education systems is important to OECD's vision for the world economy.

Some economists assign association between improvements to skill level of 'human capital' and economic growth (Hanushek and Woessmann 2009, 2010; Hanushek 2017). Hanushek and Woessmann (2009) boldly argues for a causal relation, that is, cognitive skills as measured by PISA create economic growth. The researchers use a variety of approaches to convince their readership, such as eliminating other confounding factors (e.g. geographical location, political stability, and school inputs, openness of the economy), negating the reverse causal argument, and connecting changes in test scores to changes in economic growth. Firmly convinced about the validity of a causal relationship, they claim that a one half of a standard deviation gain in average PISA score will create a 0.87% increase in GDP. They extrapolate that improvements to PISA scores will result in percentage gains in GDP into the future.

The assertion of causality, and precise projections of economic growth, is met with scepticism by many researchers. Such doubt is understandable given the uncertainty of statistical inference coupled with the vulnerability of economic forecasting. Several groups note that the impact of students' PISA scores would not be felt until enough of those students entered the workforce. Using time lag analysis in which PISA performance is compared to GDP growth, years later, lead to contrary findings that test scores were not correlated significantly (Ramirez et al. 2006; Kamens 2015; Yu et al. 2012).

Growth in GDP is better predicted by evidence of research and development using scientific publications per million people as a measure. However, Zhi makes the valid point that performance on PISA science is strongly correlated with research output in science and technology, except in nations like USA that attract overseas talent, offsetting the need to build internal capacity. This finding suggests that PISA success may be a stronger influence on success for nations that are not large, dominant economies. It seems a truism that well-educated citizens are better positioned to participate in the economy than those less educated. Counter examples also exist. Japan, a strong performer on PISA since its outset, has suffered economic stagnation over the last two decades. An aging population has put significant constraints on economic growth. The statistical methods do not stand up to scrutiny. Many factors influence economic growth, and once again, the deterministic causal claims of economists are called into question.

PISA Influence on Educational Policy

The participation of countries in PISA has increased substantially since the first round in 2000. Now over 65 nations and jurisdictions use PISA to assess their 15-year-old students on reading, mathematics, and science. Testing occurs every 3 years. Increased participation is one signal that the data provided by PISA is valued by educational policy makers. PISA related publications advocate for results to be regarded as substantive evidence of the success of education systems (Pont and Viennet 2017). Addey and Sellar (2017) give many reasons for participation in

PISA, including provision of evidence for policy decision-making, building of technical capacity, furthering of international relationships, internal pressure from politicians, and to inform curriculum and pedagogy. Breakspear (2012) surveyed high level officials in 16 countries and reported high levels of influence for PISA data on educational policy.

In a case study of New Zealand and Norway, Stray and Wood (2018) found that officials, despite unwavering trust in PISA results, played a key role in mediating responses within their countries to those results. While policy makers use PISA for overall monitoring of system performance, curriculum change, and setting of standards, there appears to be little impact on learning and teaching at classroom and school level (Lietz and Tobin 2016; Tobin et al. 2016). The strong influence of PISA on educational policy is also evidenced by considerable scholarly interest, particularly in secondary analysis of the data (Hopfenbeck et al. 2018). Many scholars question PISA results as ‘perfect knowledge’ and are sceptical about the use of rankings to justify wide-scale educational policy reforms. Like the voices of economists, outside the monetarist school, who question unrelenting faith in free markets to maintain financial equilibrium and growth, voices in education are advocating for strong caution is accepting the policy suggestions derived from PISA. An open letter to Andreas Schleicher, director of PISA, was signed by over 3000 educationalists worldwide (Meyer et al. 2014). The main theme of the letter is that the narrow focus of PISA tests is distorting the focus of policy makers to short-term fixes and narrowing of the curriculum.

Can PISA Data Be Trusted as ‘Perfect Knowledge’?

The use of PISA data as a measure of quality of learning opportunity to inform education policy been challenged by a significant number of researchers. Hopfenbeck et al. (2018) find that 40% of articles they review express negative findings about PISA. Main criticisms centre around validity and reliability of the test results, especially the ranking of countries and jurisdictions, and the assertions of causal relationships between features of education systems and success on PISA. Labaree (2014) seizes upon the fact that PISA does not claim to assess the senior school curricula of participating jurisdictions, yet OECD reports treat the results as proxy for system performance. He claims that PISA tests what no one teaches.

Araujo et al. (2017) acknowledge that the ambitious agenda of PISA to assess students’ application of reading, mathematics, and science to challenging real-world contexts leaves the developers vulnerable to criticism. For example, the 2018 PISA framework for mathematics (OECD 2019) requires that students formulate situations mathematically, employ mathematical concepts, facts, procedures and reasoning, and interpret, employing and evaluating the results in context (p. 77). Seven mathematical processes are highlighted, communication, mathematization, representation, reasoning and argumentation, problem solving strategies, using language, and using mathematical tools. The complex framework is a mathematics educators dream. However, the challenge is whether it is possible to assess such complex outcomes in constrained test environments, particularly with multi-choice items. Critics also point out that tests focus on a narrow range of subjects, to the neglect of other areas of learning, and cannot assess other characteristics of students that are sought by employers and important to participation in the workforce, such as independence, initiative, ability to collaborate, and communicate with others (Carnoy 2015; Sjoberg 2016). The need for items to work psychometrically across all nations places considerable constraints on the real-world contexts that can be used.

The reliability of PISA data has also been the subject of much debate. PISA items are firstly developed in English or French, then translated into other languages. Although there are rigorous reciprocal checks on translation, Goldstein (2017) questions the comparability of items in different languages, and doubts claims that differences smooth out over many items. Blum et al. (2001), and Arffman (2010) demonstrate that equivalence of translated items between languages is very difficult to achieve. Differential Item Functioning (DIF) across countries causes some researchers to question the statistical model on which PISA rankings are based (Fernandez-Cano 2016; Kreiner and Christensen 2014; Lu and Bolt 2015). The use of Rasch modelling assumes a single trait or dimension. Researchers show that adoption of two or three-dimensional models, factoring in DIF, and local dependence, creates considerable fluctuation in the ranking of participating countries and jurisdictions, on which so much policy advice is based. Carnoy (2015) maintains that comparison of education systems among countries, and among areas within countries, is only feasible when Family Academic Resources (FAR) are factored into the model.

The opaque nature of sampling, and the differential effect of using sample sets, rather than a single uniform test, are also queried. Mortality rates, the proportion of students who are invited but do not participate, varies markedly among countries. Exclusion criteria are open to considerable interpretation, and many commentators question whether samples of students attempting the tests are representative of the population in many participating economies. In short, the statistical short-comings point to PISA results as being far from a source of perfect knowledge.

Causal Claims Justifying Systemic Reform

Free market economic theory rests on assumptions of perfect access to knowledge, and rational participants, who make logical, self-interested decisions based on that perfect knowledge. Evidence of rational participation would show as consistency in the way that PISA results, and results from other large-scale assessments, influence educational policy worldwide. Volante (2016), and Volante et al. (2017) summarise evidence from many jurisdictions, and claim that OECD survey data, including PISA, is not consistently transferred into policy initiatives. They add that the uptake of policy suggestions is influenced by the political, cultural, economic and educational landscape. PISA data is most commonly used to justify, but seldom to refute, policies that reflect the dominant ideologies and perceptions already in place (see Nortvedt 2018, and Choi and Jerrim 2016, for the cases of Norway and Spain). Another example is provided by Bieber and Martens (2011) who describe the contrast between the impact of PISA data on policy in Switzerland (high performing) and USA (low performing).

Media interest provided a window to extensively reform the traditional education system in Switzerland, but there was little interest in the data in USA, and even less appetite for change. Educational commentators may assume partial responsibility for the caution exhibited by some jurisdictions towards PISA results. Just as deterministic claims of causality are rife in economics, and are hotly debated, claims of the effect of systemic features on student achievement often accompany PISA data, and are also contested. Auld and Morris (2014, 2016) analyse the mechanisms by which correlations between system features and PISA ranking are turned into arguments for reform, based on the idea of policy borrowing from successful systems. Strategies include creating a crisis through PISA ranking data, establishing expertise by assertion, restricting analysis, assigning causality whilst ignoring other explanations, and qualifying recommendations by necessary conditions.

As well as OECD reports they discuss commercial companies that publish reports offering remedies to ailing systems, such as Mourshed et al. (2010), and Jensen et al. (2012). Auld and Morris are very critical of the epistemic communities built around commercial enterprises that package themselves, as messengers, reformers, resource providers, and evaluators (see Grek 2013, for a discussion on 'missionaries of fortune'). The authors state that advice about systemic best practice is often contradictory, embodies a narrow view of the role of education as preparing students for the workforce, downplays cultural contexts and non-educational factors, and frequently confuses correlation with causality.

Recommendations derived from correlations usually align with what Sahlberg (2016) describes as GERM, the Global Education Reform Movement, reflective of neo-liberal, market driven economic principles. The principles of GERM are:

- Increased competition among schools to promote quality through parental choice;
- Standardisation of teaching and learning through prescribed curricula and reporting requirements;
- Increased emphasis on core subjects, reading literacy, mathematics and science, that are crucial to participation in the workforce;
- Borrowing of change models from the corporate world, manifest in agendas such as performance pay for teachers, and data driven goal setting;
- Test based accountability for schools and teachers, manifest in league tables that rank schools.

Sjoberg (2015) goes further in describing PISA as an instrument to facilitate the transfer the concepts of the market economy to education. He gives examples of OECD advice to Norway in 2008 which included closing small schools, increasing class sizes, and payment for teachers based on test results. Some researchers play

GERM advocates at their own game. Darling-Hammond (2014) uses the same correlational arguments to justify suggestions for reform by comparing PISA 2012 data from Singapore and Finland. While some suggestions, such as national standards, a national curriculum, and teacher professional development, are congruent with OECD principles, others such as paying teachers high salaries that are competitive with other professional fields, and removing national examinations are not. Likewise, Sahlberg (2011) reports on the declining PISA performances of USA, UK, Canada, Australia, Japan, and New Zealand over the period 2000–2006, suggesting ironically that market driven education reforms are associated with declining achievement.

The borrowing of educational policies from "reference societies" as a method to improve the quality of education systems has also been challenged. Auld and Morris (2014) describe the approach as setting up a utopia (high performers) versus dystopia (others) dichotomy. Alexander (2012, p.8) sums up the dangers of assigning causality from correlation, as is common in policy borrowing:

> X may well be a common feature of high-performing education systems a, b, c, d and e, but that doesn't demonstrate a cause-effect relationship between feature and performance. And if x is also a common feature of low-performing systems g, h, i, j and k, then the claimed correlation is clearly inadmissible.

Other researchers set up counter examples to policy borrowing from foreign sources. Gorur and Wu (2015) show that Australia would be wiser to investigate the practices in its own state of Queensland, where PISA results are as high as top five performing jurisdictions, than to look elsewhere. Carnoy (2015) uses a similar argument in suggesting that USA look to the policies of states like Massachsetts, North Carolina, and Minnesota, that resulted in significant gains in mathematics scores over the last 20 years. Even the measures used by PISA for system equity are not immune. Gaber et al. (2012) show that between the school variance measure is strongly influenced by the transition age to specialised senior secondary courses in Slovenia, and that the specialised transition also influences within school measures of variation.

In their literature searches of scholarly research about PISA, Ercikan et al. (2015) categorically reject sweeping conclusions about the quality and effectiveness of systems based on PISA ratings. Performance is influenced by a complex range of economic, cultural, societal, geographical, and systemic variables, making claims for simple cause and effect dubious. A cursory look at top performers might lead an observer to believe the key to PISA success is a mono-cultural population, high GDP per capita, strong parental investment in education, and a small, geographically contained jurisdiction. PISA results may be more a reflection of influences outside an education system than within it. Feniger and Lefstein (2014) show that the performance of Chinese immigrant students educated in New Zealand is superior to that of their high-performing peers in China. Yet in New Zealand politicians have maintained the relative insignificance of family socio-economic factors in educational achievement, whilst strongly implicating the impact of teachers and schools (Thrupp 2014). Furthermore, PISA uses a crosssectional design meaning that each sample of students assessed in a cycle is different to that of previous or subsequent cycles. For causal claims to be made about the effect of education systems a longitudinal design is needed, that assesses the same samples of students over time (Araujo et al. 2017; Eivers 2010).

Evaluation

There is no doubt that the economic objectives of the OECD have significantly influenced educational policy worldwide, albeit in varying ways. Yet economics is also in crisis, as repeated, unexpected shocks resulted in the assumptions of free-market, monetarist theory to be questioned. Globalisation, and the inter-dependency of financial markets, contributed to adverse domino effects when crises struck, that tended to impact emerging and small economies most. The mechanisms expected to ensure equilibrium failed to do so. Unrealistic assumptions, particularly of rational players with perfect knowledge, are implicated in the difference between the theorised and the actual reality.

It is ironic that the influence of large-scale international assessments, such as PISA, has been greatest over the last two decades when economic instability has been prevalent. PISA is an attempt to satisfy the condition of perfect knowledge. The focus on a narrow set of indicators reading literacy, mathematics, and science reflects the perceived significance of those indicators for creating a flexible, competent workforce. There is obvious merit in assessing the achievement of students in those key areas. Given the complexity of creating comparable assessments across over 65 nations, coupled with the ambitious frameworks created by PISA itself, it is inevitable that many questions are asked about the reliability and validity of the tests. Critique about margins of error, representativeness of sampling, comparability of translations, use of a single dimension Rasch Scale to rank nations, and narrowness of content, suggest that results from PISA need to be interpreted with caution.

Yet, when policy positions are taken, the data are assumed to be perfect. The rankings are provided as absolutes with banding of similarly ranked jurisdictions the only acknowledgement of variability in the data. In the world of economic forecasting there is no room for uncertainty, in theory at least. Auld and Morris (2016) believe that much literature around PISA inspired policy recommendations is advocacy rather than robust research. The worst offences occur when correlations are assumed to reveal causal relationships, ignoring the complex variables that contribute to students' test performance. The result is that there is no more clarity about policy initiatives, and system structures, that reliably enhance achievement, in individual jurisdictions, than there is about what causes the reverse Flynn effect.

Even if PISA, and other large-scale assessments, meet the criteria for perfect knowledge, would it be safe to assume that the players in educational policy act rationally?

In discussing the merits of PISA for educational policy Schleicher and Zoido (2016, p. 384) state:

> …that is why PISA does not venture into telling countries what they should do, but its strength lies in telling countries what everybody else around is doing and with what success. (p.384).

Their statement is akin to saying that media, politicians, and educational leaders are provided with perfect knowledge, and they will do with that knowledge what they will.

Conclusion

Many stories in this chapter from around the world show that PISA findings are frequently misinterpreted and used to promote reform agendas. Policy changes usually align to a neo-liberal agenda which in turn reflects a market-driven competitive approach to education. Research shows that PISA rankings are used to justify reforms that are already on political agendas and are based more on ideology than evidence. The players in educational policy appear far from rational. Faced with the Global Financial Crisis many economies fell back on traditional Keynesian theory, and Governments intervened directly in financial markets to avert the crisis. While free markets remain the fundamental mechanism in most economies, policy makers are now aware that the predictions of monetarist theory do not always hold for the real world. The way forward for educational policy, as it is with economic theory, is to maintain healthy scepticism about theoretical approaches for improving student achievement and be more sensitive to the nuances and complexities of individual jurisdictions. PISA, as an instrument of the OECD, needs to provide better information to participant countries about the strengths and weaknesses of students in relation to the assessment frameworks, be more transparent about its methods, including the items used, and how measurement error is calculated, and broaden the assessment focus to include a broader range of competencies.

References

Addey, C., & Sellar, S. (2017). Why do countries participate in PISA? Understanding the role of international, large-scale assessments in global education policy. In A. Verger, M. Novelli, & H. K. Altinyelken (Eds.), *Global education policy and international development: New agendas, issues and policies*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Alexander, R. J. (2012). *International evidence, national policy and classroom practice: Questions of judgement, vision and trust.* Paper presented at the from regulation to trust: Education in the 21st century, Third Van Leer International Conference on Education, Jerusalem.

Araujo, L., Saltelli, A., & Schnepf, S. V. (2017). Do PISA data justify PISA-based education policy? *International Journal of Comparative Education and Development, 19*(1), 20–34.

Arestis, P., & Singh, A. (2010). Financial globalisation and crisis, institutional transformation and equity. *Cambridge Journal of Economics, 34*(2), 225–238.

Arffman, I. (2010). Equivalence of translations in international reading literacy studies. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 54*(1), 37–59.

Auld, E., & Morris, P. (2014). Comparative education, the 'New Paradigm' and policy borrowing: Constructing knowledge for educational reform. *Comparative Education, 50*(2), 129–155. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2013.826497.

Auld, E., & Morris, P. (2016). PISA, policy and persuasion: Translating complex conditions into education 'best practice'. *Comparative Education, 52*(2), 202–229.

Baier, S. L., & Bergstrand, S. H. (2007). Do free trade agreements actually increase members' international trade? *Journal of International Economics, 71*(1), 72–95.

Bieber, T., & Martens, K. (2011). The OECD PISA study as a soft power in education? Lessons from Switzerland and the US. *European Journal of Education, 46*(1), 101–115.

Blum, A., Goldstein, H., & Guerin-Pace, F. (2001). International adult literacy survey (IALS): An analysis of international comparisons of adult literacy. *Assessment in Education, 8*(2), 225–246.

Breakspear, S. (2012). *The policy impact of PISA: An exploration of the normative effects of international benchmarking in school system performance* (OECD Education Working Papers, No. 71). Paris: OECD.

Calude, C. S., & Longo, G. (2016). The deluge of spurious correlations in big data. *Foundations of Science, 21*, 1–18.

Carnoy, M. (2015). *International test score comparisons and educational policy: A review of the critiques*. Boulder: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved from http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/international-test-scores.

Choi, A., & Jerrim, J. (2016). The use (and misuse) of PISA in guiding policy reform: The case of Spain. *Comparative Education, 52*(2), 230–245. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2016.1142739.

Colander, D., Folmer, H., Haas, A., Goldberg, M. D., Juselius, K., Kirman, A. P., Lux, T., & Sloth, B. (2009). *The financial crisis and the systemic failure of academic economics*. Technical report, 98th Dahlem workshop.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). What can PISA tell us about U.S. education policy? *New England Journal of Public Policy, 26*(1), Article 4. Retrieved from: http://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp/vol26/iss1/4

Drozdz, J., & Miškinis, A. (2011). Benefits and threats of free trade. *Ekonomia Economics, 2*(14), 40–48.

Dutton, E., van der Linden, D., & Lynn, R. (2016). The negative Flynn effect: A systematic literature review. *Intelligence, 59*.(2016, 163–169.

Eivers, E. (2010). PISA: Issues in implementation and interpretation. *The Irish Journal of Education, 38*, 94–118.

Ercikan, K., Roth, W.-M., & Asil, M. (2015). Cautions about inferences from international assessments: The case of PISA 2009. *Teacher College Records, 117*(1), 1–28.

Feniger, Y., & Lefstein, A. (2014). How not to reason with PISA data: An ironic investigation. *Journal of Education Policy, 29*(6), 845–855.

Fernandez-Cano, A. (2016). A Methodological Critique of the PISA Evaluations. *RELIEVE, 22*(1), art. M15. https://doi.org/10.7203/relieve.22.1.8806.

Flynn, J. R. (1987). Massive gains in 14 nations: What IQ test really measure? *Psychology Bulletin, 101*, 171–191.

Flynn, J. R. (2012). *Are we getting smarter? Rising IQ in the twenty first century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gaber, S., Cankar, G., Marjanovic, L., & Tasner, V. (2012). The danger of inadequate conceptualisation in PISA for education policy. *Compare, 42*(4), 647–663.

Goldstein, H. (2017). Measurement and evaluation issues with PISA. In L. Volante (Ed.), *The PISA effect on global educational governance*. New York/London: Routledge.

Gorur, R., & Wu, M. (2015). Leaning too far? PISA, policy and Australia's 'top five' ambitions. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 36*(5), 647–664. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2014.930020.

Grek, S. (2013). Expert moves: International comparative testing and the rise of expertocracy. *Journal of Education Policy, 28*(5), 695–709.

Hanushek, E. A. (2017). For long-term economic development, only skills matter. *IZA World of Labor*, 343. https://doi.org/10.15185/izawol.343.

Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2009). *Do better schools lead to more growth? Cognitive skills, economic outcomes, and causation* (IZA Discussion papers, No. 4575). Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor.

Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2010). *The high cost of low educational performance: The long-run impact of improving PISA outcomes*. New York: OECD.

Hoekman, B. (2015). *Trade and growth – End of an era? The global trade slowdown: A new normal?* VoxEU.org eBook (pp. 3−19).

Hopfenbeck, T. N., Lenkeit, J., El Masri, Y., Cantrell, K., Ryan, J., & Baird, J. (2018). Lessons learned form PISA: A systematic review of peer-reviewed articles on the programme for international students assessment. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 63*(3), 333–353.

Jensen, B., Hunter, A., Sonnemann, J., & Burns, T. (2012). *Catching up: Learning from the best school systems in East Asia*. Carlton: Grattan Institute. Online. http://grattan.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/130_report_learning_from_the_best_detail.pdf

Johnson, R. C. & Noguera, G. (2016). *A portrait of trade in value added over four decades* (Unpublished Manuscript). Boston: Dartmouth College (MIT).

Kamens, D. H. (2015). A maturing global testing regime meets the world economy: Test scores and economic growth, 1960–2012. *Comparative Education Review, 59*(3), 420–446.

Kose, M. A., Prasad, E., Rogoff, K., & Wei, S.-J. (2006). *Financial globalization: A reappraisal* (IMF Working Paper WP/06/189). Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.

Kose, M. A., Prasad, E. S., & Taylor, A. D. (2009). *Thresholds in the process of international financial integration.* IZA discussion papers, No. 4133, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn.

Kreiner, S., & Christensen, K. B. (2014). Analyses of model fit and robustness. A new look at the PISA scaling model underlying ranking of countries according to reading literacy. *Psychometrika, 79*(2), 210–231. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-013-9347-z.

Krugman, P. (2009). How did economists get it so wrong? *New York Times Magazine* (September 2) at http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/06/magazine/06Economic-t.html

Labaree, D. F. (2014). Let's measure what no one teaches: PISA, NCLB, and the shrinking aims of education. *Teachers College Record, 116*(2014), 1–14.

Lietz, P., & Tobin, M. (2016). The impact of large-scale assessments in education on education policy: Evidence from around the world. *Research Papers in Education, 31*(5), 499–501. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2016.1225918.

Lingard, B., & Lewis, S. (2016). Globalisation of the Anglo-American approach to top-down, test-based educational accountability. In G. T. L. Brown & L. R. Harris (Eds.), *Handbook of human and social conditions in assessment* (pp. 387–403). New York: Routledge.

Lo, A., Repin, D. V., & Steenbarger, B. N. (2005). Fear and greed in financial markets: A critical study of day-traders. *America Economic Review, 95*, 352–359.

Lu, Y., & Bolt, D. M. (2015). Examining the attitude-achievement paradox in PISA using a multilevel multidimensional IRT model for extreme response style. *Large-scale Assessments in Education, 3*, 2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-015-0012-0.

Meyer, H. D., et al. (2014). *Open letter to Andreas Schleicher on PISA*. http://oecdpisaletter.org/. Accessed 15 Oct 2014.

Mourshed, M., Chijioke, C., & Barber, M. (2010). *How the world's most improved school systems keep getting better*. Washington, DC: McKinsey. Online. http://mckinseyonsociety.com/how-the-worlds-most-improved-school-systems-keep-getting-better/

Nortvedt, G. A. (2018). Policy impact of PISA on mathematics education: The case of Norway. *European Journal of Psychology in Education, 33*, 427–444. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-018-0378-9.

Ocampo, S., & Stiglitz, J. E. (2008). Capital market liberalisation and development. In J. A. Ocampo & J. E. Stiglitz (Eds.), *Capital market liberalisation and development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

OECD. (2010). *Trade and the economic recovery: Why open markets matter?* http://www.oecd.org

OECD. (2019). *PISA 2018 assessment and analytical framework*. Paris: OECD. https://doi.org/10.1787/b25efab8-en.

Pont, B., & Viennet, R. (2017). *Education policy implementation: A literature review and proposed framework* (OECD Education Working Papers, No. 162). Paris: OECD. https://doi.org/10.1787/fc467a64-en.

Ramirez, F. O., Luo, X., Shofer, E., & Meyer, J. W. (2006). Student achievement and national economic growth. *American Journal of Education, 113*(1), 1–29.

Sahlberg, P. (2011). The fourth way of Finland. *Journal of Educational Change, 12*, 173–185. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-011-9157-y.

Sahlberg, P. (2016). The global educational reform movement and its impact on schooling. In E. Mundy, A. Green, B. Lingard, & A. Verger (Eds.), *The handbook of global education policy* (1st ed.). Oxford: Wiley.

Schleicher, A., & Zoido, P. (2016). The policies that shaped PISA, and the policies that PISA shaped. In E. Mundy, A. Green, B. Lingard, & A. Verger (Eds.), *The handbook of global education policy* (1st ed.). Oxford: Wiley.

Schmukler, S. L. (2008). The benefits and risks of financial globalisation. In J. A. Ocampo & J. E. Stiglitz (Eds.), *Capital market liberalisation and development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sjoberg, S. (2015). PISA and global educational governance – A critique of the project, its uses and implications. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 11*(1), 111–127.

Sjøberg, S. (2016). OECD, PISA and globalisation: The influence of the international assessment regime. In C. H. Tienken & C. A. Mullen (Eds.), *Education policy perils: Tackling the tough issues* (pp. 102–133). New York: Routledge.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2008). Capital market liberalisation, globalisation and the IMF. In J. A. Ocampo & J. E. Stiglitz (Eds.), *Capital market liberalisation and development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stray, J. H., & Wood, B. (2018). Global-local education policy dynamics: A case study of New Zealand and Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 1*, 1–14.

Thrupp, M. (2014). When PISA meets politics – A lesson from New Zealand. *Policy Futures in Education, 12*(7), 880–882.

Tobin, M., Nugrohob, D., & Lietz, P. (2016). Large-scale assessments of students' learning and educational policy: Synthesising evidence across world regions. *Research Papers in Education, 31*(5), 578–594.

Valickova, P., Havranek, T., & Horváth, R. (2013). *Financial development and economic growth: A meta-analysis* (IOS Working Papers, No. 331). Institut für Ost- und Südosteuropaforschung, Regensburg.

Volante, L. (2016). *The intersection of international achievement testing and educational policy: Global perspectives on large-scale reform*. London: Routledge.

Volante, L., Fabio, X., & Ritzen, J. (2017). The OECD and educational policy reform: International surveys, governance, and policy evidence. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 184*, 34–48.

Woodley, M., & Meisenberg, G. (2013). In the Netherlands the anti-Flynn effect is a Jensen effect. *Personality and Individual Differences, 54*, 871–876.

Yu, C. H., DoGangi, S., & Jannasch-Pennell, A. (2012). A time-lag analysis of the relationships among PISA scores, scientific research publication, and economic performance. *Social Indicators Research, 107*, 317–330.

Chapter 5
Globalizations, Meta-ideological Hegemony and Challenges from Populism in Education

Holger Daun

Abstract In the beginning of the 1990s, Sweden implemented educational reforms of the same type as in several other countries: privatisation, decentralisation and freedom of choice. The steering of the education system was changed from highly centralised and a very limited number of students in private schools to an extremely decentalised system and with an increasing number of private providers of education. The results almost 30 years later are not very encouraging. The most apparent feature is declining results in the international tests.

Keywords Decentralisation · Globalisation · Education reforms · Ideology · International tests · Meta-ideology · Policy change · Privatisation · Sweden

Globalisations, Meta-ideological Hegemony and Education Reforms in Sweden

Political parties, politicians and governments in various countries around the world have in the past four decades accepted or been pushed to formulate educational policies that they were unlikely to favour earlier. They have formulated and often implemented policies that are alien or strange to their traditional core programs and constituencies. One principal reason for this is that new types of structures, cultures and challenges have emerged, to which established cultures and ideologies have been compelled to respond. As a result, ideological changes or shifts are taking place. Some of the frontiers between the prevailing ideologies have been blurred

H. Daun (✉)
Department of Education, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden
e-mail: holger.daun@edu.su.se

J. Zajda (ed.), *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms*, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 20,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1743-2_5

(Miller 1989). Also, a "gap" has emerged between rulers and ruled. In this vacuum populism has emerged and grows.

The early modern ideologies were formed primarily along lines of the left – right division but new phenomena have emerged to be evaluated, explained and acted upon along new ideological dimensions, for instance: large-scale arrangements versus small-scale arrangements, "ecologism" versus "economism", and so on. Some political and educational ideologies have revived certain of their classical elements.

Islam itself is a globalising force. Thus, we have to deal with two principal types of globalization – Western and Islamic – and may therefore use "globalisations (in plural), even if there among Muslims are different views on the relationship between Islam and the Western-style globalization (Daun and Arjmand 2018).

It is argued here that since the 1990s, ideological and policy changes are conditioned by the challenges from the globalized meta-ideology, which is hegemonic in that it determines the discourse and argues, for example, that education is first and foremost for making countries economically competitive and modern. In the second place comes education for the sake of e.g. Human Rights and Liberal democracy (Zajda and Ozdowski 2017). Thus, the Western globalization carries a meta-ideology with strong elements of some Western ideological features – principally individualism, the uniqueness of the individual, freedom of choice, and so on, which are among the elements that neo-liberalism and modern communitarianism share, and this common denominator may be called the *global hegemonic meta-ideology.* Ideological adaptations towards this meta-ideology has taken place in many places in the world, but since the beginning of this millennium populism has emerged as a counterforce (Zajda 2014, 2016). Populism is not a coherent ideology, but populist movements and ideas around the world have certain features in common (Mackert 2018; Stockemer 2019a, b).

The ideologies linked to Western globalization wield hegemonic power as globalization is presented as an inevitable and unavoidable process, and global competition as an indispensable feature for a society in order to progress or at least survive (Brown 1999; Burbules and Torres 2000; Cox 2000; Mittelman 1996; Spring 2009).

In a similar vein as many other social, religious and cultural phenomena, Islam and its educational practices, institutions, and the manner of organizing them need to be studied in a global context. The world system and Western globalization processes challenge Islam and its educational institutions in different ways, while at the same time, Islam itself – as a world religion- is also a globalizing force (Beeley 1992; Berger 1999; Haynes 1999).

Education for children and youth, both secular and religious, has been globalized (Daun 2006; Daun and Strömqvist 2011; Spring 2009). During the past decades, Islam has been extended to new areas and it has been the most expansive religion in terms of new adherents, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, parts of Asia and Latin America (An-Náim 1999; Berger 1999; Martin 1999). In most contemporary Muslim societies Western globalisation has produced uneven and differentiated effects. Increased human mobility and global connectedness have resulted in greater contact between Muslims of differing orientations and has created significant

Muslim communities in the West (Mandaville 2016). This chapter will bring up certain issues related to globalization and then some key concepts that will be applied in the later sections.

Globalization

Globalization is something more than internationalization. The latter is resulting from state as well as non-state actions taken from within countries in relation to bodies and people in other countries. Western globalization is processes of compression of the world (in space and time) through ICT; economic interdependencies of global reach; an ideology (Cox 2000), or "the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole" (Robertson 1992, p. 8). Usually, globalization processes are classified into different categories, such as financial globalisation, military globalization, cultural globalization, political globalization, and economic globalization (p. 29).

The de-regulations implemented on the basis of neo-liberal ideas from the 1980s imply that multinational companies are not bound to any specific countries but may have units in different countries and they make decisions that many times ignore national borders. This fact makes them able to steer economic matters more or less independently from the states. Such de-territorialization also takes place in the case of religions.

Western globalization implies among other things: a challenge to and a questioning of national and local cultures; universalization of certain aspects of knowledge and ideas and particularization of others; a new role for the national state to mediate universalization and encourage competitiveness; and extension of liberal democracy and human rights. It is also the near-global spread of ideas, discourses, a standardized culture, institutions, organizations, technology and so on. Of particular importance is the general penetration of capitalist forms, market principles and purposive rationality (Touraine 1971). In the realm of institutionalized education, it is the dissemination of the world model – illuminated by Meyer et al. (1997), among others – that constitutes another feature of globalization.

With the dissemination of the market model, commodification and rationalization of non-economic spaces is spreading (Camps 1997; Sears and Moorers 1995). This might provoke resistance in the form of exaggeration of the importance of local ideas and traditional values (particularism). Revival movements and withdrawal from the state institutions may to some extent be seen as resistance or counter-hegemonic attempts.

Complex and sometimes contradictory processes occur. Culturally, national societies and local communities experience "constraints to produce their own unique accounts of their places in world history" (Robertson 1992, pp. 289–290). The taken-for-granted aspects of cultures are challenged and" Traditions have to explain themselves…" (Giddens 1994, p. 23). Populism may partially be seen as one of the important responses to the uncertainty experienced due to these processes.

Western globalization contributes to new and sometimes contradictory requirements in relation to education, some of which are: religious-moral versus secular; formation of human capital versus broad personality development, competition and elitism versus equality and democracy (Benhabib 1998; Chabbott and Ramirez 2001; Hannum and Buchmann 2003; Zajda 2018). Globalisation of capitalism and the market economy is perceived by politicians and policy-makers to require competitiveness, and the way to achieve this is by the same actors believed to be found in the world models as they are defined and studied by Meyer et al. (1997), and in the meta-ideology. The ideologies linked to the world models may be seen as part of the meta-ideology.

Among Muslims and governments in Muslim states at least four views on globalization: (i) Islam as a powerful globalising force; (ii) Islam as a potential globalising force; (iii) Islam and Muslims as excluded from the favourable aspects of Western globalisation; and (iv) Islam as threatened by the predominating (Western) globalisation forces. These views on globalisation correspond to some extent to four principal Muslim ideological orientations – secularism, traditionalism, modernism/liberalism, and fundamentalism/Islamism (Daun and Arjmand 2018; The Levin Institute 2008; Saadallah 2018).

In the Western view, two sets of theoretical perspectives deal with the global phenomena affecting education: (i) World System (WS) perspectives and (ii) globalization perspectives. The World System perspectives include more long term and historical aspects than globalization perspectives generally do (Clayton 2004). Western globalization may be seen as taking place within the framework of a world system. Two World System perspectives are relevant in the present context: the political-economic world perspective and the neo-institutionalist world perspective. According to the former, the drive for competitiveness, profit and accumulation is the principal 'cause' of or condition for what occurs globally (Dale 2000; Elwell 2006; Wallerstein 1991, 2006). Wallerstein (2006) defines four different categories of countries or areas (among them peripheral and core areas), but practically all countries now at least pay lipservice to involvement in the drive for competitiveness. In what is labelled the Third World, differences and inequalities existing after the Second World War have since then been reinforced. We now, according to Cardoso (1993) and Castells (1993) have to count with "four worlds": (i) Winners in the new international division of labour; (ii) potential winners (Brazil, Mexico); (iii) large continental economies (India, China); and (iv) clear losers that could be called the Fourth World. Most of Africa, the not-oil-producing Middle Eastern countries, large parts of Asia and Latin America belong to the Fourth World. Many Asian and most sub-Saharan countries, including those having a substantial proportion of Muslims, belong to the fourth category.

Economically, the position countries have in the world system may thus vary from marginalized to strongly incorporated into (competitive) world markets (Castells 1993; Foreign Policy 2007; Griffith-Jones and Ocampo 1999). Western (Neoliberal) globalization results in economic growth in some countries or places but also in marginalization of other places and increasing gaps between the North and the South (Griffin 2003; Lipumba 2003). High technology activities, growth and richness are concentrated in certain geographical zones (East and Southeast Asia, Europe, Oceania and North America). Countries situated "outside" of the most intensive flows are indirectly influenced; their position in the world system is more or less "cemented" and their frame of action (even internally) is conditioned by their positions.

Economic actions and processes aim at and contribute to encouraging or compelling people to enter into commodified, monetized and priced exchanges as producers and consumers. Market forces are spreading to most areas of life, among them education. The "market order" on a global scale is country-wise mediated by national and local history, and politics (Bretherton 1996a; Cox 2000). Predominantly Muslim countries belong to both the highly involved category (principally oil producing countries) and the marginalized category (Beeley 1992; Daun and Arjmand 2018). From this World System perspective, education of the Western type is seen as subordinated to the requirement to contribute to competitive human capital.

On the other hand, the neo-institutionalist World System perspective, as defined by Meyer et al. (1997) assumes the existence of a world polity which is a symbolic cultural construction and a discursive entity including world models consisting of a complex of cultural expectations and tacit understandings – "cognitive and ontological models of reality that specify the nature and purposes of nation-states and other actors (p. 144)". The models stipulate how the relationships between e.g. the state, civil society, the citizen and education should be arranged. Beyond these relationships, this package of ideas and values or meta-ideology consists of "a distinct culture – a set of fundamental principles and models mainly ontological and cognitive in character, defining the nature and purposes of social actors and actions" (Boli and Thomas 1997; Meyer et al. 1997). Although merely consisting of recommendations and suggestions, the world models have enforcing characteristics. Paradoxically, while world models "signal" plurality, individualization and multiculturalism they also standardize and secularize cultures and ideologies (Burbules and Torres 2000).

According to this perspective, the world models embody the Western worldview and include features as diverse as, for instance, Human Rights, Children Rights (emphasizing individual autonomy and the like), modern Communitarian views (altruism, solidarity, etc.), Neoliberal views (the self-interested and utility maximizing man), consumerist ideals, Liberal democracy, education as a private and individual good, and so on (Ahmed 1992; Barber 1996; Spring 2009). Thus, the Western set of world models may be seen as containing or representing the market-oriented discourse as well as the modern communitarian-oriented ideology.

In regard to culture and religion, globalizations result in intensive encounters between Islam, Christianity, Buddhism and Hinduism. The world religions compete and challenge one another, each of them claiming to possess "exclusive and largely absolute truths or values" (Turner 1991, p.173). The outcomes of the encounters between Islam and other globalized belief and value systems differ from one geographical and cultural area to another. In the pre-dominating world models, competing features, such as Islam and Buddhism, etc. are not considered in the same way and to the same extent as Western belief and value systems. That is, although Islam is being globalized it does not make part of the Western-oriented world models (Ahmed 1992; An-Naím 1999; Beeley 1992; Carney et al. 2012; Turner 1991).

Traditionally, culture has tied individuals, social systems and territories to one another. The local in this sense implies different (holistic or totalistic) collectives ranging from loose voluntary associations and networks to extended families, lineages, clans, kinships and fundamentalist groups. In areas less influenced by market forces, sections of the economy are driven not primarily by profit-seeking or individual utility maximization, but by the need for collective (extended family, clan, tribe, and so on) survival. Culturally, complex and sometimes contradictory processes occur around the world. Economic activities "remain embedded in the social fabric" and have "another logic, another set of rules" (than the capitalist) (Esteva and Prakash 1998, p. 86). Individuals make part of networks and there is a low degree of individualism (Hoerner 1995).

The spread of Western cultural features has different outcomes, ranging from revitalization of local cultures, which is particularization, to the emergence of "syntheses" or what Robertson (1995) labels "glocalization" and calls "hybridization", to the elimination of local cultures. When glocalization occurs, universal features are transformed and translated into local cultures, while in hybridization the universal and the local more or less merge. Both glocalization and hybridization cover the outcomes of the encounter between global, standardized cultural aspects and local and/or value-oriented cultural aspects. According to Touraine (1971), the social has been decomposition, individualism has become the principal of ´morality´, and society has fragmented into communities.

The market ideology and the modern communitarian orientation have a common denominator that largely corresponds to the world models. The core of the policy documents produced in and disseminated from international non-Islamic organizations (e.g. OECD, UNESCO, and the World Bank) may be seen as constituting world models, although rarely explicitly. Since the world system as such does not have an overall physical or material world state, government or polity, governance is performed not only by nation-states but to a large extent by market forces, the enforcing characteristics of the world models and through the activities performed by a myriad of networks and organizations (Garsten and Jacobsson 2007; Messner 1997; Mundy 2007).

Awareness of one's rights and demand for them has increased as a result of globalization and civil and human rights have become important themes in the globalizing discourses and policies. Global pressure for human rights and pressure from IGOs and INGOs concerning political freedom and freedom of organization have made many governments organize multiparty elections (Bretherton 1996b; Giddens 2002). However, this has not materialized at any large extent in pre-dominantly Muslim countries (Kurzman 2002).

The neoliberal and human rights globalizations and the spread of the Western worldviews and lifestyles (Liberal, pluralist and market oriented) thus have come to challenge also Islamic beliefs, ideologies, institutions and way of life, which previously seemed to be valid (Ahmed 1992). As Giddens (1994, 22) argues, "Globalization is not just about the creation of larger systems, but about the transformation of the contexts of social experience." That is, global processes also reach the individual level. Individuals can less than before trust the immediate and experienced past and present (Robertson 1992; Waters 2001).

Education Reforms

Regarding the influences of international and global forces on education, it is necessary to make a distinction between: (i) general processes of globalization, and (ii) direct and specific educational processes such educational borrowing (Meyer et al. 1997; Steiner-Khamsi 2004). The former includes general economic, cultural, and political forces affecting education indirectly, while the latter takes place in the domain of education and thus affects education directly. In the latter case, the spread of educational policies takes place through, for instance, borrowing, learning (from others), and imposition (Dale 1999).

The Western-style modern education has been globalized through its massive expansion around the world. The changes within this type of education are taking place in the direction proposed in the world models: in overall goals, educational organization, type of governance, administration, mode of finance and organization of educational provision and delivery and regulation as well as the curriculum (Daun 2002, 2006; Spring 2009). The culture of Western-style primary and secondary education is increasingly biased towards cognitive and measurable elements, and quality is assessed in terms of achievement on test scores rather than socialization skills, personality formation or moral training. In such a context, education tends to be seen as a commodity, while moral training and ethical virtues are neglected. Expansions and changes of the curriculum and developments within the aspects of education affect Islamic education in different ways.

Western-style education is generally seen as the means to achieve a large number of goals, including development, economic growth, peace, and democracy. The processes of neo-liberal globalization generally drive countries to at least attempt to make people technologically and economically competitive; and more specifically to enhance students´ cognitive and technical skills. However, in reality education has maintained its different complementary as well as contradictory functions: transformation of society, reproduction of power relations, sorting, selection, qualification of pupils, and so on. Some of these features seem to apply to some types of Islamic education as well, partly because Islamic knowledge is stratified, as some groups are not entitled or able to reach the highest levels of knowledge (see Nasr 1975).

Key Concepts

In many countries a gap has emerged between, national leaders and voters (see, for example, Andeweg 1996; Bakker et al. 2010). However, values have not changed as much as societal structures, economic patterns and technology (World values survey 2015). Paradigm, culture, ideology and policy are interrelated concepts. A paradigm is the most abstract but also the most profound features of cultures, ideologies, social theories and common sense, and these features are situated at the level of (a) epistemology and ontology (view of man, view of society, view of the state, view of knowledge, and so on); (b) view of the role of education in society and for the individual, and (c) discourse and policies (Burrel and Morgan 1992; Watt 1994). Culture is an ongoing construction of shared world views, visions and meanings.

Ideologies are aspects of culture(s); they are visions used politically and programmatically to justify a certain state of affairs or vision of certain states of affair. When ideological elements are transferred into the policy-making arena, they tend to adapt to the context and concrete circumstances (Sörensen 1987). Ideologies were originally to a large extent linked to socio-economic class and material conditions of people but are now being de-linked from class structures and group interests and more and more linked to the drives for individual autonomy, competitiveness, "modularity",[1] new types of governance, uncertainty, risk, and so on (Gellner 1994; Reich 1997; Touraine 1971).

Political party programs and ideologies are more concrete than paradigms and often have to deal and "negotiate" with the concrete realities. Therefore, political programs and ideologies may borrow from different paradigms, and different political parties may borrow from one and the same paradigm. That is, the content of the paradigm does not necessarily correspond completely to, for example, actual political party programs or ideology, nor can paradigms be applied to specific societal or educational situations or problems. Instead, they have to be "operationalized" and "negotiated" in order to become applicable in policies.

Policies are political decisions and their implementation, and they can vary in a number of dimensions, but here it will suffice to mention the ideological dimension, which may range from utopian to remedial. In the first case, policies are oriented towards goals that correspond to a low degree to existing realities. Remedial policies are defensive, since they, at least at the discursive level, aim at solving existing problems. However, there are various perceptions of what constitutes a problem and still more so of the solution of problems. Events, processes and states of affair need to have a certain structure in order to be perceived as problems (Sörensen 1987).

It is evident that, apart from globalization processes, certain aspects internal to each country contribute to the ideological and political shifts: for example, the expansion and prolongation of education and a higher material standard of living among the populations in some areas in the world have contributed to the changed

[1] This term has been coined by Gellner (1994) and means that individuals are socialized in such a way that they fit in and behave appropriately in many different situations and contexts.

basis and nature of ideologies (Inglehardt 1990, 1997; Norris and Inglehart 2004; World Values Survey 2015).

Hegemony, as it was once conceptualized by Gramsci (1971) operates at the national level and implies consensus within the framework of a national, industrialized capitalist economy, based on the fact that the capitalist class is able to make the dominated class(es) accept the dominant culture and ideology as" common sense" (Sears and Moorers 1995). Thus, hegemony is ideological domination. Moreover, Sears and Moorers (1995:244) refer to Laclau, who argues that hegemony is a discursive matter: it is the ability to extend the dominating discourse and make its alternatives converge with itself. However, hegemony can reasonably be expanded to fit a global framework, in the context of global processes.

Despite the uniform pattern of ideologies and policies deriving from the hegemonic paradigms, nation-states, education systems and schools do not adapt immediately or in a uniform way (McGinn 1997; Meyer et al. 1997). This indicates inertia, resistance or some type of counter-hegemony (Camps 1997).

As far as education is concerned, its value tends to be perceived in two principal ways: (i) as a value in itself, or (ii) as an instrumental value. In the first case, it is seen as a human right, a basic human need or an indispensable aspect of welfare and well-being. In the second case, it is an investment and qualification for future roles in the spheres of production and consumption or a means to create democratic citizens, for instance (Colclough 1990; Cornia et al. 1987; Farrell 1992). Furthermore, the relationship between society and the education systems has, during different historical periods, been seen in four different ways: (i) Education is conditioned by and adapting to societal changes; (ii) education is the Motor driving societal changes, (iii) society and education are in a mutual interrelationship, or (iv) education is more or less independent of or isolated from society (Karabel and Halsey 1977). A certain view among the four has prevailed for a certain period and then faded away or been abandoned due to the emergence of another view. The second (ii) view has dominated since the beginning of the 1990s and it corresponds to the liberal market view (see, for example, human capital theory).

Against this background describing globalization and of conceptual distinctions, the most common ideologies and their shifts will now be discussed.

The most Influential Western Ideologies

Liberalism, Social Liberalism and Neo-Liberalism

The principal ideas of the political branch of Liberalism were realized in the countries in North America and parts of Europe with the breakthrough of liberal democracy and implementation of human and civil rights. With the economic depression and the application of Keynesian policies in the 1930s, classical liberalism eventually accepted a range of state interventions for the sake of economic growth, economic stability and equality. This version of liberalism came to be called *social liberalism*. On the other hand, some central elements of the classical liberal ideology – especially in the economic domain – have been revived and sometimes refined under the label neo-liberalism (Crowley 1987).

Neoliberalism is hostile to and defines traditions as “externalities” (to the economy) but at the same time it depends in on the persistence of tradition (nation, religion, family) (Apple 2000; Giddens 1994). Two important assumptions are that everything could be “marketized” and that human beings are driven by the desire to maximize own utility regardless of time and place. Structural adjustment programs initiated by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in a large number of countries around the world are based on the neoliberal assumptions.

Crouch (2017, p, 8) argues that neoliberalism is “… a political strategy that seeks to make as much of our lives as possible conform to the economist’s ideal of a free market.”. And development aid implies that “the recipient countries should develop and implement policies ensuring privatisation of state-owned enterprises, deregulation, liberalisation of imports and foreign direct investment inflows and interest rates, as well as legislate to minimise the role of government intervention into the economy”. In the market discourse, education is seen as a good or commodity. Moral issues and moral education (honesty and other values) are assumed to be acquired through the workings of market mechanisms (Giddens 1994, Giddens 2002).

Conservatism

Contemporary conservatism is impregnated by ideas from earlier periods and its principal goal is to revive societal features and values that formerly existed. Locality and territory are important in the conservative ideology, be it the local community or the nation. For nationalists among the conservatives, it is the nation that is the context of decision-making and identity, while it is the local community among locally oriented conservatives (similar or akin to one of the early – traditional – communitarian branch) (McCarthy et al. 1981). As in liberalism, inequalities were (and are) seen to be due to inherited biological differences; differences in efforts made by the individual himself or herself; or both. Individual freedom is important but earlier as well as certain later conservatives do not believe as much as neoliberals in individual rationality and market solutions. They see a need for moral training in accordance with specific conservative values, and – in the Western context – dissemination of Christianity. Also, there is a need for a state guarding the nation and for religious institutions and families that guarantee moral values (Held 1995, p. 139). For example, if the dissemination of Christian values and nationalist elements are perceived to be at risk with the implementation of decentralization, then late conservatives are reluctant to such a reform (Lauglo 1995).

Held (1995) finds within the New right “severe tensions between individual liberty, collective decision-making and institutions and processes of democracy” (p. 495). Brown et al. (1997) argue along the same lines when they – within the

New Right – find argument for international competition as well as romanticization of the past of the “ideal” home, family and school. In conservatism, education is generally seen as fostering, mainly in moral values and citizenship.

Conservatism exists also in cultures and civilizations other than the ones in Europe, America and Oceania. Among adherents to Islam, for instance, there are conservative groups, whose values and beliefs have many features in common with conservatives in the non-Muslim countries. (See, for instance, Ahmed 1992; Ayubi 1991; Saadallah 2018).

Communism, Utopian Socialism, Syndicalism, Anarchism, Cooperative Socialism

These ideologies have one thing in common: the belief in a classless and stateless society with emancipated individuals who are collectively oriented and rational. The locus for decision-making is the local, be it a community, a factory or another collective entity. However, the means to reach this state of affairs and the solutions these ideologies suggest for reaching this utopian society differ considerably (Bakunin 1981; Kropotkin 1981; Sabine 1964; Woodcock 1962). In communism, revolution is the means to radically change society into a classless society. Anarchism implies individualism, but it is an individualism which is collectively oriented. The classical anarchists believed that individual (and sometimes violent) actions, such as sabotage, strike, etc. could make the capitalist society collapse and that an egalitarian society could be created from the ruins of the capitalist society. Utopian socialism and cooperative socialism existed mainly in England and France during the nineteenth century. These socialists were convinced that the establishment of cooperative movements and firms (not-for-profit) could lead to a better society without capitalism and a strong, central state. A general theme in syndicalism is the belief that society can change in the direction mentioned above through massive participation in trade unions and their strategic general strikes.

Socialism and Keynesianism

Reformist socialism eventually became Social Democracy, that rejected the revolutionary way of changing the capitalist society (Sabine 1964). Instead, it was seen as possible to seize the state through general elections and then use it for societal transformation. Before reformist socialists ever came into power position, they tended to see the education system as one of the ideological apparatuses of the state, an apparatus that defended the interests of the privileged class. When they had implemented universal primary and secondary education, this view changed, and nowadays education by them is seen to a more egalitarian society (even if the sorting function of education systems is still recognized to be working) (Blackledge and Hunt 1985).

Communitarianism and Populism

Communitarianism is not a paradigm in the same sense as the others. Rather, it consists of various ideas and practical approaches that have a certain common denominator, different from the core of the other paradigms. Communitarians have a common denominator in what Thomas (1994) calls" college" (the local or voluntary organisations as the platform for decision-making and locus of intent); decisions are made at the local level and for the common good at that level. That is, a "community" or an association should be the context for decision-making and ties of solidarity. The common is not necessarily the nation-state but a "community".

Communitarians argue that a strong civil society and social capital are necessary for the preservation of individual liberty and at the same time solidarity. Many communitarians do not question the state and capitalism as such. They see both as a necessary foundation for freedom and welfare per se, but reject their extreme forms, such as a high degree of state centralization and alliances between lobbying pressure groups and the state. Also, they argue that communitarianism is a third alternative – between capitalism and centralized political bureaucracy (Etzioni 1995; Wesolowski 1995). In this view both welfare bureaucracy and market forces undermine altruistic incentives and create anonymity and alienation (Green 1993; Hunter 1995). On the other hand, the state is seen as the only guarantor against the complete take over by the capitalist and market forces. Communitarians fear elitism and tend to see the Keynesian approach as suppression of difference, of individual rights and freedom. What is needed is solidarity and a feeling of belongingness (McCarthy et al. 1981).

A basic idea of early communitarianism is that the individual once belonged by birth to his/her community. Each community formed an organic whole. Such conditions of life have now, according to them, got lost and have been substituted by a direct "contract" between the individual and the state (McCarthy et al. 1981). Still today, in many places in low income countries, the community is more important than the individual. The communitarian-oriented ideology includes a traditional and a modern branch. The traditional branch is based on the idea that a geographical area and its population form an organic whole. Traditional communities are those in which people are born, or are related by religion, family or kinship. The adherents to traditional branch aim at restoring community or at least the spirit of community and see education as a holistic matter. Muslims, wherever in the world they live, tend to form communities of the traditional type, communities that are perceived to belong to *umma.*

There are thus two branches of communitarianism. One is the early conservative communitarianism, based on the local community traditions. The other branch is the late communitarianism that emerged in the 1960s. Waters (2000) distinguishes between two categories of communitarians: (a) the New Right, conservative, that is searching for an organic and integrated association between people who have many features in common; and (b) the New Left, the radical communitarians, according to which communities based on some common interests or common life styles are good for democratic participation. The New Right stress individual autonomy and the right to consume. The New Left are critical to the neo-liberal concept of freedom as something neutral and independent of social and cultural context. They see the common good as resulting from shared activities and transmitted values but also as the context from which the individual derives his or her freedom and choice possibilities (Haldane 1996).

For some of the late communitarians, the goal is to restore the “spirit” of community (Etzioni 1995), while early communitarians go still further and argue for a restoration not only of the spirit but of the functions and forms of the old communities (McCarthy et al. 1981). Late communitarians do not see “community” as something necessarily based on common residence or locality but as some type of “sameness” (Offe 1996) or shared life style, be it ecological issues, feminist issues, gay life styles, etc. This branch seems to have been influenced by anarchism, utopian socialism and post-modernism. It is internationally oriented and defends individual autonomy and civil society (Held 1995).

Populism is to a by some researchers seen as socialist, while others see it as conservatism (or even fascism). In this chapter, no attempt will be made to classify populism but it is included here, because it is sometimes an ingredient of communitarianism, and during the past decades it has become widespread (Stockemer 2019b). Nowadays “populism” is often used in everyday language to mean “opportunistic”, “folk”-oriented, etc. However, the term populism was originally used for the view that once upon a time, people lived in a “natural” or “innocent” state of affairs; there was no urbanization, no large scale capitalism or big state, and leaders were locally based and came into power position either by tradition or through elections at the local (village) level. Life was not very complicated, there were no national elites and people at the grassroots level knew what was best for themselves (Ionescu and Gellner 1969). Society is by populists seen as divided into folk and elite. Directors and owners of big companies, intellectuals and national politicians are seen the elite, that does not know and understand the desires and needs of the folk.

Mackert (2018) argues that one of the reasons for the appearance of populism is the global financial crisis in 2008, “All these manifestations of right-wing populism share a common feature: they attack or even compromise the core elements of democratic societies, such as the separation of powers, protection of minorities and the rule of law (p. 1). Crouch (2017,13) summarizes populism with the following characteristics: (1) anti-establishment, (2) all the left (populist) parties are against austerity, which indicates against some aspects of neoliberalism, (3) many populist parties are anti-globalisation, (4) most right wing parties against EU, (5) all of the populist parties on the right are anti-immigration and anti-Islam. Populists “see themselves as neglected … feel marginalised … marginalisation is potentially a loss of identity” (p. 14). Everyday life of people is impregnated by competition, “… individual egoism and utility maximisation…” and “old social cleavages” have been reactivated and new ones have been triggered – “citizens vs. migrants, old vs. young, urban vs. rural, wealthy vs. poor”.

According to Jakupec (2018), Trumps’s politics and policies are a variety of populism. They are “challenging the neoliberal ideology of the Washington

Consensus institutions (e.g. World Bank, IMF, WTO)" (p. v). What he terms "Trumponomics" is "based on isolationism, protectionism, antiglobalisation, anti-neoliberalism" (p. ix). "…today's populism … a mediate consequence of neo-liberalism's destruction of the social fabric, norms and values, and democratic institutions of Western societies (p. 6).

In all, populism is seen as a "thin" ideology (Green and White 2019).

Meta-ideological Dimensions and Education

An educational paradigm is a whole package of the principal ideas concerning the ideal relationships between the political, economic, cultural spheres of society, on the one hand, and the role of education in society, on the other hand (Burrel and Morgan 1992; Watt 1994). Using ideal types (in the Weberian sense, see Gerth and Mills 1970), which directs attention towards cores of categories and emphasize differences between categories, the dominating paradigms and some of their principle themes and elements are described below. As ideal types, the paradigms correspond neither directly to any present-time political parties and various movements nor to particular varieties of educational policies. Three paradigms behind educational policies and surrounding educational issues have during the past decades been the most influential in many areas of the world. These paradigms will be referred to as: the market-oriented paradigm, the etatist-welfarist-oriented paradigm, and the communitarian-oriented paradigm. However, etatism has lost a lot of its attraction since the 1980s and during the 2010s, populism has arisen as a reaction to the changes in the world, especially globalization and neo-liberal changes (Colliot-Thélène 2018).

The Market-Oriented Paradigm

The whole philosophy and terminology of this paradigm derive from liberal micro-economics (as opposite to Keynesian policy which is macro-oriented). Consequently, for the basic assumptions of the market-oriented paradigm, reference may be made to the previous description of liberalism. Market proponents believe in individualism and individual rationality, features which have been specified by philosophers such as Hayek (1960). Individualism in this context means that the individual is a utility-maximizing creature who acts rationally (purposively) through self-seeking behaviour of the market-place (Held 1995). For the individual to be able to do so, there should be as much freedom as possible and as little steering as possible from forces (called externalities) other than the market mechanisms (Miller 1989). Tradition, family, clan and nation are externalities that are anachronistic and irrelevant for rational action or an obstacle to development to a higher stage of efficiency and material standard of living (Crowley 1987). When individuals can maximize their own utility, this accumulates and favours the development of society at large.

Deregulation of markets worldwide will make the world more conducive for individual utility-maximization and, thus, higher stages of societal development (Hayek 1960).

The basic assumptions mentioned above are used in the educational domain. To base education on market principles is an idea that comes from Friedman (1962) and Schultz (1961). More specifically, education is seen as a good or commodity, and when all consumers can choose, the quality of the goods and services improves. The market paradigm has been applied to education either literally or as a metaphor. In the first case, actions and arrangements in the educational field follow the market principles. The prototype is a private agent who calculates the revenues in relation to the costs of organizing education. The owner as actor does not have any other revenue from the educational supply than the fees paid by the parents (or per pupil subsidies from the central state or from the community authorities). Marginal profit from accepting each new pupil is estimated. Unlimited choice and school fees are two of the most important features in the first case. There is competition between suppliers. In the second case, the educational field is treated as if it were a market (quasi-market). Choice among public schools is one such example. “Marketization” of the field of education can, in this view, be partial – the ownership and delivery are private but the owners or their customers receive public funds. The market paradigm has impregnated the educational and other discourses during the past three, four decades. These discourses have adopted terms such as entrepreneur, delivery, efficiency, consumer, client, etc. from the market paradigm.

The Etatist-Welfarist-Oriented Paradigm

The assumptions of this paradigm are often not as explicit as those of the market approach. However, the following assumptions may be derived or inferred from different sources (Cuzzort and King 1976; Dow 1993; Sabine 1964; Vincent 1994). The role of the state is to eliminate, or at least reduce, inequalities or inefficiencies resulting from the workings of the capitalist system. Capitalism itself should not be abolished but regulated (Curtis Curtis 1981; Sabine 1964). The individual is seen as a self-actualizing agent. Due to societal inequalities and different phases in individuals´ biography (childhood, for example), there are always individuals who are not able to satisfy some of their basic needs through own efforts. Satisfaction of their needs has to be guaranteed by the collectivity (the public sector) and efforts are made to optimize needs satisfaction (Doyal and Gough 1991).

Inasmuch as the etatist-welfarist orientation assumes that education and individual positions are conditioned by macro structures, measures to improve education have to deal not only with the formal education system, but also with societal structures. Due to an emphasis on the state as guarantor of individual and societal prosperity and development, a liberal world market is useful only to the extent that it can serve in the construction of human welfare; economic growth is not seen as a value in itself but as a means to achieve maximal or at least optimal well-being (Cornia et al. 1987; Doyal and Gough 1991).

Proponents of this paradigm suggest political means to achieve goals and political solutions to social problems. To the extent that issues are transferred to the political platform for public decision-making, democracy is enhanced (Dow 1993). Educational reforms should be decided upon and accomplished through the state, and proponents of this paradigm have traditionally been reluctant to decentralized and private solutions (Lauglo 1995). Coordination at the central level is necessary so as to guarantee equality or equivalent provision of services. On the other hand, decentralization of the state apparatus will give schools enough autonomy to improve education and choice among schools within the public sector will make schools more accountable and stimulate them to improve.

School education is a human right that must be guaranteed by the state (Zajda and Ozdowski 2017). Through schooling, economic and other equalities in the larger society can be achieved. In turn, society benefits from a schooled population. Thus, the state has an interest in organizing or, at the very least, supporting formal education. Agents other than the state would not concern themselves with issues such as democratic training, democratic participation and equality (Carnoy 1992).

The Communitarian Paradigm and the Populist Perspectives

In regard to education, schools should be locally owned and run, either by local communities, NGOs or other associations. Communitarians argue that many children grow up without a network in which they can be properly socialized and supported. Schools are expected to repair this "undereducation" but are today too narrow in their task and too test oriented. They should teach morals, solidarity and responsibility and produce social capital. Democracy should be learnt by experiences of cooperation, moral training, and so on, in school life (Etzioni 1995). As mentioned before, populism can to some extent be seen as a sub-category of traditional communitarianism. In the populist view, education should be principally locally based and owned, and it should be for local purposes (Lauglo 1995).

Meta-ideological Dimensions

From studies on values and morals (e.g. Inglehardt 1990, 1997; Norris and Inglehart 2004; World Values Surveys 2015) we may derive or distil certain ideological features, which here are considered as dimensions of paradigms. Certain features of paradigms are highly relevant in an educational context. If we take these features to be dimensions with opposite poles, the paradigms can then be located along these dimensions. The choice of dimensions and the number of positions along them may vary in relation to the purpose of studying them. Provisionally and for heuristic purpose, the dimensions have here been scaled into seven positions.

The dimensions selected here are: (i) Materialism/consumption vs. post-materialism; (ii) centralism vs. decentralism; (iii) big state vs. small state; (iv)

Table 5.1 Principal Paradigm and Ideology Dimensions

Materialism, consumerism, materialist values	M		E		C 1	P, C2		Humanistic, post-materialist values
Centralism			E	C1		P	M, C2	Decentralism
Big state	E			C2	P, C1		M	Small state
Representative democracy	E		M[a]			P	C1, C2	Direct democracy
Secularism	M, E			C2	P		C1	De-sceularism
Self-orientation	M	C2			E	P	C1	Other-orientation
Individualism	M		C2	C1	P, E			Collectivism
Autonomy, freedom	M[c], C2[b]	P, C1[b]				E		Equality
Universalism	M	E	C2			C1	P	Particularism
Purposive rationality	M, E					P, C2	C1	Moral rationality

M Market orientation, *E* Etatist orientation representative, *C1* Early communitarianism, *C2* Late communitarianism, *P* Populism
[a]Apart from democracy (elite competition for running of the state), choice is democracy
[b]Not individual but local autonomy in relation to the central state
[c]Individual autonomy

purposive rationality vs. value rationality; (v) representative democracy vs. direct democracy; (vi) secularism vs. sacredness; (vii) self-orientation vs. other-orientation; (viii) individualism vs. collectivism; (ix) autonomy vs. equality; and (x) universalism vs. particularism. In principle, the paradigms and ideologies can be placed along the dimensions as in Table 5.1.

Materialism/consumption vs. post-materialism: This dimension is used by Inglehart (Inglehardt 1990, Inglehardt 1997; Norris and Inglehart 2004: World values survey 2015) in their analysis of the values in a number of countries. Materialism and consumption mean that acquisition of goods and services takes place principally for its own sake. Post-materialism means that priority is given to non-material ideals (morals, ecology, humanitarianism, and so on). *Centralism vs. decentralism:* This is an "old" dimension that has been debated ever since the emergence of classical ideologies, but has been revived since the 1980s. It concerns the level of decision-making and implementation. *Big state vs. small state:* This is also an old dimension. It deals with the legitimacy and desirability of state intervention in society. Logically and semantically, this dimension does not have to accompany the centralism-decentralism dimension. That the state is centralist does not necessarily imply that it is big.

Representative democracy vs. direct democracy: This is also an old issue but is has been actualized with the new movements´ demands for direct democracy. It is visible i.a. in the type of boards or councils that are implemented when decentralization (school-based management) takes place. *Secularism vs. de-secularism:* This dimension should not be perceived to apply to the religious aspect only. Apter

(1965) and Gellner (1994), for instance, see strong de-secularist elements in utopian ideologies as the opposite of secularism, especially in connection with revolutionary changes in a society. *Purposive vs. value rationality*: Purposive rationality means that means and goals are estimated to correspond to one another in an optimal way. Revolutionary ideologies, for example, tend to be value rationalist during their early phases. *Individualism vs. collectivism:* Refers to the arrangements for attaining goals – whether the goals should be predominantly individual or collective and whether the goals should be attained through individual or joint efforts (Thomas 1994). *Self-orientation vs. other-orientation:* Refers to the goals themselves (ego vs alter) – whether self or other is the object for goal achievement (ibid).

Autonomy/freedom vs equality: The attainment of the former tends to imply increasing inequality and vice versa. When resources are or are seen as limited, this dimension is articulated. *Universalism vs particularism:* Universalists assume that social, political and educational phenomena are transferable to any cultural context in the world, regardless of time and place, while the opposite applies to particularists, who argue that cultures, values, etc. are local and specific.

Three of the most globalized paradigms (the market paradigm, the etatist paradigm and the communitarian paradigm) are placed along these dimensions in Table 5.1. Populism is not a paradigm but has been included here because of it spread during the past decade. The placements of the paradigms in positions along the defined dimensions should be seen as approximations based mainly on the sources mentioned (see, for instance, Inglehardt 1990, 1997). Moves are not shown in the table, but it may be mentioned that several Social Democratic and Socialist parties around the world have moved on the dimension of centralism-decentralism (in the direction from an “etatist” to a “communitarian” position or even to a market position. Market proponents and late communitarians share position on decentralism, while early communitarianism is closed to etatism on self-orientation and autonomy. We also find that communitarians are opposite to the other paradigms on representative vs. direct democracy.

Approximations of positions of paradigms along certain, relevant dimensions can also be made specifically for the domain of education, and we once again use ideal types in the Weberian way. The following dimensions have been included (Table 5.2):

Since the 1980s, certain developments in the educational policy community have laid the groundwork for the spread and main streaming of the Market paradigm to many areas of the globe. Ideological elements such as ‘the agent’, ‘the micro’ and ‘the rational individual’ took a leading position in the educational policy communities (Ball 1990; Craib 1992; Morrow and Torres 2000; Popkewitz 2000). These are typical features of the market-oriented paradigm. However, another discourse stemming from the communitarian paradigm emerged with a focus on cultural issues and human rights. The elements of these two dominant paradigms are now articulated in the form of globe-wide policies, their common denominators (See Fig. 5.1) are attaining global spread.

Table 5.2 Principal Paradigm and Ideology Dimensions in the Educational Domain

Education as skills formation	M		E	C2		P, C1		Education as broader personality formation
Education principally as an instrument for achieving higher productivity and citizenship competence	M		E	C2		P	C1	Education as a value in itself
Limitless choice	M		C2		E	C1	P	No choice
Education run as a market	M		C2			P, C1	E	Education as a public matter
Centralized governance		E		C2		P, C1	M	Decentralized governance
Competition among schools and among students	M		C2		E	P, C1		Cooperation among schools and among students
National curriculum	E	M		C1	P		C2	Local curriculum
Education as individual good	M		C2		P	E	C1	Education as common good
Secularism	M	E	C2			P	C1	De-secularism
Diversified		P, M	C2		C1		E	Unitarian

<table>
<tr><td>Market-oriented</td><td>Meta-ideology (Globally hegemonic common denominator)</td><td>Communitarian-oriented</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Generally</td></tr>
<tr><td>Civil society as society minus state; profit or utility maximization; effectiveness; efficiency; competition; human capital.</td><td>Individualism; freedom of choice; technical (purposive) rationality; participation; individual autonomy. Private actors, entrepreneurs</td><td>Civil society as society minus state and market) Human Rights; NGOs; solidarity; values; multi-culturalism; local community</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">The common denominator educationally</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Individualism; freedom of choice; purposive (technical) rationality; decentralization; per pupil funding of schools; accountability; participation; individual autonomy; state withdrawal; privatization; education as an individual issue. Education as The Motor of development. Lifelong learning.</td></tr>
</table>

Fig. 5.1 Basic features of the market-oriented and communitarian-oriented paradigms and their common denominator

Much of the adaptations to the meta-ideology takes place through borrowing (Steiner-Khamsi 2004), various types of pressure from the international organizations such as donors and lenders (Dale 2000; Mundy 2007) and/or through states´ own efforts to be modern, up to-date and reliable (Meyer et al. 1997). As result, populism – whatever we think about it – has now come to challenge the meta-ideology, especially the neoliberal aspect of it.

Evaluation

Governments perceive themselves compelled to or have the ambition to be on the track, and the meta-ideology is seen as the answer to the requirements of competitiveness and modernity. This is one of the principal reasons for the ideology and paradigm shifts (Burbules and Torres 2000; Camps 1997; McGinn 1997; Meyer et al. 1997; Steiner-Khamsi 2004). On the other hand, at various levels and in different places, the meta-ideology and Western globalisation has met resistance and opposition, if not from governments so at least from segments of the populations and certain politicians, among them populists.

To use dimensions for analytical purpose can be fruitful in different ways: (a) we can place the policies of one and the same political party or government on the scales at different moments in time and establish if and what shifts have taken place and investigate why; and (b) we can discover what positions different political parties in a country have at certain phases in time. The dimensions make evident what positions different ideologies or political parties have at different moments in time, but also how they compare at a specific moment in time. When there are shared or close positions, there is space for "alliances" and a middle position makes it possible to negotiate with both "sides", such as the one between the market paradigm and the communitarian paradigm in individualism. However, in many cases unanticipated moves towards or adaptations to the meta-ideology have taken place.

Islam is being globalized; all countries with a Muslim presence have Quranic education organized by and in the civil sphere of society. Most rural areas in the Middle East, parts of Asia and in Central and West Africa and Africa's Horn have at least one Quranic school and/or some madrassas organized by civil forces. The spread of Western education has resulted in different outcomes and responses from the Islamic educational institutions: renovation, revivalism, ritualism. Efforts at integration between the Western and Islamic types of education have been and are being made in many places in the world. One principal way is when previously established religious (Islamic) schools place secular or "neutral" subjects in the framework of an otherwise Islamic education, and another one is when state schools in Muslim countries include Islamic subjects in an otherwise secular curriculum. General globalization causes changes in Muslim and non-Muslim societies, while globalization of specific educational policies neglect or under-emphasize moral and values education.

Conclusion

This chapter has analysed and discussed the predominating paradigms and ideologies and their positions along selected dimensions. The globalised meta-ideology was assumed to condition changes in positions, but other reasons for or causes of the changes might be an object of future, in-depth, research. In the past years populism has come to challenge the prevailing hegemony. As the above demonstrates, despite frequent incompatibilities with local economic structures and cultural patterns, the meta-ideology or paradigmatic features described above are taken for granted by politicians and policymakers around the world. The educational features that have been globalized are ostensibly biased towards achievement, cognition and purposive rationality.

References

Ahmed, A. S. (1992). *Postmodernism and Islam. Predicament and promise*. London: Routledge.

Andeweg, R. B. (1996). Élite-mass linkages in Europe: Legitimacy crisis or party crisis? *Oxford Scholarship Online Monographs, 22*, 143–164.

An-Náim, A. A. (1999). Political Islam in national politics and international relations. In P. L. Berger (Ed.), *The desecularization of the world. resurgent religion and world politics*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdman Publishing.

Apple, M. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic knowledge in a conservative age*. New York: Routledge.

Apter, D. (1965). *The politics of modernization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ayubi, N. N. (1991). *Politics and Islam. Politics and religion in the Arab world*. London: Routledge.

Bakker, et al. (2010). The role of personality in the job demands-resources model. *Career Development International, 15*, 622–636.

Bakunin, M. (1981). God and the state. In M. Curtis (Ed.), *The great political theories* (Vol. 2). New York: Avon Books.

Ball, S. (1990). *Politics and policy making in education. Explorations in policy sociology*. London: Routledge.

Barber, B. R. (1996). An American civic forum: Civil society between market individuals and the political community. In R. F. Paul & F. D. Miller Jr. (Eds.), *The communitarian challenge to liberalism* (Vol. 13, pp. 269–283). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Beeley, B. (1992). Islam as a global political force. In A. G. McGrew & P. G. Lewis (Eds.), *Global politics*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Benhabib, S. (1998). Democracy and identity. In search of the civic polity. *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 24*(23), 85–100.

Berger, P. L. (Ed.). (1999). *The desecularization of the world. Resurgent religion and world politics*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdman Publishing.

Blackledge, D. A., & Hunt, B. (1985). *Sociological interpretations of education*. London/Dover: Helm.

Boli, J., & Thomas, G. M. (Eds.). (1997). *Constructing world culture. International nongovernmental organizations since 1875*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bretherton, C. (1996a). Introduction: Global politics in the 1990s. In C. Bretherton & C. Ponton (Eds.), *Global politics. An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Bretherton, C. (1996b). Universal human rights: Bringing people into global politics? In C. Bretherton & G. Ponton (Eds.), *Global politics. An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Brown, T. (1999). Challenging globalization as discourse and phenomenon. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 18*(1), 3–17.

Brown, P., Halsey, A.H., Lauder, H. & Stuart Wells, A. (1997). Politics, markets and school effectiveness. In A. H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown & Stuart Wells (eds.). *Education, culture, economy, society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burbules, N. C., & Torres, C. A. (2000). Globalization and education: An introduction. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education. Critical perspectives* (pp. 2–26). London: Routledge.
Burrel, G., & Morgan, G. (1992). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. Hants: Angle.
Camps, V. (1997). Education for democracy. *Prospects, XXVII*, 493–499.
Cardoso, F. H. (1993). North-south relations in the present context: A new dependency? In M. Carnoy, M. Castells, S. S. Cohen, & F. H. Cardoso (Eds.), *The new global economy in the information age*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University.
Carney, S., Rappleye, J., & Silova, I. (2012). Between faith and science: World culture theory and comparative education. *Comparative Education Review, 56*(3), 366–420.
Carnoy, M. (1992). Education and the state: From Adam Smith to Perestroika. In R. Arnove, P. Altbach, & G. Kelly (Eds.), *Emergent issues in education, comparative perspective*. New York: State University of New York.
Castells, M. (1993). The informational economy and the new international division of labor. In M. Carnoy, M. Castells, S. S. Cohen, & F. H. Cardoso (Eds.), *The new global economy in information age*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University.
Chabbot, C., & Ramirez, F. C. (2001). Development and education. In M. T. Hallinan (Ed.), *Handbook of sociology in education*. New York: Plenum.
Clayton, T. (2004). Competing conceptions of globalization revisited: Relocating the tension between world-systems analysis and globalization analysis. *Comparative Education Review, 48*(3), 274–294.
Colclough, C. (1990). Structuralism versus neo-liberalism: An introduction. In C. Colclough & J. Manor (Eds.), *States or markets? Neo-liberalism and the development policy debate*. Oxford: Clanderon Press.
Colliot-Théĺène, C. (2018). Populism as a conceptual problem. In G. Fitzi, J. Mackert, & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Populism and the crisis of democracy, Vol 1: Concepts and theory*. London/New York: Routledge.
Cornia, G. A., Jollby, R., & Stewart, F. (1987). *Adjustment with a human face*. Oxford: Clanderon Press.
Cox, R. W. (2000). Political economy and world order: Problems of power and knowledge at the turn of the millenium. In R. Stubbs & G. R. D. Underhill (Eds.), *Political economy and the changing global order* (2nd ed., pp. 25–37). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Craib, I. (1992). *Modern social theory* (2nd ed.). London: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.
Crouch, G. (2017). *Can neoliberalism be saved from itself?* London: Social Europe Ltd..
Crowley, B. L. (1987). The self, the individual and the community. In *Liberalism in the political through of F.A. Hayek and Sidney and Beatrice Webb*. Oxford: Clanderon Press.
Curtis, M. (Ed.). (1981). *The great political theories* (Vol. 2). New York: Avon Books.
Cuzzort, R. P., & King, E. W. (1976). *Twentieth-century social thought*. New Jersey: Little Falls.
Dale, R. (1999). Specifying globalization effects on national policy: A focus on the mechanisms. *Journal of Education Policy, 14*(1), 1–17.
Dale, R. (2000). Globalization and education: Demonstrating a "common world educational culture" or locating a "globally structured educational agenda"? *Educational Theory, 40*(4), 427–428.
Daun, H. (2002). Globalization and National Education Systems. In H. Daun (Ed.), *Educational restructuring in the context of globalization and National Policy* (pp. 1–32). New York: Routledge Falmer.
Daun, H. (2006). Globalization and the governance of national education systems. In H. Daun (Ed.), *School decentralization in the context of globalizing governance. International comparison of grassroots responses*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Daun, H., & Arjmand, R. (2018). Islam, globalizations and education. In H. Daun & R. Arjmand (Eds.), *Handbook of Islamic education*. Berlin: Springer.

Daun, H. (ed. with G. Strömqvist) (2011). *Education and development in the context of globalization.* New York: Nova Science Publisher.

Dow, G. (1993). What do we know about social democracy. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 14*, 11–48.

Doyal, L., & Gough, I. (1991). *A theory of human need*. London: The MacMillam Press.

Elwell, F. W. (2006). *Macrosociology: Four modern theorists*. Paradigm Publishers. Http//:www.faculty.rsu.edu/~felwell/Theorists/Elwell/MajorWorks.html. Accessed 6 Feb 2006.

Esteva, G., & Prakash, M. S. (1998). *Grassroots postmodernism. Rewaking the soil of cultures*. London: Zed Books.

Etzioni, A. (1995). *The spirit of community. Rights, responsibilities and the communitarian agenda*. London: Fontana.

Farrell, J. P. (1992). Conceptualizing education in the drive for social equality. In R. F. Arnove, P. G. Altbach, & G. P. Kelly (Eds.), *Emergent issues in education. Comparative perspectives*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Foreign Policy. (2007). *The seventh annual A. T. Kearney/Foreign Policy Globalization Index*. Foreign Policy 2007.

Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Garsten, C., & Jacobsson, K. (2007). Corporate globalisation, civil society and post-political regulation – Whither democracy? *Development Dialogue, 49*, 143–157.

Gellner, E. (1994). *Conditions of liberty. Civil society and its rivals*. London: Harnish Hamilton.

Gerth, H. H., & Mills, C. W. (Eds.). (1970). *From Max Weber. Essays in sociology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Giddens, A. (1994). Brave new world: The new context of politics. In D. Miliband (Ed.), *Reinventing the left* (pp. 21–38). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (2002). *Runaway world. How globalization is reshaping our lives*. London: Profile Books.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from prison notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.

Green, D. G. (1993). *Reinventing civil society. The rediscovery of welfare without politics*. London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit.

Green, M., & White, J. K. (2019). Populism in the United States. In D. Stockemer (Ed.), *Popuplism around the world. A comparative perspective*. Cham: Springer.

Griffin, K. (2003). Economic globalisation and institutions of global governance. *Development and Change, 34*(5), 789–807.

Griffith-Jones, S., & Ocampo, J. A. (1999). *The poorest countries and the emerging international financial architecture*. Report 1999:4 from the EGDI group. Stockholm: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Haldane, J. (1996). The individual, the state and the common good. In R. F. Paul & F. D. Miller Jr. (Eds.), *The communitarian challenge to liberalism* (Vol. 13, pp. 59–79). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hannum, E., & Buchmann, C. (2003). *The consequences of global educational expansion*. Cambridge, MA: American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Hayek, F. (1960). *The road to serfdom*. London: Routledge Classics.

Haynes, J. (1999). Introduction. In J. Haynes (Ed.), *Religion, globalization and political culture in the third world*. London: Macmillam Press.

Held, D. (1995). *Political theory and the modern state*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hoerner, J.-M. (1995). *Le tiers-monde. Entre la survie et ĺ informel. (The third world. Between survival and the informal)*. Paris: Harmattan.

Hunter, A. (1995). Rethinking revolution in the light of the new social movements. In M. Darnovsky, B. Epstein, & R. Flacks (Eds.), *Cultural politics and social movements*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Inglehardt, R. (1990). *Culture shifts in advanced industrial society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Inglehardt, R. (1997). *Culture shift in advanced industrial societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Ionescu, G., & Gellner, E. (1969). *Populism. Its meanings and national characteristics*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.
Jakupec, V. (2018). *Development aid – Populism and the end of the neoliberal agenda*. Cham: Springer.
Karabel, J., & Halsey, A. H. (Eds.). (1977). *Power and ideology in education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Kropotkin, P. P. (1981). Anarchist communism. In M. Curtis (Ed.), *The great political theories* (Vol. 2). New York: Avon Books.
Kurzman, C. (2002). The globalization of rights in Islamic Discourse. In A. Mohammadi (Ed). *Islam encountering globalization*. London: Routledge Curzon. http://www.unc.edu/~kurzman/cv/Kurzman_Globalization_of_Rights.pdf. Accessed 16 Nov 2010.
Lauglo, J. (1995). Forms of decentralization and their implications for education. *Comparative Education, 31*(1), 5–30.
Lipumba, I. H. (2003). *Globalization and economic development: Can Sub-Sahara Africa avoid marginalization?* Paper presented at the conference on "Rich and poor: Current development research and its condition in Sweden", January, 2003, Lund University, Lund, Sweden.
Mackert, J. (2018). Introduction. Is there such as thing as populism? In G. Fitxi, J. Mackert, & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Populism and the crisis of democracy, Vol 1: Concepts and theory*. London/New York: Routledge.
Mandaville, P. (2016, February 16). Globalisation and Muslim societies. Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE (K. Fleet, G. Krämer, D. Matringe, J. Nawas, E. Rowson). Brill Online, 2016. Lund University. http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-3/globalisation-and-muslim-societies-COM_27486
Martin, D. (1999). The evangelical upsurge and its political implication. In P. L. Berger (Ed.), *The desecularization of the world. Resurgent religion and world politics*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdman Publishing.
McCarthy, R., Oppewal, D., Peterson, W., & Spykman, G. (1981). Society, state & schools. In *A case for structural and confessional pluralism*. Michigan: William B. Edwards Publishing Co.
McGinn, N. (1997). The impact of globalization on national education systems. *Prospects,* 27
Messner, D. (1997). *The network society: Economic development and international competitiveness as problems of social governance*. New York: Routledge.
Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G. M., & Ramirez, F. O. (1997). World society and nation-state. *American Journal of Sociology, 103*, 144–181.
Miller, D. (1989). *Market, state and community*. Oxford: Clanderon Press.
Mittelman, J. H. (1996). The dynamics of globalization. In J. H. Mittelman (Ed.), *Globalization: Critical reflections* (pp. 1–14). London: Bouldner.
Morrow and Torres. (2000). The state, globalization, and educational Policy. In R. A. Morrow & C. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 27–56). New York: Routledge.
Mundy, K. (2007). Educational multilateralism and the world (dis) order. *Comparative.*
Nasr, S. H. (1975). *Islam, perspectives et réalités*. Paris: Éditions Bachet/Chassel.
Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2004). *Sacred and secular: Religion and politics worldwide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Offe, C. (1996). *Modernity and the state. East, west*. Cambridge, MA, The MIT Press.
Popkewitz, T. S. (2000). Reform as the social Administration of the Child. Globalization of knowledge and power. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education. Critical perspectives*. London: Routledge.
Reich, R. B. (1997). Why the rich are getting richer and the poor, poorer. From "the work of nations: A blueprint for the future" (Simon & Schuster, 1991). In A. H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, & A. Stuart Wells (Eds.), *Education. Culture, economy, society* (pp. 208–224). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization, social theory and global culture*. London: Sage Publications.
Robertson, R. (1995). Globalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities*. London: Sage Publications.
Saadallah, S. (2018). Changes in muslim orientation and views on education. In H. Daun & R. Arjmand (Eds.), *Handbook of Islamic education*. Berlin: Springer.
Sabine, G. H. (1964). *A history of political theory* (3rd ed.). London: Georg G. Harrap & Co..
Schultz. (1961). Investment in human capital. *American Review of Education, 51*(1), 1–17.
Sears, A., & Moorers, C. (1995). The politics of hegemony: Democracy, class and social movements. In M. Zavarzadh, R. L. Ebert, & D. Morton (Eds.), *Post-ality: Marxism and postermodernism* (pp. 216–242). Washington: Maisonneuve Press.
Sörensen, R. (1987). Bureaucratic decision-making and the growth of public expenditure. In J.-E. Lane (Ed.), *Bureaucracy and public choice*. London: Sage Publications.
Spring, J. (2009). *Globalization of education*. New York: Routledge.
Steiner-Khamsi, G. (Ed.). (2004). *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Stockemer, D. (2019a). Introduction. In D. Stockemer (Ed.), *Popuplism around the world. A comparative perspective*. Cham: Springer.
Stockemer, D. (2019b). Conclusion. In D. Stockemer (Ed.), *Popuplism around the world. A comparative perspective*. Springer: Cham.
The Levin Institute. (2008). *Globalization vs. westernization*. The Levin Institute
Thomas, H. (1994). Markets, collectivities and management. *Oxford Review of Education, 20*, 21–56.
Touraine, A. (1971). *The post-industrial society. Tomorrow's social history: Classes, conflicts and culture in the programmed society*. New York: Random House.
Turner, B. S. (1991). Politics and culture in Islamic globalism. In R. Robertson & W. R. Garret (Eds.), *Religion and global order*. New York: Paragon House Publishers.
Vincent, A. (1994). *Theories of the state*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Wallerstein, I. (1991). Culture as the ideological battleground of the modern world system. In M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global culture. Nationalism, globalization and modernity*. London: Sage Publications.
Wallerstein, I. (2006). *Modern history sourcebook: Summary of Wallerstein on world system theory*. Retrieved from https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/mod/Wallerstein.asp
Waters, M. (2001). *Globalization*. London: Routledge.
Watt, J. (1994). Political philosophy of education. In N. Postlethwaite & T. Husén (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education* (pp. 4571–4575). Oxford: Pergamon.
Wesolowski, W. (1995). The nature of social ties and the future of post-communist society: Poland after solidarity. In J. A. Hall (Ed.), *Civil society. Theory, history and comparison*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Woodcock, G. (1962). *Anarchism*. Chicago: The World Publishing Company.
World Values Survey. (2015). https://www.google.se/search?source=hp&ei=R6w4XcXhHoOtrgSvoLnQAg&q=world+values+survey&oq=World+values+su&gs_l=psy-ab.1.0.0l10.207.1826..4213...0.0..0.620.2945.1j3j1j0j1j3......0....1..gws-wiz.......0i10.3cefioJIFAc
Zajda, J. (2014). Ideology. In D. Phillips (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational theory and philosophy* (pp. 399–402). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
Zajda, J. (Ed.). (2016) *Globalisation, ideology and politics of education reforms.* Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9783319195056
Zajda, J. (2018). *Globalisation and education reforms: Paradigms and ideologies.* Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9789402412031
Zajda, J., & Ozdowski, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Globalisation, human rights education* and *reforms*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9789402408706

Chapter 6
Social Change and Education Reforms in High Performing Education Systems: Policy Lessons from Singapore and Hong Kong

Michael H. Lee and S. Gopinathan

Abstract Both Singapore and Hong Kong have been ranked top (first and second) in international rankings such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), Progress in International Reading Literacy Studies (PIRLS), and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) in recent years. As such they are thus widely admired as high performing education systems (HPES) and, not surprisingly, among the best education systems in the world. The success stories of Singapore and Hong Kong education have aroused widespread attention among different stakeholders such as policymakers, researchers and practitioners internationally to see if it is possible for their policies and practices to be learnt and borrowed by other countries. Moreover, we stress the importance of context in understanding policy phenomena and possibilities for policy transfer. The two HPES are also encountering problems arising from globalisation and social change, and how well they deal with these problems will determine if their present international standing continues into the future. In addition, as both Singapore and Hong Kong are in the stage of post-developmental states, this chapter provides a critical review of education policies and reforms in both Singapore and Hong Kong to see how they can be refined and adjusted in order to cope with challenges facing both education systems.

Keywords Education reforms · The programme for international student assessment (PISA) · Globalisation · High performing education systems (HPES) · Hong Kong · Progress in international reading literacy studies (PIRLS) · Singapore · Trends in international mathematics and science study (TIMSS) · Social change

---

M. H. Lee (✉)
Department of History, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, Hong Kong
e-mail: michaellee@cuhk.edu.hk

S. Gopinathan
Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore

J. Zajda (ed.), *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms*, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 20,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1743-2_6

Social Change and Education Reforms in High Performing Education Systems: Introduction

Since the beginning of the new millennium, a series of education policy initiatives have been adopted in Singapore and Hong Kong. Comprehensive education reforms, which address the importance of twenty-first century skills in the age of globalisation, are being carried out with the aims of cultivating a culture of lifelong learning, educating students with creative, innovative and critical thinking skills, broadening students' learning experiences, and preparing students to be "future ready" and to be global citizens (Education Commission 2000; Goh 1997). Curriculum, pedagogy and examinations have been restructured in order to enhance students' autonomy in learning and to get rid of the traditional examination-oriented and teacher-driven learning culture (Gopinathan and Mardiana 2013). The quality and social status of the teaching profession has been improved substantially with higher entry requirements, strengthened teacher education and sophisticated professional development mechanisms (Tan 2012). Education pathways have also been diversified at the school level and to better integrate national economies with the global economy to provide more opportunities for students to receive postsecondary and tertiary education. Both governments have endeavoured to transform Singapore and Hong Kong as education hubs with a more globalised outlook in line with the trend of internationalization and to better integrate national economies with the global economy (Lee 2010). Further, apart from being educated as global citizens, schools have been consistently reminded of the importance values and national education for a strong sense of national identity and belonging (Gopinathan 2015; Gopinathan and Lee 2013; Leung et al. 2017; Tan 2008, 2010a).

Nevertheless, there is a dilemma that while Singapore and Hong Kong students perform very well in those international rankings, their top performance is ironically achieved by rather traditional methods of teaching and learning in societies which are still very much examination-oriented in tandem with the strong influence of high-stakes public examinations, which are often used for selection purposes (Deng and Gopinathan 2016). Although there has been steady and remarkable improvement of both Singapore and Hong Kong's performance in those international comparisons, high achieving students in both cities have been found to lack confidence and interest in core subjects like mathematics, science and reading, together with a high level of test anxiety among high performing students (Davie 2017; OECD 2017; Zhao 2015). Moreover, how to achieve more equitable outcomes has become another concern with widening income gaps and social class differences in both Singapore and Hong Kong; individual's educational achievement or success seems to be increasingly related to social class and family backgrounds. It is argued that the problem of inequitable educational opportunity would be one of the most important issues to be tackled by policymakers in both Singapore and Hong Kong (e.g. Chua and Ng 2015; Gopinathan 2007, 2015; Ho 2010; Ng 2013; Tan 2010a, b, 2014; Yuen 2017).

By reviewing and examining recent education policy developments in Singapore and Hong Kong, this chapter argues that apart from maintaining top ranks in international comparisons, it is equally important for policymakers to deal with shortcomings and drawbacks in both the education systems. The following questions will be examined and discussed: What are major shortcomings facing the education systems in Singapore and Hong Kong today? How can these shortcomings be rectified with education policies and reforms? What policy choices face these two governments? Apart from sustaining high performance, what education goals should Singapore and Hong Kong aim for in the face of changes and challenges arising from globalisation and technological disruption? Through this discussion, it is expected that crucial lessons can be learnt from responses of the two governments which would be of interest and use to the global education community.

Following this introductory section, there are five sections in the remainder of this chapter. The second section provides a brief overview of the socio-political context of education development in Singapore and Hong Kong. It is followed by the third section examining major challenges facing both education systems in Singapore and Hong Kong and examines how they are similar or different within the present socio-economic context. Then the fourth section turns to focus on what policy actions are needed to deal with these challenges in both places. The penultimate section provides a discussion on what policy lessons can be learnt from the development of education policies and reforms in Singapore and Hong Kong when both of them are in the post-developmental state stage.

Socio-Political Context of Education Development

Being dominated by the Chinese population, both Singapore and Hong Kong have significant similarities and important differences. In spite of lacking any natural resources, they are important port cities and financial hubs, which were once under British colonial rule for about one and a half centuries since 1819 and 1842 respectively. The economic fortune of Singapore and Hong Kong was similarly founded on proximity to large, resource rich Southeast Asia and China as their hinterlands respectively. In geopolitical terms, both cities had administrations that committed themselves to economic growth in order to build legitimacy, similar to other developmental states, Japan and South Korea in East Asia (Castells 1988; Gopinathan 2007). This is especially true of Singapore whose efforts to be part of a larger political entity, Malaysia, failed in 1965, when it found itself a "reluctant" independent nation.

Significant differences lie in the fact that Hong Kong is a part of China and thus to some extent constrained by mainland imperatives. Singapore's independent status gives the government considerable freedom to set policy. Secondly, Singapore, even though being Chinese-dominated, is considerably more multi-ethnic and multi-lingual with the presence of Malays, Indians and Eurasians. Since its independence in 1965, a key imperative in education policy in Singapore has been using the

Table 6.1 Singapore and Hong Kong education at a glance (2018)

	Singapore	Hong Kong
Land area (sq km)	721.5	1106.7
Political status	Independence since 9 August 1965	Special Administrative Region in China since 1 July 1997
Total population (million)	5.61	7.39
Ethnic composition (%)		
Chinese	76	94
Malays	15	n.a.
Indians	7	0.4
Others	2	5.6
GDP per capita (US$)	57,710	46,190
Unemployment rate (%)	2.2	2.8
Human Capital Index (2017 Rank)	11	n.a.
Index of economic freedom (rank)	2	1
Global competitiveness index (rank)	2	7
Gini coefficient	0.458	0.539 (2017)
Education institutions		
Number of primary schools	185	587
Number of secondary schools	143	506
Number of publicly-funded universities	6	8
Student enrollments (2017)		
Primary school students	228,700	372,500 (2018)
Secondary school students	152,700	325,500 (2018)
Publicly-funded polytechnic students	71,400	n.a.
Publicly-funded university students	69,300	85,100
Government expenditure		
Total government expenditure on education	S$13.1 billion	HK$110.5 billion
	(US$9.6 billion)	(US$14.1 billion)
Ratio of total government expenditure on education to total government expenditure	16.6	20.6
Ratio of government expenditure on education to gross domestic product (GDP)	3.6	3.9

Sources: Census and Statistics Department, HKSAR Government (2017, 2018), Education Bureau, HKSAR Government (2019), Ministry of Education, Singapore (2018), Ministry of Finance, Singapore (2019), Singapore Department of Statistics (2018a, b), The Heritage Foundation (2019), University Grants Committee, HKSAR Government (2018), World Economic Forum (2017a, b, 2018)

school system, in institutional and curriculum terms, to promote racial harmony and social cohesion by inculcating people with a strong sense of Singaporean identity.

As a consequence of resource scarcity, both Singapore and Hong Kong invested heavily in education to build human capital, the only resource available for both cities' economic growth and development (see Table 6.1). Singapore moved decisively from a strong British style academic curriculum, to a strong emphasis on English, Science and Mathematics and invested heavily in polytechnic and vocational education, from the 1970s onwards. Since the 1990s the two cities have similarly made significant policy changes in curriculum and pedagogy to take advantage of globalisation's opportunities. In the twenty-first century, it is the stock of human capital that fuels inward investment, significant growth in knowledge-intensive manufacturing and services. Singapore and Hong Kong graduate students are bilingual with the highest standards of English proficiency in the region. Moreover, they confront challenges to strengthen citizenship and civic identity. A distinctive Hong Kong identity, different from the mainland would be very difficult to achieve; Singapore's multiethnic nature means that social cohesion and racial harmony is always a work in progress; it is made particularly difficult in the present context of regional and international identity politics.

Major Challenges Facing Education Systems

Singapore and Hong Kong have demonstrated a strong ability to consistently improve their education systems. They continue to outperform more developed countries in Europe and North America, in various international rankings and comparisons in educational performance, such as TIMSS, PISA and PIRLS (see Table 6.2). Their outstanding performance can be attributed to the high quality of their schooling systems which depend on the availability of well-developed teacher education programmes and stringent selection of teachers and principals (OECD 2019), timely self-renewal of curriculum and pedagogy in response to emerging needs of the global economy, the effectiveness of educational administration by competent leadership in the education ministry and through the substantial investment in education with high efficiency in education spending. We also need to acknowledge the support provided to these policies by cultural values and norms, notably Confucianism which values learning, effort, and respect for authority. Since Singapore and Hong Kong are migrant societies, social mobility is valued and parent's expectations for education success are high.

Their "success stories" have been widely documented and studied by other countries, both developed and developing ones; these countries have been highly interested to learn from their education policies and practices in these two HPES and see if they could be borrowed and adopted to provide policy solutions to improve the effectiveness of their education systems. Nevertheless policy borrowing, which has become more common in the age of globalisation, cannot be carried out blindly without taking into consideration the borrowers' local contexts. A more cautious attitude towards policy borrowing is needed in order to determine which policies and practices can be adopted and refined before their implementation (Forestier et al. 2016; Morris 2016; Rizvi and Lingard 2010). Even the two HPES in Singapore and Hong Kong are not immune from being affected by new changes and challenges.

Table 6.2 International Education Rankings

	PISA-Science (2015)	PIRLS (2011)	TIMSS (2015)			
			4th Grade Maths	8th Grade Maths	4th Grade Science	8th Grade Science
Singapore	1 (556)	4 (567)	1 (618)	1 (621)	1 (590)	1 (597)
Hong Kong	9 (523)	1 (571)	2 (615)	4 (594)	5 (557)	6 (546)
China	10 (518)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Chinese Taipei	4 (532)	8 (553)	4 (597)	3 (599)	6 (555)	3 (569)
Japan	2 (538)	n.a.	5 (593)	5 (586)	3 (569)	2 (571)
South Korea	11 (516)	n.a.	3 (608)	2 (606)	2 (589)	4 (556)
Finland	5 (531)	2 (568)	16 (535)	n.a.	7 (554)	n.a.
France	26 (495)	29 (520)	35 (488)	n.a.	34 (487)	n.a.
Germany	15 (509)	16 (541)	24 (522)	n.a.	20 (528)	n.a.
Netherlands	15 (509)	13 (546)	19 (530)	n.a.	29 (517)	n.a.
Russia	32 (487)	2 (568)	7 (564)	6 (538)	4 (567)	7 (554)
Spain	28 (493)	30 (513)	31 (505)	n.a.	28 (518)	n.a.
UK/England	15 (509)	10 (552)	10 (546)	10 (518)	15 (536)	8 (537)
US	25 (496)	6 (556)	14 (539)	10 (518)	10 (546)	10 (530)

Note: Rank (Score)
Sources: Mullis et al. (2011, 2016a, b), OECD (2015)

While Singapore and Hong Kong are praised as being among the most competitive economies in the world (see Table 6.1 and also The Heritage Foundation 2019; World Economic Forum 2018), both East Asian financial and trading hubs are not free from such social problems as poverty and income inequality with widening income gaps. Singapore has the highest Gini coefficient on household income among advanced economies (World Economic Forum 2017a), despite the figure having dropped from a high of 0.482 in 2007 to 0.458 in 2016, the lowest in a decade (Singapore Department of Statistics 2018a). In comparison, the Gini coefficient on household income in Hong Kong was in general higher than Singapore as it was recorded as 0.533, 0.537 and 0.539 in 2006, 2011 and 2016 respectively (Legislative Council 2016; Census and Statistics Department, HKSAR Government 2018). Both Singapore and Hong Kong's figures are relatively high and above 0.4 the international inequality threshold alert line, with 0.4–0.5 fairly inequitable and above 0.5 considerable disparities.

Therefore, the policy challenge for both governments of Singapore and Hong Kong is to sustain economic growth and to contain income inequality at the same time. Policy responses in education have included an emphasis on lifelong learning and skill upgrading, considered essential to improve productivity and thus economic competitiveness. Additionally, public expenditures on social welfare and transfers have been enhanced for assisting the lower income group through such means as providing additional preschool education subsidies and reducing university tuition fees (see e.g. Lee 2019). However, issues related to educational disparities, lack of job opportunities, negative impacts of the influx of immigration, and social immobility have become more critical that may cause harm to social stability if they are not dealt with properly. It is therefore necessary to be aware of all possible unfavourable impacts arising from the policies and practices being adopted in these two newly developed East Asian economies.

Economisation of Education

One of the most remarkable ant changes and challenges facing education in Singapore and Hong Kong is the reinterpretation of the aims and uses of education from an economic-driven perspective, which Spring (2015) labels as the "economisation of education" for it suggests:

> the increasing involvement of economists in education research, the evaluation of the effectiveness of schools and family life according to cost/benefit analyses, and the promotion of school choice in a competitive marketplace. (pp. 1–2)

With the economic value of education being emphasized, the relationship between education and economic development has given rise to a vast literature and this has been utilised by policymakers to justify continuing education investment and reform. Substantial investment for education is justified in that it works to educate and equip the labour force with new knowledge and skills to cope with the ever changing needs arising from globalisation, especially economic, and automation and technology-driven disruption. This is also the most common rationale for education reforms in many countries in the world, including Singapore and Hong Kong (Education Commission 1999, 2000; Goh 1997).

The relationship between education and economic development is also reflected in international benchmarking mechanisms such as those managed by OECD like PISA with an assumption that high performance in these comparisons is a prerequisite for economic growth and development. Nevertheless, this claim has been challenged as some critics have questioned if there is a positive relationship between high performance in international education benchmarks and economic productivity and innovation. It would appear that notwithstanding high test scores, both Singapore and Hong Kong are not seen as societies in which their economies at the present time are innovation-driven ones. Economic productivity as suggested by other scholars may be more a function of efficient governance, market-favourable policies, and investment in education (Morris 2016; Zhao 2015).

Furthermore, the application of economic reasoning in policymaking makes education more likely to be seen as a commodity or an industry. This is reflected in the increasing use of market mechanisms such as accountability, competition, choice, cost-effectiveness, league tables, managerial efficiency, market relevance and responsiveness, performance indicators, quality assurance, and "value for money" (Mok and Tan 2004). These terms also denote the core themes of the public sector reforms, which also cover education, prevailing in both Singapore and Hong Kong since the 1990s with the ultimate goal of enhancing both education quality and effectiveness. For example, more autonomy has been devolved to educational institutions through the implementation in Singapore of the independent schools initiative and later the School Excellence Model in Singapore and School-Based Management in Hong Kong in exchange for greater accountability to different stakeholders like government, parents and students (Chan and Tan 2008; Ng 2008; Sharpe and Gopinathan 2002; Tan 2006).

Through the processes of diversification and customisation since the late 1980s, with the creation of independent, autonomous and specialist schools and the introduction of integrated programmes in some independent schools and junior colleges in Singapore (Gopinathan 2007; Tan 1998, 2006), and in Hong Kong, the launch of the Direct Subsidy Scheme (DSS) schools, parents and students have been given more choices in the quasi-market of education, in which the state sector or government remains a major player acting as a financier, service provider or regulator (Tse 2008; Tsang 2011; Woo 2017). Marketisation has given rise to inter-school competition which had once been encouraged with the release of league tables as the case in Singapore and the disclosure of quality review reports to the general public in Hong Kong. As a consequence, schools have narrowly focussed on areas which are directly related to the rankings in league tables and quality assurance exercises. These ranking and quality assurance outcomes have often been utilized by schools for their marketing and publicity activities to attract high achieving students (Tan 2006; Tse 2017).

Likewise, the higher education systems in Singapore and Hong Kong have been placed under much greater pressure to cope with various ranking league tables, like the ones conducted by QS, Shanghai Jiaotong University in China and *Times Higher Education Supplement*, which provide service users or "consumers" the information on these institutions' reputation and international standing. Moreover, universities in Singapore and Hong Kong play a more important role in contributing to the development of regional education hubs through bringing in a larger number of international students to study and eventually work in both cities in order to remedy their "brain drain" problem. It is also noteworthy that both Singapore and Hong Kong have put in tremendous efforts and resources to build up a solid foundation of higher education institutions since massification began in the 1990s. As a consequence, the privatisation of higher education is less apparent in Singapore and Hong Kong where state or publicly-funded institutions are dominant.

Educational Disparities

While choice and competition have been encouraged through the economization and marketisation of education in Singapore and Hong Kong, there have also been increasing concerns over issues related to educational disparities in recent years. A more diversified schooling system comes with a growing hierarchy of schools and social stratification. In Singapore, the highly limited number of independent secondary schools, which are less than ten, selected by the government are well-established, prestigious, and academically selective when the policy was at first implemented in the late 1980s. Apart from enjoying greater autonomy in school management and resource utilization, it is much easier for these independent schools to attract students with the highest academic ability because of their reputation and influence in the society as well as their distinguished alumnus. Two of three Singapore's prime ministers studied at Raffles Institution. The institutionalisation of integrated programmes and the Direct School Admission scheme since the early 2000s strengthened these independent schools' advantages to admit top students based on their academic and non-academic track records (Tan 2014). The creation of independent schools was supposed to provide outstanding examples for other schools to follow and imitate so that all other schools could also improve their education quality (Ministry of Education 1987); there is little evidence that this in fact happened. With the persistence of a highly selective school environment in Singapore, the socio-academic elite is reproducing itself and jeopardising the much vaunted meritocratic ideal that underpins education and society in Singapore.

A similar scenario can also be found in Hong Kong where the DSS was firstly introduced in the 1990s, when it initially catered for the incorporation of a small number of private schools, including a few "left-wing pro-China patriotic" schools during the British colonial period, into the mainstream public subsidized schooling system subject to the regulations of the government. In the early 2000s, the scheme was modified to attract not only new schools to join DSS but also traditional and top-notched grant schools, which were set up by missionaries or religious bodies between the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These schools are also well-established and top-notch schools in Hong Kong (Tsang 2011). Different from the independent schools in Singapore, they were not selected by the government to join the DSS but their sponsoring bodies could opt to join the scheme, subject to the government's approval. Moreover, they can increase tuition fees up to a limit set by the government and also receive subsidies per headcount from the government (Lee 2009).

Additionally, these DSS schools are granted greater autonomy in management, staff recruitment, student enrolment, curriculum, and also the medium of instruction. This reflects a possible way out for these schools to be getting away from the negative impacts of the ongoing education reforms. Although the government explained that the "revised" DSS was aimed to create a more diversified schooling system by allowing more choice for parents and students, some "new" DSS schools which are also traditional top schools charge relatively high tuition fees, up to over HK$50,000 per year which is an amount even higher than local subsidized university degree programmes'; this in effect, means that only middle or upper social class students can afford fees, regardless the provision of student assistantship or scholarship by those DSS schools as stipulated by the government (Tse 2008; Tsang 2011; Woo 2017). In this sense, therefore, these top "new" DSS schools automatically exclude students from lower income families. Meanwhile, the interests of this group of top schools can be protected through the "new" DSS policy for they are financed by students' tuition fees and subsidized by the government simultaneously to maintain their competitive advantages (Lee 2009; Tsang 2011).

Another aspect of educational disparity concerns ethnic differences or segregation found in the Singapore schooling system. As a consequence of the streaming policy introduced in the late 1970s, a much larger proportion of Malay and Indian students are streamed into lower ability streams. This is in large measure due to education disadvantage in the early years of schooling due to poverty, low income, and lack of participation in early childhood education (Shamsuri 2015). Malay and Indian students are underrepresented in the most prestigious and top schools, where most students are Chinese and from wealthier family backgrounds (Gopinathan 2015; Tan 2014; Zhang 2014). In addition, Malay students have had a lower percentage of mathematics and science pass rates in public examinations over many years. This correlates to relatively low percentage of Malay students enrolled in the junior colleges and universities (Tan 2010a, b). The government responded by setting up the Council on Education for Muslim Children (Mendaki) in the early 1980s to provide financial and educational assistance to Malay students. While dropout rates were reduced significantly and their performance in public examinations were improved, and the gap narrowed between ethnic groups, a gap with Chinese students persists (Shamsuri 2015; Tan 1997, 2014). This reflects the link between social stratification and academic stratification which requires more policy attention in Singapore (Gopinathan 2015).

In Hong Kong, with over 95% of the population Cantonese-speaking, there are also similar concerns about two specific groups of non-local students' educational performance. One group is the so-called "new immigrants" from the Chinese mainland who come to Hong Kong largely for family reunion. There new immigrant students were born in China with one or both of their parents residing permanently in Hong Kong. Some of these children face difficulties in adapting to the Hong Kong curriculum, in particular the learning of the English language, together with a very different living environment and culture as compared with the Chinese mainland. This, however, does not rule out good academic performance accomplished by these immigrant students, some of whom performed even better than local students in PISA 2012. Ho (2017) explains their good performance as a result of their parents' strong desire to improve their living standards through their children's academic performance creating upward social mobility in the future. As most of these children's parents are from the lower income group, it is rather difficult for them to afford additional expenses for co-curricular activities, private tutoring and those DSS schools which charge high tuition fees. Another group is the descendents of South Asian minorities who have been permanently residing in Hong Kong. Unlike those new Chinese immigrants, these South Asian minority students face the problem of Chinese proficiency, which is a prerequisite for them to find employment in the government and other institutions in Hong Kong (Yuen 2017). Thus while there has been some progress, like Singapore, gaps persist. However, as Ho (2017) suggests with reference to PISA 2012 findings, Hong Kong has a better record than other countries like Singapore in providing education opportunity with relatively high quality and high equity, regardless of students socio-economic and cultural backgrounds.

Meritocracy or Parentocracy?

Meritocracy has long been a core cultural value for Singapore and Hong Kong. This is because education plays a crucial role in identifying and selecting elites for both societies which consistently emphasize the importance of the principles of fairness, non-discrimination, and equality of opportunity. Meritocracy refers to the rewarding of individual merit with social rank, job positions, higher incomes, general recognition and prestige, and, in the education system, greater educational resources. It points to merit as a rule or principle that governs how the economy, society, and politics are organized. Individuals are motivated to do the best that they can (Lim 2013; Tan 2008, 2010b, 2017, 2018). Meritocracy, which ensures a clean and efficient government, is also a fundamental principle of governance guiding the selection of political elites through national examinations and scholarships offered by the government and its related institutions (Wong 2013). Former Singapore Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong has recently stressed that meritocracy must remain a key pillar of Singapore society to guard against social inequity and also the "greater dangers of nepotism and cronyism." The government would intervene and make appropriate policies to ensure meritocracy works in the country so that every citizen has equal opportunities at the starting line and a fair chance to succeed throughout life (Seow 2017).

Nevertheless, there have been concerns whether this meritocratic system is really open to all and run on a level-playing field or whether over time it has come to be dominated by the elitist class in the society. Singapore's founding Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew, who believed in eugenics, upheld a view that there is a relationship between parents' educational achievements and their children's. This view was translated into a controversial policy initiative in that the better educated were encouraged to have more children. In other words, this implies that only individuals whose parents are well-educated and from middle or upper classes are more likely to succeed in this meritocratic and elitist education system, which focuses on elite selection and formation. Barr (2014) points out that a majority of top scholarship recipients in Singapore have been from certain elite schools such as Raffles Institution and Hwa Chong Institution. Meanwhile it is more likely for these top schools to admit students whose fathers are university graduates than neighbourhood schools and they are more likely to live in private property (Davie 2013). A similar situation can also be found among those DSS schools whose high tuition fees in Hong Kong probably exclude those students from working class and lower income groups.

One could argue that over the decades a paradigm shift from meritocracy to parentocracy has occurred. Education achievement is now more likely determined by their parents' wealth and social networks instead of their own ability and efforts alone (Brown and Lauder 2001; Goh 2015; Lee and Morris 2016; Tsang 2011). Parents are playing a more prominent role in deciding their children's education pathways. The cultural capital available to upper and middle class parents is arguably more important in ensuring children's success in such a highly competitive education system like Singapore (Tan 2014, 2019a). Parents are able to use different means in ensuring that their children are admitted to top or elite schools, are able to move to areas near these well established schools, to volunteer in those schools, and to invest heavily in private tuition to prepare their children for public examinations like Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE) and to get them into specialized programmes like the gifted education programme or integrated programmes offered in those elite schools (Ng 2013; Tan 2019a). Similar to Singapore, in Hong Kong competition in the schooling system has been getting tougher in recent years. Some wealthier households class are now more frequently sending their children to study in international schools or study abroad if they find it affordable.

Education Policy Actions for Social Change

In response to the challenges which have been discussed in the previous sections, governments in both Singapore and Hong Kong have responded to increasing concerns over slowing social mobility and growing inequality. New directions in education policies and reforms in both places are expected to provide students with sufficient and equal opportunity for receiving quality education, to enable every school to develop and strengthen its merits, strengths and niche areas, and to cultivate a culture of "compassionate meritocracy," as suggested by former Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong (Seow 2017), striking a right balance between educational competition and mutual help spirit in society. This section elaborates on these three policy directions which are applicable to both Singapore and Hong Kong under the present socio-economic context.

Education for Life

One policy initiative has been that to ensure all people, no matter how old they are, are entitled to enough and equal opportunity to receive education as a lifelong process to consistently renew the workforce with new knowledge and upgraded skills to cope with the ever changing global economic needs and also challenges from technological disruptions. While the notion of lifelong learning is not a new idea for education reforms, for it was at first proposed in Singapore and Hong Kong in the late 1990s when both places embarked under the themes of "Thinking Schools, Learning Nation" and "Learning for Life, Learning through Life" respectively (Education Commission 2000; Goh 1997), this remains a major policy goal to engage working adults to receive education on a lifelong basis in order to renew and upgrade their knowledge and skill for improving the overall economic productivity and competitiveness as well as workers' employability and incomes. The launch of the Skills Future programme, together with the setting up of the Skills Future Council (which is currently known as the Council for Skills, Innovation and Productivity) in Singapore in 2014 is an example of the government seeking to integrate education, training and industry support for career advancement by collaborating with employers, labour unions and industries.

Therefore, more emphasis and resources have been devoted to the promotion of applied learning and research being undertaken by brand new universities such as Singapore University of Social Sciences (formerly known as UNISim) and Singapore Institute of Technology, which are aimed to provide more opportunities for working adults and polytechnic graduates to receive higher education and also to encourage lifelong learning in line with the Skills Future initiative among the entire population in Singapore (Tan 2019b). In Hong Kong, on the other hand, there is the Qualifications Framework defining standards applicable to qualifications in the academic, vocational and professional education sectors and also assuring their programmes are relevant to industry needs so as to facilitate lifelong learning by working adults. In addition, the ideas of "applied learning" and "experiential learning" have been promoted to motivate students learning through attaining hands-on experience from apprenticeship and internship.

Apart from this, education policies need to address the difficulties facing disadvantaged or underperforming groups such as lower income families and ethnic minorities in Singapore as well as new immigrant students from the Chinese mainland and South Asian minorities in Hong Kong. Some government-sponsored institutions or voluntary and non-government organizations in both places dedicate themselves to providing financial resources and non-financial assistance like private tutorials to enable these "underprivileged" students to cope with their school work and assessments. For instance, the Singapore government also pointed out that Malay education performance as shown in public examinations has shown improvement in the past decade. However, the educational achievement gap between Malays and the ethnic Chinese majority remains significant. It is not known how effective such voluntary assistance would be to improve these disadvantaged groups' educational achievement. In Hong Kong, in face of the growing public awareness of educational disparity facing disadvantaged groups, the government is allocating more resources and refining policies to better cater to their needs. For instance, additional funding has been given to schools which enrolled at least 10 ethnic (mainly South Asian) minority students for teaching Chinese as a second language, as an alternative recognized qualification for their Chinese proficiency.

Every School a Good School

"Every school a good school," a slogan created by then Singapore Education Minister Heng Swee Keat in 2012 when he identified six features of a good school, including studying and knowing the needs and interests of each student to help them grow; ensuring all students acquire strong fundamentals of literacy and numeracy; creating a positive environment for each student; having caring and competent teachers; having the support of parents and the communities; and caring for and providing opportunities to all students regardless of family circumstances, was intended to signal the ministry's intention to remove perceived disparities between schools and diminish competition to get to the best schools (Heng 2012). These criteria thus serve as the basic guidelines for schools to achieve the goal of providing every child with the opportunity to develop holistically and maximize his or her potential. Nevertheless, it does not mean that all schools have to be good identically but they need to sort out their own ways to become good schools (Mathews et al. 2017).

Individual schools are expected to excel in different areas other than academic performance to meet the needs of different students. This policy direction is to facilitate the development of a much more diversified schooling system which contains a wide range of schools which are with different characters and uniqueness. Good schools therefore not only refer to those independent, autonomous, and Special Assistant Plan (SAP) schools but also a majority of neighbourhood schools which possess with their own areas of excellence. Moreover, good schools can enable students to possess skills in languages, mathematics and science as well as ability in problem-solving, persistence, collaboration and having curiosity. However, in Singapore, it is still likely for parents to choose schools based on academic performance even though they desire for character-building and other holistic areas of education in a more balanced education system (Mathews et al. 2017).

Despite the good intentions, it is not so easy to change parents' mindsets to accept that all Singapore schools are equally good for parents still mainly refer to academic performance and achievements of individual schools as a yardstick for making choices for their children. Although it is a good policy intention to create a diversified schooling system, in which parents are able to exercise their choices, it may turn out to be those families from the middle and upper classes who possess more cultural capital are better able to choose between different schools. Therefore, as Ho Kwon Ping noted, a majority of students in the most prestigious primary schools in Singapore do not live in public housing, which is home to about 80% of all children in Singapore (*The Economist* 2015). Similarly, in Hong Kong, it is more likely for the middle and upper class families to send their children to study in the "new" DSS schools, most of which were converted from the most prestigious traditional grant schools, even though they charge very high tuition fees that the working class and lower income group find unaffordable. Further most parents are willing to spend much more money on private tutoring to get their children better prepared for getting into "good" primary and then secondary schools.

Regardless of the policy intention to persuade parents that every school is a good school that comparisons and rankings are considered not necessary, the competition between students, together with their parents, for getting into top schools is getting more intense. For instance, Mathews et al. (2017) found in a survey on parents' perceptions of the Singapore primary school system that over 70% of respondents indicated that it is important and even essential for "good" schools to have a record of high PSLE scores and have students being admitted into top secondary schools, even though most of them agree that schools should put more emphasis on students' character and values as well as discipline (pp. 21–22).

Amidst this highly competitive schooling system, there have been policy attempts recently made by the government to alleviate pressure facing students, such as streaming at secondary schools will be scrapped and gradually replaced by subject-based banding, and also a revamp of PSLE scoring system to allow students greater flexibility to develop their strengths and interests according to their individual performance in the subjects regardless of how their peers perform. It is also a means to reduce the stigmatization effect arising from streaming and high-stakes examinations (Ministry of Education, Singapore 2019; Ong 2019). Interestingly, only slightly more than half of the respondents agreed that independent, autonomous and SAP schools should be scrapped (p. 41). Meanwhile over 90% of the respondents agreed that government funding to non-prestigious neighbourhood schools should be increased with the allocation of best teachers to all primary schools (p. 42). These findings demonstrate that parents in Singapore remain conscious about how well "good" schools perform academically, regardless of the government's urge for them to focus on niches other than academic achievements of individual schools.

Compassionate Meritocracy

The importance of education in Singapore and Hong Kong lies in its close relationship with the core value of meritocracy as discussed in the previous section. The ruling elites believe that meritocracy provides equal opportunities to all in a non-discriminatory manner, regardless of socio-economic background. Those who perform well academically in the education system are rewarded with scholarships, university places and eventually lucrative careers in the future. Thus, both places seek to identify and select elites impartially for effective governance. Nevertheless, these meritocratic elites, once successful, will invest even more on their children's education so that they are advantaged to succeed in a competitive education system and thus more likely to become beneficiaries in the meritocratic system, which in turns contributes to a cycle of social stratification and reproduction across generations (Tan and Dimmock 2015). Moreover, with the Gini coefficient ranging between 0.45 and 0.54 in Singapore and Hong Kong respectively, which are among the highest among advanced economies, the problem of income inequality and social class difference and stratification is now accepted to be more serious in both places than other developed economies. This situation raised questions about the meritocratic system not promoting equal opportunity or social mobility but social segregation in favour of elitism.

These negative perception and impact of meritocracy have been recently tackled, for instance, by the Singapore government to make use of a new term called "compassionate meritocracy", which was first raised by former Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong in November 2006, to ask those who benefited from the meritocratic system to contribute to society by assisting the less able and less fortunate (Anwar 2015). As shown in a survey conducted by the Institute of Policy Studies in 2013, most people in Singapore were in favour of a less competitive, more holistic education system, which is also more inclusive, thus enabling students to learn with others of different abilities and backgrounds (Amir 2013).

This shows that the government needs to be more responsive to the general public's reactions to major policy issues like ensuring meritocracy works properly with a level-playing field against the danger of nepotism and cronyism in Singapore society that Goh Chok Tong has addressed recently (Seow 2017). For instance, Finance Minister Heng Swee Keat announced in his Budget 2016 the allocation of around S$20 million to launch the 3-year KidStart scheme, which is aimed to benefit 1000 children aged up to six from disadvantaged families through regular home visits, enhanced health and learning support as well as placement in pre-schools (*The Straits Times*, 12 April 2016). The KidStart scheme is aimed to level the playing field for disadvantaged children and thus prevent social problems such as inequality and family dysfunction from becoming entrenched. This scheme will be made permanent as a means to break the cycle of poverty in Singapore (*The Straits Times*, 17 July 2017), and it will be further expanded to assist 5000 disadvantaged children over the next 3 years (Lee 2019). As what Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong firstly put forward in his National Day Rally 2017 speech, children, regardless of their family backgrounds, will have equal opportunity to access quality and affordable preschool education, and the government will ensure this by providing more preschool places and upgrading the standards of preschool teachers (Lee 2017).

As in Singapore, there has also been growing concern in Hong Kong about the problem of social segregation slowing social mobility, both of which were considered to be one of the reasons beyond political factors explaining the involvement of a significant number of young people in political protest movements which cumulated with the Umbrella Movement in 2014 and, more recently, the Anti-Expedition Bill Movement in 2019, which turned out to be the most serious political and governance crisis facing Hong Kong after its handover in 1997.

In response to youth discontent, more resources were made available for students to receive tertiary education. This is partly done by providing financial subsidies to students who study in local self-financed degree programmes. More new permanent teaching posts are also to be created in order to accommodate a number of teachers who were originally hired on a contract basis (Lam 2017). In short, the government has recognized the need to be more responsive to the needs of the general public and to be more communicative in responding to the needs of stakeholders in making education policies. However, in a deeper sense, the effectiveness of these policies to entice the youngsters' national identity and patriotism towards China largely remains an unresolved issue to be tackled by the government (Lo 2019). Meanwhile, a more proactive role of the government in making education policies to offer more educational opportunities for the disadvantaged groups, including students from low income families, new immigrant students from the Chinese mainland as well as South Asian minority students, is expected to ensure that fairness and justice can be achieved in Hong Kong society.

Policy Lessons Learnt from Singapore and Hong Kong

We have attributed the transition of both Singapore and Hong Kong from resource-starved entities to prosperous economies with GDP per capita in 2018 in Singapore at US$57,710 and Hong Kong at US$46,190 to their successful development and implementation of human capital politics. Obviously, the specific policies, rationales, implementation strategies are context specific, but it is, we believe, possible to step back and draw some general lessons for their development experience. We suggest a 3Cs framework comprising (a) context, (b) culture, and (c) competence.

Context

With regard to context, both Singapore and Hong Kong faced existential challenges. For Singapore, it was the failure of merger with Malaysia and the need to chart a new future. It was a small, vulnerable island in the midst of more populous neighbours, and with considerable internal diversity. For Hong Kong it was the rise of the Chinese Communist Party to power on the Chinese mainland since 1949 and the realisation of Hong Kong would in 1997 be "returned" by the British to China according to the Sino-British Joint Declaration signed in 1984, which stipulated that Hong Kong would be run as a Special Administrative Region according to the "One Country, Two Systems" principle.

We would argue that these threats focused attention on the need to survive and prosper. Indeed, in Singapore, the period 1965–1978 is known as the "survival" period. A development-oriented mindset took hold, with economic development given priority. High quality and relevant education were seen as essential in meeting economic objectives. Curriculum was rapidly modernized and both STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) and TVET (technical and vocational education and training) subjects gained in prominence. As a consequence of the economic growth that followed and the redistributive policies of governments, such as investing in public housing and health, governments gained legitimacy to take unpopular decisions. An example from Singapore would be the decision to adopt English, the former colonial language as medium of instruction for all subjects. This was politically a very risky decision, given the hostility of the Chinese-educated towards English. But the government prevailed and Singapore was able to join the global economy earlier and more successfully than other Asian countries whose language policies were more nationalistic in nature (Gopinathan 2015).

Thus, one lesson could be that the state made education policies on the basis of pragmatism not ideology, linked it closely to its development agenda and maintained sufficient control to ensure that its goals were met.

Culture

Both Singapore and Hong Kong are, given their Chinese majorities, Confucian-based cultures. Traditionally in this culture, scholars and scholarship were highly valued. This was valuable in the context of an emphasis on schooling and certification noted earlier. This orientation was strengthened with economic growth leading to the growth of a middle class who had high aspirations for their children and valued the social mobility that success in education produced. Parents take the education of their children seriously and have high expectations. Both parents and students know that to succeed in a competitive system, ability and effort are required. In both Singapore and Hong Kong a meritocratic ethos prevails. The downside is that both education systems have become excessively competitive and a potential source of socio-economic inequality; well-to-do parents invest in additional academic and non-academic enrichment activities for their children, thus strengthening their academic and cultural capital. Thus, Singapore and Hong Kong children are academic high achievers but anxious and stressed (Davie 2017; OECD 2017).

Additionally, it also takes into consideration a significant change in governance culture. Unlike other East Asian economies like Japan, South Korea and Taiwan where the authority and capacity of the state have been challenged by domestic political and international economic factors, Singapore is the exception in this post-developmental state era for the state remains relatively strong and has demonstrated its ability to keep the economy growing, albeit more slowly. As Gopinathan (2015) points out, Singapore has been shifting into an "adaptive developmental state" mode recognising that not only economic policy but also social policy is necessary in tackling inequalities and marginalisation which erode trust between ethnic groups and socio-economic classes. It is therefore essential for the government not only to raise economic productivity and competitiveness but also to maintain a cohesive, confident, compassionate and caring society. With a more well-educated middle-class society in Singapore, it is inevitable that governance changes from a paternalistic style to a more participatory or collaborative political culture, one that provides more incentives for people to engage in policy debate (Mahbubani and Teng 2017).

Competence

The Singapore model is characterised by a high level of administrative capacity. Singapore's political leaders, at the onset recognized the value of long term planning, the rule of law, planning on the basis of pragmatism and rational rather than sectorial interest. They sought to, and were successful, in attracting the "brightest and the best" into the civil service. Leadership of the Ministry of Education was often a sign of high competence; many education ministers have gone on to attain senior cabinet positions. At the time of writing, for instance, the current Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister Heng Swee, was once the education minister between 2012 and 2015.

Key features of how Singapore built up an underperforming education system in the 1960s and 1970s include the ability to take a "whole of government" approach, i.e. to include key stakeholders like finance, trade and industry and manpower in planning in major education reform initiatives, to take the long view and do incremental and calibrated reform rather than 'big bang' reform. Another feature of intelligent policy making in Singapore was the attention paid from early on to building capacity in school leadership and teacher professionalism. Singapore was able to take advantage of its small size to structure a close alignment between Ministry of Education and the schools in which the children were educated. A greater fidelity of ministry objectives was thus achieved in the case of Singapore. In addition, the calibre of Singapore teachers is respected both nationally and internationally and the cadre of school leaders it developed has been able to steer the system through the many changes introduced in the last three decades. It is not surprising therefore that in the Worldwide Educating for the Future Index conducted by the Economist Intelligence Unit in 2018, Singapore was ranked first in terms of the policy environment (The Economist Intelligence Unit 2018).

In contrast, Hong Kong has been facing a critical problem of political legitimacy crisis generated by the fact that the government is not voted in through universal suffrage. The past few years have witnessed ineffective governance or even a crisis of governance, which was reflected in several mass movements since the mid-2010s, for most of its policies were not effectively implemented due to a lack of a strong base of popular support and political legitimacy (Lee and Tse 2017). For instance, the unsuccessful implementation of the national education programme in 2012 demonstrated a lack of mutual trust from the general public in the government for its intention to propose a new national education curriculum was widely questioned (Leung et al. 2017). It is therefore more important for the government in Hong Kong to revamp its governance style to be more communicative by seeking stakeholders' viewpoints and opinions on the making of education policies. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, as the government is less trusted by the people in the case of Hong Kong especially through recent years of political disturbance and controversies, it is not difficult to see how policy implementation could be easily blocked by opposition from below, regardless of the good intentions behind the policy (Lee and Tse 2017). In the Worldwide Educating for the Future Index 2018, Hong Kong was ranked twenty-second with reference to the policy environment (The Economist Intelligence Unit 2018). This shows a big difference from Singapore where the governance by the ruling party is in general trusted by the general public.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have reviewed some important issues facing the education systems in Singapore and Hong Kong, two HPES in Asia. These are issues that cannot be revealed from international rankings like PISA, PIRLS and TIMSS, but they cannot be neglected. They include the increasing economization of education, educational disparity in terms of social class and ethnic inequality, and the shift from meritocracy to parentocracy. While both places are keen to uphold their top performance in international rankings of education, they also need to pay attention to those issues related to social fairness and justice like narrowing the gaps between educational achievements by different social classes and ethnic groups, as well as making sure there is equal opportunity for education and that upward social mobility remains feasible. In addition, the core value of meritocracy has been challenged for it does not always guarantee impartial selection of elites for they can be reproduced by the elitist captive of the education system. Meritocracy is seen to be increasingly overtaken by parentocracy which highlights the role of parents in bringing about their children's education success. There have been significant responses in both Singapore and Hong Kong, but it remains to be seen how successful these will be.

References

Amir, H. (2013, August 26). Singaporeans want 'compassionate meritocracy'. *Today*, 26 August.

Anwar, N. (2015). Negotiating Singapore's meritocracy: A subtle shift? *RSIS Commentary*, No. 30, 12 February. Singapore: S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies.

Barr, M. (2014). *The ruling elite of Singapore: Networks of power and influence*. London/New York: I.B. Tauris.

Brown, P., & Lauder, H. (2001). *Capitalism and social progress*. London: Palgrave.

Castells, M. (1988). *The developmental city-state in an open world economy: The Singapore experience* (Working Paper 31). Institute of International Studies. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley.

Census and Statistics Department, HKSAR Government. (2017. June 6). *Press release: Census and Statistics Department announces results of study on household income distribution in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Census and Statistics Department.

Census and Statistics Department, HKSAR Government. (2018). *Hong Kong annual digest of statistics*, 2018 edition. Hong Kong: Census and Statistics Department.

Chan, D., & Tan, J. (2008). Privatization and the rise of direct subsidy scheme schools and independent schools in Hong Kong and Singapore. *International Journal of Educational Management, 22*(6), 464–487.

Chua, V., & Ng, I. (2015). Unequal returns to social capital: The study of Malays in Singapore through a network lens. *Asian Ethnicity, 16*(4), 480–497.

Davie, S. (2013, August 23). Widening doors to top schools. *The Straits Times*.

Davie, S. (2017, August 20). S'pore students suffer from high levels of anxiety: Study. *The Sunday Times*.

Deng, Z., & Gopinathan, S. (2016). PISA and high-performing education systems: Explaining Singapore's education success. *Comparative Education, 52*(4), 449–472.

Education Bureau, HKSAR Government. (2019). *Figure and statistics*. Website: http://www.edb.gov.hk/en/about-edb/publications-stat/figures/index.html

Education Commission, HKSAR. (1999). *Learning for life: Review of education system – Framework for education reform*. Hong Kong: Education Commission.

Education Commission, & HKSAR. (2000). *Learning for life, learning through life: Reform proposals for the education system in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Education Commission.

Forestier, K., Adamson, B., Han, C., & Morris, P. (2016). Referencing and borrowing from other systems: The Hong Kong education reforms. *Educational Research, 58*(2), 149–165.

Goh, C. (1997, June 2). *Speech by Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong at the opening of the 7th international conference on thinking*. Singapore: Ministry of Education.

Goh, C. (2015, August 18). Tilting the playing field for a more equitable society. *Today*.

Gopinathan, S. (2007). Globalisation, the Singapore developmental state and education policy: A thesis revisited. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 5*(1), 53–70.

Gopinathan, S. (2015). *Education*. Singapore: Straits Times Press.

Gopinathan, S., & Lee, M. H. (2013). Reforming curriculum in Singapore and Hong Kong. In Z. Deng, S. Gopinathan & C. Lee (Eds.), *Globalisation and the Singapore curriculum: From policy to classroom* (pp. 225–240).

Gopinathan, S., & Mardiana, B. (2013). Globalisation, the state and curriculum reform. In Z. Deng, S. Gopinathan & C. Lee (Eds.), *Globalisation and the Singapore curriculum: From policy to classroom* (pp. 15–32).

Heng, S. (2012). *Keynote address by Mr Heng Swee Keat, Minister for Education, at the Ministry of Education*, Work Plan Seminar, 12 September. Singapore: Ministry of Education.

Ho, K. (2010). Social mobility in Singapore. In T. Chong (Ed.), *Management of success: Singapore revisited* (pp. 217–241). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Ho, E. (2017). In search of equal and excellent basic education in Hong Kong: Insights from programme for international student assessment. In T. Tse & M. Lee (Eds.), *Making sense of education in post-handover Hong Kong* (pp. 73–94). Oxon/New York: Routledge.

Interview with Tan Chuan-Jin. (2017). Early action to break cycle of poverty in Singapore. *The Straits Times*, 17 July 2017.

Lam, C. (2017). *Connecting for consensus and a better future: Manifesto of Carrie Lam chief executive election 2017*. Hong Kong: Campaign Office of Carrie Lam.

Lee, M. H. (2009). Private education policy at a crossroads: Comparing Hong Kong and Singapore. In K. Mok & R. Forrest (Eds.), *Changing governance and public policy in East Asia* (pp. 228–252). Oxon/New York: Routledge.

Lee, M. H. (2010). Internationalizing universities: Comparing China's Hong Kong and Singapore (1996–2006). In D. Chapman, W. Cummings, & G. Postiglione (Eds.), *Crossing borders in East Asian higher education* (pp. 283–315). Dordrecht: Springer.

Lee, H. (2017). *National Day Rally speech 2017*. Singapore: Prime Minister's Office.

Lee, H. (2019). *National Day Rally speech 2019*. Singapore: Prime Minister's Office.

Lee, M., & Morris, P. (2016). Lifelong learning, income inequality and social mobility in Singapore. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 35*(3), 286–312.

Lee, M. H., & Tse, T. (2017). Introduction: Setting and issues. In T. Tse & M. Lee (Eds.), *Making sense of education in post-handover Hong Kong: Achievements and challenges* (pp. 1–20). Oxon/New York: Routledge.

Legislative Council, HKSAR. (2016). *Fact sheet: Hong Kong in figures 2016*. Hong Kong: Research Office, Legislative Council Secretariat.

Leung, Y., Chong, E., & Yuen, T. (2017). Civic education in Hong Kong: From the colonial era to the post-occupy movement era. In T. Tse & M. Lee (Eds.), *Making sense of education in post-handover Hong Kong: Achievements and challenges* (pp. 127–144). Oxon/New York: Routledge.

Lim, L. (2013). Meritocracy, elitism, and egalitarianism: A preliminary and provisional assessment of Singapore's primary education review. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 33*(1), 1–14.

Lo, K. (2019). The trouble with trying to turn Hong Kong's young people into 'patriotic youth.' *South China Morning Post*, 21 August.

Mahbubani, K. & Teng, K. (2017). Figuring out the right path for political evolution. *The Straits Times*, 22 July.

Mathews, M., Lim, L., & Teng, S. (2017). *Parents' perceptions of the Singapore primary school system*. Singapore: Institute of Policy Studies.

Ministry of Education, Singapore. (1987). *Towards excellence in schools: A report to the Minister for Education*. Singapore: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education, Singapore. (2018). *Education statistics digest 2018*. Singapore: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education, Singapore. (2019). *Updates to PSLE2021 scoring system: Enabling students to progress, regardless of starting points, 25 July*. Singapore: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Finance, Singapore. (2019). *Budget 2019: Building a strong, united Singapore*. Singapore: Ministry of Finance.

Mok, K., & Tan, J. (2004). *Globalisation and marketization in education: A comparative analysis of Hong Kong and Singapore*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Morris, P. (2016). *Education policy, cross-national tests of pupil achievement, and the pursuit of world-class schooling: A critical analysis*. London: UCL Institute of Education.

Mullis, I., Martin, M., Foy, P., & Drucker, K. (2011). *PIRLS 2011 international results in reading*. Boston: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Lynch School of Education, Boston College.

Mullis, I., Martin, M., Foy, P., & Hooper, M. (2016a). *TIMSS 2015 international results in mathematics*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Mullis, I., Martin, M., Foy, P., & Hooper, M. (2016b). *TIMSS 2015 international results in science*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Ng, P. (2008). The phases and paradoxes of education quality assurance: The case of the Singapore education system. *Quality Assurance in Education, 16*(2), 112–125.

Ng, I. (2013). Education and intergenerational mobility in Singapore. *Educational Review, 2013*, 1–15.

OECD. (2015). *PISA 2015 results: Excellence and equity in education*. Paris: OECD.

OECD. (2017). *PISA 2015 results: Students' well-being*. Paris: OECD.

OECD. (2019). *Results from TALIS (Teaching and Learning International Survey) 2018: Singapore*. Paris: OECD.

Ong, Y. (2019). *Ministry of Education Financial Year 2019 Committee of Supply Debate Response by Minister for Education Ong Ye Kung, 5 March*. Singapore: Ministry of Education.

Parliament: KidStart scheme to start with 1,000 vulnerable children in second half of 2016. *The Straits Times*, 12 April 2016.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. Oxon/New York: Routledge.

Seow, J. (2017). Reserved presidential elections unique stabiliser in S'pore system: ESM Goh. *The Sunday Times*, 20 August.

Shamsuri, J. (2015). Evaluating the work of Singapore's Malay-based organizations in raising the educational attainment of the ethnic community: A continuing analysis. *Journal of International and Comparative Education, 4*(1), 14–27.

Sharpe, L., & Gopinathan, S. (2002). After effectiveness: New directions in the Singapore school system? *Journal of Education Policy, 17*(2), 151–166.

Singapore Department of Statistics. (2018a). *Key household income trends* (p. 2018). Singapore: Singapore Department of Statistics.

Singapore Department of Statistics. (2018b). *Yearbook of statistics Singapore 2018*. Singapore: Department of Statistics.

Spring, J. (2015). *Economization of education: Human capital, global corporations, skills-based schooling*. New York/Oxon: Routledge.

Tan, J. (1997). Improving Malay educational achievement in Singapore: Problems and policies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 17*(1), 41–57.

Tan, J. (1998). The marketisation of education in Singapore: Policies and implications. *International Review of Education, 44*(1), 47–63.

Tan, J. (2006). Limited decentralization in the Singapore education system. In C. Bjork (Ed.), *Educational decentralization* (pp. 59–70). Dordrecht: Springer.

Tan, K. (2008). Meritocracy and elitism in a global city: Ideological shifts in Singapore. *International Political Science Review, 29*(1), 7–27.

Tan, J. (2010a). Education in Singapore: Sorting them out? In T. Chong (Ed.), *Management of success: Singapore revisited* (pp. 288–308). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Tan, K. (2010b). The transformation of meritocracy. In T. Chong (Ed.), *Management of success: Singapore revisited* (pp. 272–287). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Tan, O. (2012). Fourth way in action: Teacher education in Singapore. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 11*, 35–41.

Tan, J. (2014). Closing the achievement gap in Singapore. In J. Clark (Ed.), *Closing the achievement gap from an international perspective* (pp. 251–262). Dordrecht: Springer.

Tan, K. (2017). *Governing global-city Singapore: Legacies and futures after Lee Kuan Yew*. Oxon/New York: Routledge.

Tan, K. (2018). *Singapore: Identity, brand, power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tan, J. (2019a). Equity and meritocracy in Singapore. In S. Teng, M. Manzon, & K. Poon (Eds.), *Equity in excellence: Experiences of East Asian high-performing education systems* (pp. 111–126). Dordrecht: Springer.

Tan, J. (2019b). University governance and management in Singapore: The case of the Singapore Institute of Management University (UNSIM). In D. Chang, M. Lee, & H. Loke (Eds.), *The governance and management of universities in Asia: Global influences and local responses* (pp. 112–118). London: Routledge.

Tan, C., & Dimmock, C. (2015). *Tensions between meritocracy and equity in Singapore: Educational issues in preparing a workforce for the knowledge-based economy*. Singapore: The Head Foundation.

The Economist Intelligence Unit. (2018). *Worldwide educating for the future index 2018: Building tomorrow's global citizens*. London: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

The Heritage Foundation. (2019). *2019 index of economic freedom*. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.

The rich are always with us. *The Economist*, 16 July 2015.

Tsang, W. (2011). *Analysis of education policy in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (xianggang tequ jiaoyu zhengce fenxi)*. Hong Kong: Joint Publishing. [in Chinese].

Tse, T. (2008). Choices for whom? The rhetoric and reality of the Direct Subsidy Scheme in Hong Kong (1988–2006). *Education and Urban Society, 40*(5), 628–652.

Tse, T. (2017). Should there be public reporting of school performance?: The lessons from the school inspection reports disputes. In T. Tse & M. Lee (Eds.), *Making sense of education in post-handover Hong Kong: achievements and challenges* (pp. 161–179). Oxon/New York: Routledge.

University Grants Committee, HKSAR Government. (2018). *University Grants Committee annual report 2017–18*. Hong Kong: University Grants Committee.

Wong, B. (2013). Political meritocracy in Singapore: Lessons from the PAP government. In D. Bell & C. Li (Eds.), *The East Asian challenge for democracy: Political meritocracy in comparative perspective* (pp. 288–313). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Woo, J. (2017). Parental choice in the new education market: Aided-turn-direct subsidy scheme schools in focus. In T. Tse & M. Lee (Eds.), *Making sense of education in post-handover Hong Kong: Achievements and challenges* (pp. 40–53). Oxon/New York: Routledge.

World Economic Forum. (2017a). *The inclusive growth and development report 2017*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

World Economic Forum. (2017b). *The global human capital report 2017*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

World Economic Forum. (2018). *The global competitiveness report 2018*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

Yuen, C. (2017). Changing student diversity, changing cultures and changing education policies: Cross-boundary students, Chinese immigrant students and non-Chinese speaking students in focus. In T. Tse & M. Lee (Eds.), *Making sense of education in post-handover Hong Kong: achievements and challenges* (pp. 200–214). Oxon/New York: Routledge.

Zhang, J. (2014). *Debunking the myth of the lazy Malays*. MENDAKI occasional paper series: Education, No. 1. Singapore: Yayasan Mendaki.

Zhao, Y. (2015). *Lessons that matter: What should we learn from Asia's school systems?* Mitchell Institute discussion and policy paper No. 04/2015. Melbourne: Mitchell Institute for Health and Education Policy.

Chapter 7
Globalisation and Current Research on Teaching Values Education

Joseph Zajda

Abstract This chapter discusses current and dominant models employed in teaching values education in schools. It offers researchers, teachers and students with an insight as to why values education should be incorporated in classroom teaching. It is suggested that values education, in addition to focusing on moral education, is connected to democracy, active citizenship education, social justice and human rights education. Drawing on current research, various curriculum and pedagogical approaches are offered as to how to improve the effectiveness values education in classroom pedagogy. The chapter concludes that values education to be meaningful, engaging and authentic must involve a greater sense of active citizenship education, social constructivist pedagogy, and more emphasis on cultural diversity, critical thinking and a deeper and critical understanding and knowledge of democracy, equality, human rights and social justice for all.

Keywords Active citizenship education · Globalisation · Ethics · Moral education · Classroom pedagogy · Values education

Globalisation as a Multi-faceted Phenomenon: Implications for Values Education

Values can be defined as the principles and fundamental convictions which act as general guides to behaviour and the standards by which actions are judged as good or desirable (Halstead et al. 2000, p. 169). In general, values refer to ideas held by individuals or groups concerning moral standards defining actions that are 'good or

J. Zajda (✉)
Faculty of Education & Arts, School of Education, Australian Catholic University, East Melbourne, VIC, Australia
e-mail: joseph.zajda@acu.edu.au

J. Zajda (ed.), *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms*, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 20,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1743-2_7

bad', what is desirable and what is not desirable (Giddens 2009). Values are regarded as one of the most fundamental components (like ideology) of a group's culture (Zajda 2009a, p. 13). They generally represent the core of the ideological system, and provide individuals with values about their social identity, and which define and characterise the social group and its membership (Zajda 2009b, p. 15). Smolicz (1999) stressed the symbolic and collectivist essence of values and their significant role in maintaining both individual and collective identity: "it is through core values that social groups can be identified as distinctive ethnic, religious, scientific or other cultural communities" (1999, p. 105). Cummings et al. (2001) in their study of values education in 12 countries, observed that at the core of values education is the autonomous individual, and suggested that values education will have a high priority, and schools will play a key role in values education (see also Habermas 1990; Shor 1992; Hattie 2003; Brady 2005, 2011a).

The term values education refers to a multifaceted process of socialization in schools, which transmits dominant values, in order to provide and legitimate the necessary link between the individual, the group and society. Values education is a structured process of instilling desirable aspects of moral education, ethical traits and standards. Values are culturally internalized, shared, and transmitted ideas about what is good or desirable. Values may refer to: a particular belief system—believing that pluralist democracy is the best model of social/political system; a code of conduct—being honest, tolerant and courageous; a state of existence—peace, tolerance and equality); or a moral judgment—truth, beauty, and justice.

Every society has its own rules defining behaviour and actions. This is a normative dimension of a society and its culture, consisting of norms, and values. Values refer to ideas held by individuals or groups concerning moral standards defining actions that are 'good or bad', or what is desirable and what is not desirable (Giddens 2009). Values are regarded as one of the most fundamental components (like ideology) of a group's culture (Zajda 2009a, p.13). They generally represent the core of the ideological system, and provide individuals with values about their social identity, and which define and characterise the social group and its membership (Zajda 2009b, p. 15). Smolicz (1999) stresses the symbolic and collectivist essence of values and their significant role in maintaining both individual and collective identity: 'it is through core values that social groups can be identified as distinctive ethnic, religious, scientific or other cultural communities'(1999, p. 105). Cummings et al. (2001) in their study of values education in 12 countries, observe that at the core of values education is 'the autonomous individual', and suggest that values education will have a high priority, and schools will play a major role in values education.

Since the 1990s, a number of scholars and policy analysts began to stress the moral function of pedagogy, both locally and globally (Purpel 1999; Cummings et al. 2001; Bindé 2002; Zajda 2014, 2018; Lovat 2017). For instance, Jacques Delors (1998) in his report to UNESCO of international Commission on education for the twenty-first century, *Learning: the Treasure Within*, believed that education had an important role to play in promoting tolerance and peace globally:

> In confronting the many challenges that the future holds in sore, humankind sees in education an indispensable asset in its attempt to attain the ideals of peace, freedom and social justice. (p. 13)

A similar concern with a moral dimension in education is present in Jérôme Bindé (2002) in 'What Education for the Twenty-First Century? It is argued that a new paradigm shift in education should be aiming to 'humanize globalization' (Bindé 2002, p. 391, see also Bindé 2000). At the same time he reminds us that one of education's future major challenges will be to use the new information and communication technologies to disseminate knowledge and skills (Bindé 2002; see also Zajda and Gibbs 2009).

Cultural Origins of Values

> *We are all citizens of one world; we are all of one blood. To hate a man because he was born in another country, because he speaks a different language, or because he takes a different view on this subject or that, is a great folly. Desist I implore you, for we are all equally human…Let us have but one end in view, the welfare of humanity.* (Comenius 1592–1670)

Global research on social, cultural and political capital demonstrates that the core values of a culture act as 'strong forces' that shape societies (Cummings et al. 2001; Willms 2003; Zajda and Daun 2009; Zajda and Ozdowski 2017). Every society has its own rules defining behaviour and actions. This is a normative dimension of a society and its culture, consisting of norms, and values. Some researchers have argued that values may focus on 'ends' such improvement in culture or the quality of life (Cummings et al. 2001; see also Purpel 1999; Zajda and Daun 2009). Others have focused on 'means' such as the 'enhancement of civic mindedness' (Cummings et al. 2001, p. 11).

Values education is an essential part of school pedagogy, even though the nexus between values education and pedagogy is very contested and problematic. The situation is further complicated, as values education (and moral education) seem to be 'subject to changes of fashion' (Winch and Gingell 1999). Berkowitz (2011) perceived the values education process in schools to be an "attempt within schools to craft pedagogies and supportive structures to foster the development of positive, ethical, pro-social, inclinations and competences in youth…" (Berkowitz 2011, p. 153). For instance, when MacIntyre (1981) re-interpreted and revived the Aristotelean pedagogy of values education, it became a very popular approach to virtue theory, which was based on Aristotle's *Nichomachaean Ethics*. Virtue advocates argue that moral concepts and values should be explicated in terms of character traits, which children can internalise, through classroom pedagogy and reflection. In the Soviet Union this process of moral education was known as *vospitani*e (upbringing) (Zajda 2017). Desirable character traits or *virtues* include tolerance, altruism, asceticism, benevolence, honesty, courage, fairness, moderation, conscientiousness, selflessness, sincerity, humility, modesty, magnanimity, sympathy, tactfulness, diligence, nobleness, trust, self-mastery, solidarity, and frugality.

Are values to be ‘caught’, instead of being taught? Values such as *peace, tolerance, courage*, *civility, honesty, moderation*, and *frugality* should be taught to all if we are to maintain a truly caring and responsible democratic community. Some values deal with proper ways, or standards, of interacting with others (being polite, cooperative, truthful, and accepting). Other values describe desirable states of existence to which we all aspire—desire for work, happiness, peace, love, and fulfilling life (see also Kohlberg 1975).

Teaching our students morality or values education, means teaching them what we ourselves, as citizens, with a democratic voice in a pluralist democracy, understand by morality and moral values. It is important to understand that not only values may vary from culture to culture they are also subjective, and relative. A value considered good in one society at a particular point in time may be bad in different era. For example, the White Australia Policy, which enforced racial aspects of the immigration law, was dismantled by the Holt Government’s Migration Law in 1966, and 1973 marked the end of the White Australia policy. Similarly, the value of racial segregation in the USA, or *de jure segregation*, or segregation sanctioned by law, was practised until 1954, when the US Supreme Court ordered that the public schools be desegregated. The value has shifted towards racial equality, inclusive schooling and school integration. It has taken many decades to achieve this significant value shift.

Global Models for Values Education

The Western and non-Western models of values act as dominant agencies of socialization for values education, social identity, and nation-building. Western-informed international conventions provide value statements globally. The United Nation’s *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UN 1948) was a statement by the international community of the inalienable rights and fundamental freedoms for all human beings. In Article 26, Part 2 it stressed that education “shall be directed...to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedom. It shall promote understanding tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups...” (UN 1948, p. 7). Other specific value positions are found in various international and legal treaties. For example, the four major Council of Europe treaties protecting the human rights of children combined offer a policy direction for developing and promoting a global vision for a better childhood. The four principal treaties are the European Convention on Human Rights (1950), the European Social Charter (1996), the European Convention on the Exercise of Children’s Rights (1996) and the European convention on Contact Concerning Children (2003). Values associated with schooling are found in the Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the twenty-first century, *Learning: The Treasure Within* (Delores 1996) and its four essential pillars of education for the twenty-first century: *learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together* and *learning to be*. More recently, the UNESCO Conference on Education for Shared

Values and for Intercultural and Interfaith Understanding (2005) called on educational systems to incorporate common and agreed values into school curricula, to promote intercultural and interfaith understanding.

Local and National Values

Values education differs around the world both locally, regionally and nationally. Different values are transmitted, according to differences in cultural settings, be they religious, cultural or political. In some communities and societies, dominant values are defined by the ideology of religion or politics. As Huntington (1996) points out, in his book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* culturally diverse nations, divided by different and competing ideologies for global dominance, have different values priorities. In the USSR, values education was based on cultivating a communist morality of *Homo Sovieticus*, and promoting a collectivist, rather than individual identity. In the USA, being a democratic society, the values of individualism, equality, freedom, democracy and self-fulfilment are inculcated in schools. Values education in Europe reflect economic and social principles, which embrace student-centred learning, accompanied by dominant values embedded in cognitive, social and emotional development, and vocational philosophies of achievement, success and work.

Both Bronfenbrenner (1979) and Banks (2012) offer two different models of values education shaping one's social and cultural identity. In his research, Bronfenbrenner focused on major agencies of socialisation shaping the self and identity. On the other hand, Banks (2012) developed a very influential model of multicultural education, grounded in values education and citizenship education (see below).

Urie Bronfenbrenner's Model

Urie Bronfenbrenner (1917–2005) was the Jacob Gould Schurman Professor of Human Development and of Psychology in the Cornell University College of Human Ecology. He developed an ecological model describing major socio-cultural factors defining values and shaping one's social identity and learning (Bronfenbrenner 1979, 2005). Bronfenbrenner's model depicts five concentric circles: *microsystems* (learner's immediate environment—family, friends, peers, and teachers) *mesosystems* (the nexus between home and school, community and school), *exosystems* (parental aspirations and goals), *macrosystems* (cultural and societal dominant values affecting the individual), and *chronosystems* (the influence of the milieu and time). Bronfenbrenner's model was adapted and widely used by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) in Citizenship and Education in Twenty-Eight Countries study of values education in civics. The

Octagon model used in IEA studies was based on eight major socializing agencies affecting the values of individuals in different countries.

James Banks and His Model for Multicultural Education

James A. Banks, Professor in Education and Chair in Diversity Studies at the University of Washington, the author of *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society* (2007), developed his popular model for multicultural education in schools in his book *An Introduction to Multicultural Education* (2013). The model for values education within the framework of multiculturalism, proposed by Banks, consists of 5 Dimensions of Multicultural Classrooms: *Content Integration* (teaching diversity); *Knowledge Construction* (teaching how knowledge is created); *Prejudice Reduction* (developing positive relationships among students of different ethnic backgrounds); *Equity Pedagogy* (facilitating the academic success of students from different ethnic and social class groups): and *Empowering School Culture* (inclusive classroom environment that is conducive to the academic and emotional needs and growth of all students).

Values Education in Schools

Values education in schools is a complex and controversial area of the curriculum: it is an object of study, and it influences what is selected for study. It is an essential, contested and constantly changing area of study that develops thinking skills that are vital for all other areas of study. A very good example of the nexus between globalisation, and values education in humanities and social sciences education is the National Council for the Social Studies. According to NCSS, social studies educators should 'teach students the content knowledge, intellectual skills, and civic values necessary for fulfilling the duties of citizenship in a participatory democracy' and that in 'In a multicultural, democratic society and globally connected world, students need to understand the multiple perspectives that derive from diverse cultural vantage points' (National Curriculum Standards for Social Studies 2010).

The Nature of Values in Schools

Values may refer to a particular belief system—believing that pluralist democracy is the best model of social/political system, a code of conduct—being honest, tolerant and courageous, a state of existence—peace, tolerance and equality), or a moral judgment—truth, beauty, and justice. Different values are associated with different criteria. We can differentiate between aesthetic, cultural, civic, family, economic, environmental, intellectual, legal moral, political, religious, scientific, technological and social values. Snook (2002) noted the nexus between ethical theory and classroom pedagogy (see also Carr 2010; Snook 2003; Zajda 2014). In his book, *The Ethical Teacher*, Snook (2003) argues that the ethical teacher is one who one who understands both the moral purpose of education and the importance of viewing the process of teaching as essentially ethical in its nature. Among the ethical teacher's roles, Snook identifies *respect for autonomy* and *respect for reason*. He asks the question: How can teachers respect the learner as a person and yet try to change her in fundamental ways? This, according to him, constitutes the basic ethical dilemma of teaching:

> The ethical teacher, taking into account the student's age and maturity, tries to impart not just the conclusion of processes and arguments but the methods of arriving at the conclusions: not just ways of behaving but an understanding of these ways of behaving and the reasons for them. Thus, guided by teachers who respect her reason, the student gradually learns to use her own reason, to become autonomous, and hence does not have to rely forever on the views of others. This task of handing over full control to the learner may take a long time but it needs to be begun early so that she learns the habit of "thinking for herself." (Snook 2002)

In examining moral education, we note at least two closely related problems in debates surrounding ethics—the lack of provision of moral education, and the loss of moral direction in society. One could argue that a proper moral education is one that provides an adequate understanding of the 'moral sphere' (see Woods and Barrow 1995), just as the study of history equips one with the logic of historiography and the logic of historical thinking. Earlier, in his work, Barrow (1977) asks the question 'What is the most *effective* way to morally educate the children?' (Barrow 1977, p. 199). He suggests that children inevitably do, to some extent, acquire moral attitudes from their environment, which includes parents and teachers, and other role models. Perhaps the most important point Barrow makes is when he argues that it would be wrong to assume that what a moral philosopher says is true must be so. Look to his reasoning –not his judgment, reminds us Barrow (Barrow 1977, p. 212).

The Politics of Values Education

The current debate on values education has become an overtly partisan political issue producing a dominant ideology of teaching values and character education. I am reminding the readers that what we call values education was known as 'character education' in most schools during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Recently, values education has become a 'metaphor and code' for pedagogy pursuing the neo-liberal and conservative social and cultural agenda (Purpel 1999, p. 83). In some ways the values taught in schools are traditional rather than modern:

> ...the values taught in the schools are very much in line of Puritan tradition of obedience, hierarchy, and hard work, values which overlap nicely with the requirements of an economic system that values a compliant and industrious work force, and a social system that demands stability and order. (Purpel 1999, p. 89)

Not only values education appears to be more traditional than modern, but by emphasising such traditional values as loyalty, responsibility, duty, obedience and honesty they may well be advancing a newly reinvented moral paradigm of ‘domesticating values’ (Snook 2002). He argues that that all programmes of values education are dependent on political judgements, and tend to reinforce the existing inequality:

> They serve to reinforce the status quo and the power structures which serve the interests of the dominant group. We need only reflect for a moment on how the values of “loyalty and submission” and even “love” have served the oppression of women by men while generations of South Africans and African Americans were schooled to know their place and be loyal to their exploiters...

The curriculum is an ideological construct, and discourses surrounding cultural and political dimensions of schooling should emphasise the ideological nature of school subjects and moral/character/values education (Narvaez and Rest 1995; Purpel 1999; Apple 2004; Zajda 2009c, 2014). As Purpel argues, part of this strategy is to create a discourse in which the schools are blamed for not ‘teaching values’. Such a discourse, which defines desirable values to be taught in schools, attempts to shift the argument from social and political spheres to the individual and personal traits. Blaming the individual for not learning desirable values is far more acceptable than blaming society and its structures, which exert a powerful socialising influence. Purpel also reminds us that ‘Moral issues are by definition socially and culturally situated and any dialogue on proper character is based on some communal notion of propriety’ (Purpel 1999, p. 89). Yet, values education research is characterised by the near absence of political and ideological analysis. This is a paradox, as researchers and writers addressing the issues of moral crisis would necessarily need to explain social, political and economic conditions responsible for such a phenomenon (see also Arenas et al. 2009).

Moral Dilemmas

We can easily reach a consensus, at the most abstract of levels, on such values as fairness, obedience, loyalty and kindness. The Nuremberg and other trials for crimes against humanity demonstrated that obedience and loyalty to a given regime is sometimes a vice. Individuals have been executed for being obedient and following the orders of various political leaders/dictators. As Snook (2002) points out, even such a value as ‘loyalty’, when translated into practice, can be problematic:

> ...loyalty – surely we should be loyal only to those who deserve it? It is debatable whether citizens should be loyal to governments that break their word once elected. Should students be loyal to a school that treats them unjustly? Should ethnic minorities be loyal to institutions that have grossly discriminated against them? Should a woman be loyal to the man who abuses her? Should staff be loyal to educational institutions which have rejected the basic values of the academic life?

.... The lesson is that one should be obedient only to worthy authorities. We have to ask if our "democratic" governments of recent years have been worthy of our obedience...

Virtues such as freedom, justice, truth telling and kindness are general moral principles, or abstractions. They, in themselves, cannot explain daily applications. Hence, values education need to be practical, as individuals confront their values, societal values, choices and their applications in everyday life. Furthermore, a critical understanding, analysis and evaluation of moral principles such as freedom, human rights, social justice and responsibility in classroom pedagogy constitutes the essence of morality and value education and should form the foundation of moral education of an individual. Here, the focus is on translating abstract moral principles into everyday life.

The methodology and methods of values education in schools, which advocate that values need to be taught, rather than left to chance, could be Durkheimian in the sense that morality must be taught rather than caught. Marsh (2011) describes values education as the development of students' 'understanding of challenges and making choices about how to respond'. The National Framework for Values Education (2005) in Australia articulated two distinct styles of Values Education: the first develops abstracted and shared values and virtues; the second develops the critical thinking skills required to develop the students' ethical judgements and understanding of values. Understandably there is constant tension in the content, philosophical and pedagogical approaches, process and product of values education.

Recently, the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (VCAA) in the State of Victoria (Melbourne) produced a set of guidelines for Values Education in the school curriculum. The guide is not intended to be prescriptive (i.e. schools have flexibility in choosing their approach to values) and it is not intended to be specific stand-alone teaching (rather, it should be incidental teaching points within everyday learning contexts. The *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* (DEST 2005) provided a policy statement for an overarching framework for developing a vision for values education in schools. It identified the following nine core values for Australian schools:

- Care and compassion
- Doing your best
- Fair go
- Freedom
- Honesty and trustworthiness
- Integrity
- Respect
- Responsibility
- Understanding, tolerance and inclusion.

The Melbourne Declaration (2008) suggests that it is the schools' responsibility to ensure that young people are taught national values such as democracy, equity and justice; and personal values such as honesty, resilience and respect for others.

Incorporating Values into the History/HUMANITIES Curriculum

Values Education in Humanities and Social Sciences

Humanities and social sciences can assert a special interest in values learning that directly supports active citizenship in our participatory and pluralist democracy. Butts identified **twelve** core values that had to be taught, as a part of students' preparation for citizenship in a genuinely democratic society. The values are divided into two clusters: these that deal with the *obligations of citizenship* and those that define the *rights of citizenship*. Accordingly, we have an important *citizenship obligation* to support:

- justice for all,
- equality of opportunity,
- legitimate authority,
- participation,
- truth,
- patriotism.

The *rights of citizenship* include:

- the right to freedom,
- diversity,
- privacy,
- due process,
- property,
- human rights

Objectives of Values Education in the Classroom

Approaches to values education in the Humanities and social sciences curriculum should serve at least two general goals:

- To help students make the most of their lives (within reason, as 'Sky is **no**t the limit').
- To preserve and improve our evolving democratic society.

Other, more specific goals include:

- Helping students to appreciate one another's cultural differences.
- Helping students and teachers to identify cultural stereotypes as presented in the media, when teaching values of cultural diversity.
- Teaching students to avoid using language that is insensitive, offensive, embarrassing or damaging.

- Helping teachers develop multiple perspectives, conceptualizations and behaviors, when teaching values education.
- Teachers should aim to foster respect, tolerance and equality among diverse students, as equal members of their school.
- Helping students to understand that our social responsibility extends beyond local and national boundaries.

Humanities and social sciences curriculum focuses on how students learn to think about, uphold and apply values. This allows children to view values as a valuing process of feeling, thinking, expressing and acting by which people make or imply judgments about what is desirable, good or bad, moral or immoral (Gilbert 2011). Gilbert (2011) suggests that there are different elements in teaching values in the classroom:

- Understanding values principles- Values that derived over centuries through religion, and social policies, and politics. Analyzing the value of democracy—refers to the integrity and rights of all people and promoting equal opportunities and equal participation.
- Logical and empirical analysis- applying values in real life contexts and with the belief that certain actions will have certain effects.
- Empathy, tolerance and open mindedness- being open to the views of others without judging (p. 89).
- Caring—acting in ways that promote and enhance moral or ethical behaviour.

Values can be incorporated in the area of Humanities and social curriculum and generally works well in an inquiry based approach (IA), and constuctivist learning and teaching, focusing on citizenship as the area of study. Marsh (2011) suggests that there are four subject groups designated to teach values in Humanities and social sciences which are:

- Democratic process: promoting ideals of equal participation and access for individuals and groups
- Social justice: including the concern of welfare, rights and dignity for all, empathy with multicultural families and fairness
- Ecological and economical sustainability: quality of peoples' lives and the natural environment
- Peace: promoting positive relations with others and the world (Marsh 2011).

Classroom Strategies for Teaching Values

In the Humanities and social sciences F-6 classroom some of the many approaches to values education are:

- **Values Inculcation**. Instilling socially desirable values in students – through direct teaching, including story-telling, or indirectly through routine practices in the classroom, role models, reinforcement, praising, simulation and role playing to instil values in students.

- **Values Clarification** allows students to be more socially aware and become critical thinkers. It also helps students understand and accept everyone's values and beliefs. Includes practical activities to clarify feelings towards person/event/issue.
- **The Social Action and Participation**. This approach to values education assumes that individuals learn values best by practicing them. There are numerous examples of social action and participation projects, including EfS (education for sustainability), 'circles of democracy' in the classroom, human rights education etc. (Goodman 1994).
- **The Trait approach** refers to values that are classified more important than others and involves teaching a set of qualities such as honesty, loyalty and compassion.
- **Service Learning approach** – activities at school and in the community. According to Freakley (2008), schools should provide experiences as opportunities to practice making a *choice of actions*.
- **Cognitive Development Approach** is where values education is seen as a movement through stages. This helps students to improve reasoning and to not differentiate right and wrong decisions. Includes dilemma activities, small group discussions, decision making tasks to further develop students' values.
- **Role Plays** explores multi-layered values in complex moral scenarios. It is responsible for finding solutions in spontaneous unrehearsed dialogue (see Brady 2011a, b).
- **Empathy Approach** involves an informed understanding and interpretation of cultural diversity, or the values of others in different cultures.
- **The Time-Traveller Approach** involves looking back at historical events, locating them in a time continuum, and relating to current events in history (See also Brady 2011b).

Students can be given responsibility, can make decisions, and can develop their own views in relation to what has happened in the past. They can set up classroom governments, and look at questions of human rights and individual and corporate responsibility in current events (Turner 2011). Classroom activities may include:

- Using children's literature to provide examples and exercise values (Martin 2009).
- Classroom activities should provide experiences as opportunities to practice making a choice of actions (Freakley 2008).
- Setting a positive role model—you are a role model for the students in your classroom
- Being truthful and honest: The best way to encourage truthfulness in students is to be a truthful to them. Encourage them to also be truthful to others in the classroom.

- Generating serious questions that will promote dialogue about values—telling students what values they should have won't be very effective. Asking them "curious" questions will allow discussions that will eventually lead to values. "What did you think about that fight?" "What do you think he should have done?" Will be more effective than, "He shouldn't have started that fight!" (Brandenburg 2011)
- Encouraging students to be involved in helping others**.** Students learn values by practicing them (Brandenburg 2011).

Values Education and Academic Achievement

Recent research has produced evidence of the nexus between values education and academic achievement. Berkowitz (2011) argues that recent empirical research demonstrated that fostering the development of 'positive, ethical, pro-social inclinations and competencies in youth', resulted in improvement in their achievement. Similarly, Lovat (2017), having evaluated current research finding, dealing with values education and academic achievement, suggests that values education, properly implemented, is likely to impact positively on a range of educational goals, emotional, social, moral and academic.

There is also a new insight regarding the nexus between neuroscience, feelings, emotions and values education. Research findings show that that good practice pedagogy must be directed to the whole person. Furthermore, it is the process of cognition that activates a range of emotional, social and moral impulses. Lovat et al. (2010) suggest that a contemporary understanding of values education, or values and wellbeing pedagogy, fits well with recent neuroscience research:

> Notions of cognition, or intellect, are far more intertwined with social and emotional growth than earlier educational paradigms have allowed for. In other words, the best laid plans about the technical aspects of pedagogy are bound to fail unless the growth of the whole person – social, emotional, moral, spiritual and intellectual, is the pedagogical target. (Lovat et al. 2010)

Recently several neuroscientists like Churchland (2018), and Narvaez (2014) have argued that moral education possesses rare potential to activate those emotional and social centres of the brain that, taken together, can impel the form of sound reasoning associated in educational research generally with efficacious learning. Narvaez's (2014) research shows that this stimulation relies on both the learning ambience and what she refers to as efficacious pedagogy, a pedagogy that is morally bound and focussed on eliciting moral content from the curriculum. Lovat (2017) suggests that it is research of this type that would appear to highlight yet again the significant role that moral education can play in enhancing all educational goals.

Evaluation

For some educational philosophers and writers (Peters 1967; Carr 2010; Cummings 2001; Brady 2011a, b, Zajda 2014) values education is the essential part of school pedagogy. For others, like Phillips (1979), and Straughan (1982) the nexus between values education and pedagogy is very contested and problematic. The situation is further complicated, as Winch and Gingell (1999) argued that moral education seems to be 'subject to changes of fashion' (p. 147). For instance, when Hare (1981) was popular in the UK, his theory of moral education was very popular, and when MacIntyre (1981) re-invented the Aristotelean pedagogy of values education, it became very popular approach to virtue theory, which was based on Aristotle's *Nichomachaean Ethics*. Virtue advocates argue that moral concepts and values should be explicated in terms of character traits, which children can internalise, through classroom pedagogy and reflection. In the Soviet Union this process of moral education was known as *vospitani*e (upbringing). Desirable character traits or *virtues* include tolerance, altruism, asceticism, benevolence, honesty, courage, fairness, moderation, conscientiousness, selflessness, sincerity, humility, modesty, magnanimity, sympathy, tactfulness, diligence, nobleness, trust, self-mastery, solidarity, and frugality. Kohlberg criticised the virtue theory approach for advocating 'a crude deontological approach' to values education (don't lie, don't steal, don't cheat). According to Kohlberg, virtue education as part of moral education, requires deliberation and reflection, where complex moral choice (or moral dilemma) is involved (see Winch and Gingell 1999, p. 245).

The issue is not so much methodogical or pedagogical, as to the approaches to be used in classroom pedagogy of values education, but rather one between the 'believers' and 'non-believers' concerning teaching values education in the classroom. Ryle who criticised moral education in schools, argued that morality is caught not taught. He argued that if we define teaching as 'the passing on of expertise', then any notion of moral expertise seems 'deeply dubious', for if such expertise did exist we expect for it to be institutionalised (Winch and Gingell 1999, p. 148). Straughan (1982), on the other hand, in his critique of dominant approaches to the content of values education and the structure of values education, and the contested areas and boundaries between moral reasoning and the content of morality, suggested a pragmatic approach to values education, based on what I call the 3Ms of moral education:

- *teaching **that*** informed decisions must be made in making moral choices
- *teaching **how*** to think for themselves as autonomous moral agents
- *teaching children **to*** **want** to be moral (to guarantee moral goodness in an individual) (see also Winch and Gingell 1999, p. 149).

To adopt Straughan's (1982) approach to values education, especially 'teaching to want to be moral', which continues the role of exemplification in values education stressed by moral philosophers such as Carr (2010) and Phillips (1979). Pedagogues, as role-models, should act morally themselves and exemplify the role of moral agents or portray a moral action charisma. Snook (2002) argues that values education has to be supported but it must be 'liberated from those who seek to cure the ills by more doses of the medicine which caused them'. As he reminds us, schools ought to practice pluralist democracy, by discussing its values:

> There must be a place for the disparity of views which mark a pluralistic society. Current proponents are fond of talking of the values which we all share. More important are the values which divide us; it is conflict, not consensus which marks the values domain: young people in schools should confront these conflicts and learn to handle them rationally and tolerantly. (Snook 2002, p. 6)

Using Straughan's (1982) approach to values education, namely 'teaching to want to be moral', suggests that values education to be meaningful, engaging and authentic must involve more emphasis on critical thinking, and discourse analysis and a deeper and critical understanding of democracy, equality, human rights and social justice for all. There is also a connection between values education and academic achievement. The nexus between values pedagogy and academic performance has been demonstrated in recent research findings in neuroscience.

Furthermore, Shor (1992) argued for the nexus between pedagogy, empowerment and democracy. He suggested that the values that guide education should be participatory, affective, emotional, as well as intellectual, problem-posing, situated, multicultural, dialogic, activist, democratic, and 'desocializing', thus challenging both existing knowledge, and the experiences that make us what we are.

The above approaches to teaching values education in schools indicate that for values education to be effective, there is a need in teacher education to educate prospective teachers in major models of values education, as discussed above.

Conclusion

In schools, both locally and globally, where values education and critical literacy are taught, values should be discussed and critiqued, within the paradigm of cultural diversity, and pluralist democracy, grounded in human rights and social justice discourses. Values education has a potential to affect individuals in every sphere: social, emotional, moral and academic. Values education in schools ought to represent our quest for the ideal of the morally good society, in order to promote a deeper and critical understanding of democracy, equality, human rights and social justice for all.

References

Apple, M. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge Falmer.

Arenas, A., Reyes, I., & Wyman, L. (2009). When indigenous and modern education collide. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Race, ethnicity and gender in education: Cross-cultural understandings*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Banks, J. (2012). *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (Vol. 4). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Barrow, R. (1977). *Moral philosophy for education*. London: George, Allen & Unwin.

Berkowitz, M. (2011). What works in values education. *International Journal of Educational Research, 50*(3), 153–158.

Bindé, J. (2000). Toward an ethics of the future. *Public Culture, 12*(1), 51–72.

Bindé, J. (2002). What education for the twenty-first century? *Prospects, 32*(4), 391–403.

Brady, L. (2005). Dimensions of teaching. *Curriculum and Teaching, 20*(1), 5–14.

Brady, L. (2011a). Assessing values education: A tentative exploration. *Curriculum Perspective, 31*(3), 49–55.

Brady, L. (2011b). Teacher values and relationship: Factors in values education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(2), 56–66.

Brandenburg. (2011). *Top ten ways to teach values to your kids*. Retrieved December 20, 2011, from Power to change: http://powertochange.com/family/teachvalues/

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Carr, D. (2010). The philosophy of education and educational theory. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *The sage handbook of philosophy of education* (pp. 37–53). Newbury Park: Sage Publication.

Churchland, P. (2018). *Braintrust: What neuroscience tells us about morality*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cummings, W. (2001). The future of values education in the pacific basin. In W. Cummings, J. Hawkins, & M. Tatto (Eds.), *Values education for dynamic societies: Individualism or collectivism* (pp. 285–298). (CERC Studies in Comparative Education 11). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong.

Cummings, W., Tatto, M., & Hawkins, J. (2001). *Values education for dynamic societies: Individualism or collectivism*. Hong Kong: CERC, University of Hong Kong.

Delors, J. (1998). *Education for the twenty-first century: Issues and prospects: Contributions to the work of the international commission on education for the twenty-first century*. Paris: UNESCO.

Department of Education, Science and Training. (2005). *National Framework for values education in Australian schools*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Freakley, M. (2008). Values education and character development. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Society and environment* (pp. 10–12). Melbourne: James Nicholas Publishers.

Giddens, A. (2009). *Sociology* (6th ed.). Oxford: Polity Press.

Gilbert, R. (2011). Working with values and contoversial issues. In R. Gilbert & B. Hoepper (Eds.), *Teaching society and environment* (pp. 79–98). South Melbourne: Cengage Learning.

Goodman, J. (1994). Circles of democracy: School's internal governance. *New Education, 16*(2), 3–24.

Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action* (C. Lenhardt & S. Nicholson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Halstead, J., Taylor, J., & Taylor, M. (2000). Learning and teaching about values: A review of recent research. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 30*(2), 169–202.

Hare, R. M. (1981). *Moral thinking: Its levels, method, and point*. Oxford/New York: Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press.

Hattie, J. (2003). *Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence? Invited address at the Australian Council for Educational Research conference, Melbourne*. Retrieved from https://research.acer.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1003&context=research_conference_2003

Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kohlberg, L. (1975, June). *The cognitive developmental approach to moral education* (pp. 670–677). Phi Delta Kappan.

Lovat, T. (2017). Values education as good practice pedagogy: Evidence from Australian empirical research. *Journal of Moral Education, 46*(1), 88–96.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., & Clement, N. (Eds.). (2010). *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing*. Dordrecht: Springer.

MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue a study in moral theory*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co.

Marsh, C. (2011). *Studies of society and environment*. Pearson Education: Frenchs Forest.

Martin, S. N. (2009). Education in values through children's literature. A reflection on some empirical data. In J. Zajda & D. Holger (Eds.), *Global values education* (pp. 65–81). Dordrecht: Springer.

Narvaez, D. (2014). *Neurobiology and the development of human morality: Evolution, culture, and wisdom*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Narvaez, D., & Rest, J. (1995). The four components of acting morally. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral behaviour and moral development: An introduction* (pp. 385–400). New York: McGraw-Hill.

National Curriculum Standards for Social Studies: A Framework for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. (2010). Silver Spring: National Council for the Social Studies. http://www.ncss.org/standards/strands

Peters, R. S. (1967). *Ethics and education*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Phillips, D. (1979). Is moral education really necessary? *British Journal of Educational Studies, 27*(1), 42–68.

Purpel, D. (1999). *Moral outrage in education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education. Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smolicz, J. (1999). Core values and cultural identity. In M. Secombe & J. Zajda (Eds.), *Education and culture*. Melbourne: James Nicholas Publishers.

Snook, I. (2002). *The ethical teacher*. A paper presented at the annual conference of the New Zealand Association for Research in Education, Palmerston North, 5th–9th December, 2002.

Snook, I. (2003). *The ethical teacher*. Wellington: Dunmore Publishing.

Straughan, R. (1982). *Can we teach children to be good*. London: Routledge.

Turner, T. N. (2011). *What values do we want to teach?* Retrieved from Education Website: http://www.education.com/reference/article/values-we-teach/

UNESCO. (2005). *Education for shared values and for intercultural and interfaith understanding*. Canberra: Australian National Commission for UNESCO.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights. (1948). Geneva: United Nations Office of Public Information.

Willms, J. (2003). *Student engagement at school a sense of belonging and participation* (2001). Paris: OECD.

Winch, C., & Gingell, J. (1999). *Key concepts in the philosophy of education*. London: Routledge.

Woods, R., & Barrow, R. (1995). *An introduction to philosophy of education* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.

Zajda, J. (2009a). Current issues in race, ethnicity and gender in education. In J. Zajda & K. Freeman (Eds.), *Race, ethnicity and gender in education: Cross-cultural understandings*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Zajda, J. (2009b). Global pedagogies for democracy, tolerance and peace. In H. Daun, Y. Iram, & J. Zajda (Eds.), *Global values education: Teaching democracy and peace*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Zajda, J. (2009c). Globalisation, nation-building, and cultural identity: The role of intercultural dialogue. In J. Zajda, H. Daun, & L. Saha (Eds.), *Nation-building, identity and citizenship education: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 15–24). Dordrecht: Springer.

Zajda, J. (2014). Values education. In D. Phillips (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of educational theory and philosophy* (pp. 835–838). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Zajda, J. (2017). *Globalisation and national identity in history textbooks: The Russian Federation*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9789402409710

Zajda, J. (2018). *Globalisation and education reforms: Paradigms and ideologies*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9789402412031

Zajda, J. & Daun, H., (Eds.) (2009). *Global values education: Teaching democracy and peace*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/education/comparative+education/book/978-90-481-2509-8

Zajda, J., & Gibbs, D., (Eds.) (2009). *Comparative information technology: Languages, societies and the internet*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/education/learning+%26+instruction/book/978-1-4020-9425-5

Zajda, J., & Ozdowski, S., (Eds.) (2017). *Globalisation and human rights education*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/generic/search/results?SGWID=5-40109-24-653415-0&submit=Submit&sortOrder=relevance&searchType=EASY_CDA&searchScope=editions&queryText=Joseph+zajda

Chapter 8
Constructivist and Constructionist Epistemologies in a Globalised World: Clarifying the Constructs

Brendan Hyde

Abstract This chapter sets out to provide conceptual clarity around these two epistemological stances by comparing constructivism with constructionism in relation to three particular categories – (1) their origins and epistemological premises, (2) their ontologies, and (3) their purposes. It then proceeds to articulate some implications concerning the use of each epistemology to contribute to research in the field of education and to the notion of globalisation more generally. It notes in particular the positive contribution of constructionism in bringing about educational reforms and in taking a critical view towards the taken-for-granted notion of globalisation discourses. It shows how constructionism can make a positive contribution to research agendas that seek to bring about educational reform to improve the quality of teaching and learning and contribute to the betterment of societies precisely because it questions the very notions of globalisation, competitive market forces and the universalising of markets and production. Constructionist pedagogies may then be discerned and implemented as the result of the correct alignment of the theoretical perspective, research methodology and data collecting strategies with the constructionist epistemology. In making the important distinction between constructivism and constructionism, this chapter makes a significant contribution to the refinement of theories of knowledge, and to their usage in qualitative research in education to bring about improved learning and teaching to contribute positively to the betterment of societies in a globalised world.

Keywords Constructivism · Constructionism · Epistemology · Education reforms · Globalisation

B. Hyde (✉)
Deakin University, Melbourne Burwood Campus, Burwood, VIC, Australia
e-mail: Brendan.hyde@deakin.edu.au

J. Zajda (ed.), *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms*, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 20,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1743-2_8

Introduction

As a multi-dimensional process typically characterised by neoliberal ideology, the universalising of markets and production, and profit-driven managerialism (Urzua 2000), globalisation is having a profound effect on educational institutions, including higher education, which through its various research agendas, seeks to improve the quality of teaching and learning and contribute to the betterment of societies. Researchers in higher educational contexts seek to achieve this through their understanding of the theory of knowledge, that is epistemology, and the aligning of the various elements of the research process to reflect their epistemological stance in their quest bring about educational reform. In the qualitative paradigm, many educational researchers draw their epistemological stance from either constructivism or constructionism.

Yet here has been confusion in the field of education concerning the notions of constructivism and constructionism. These are two quite different epistemologies, and yet many writers use them (and their derivatives social constructivism and social constructionism) either interchangeably or in complementary ways (e.g., Hoban et al. 2010; Kafai and Resnick 1996; Lindsay 2017; McLean 2018; Xerou et al. 2016; Young and Collin 2004). Some contribute the birth of constructionism to Seymore Papert, a student of Piaget who placed emphasis on the shared constructing of knowledge, in which Piaget's original notion of constructivism becomes constructionism (e.g., Parmaxi and Zaphiris 2014). However, such a view is too simplistic and does not adequately take into account the historical and philosophical movements from which constructionism emanates. Constructivism emphasises how knowledge is constructed on qualitatively different, progressively more adequate levels, as the result of the individual's action and interaction in the world either alone or with others (see Zajda 2018). Constructionism, on the other hand, emphasises the characteristics of social participation, relationships, the setting of activity and historical change (Packer and Goicoechea 2000). Importantly, and in terms of globalisation, constructionism calls into question the taken-for-granted knowledge, concepts (such as globalisation and neoliberalism) and categorisations of peoples, places and things, inviting those who engage with it to be critical of the notion that observation of the world unproblematically yields it nature to the observer.

Constructivism

Origins and Epistemological Premises

Constructivism originates from the work of Swiss developmental psychologist Jean Piaget. Constructivism is complex and contains a number of strands of divergent thought as represented, for instance, through the writings of Vygotsky (1978) who focussed on the socio-cultural dimension of knowledge (see also Galperin 1969;

Karpov and Hayward 1998), and Rogoff (1994, 2003) who focused on the role of the community and institutional practice (see also Rogoff and Lave 1984). This chapter, however, will confine itself to a brief discussion of constructivism as proposed originally by Piaget and his proponents, in particular von Glasersfeld (1995).

The research question posed by Piaget was both epistemological and philosophical: What is the nature of knowledge and how does it grow and develop? (Ultanir 2012)While Piaget was influenced by the work of Immanuel Kant (Packer and Goicoechea 2000) (discussed in greater detail in the following section) he was also persuaded by the philosophical thinking of John Dewey who argued that knowledge is never a mere representation of reality, but rather involves a process through which human beings become a part of that reality (Dewey 1938). The focus of Piaget's project, then, was how human beings construct a stable and orderly picture from the flow of their experiences (von Glasersfeld 1995). For Piaget, knowledge arises from the functioning individual's activity, either physical or mental, and it is goal-directed activity that provides knowledge with its organisation. Therefore, "all knowledge is tied to action, and knowing an object or event is to use it by assimilating it to an action scheme" (Piaget 1967, pp. 14–15). The notion of an action scheme is central to Piaget's constructivist theory of knowledge, and with it, the associated terms of assimilation and accommodation.

Assimilation occurs when a person places an experience into a conceptual structure – an action scheme – that the she or he *already possesses* (Piaget 1988; von Glasersfeld 1995). In other words, assimilation always reduces new experiences apperceived by the individual to already existing sensorimotor or conceptual structures (von Glasersfeld 1995). The question then arises as to what happens to those experiences apperceived by an individual that do not fit into her or his already existing sensorimotor or conceptual structures, and how, therefore, is new knowledge attained. This is where the notion of accommodation has relevance.

When an individual is unable to fit an experience into an existing scheme or structure, a perturbation – a disturbance or disorder – is said to occur. This leads the individual to review the experience that has been apperceived, thereby revealing characteristics that were disregarded by assimilation. If the unexpected outcome of the activity was disappointing, the newly noticed characteristics may "effect a change in the recognition pattern and thus in the conditions that will trigger the activity in the future" (von Glasersfeld 1995, p. 65). Alternatively, if the unexpected outcome was one of interest or was pleasant, a new recognition pattern may be formed to include the new characteristic, thus constituting a new scheme. In either case, the result would be an *accommodation* of new knowledge.

Of importance in Piaget's scheme theory is the notion of *equilibration*, a term that refers to the range of perturbations the individual is able to eliminate, thereby restoring equilibrium between assimilation and the accommodation of new knowledge. Thus, the theory that emerges from Piaget's work suggests that cognitive change occurs when a scheme, instead of producing the expected outcome, leads to perturbation which, in turn, leads to an accommodation that either maintains or re-establishes equilibrium:

> Assimilation and accommodation are therefore two poles of an interaction between the organism and the environment, which is the condition for all biological and intellectual operations, and such an interaction presupposes from the point of departure an equilibrium between the two tendencies of opposite poles. (Piaget 2000, p. 353)

Therefore, learning and the knowledge it creates are said to be explicitly instrumental (von Glasersfeld 1995). However, Piaget's theory of cognition involves a twofold instrumentalism. At the sensorimotor level, action schemes are instrumental in assisting individuals to achieve goals in their interaction with the world they experience (Piaget 2000; von Glasersfeld 1995). On the level of reflective abstraction, operative schemes are instrumental in assisting individuals achieve a coherent conceptual network of structures that reflect particular ways of acting and thinking which those individuals have found to be viable.

The acquisition and use of language is especially important in constructivism. The capacity for thought is primarily developed through the acquisition of language, which in turn, can constrain or expand knowledge constructions (von Glasersfeld 1995). The language that the individual uses both shapes and is shaped by the individual's membership within families and communities (Oldfather et al. 1999). Language is entwined with thought and is therefore central to the way in which an individual makes sense of the world. Since an individual's inner thoughts are rooted in language, it can be argued that they are inherently social, like language (Brooks and Brooks 1993). However, and as von Glasersfeld (1995) cautions, while language is social in the sense that it is shared by all of the individual speakers via their linguistic interactions, and that individual meanings are modified and adapted throughout their use during the course of social interactions, they remain nonetheless, the individual's meanings, derived from the individual's own subjective experience:

> There is no doubt that these subjective meanings get modified, honed, and adapted throughout their use in the course of social interactions. But this adaptation does not and cannot change the fact that the material an individual's meanings are composed of can only be taken from that individual's own subjective experience. (Glasersfeld 1995, p. 137)

Ontology

Whereas epistemology concerns the theory of knowledge and the question of what counts as, or constitutes knowledge, ontology concerns the nature of being and reality, that is, what it means for something, or somebody, to exist or to be (Packer and Goicoechea 2000). Constructivism assumes a dualist ontology. Piaget (1972) was influenced by the philosophical thought of Immanuel Kant and his concept of *a priori* structures that are inherent in the functioning of reason. According to Kant (1952) "we find existing in the mind *a priori*, the pure form of sensuous intuitions in general, in which all the manifold[1] content of the phenomenal world is arranged and viewed under certain relations" (p. 23). These structures consist of space and time, although writers who have studied Kant's work closely include causality and object among these structures (Allison 1983; Packer and Goicoechea 2000; von Glasersfeld, 1995). For Kant (1952), then, space and time are "two sources of knowledge, from which, *a priori*, various synthetical cognitions can be made" (p. 28). It is therefore:

> …not merely possible or probable, but indubitably certain, that space and time, as the necessary conditions of all our external and internal experiences, are merely subjective conditions of all out intuitions, in relation to which all objects are therefore mere phenomena, and not just things in themselves [and therefore] much may be said *a priori,* whilst of the thing itself… it is impossible to say anything at all. (Kant 1952, p. 31)

These *a priori* structures are, then, the "fundamental forms which human reason imposes on all experience" (von Glasersfeld 1995, p. 40). Kant later went on to write that "It is not until the understanding that joins them and connects them [*a priori* structures] by a rule of thought…that they become empirical knowledge, i.e., *experience*" (Kant, cited in von Glasersfeld 1995, p. 144, italics in original). Therefore, human experience is what the individual constructs – out of the elements of the manifold – when reason is imposed upon it. The fact that only certain things are constructed while others are not is determined by the structure of reason – the primary topic of Kant's transcendental philosophy (von Glasersfeld 1995).

Therefore, although the person, individually or with others, constructs knowledge through interacting with the environment, the Kantian categories of space, time, causality, and objects (Allison 1983) are considered *a priori* structures of a person's being and experience. In taking these insights from Kantian thought, Piaget (1972) explained that "all construction elaborated on by the subject presupposes [these] antecedent internal conditions" (p. 91).[2] In other words, the categories of space, time, causality and object, which Kant considered innate to the mind, in fact shape an individual's experience of reality so that cognition "constructs in the twin senses of giving form to the empirical data of sensation and giving rise to new conceptual structures" (Packer and Goicoechea 2000, p. 228). Constructivist ontology then is an ontology of two realms – a subject (the individual) and an independent world. This dualism is problematic in terms of a coherent theory of human knowledge, for even as Dewey (1966) noted:

> The identification of the mind with the self, and the setting up of the self as something independent and self-sufficient, created such a gulf between the knowing mind and the world that it became a question of how knowledge was possible at all…when knowledge is

[1] Kant's use of the term "the manifold" is a key concept, and consists of the raw material, or '"the stuff" on which constructive perception and reason can operate" (von Glasersfelds 1995, p. 40).

[2] It should be noted that the chapters in Piaget's work *The Construction of Reality in the Child* (1954/2000) have been structured to reflect this Kantian influence, so much so that von Glasersfeld (1995) maintains that they are effectually the constructivist substitute for the categories that Kant assumed to be *a priori*.

> regarded as originating and developing within an individual, the ties which bind the mental life of one to that of his fellows and ignored and denied. (Dewey 1966, pp. 293–297)

Purpose

The third area of comparison in this analysis concerns the purpose for which each epistemology is employed. Brooks and Brooks (1993) point out that constructivism is a theory about knowledge and learning. It emphasises how knowledge is constructed on qualitatively different and progressively more adequate levels as the result of a person's action and interaction in the world, either individually or with others (Piaget 1972; Oldfather et al. 1999; Packer and Goicoechea 2000). In building upon the work of Piaget, von Glasersfeld (1995) maintained that there are two key principles that establish the purpose of constructivism. Firstly, that knowledge is not passively received, but rather that it is built up by the cognizing subject, and secondly, that the function of cognition is adaptive and serves the organisation of the experiential world rather than the discovery of an ontological reality.[3] The purpose of constructivism is, then, for the individual to construct her or his own meanings out of the elements of individual experience (or, to use Kant's terminology, out of the manifold), and then to adapt these meanings so as to form a coherent worldview. This constructing may be undertaken individually, or with others in social contexts, using in both cases language as a shared medium through which to construct meaning. However as von Glasersfeld also warns, such sharing does not imply a shared social meaning. For although language may provide for the opportunity for the negotiation of meaning and knowledge, the decisive aspect of this negotiating procedure is that the accommodated knowledge "is still a subjective construction, no matter how mutually compatible the knowledge of the negotiators may have become in the process" (Glasersfeld 1995, p. 191).

Constructionism

Origins and Epistemological Premises

In contrast to constructivism, constructionism emanates from the field of sociology against the backdrop of postmodernism. Key writers in the constructionist movement were Berger and Luckmann (1966) whose systematic account of social life – *The Social Construction of Reality* – argues that human beings together create and

[3] Although von Glasersfelds (1995) argues that constructivists do not say anything about ontology, Packer and Goicoechea (2000) maintain that that in practice, constructivists do not avoid the issues that are concerned with ontology, largely because they inhereted them from the Kantian and Piagetian traditions.

then sustain all social phenomena through social practice. They identify three particular moments in the processes of socialisation through which this occurs. The first is externalisation, which occurs when people act upon the world in some manner, creating an artefact or practice. This might occur when an individual, or community, develops a concept, such as the way in which the earth was created, and then seek to externalise this idea by, for example, telling a story or writing a book about it. The artefact (the story or book) then enters the social realm. Other people re-tell the story or read the book, and the artefact begins to take on a life of its own. This second movement is known as objectivation, whereby the artefact – a product of human activity – is "available to both [its] producers and to other men [sic] as elements of a common world" (Berger and Luckmann 1966, p. 49). It has become the object of consciousness for the society in which it was developed – a feature of the natural world itself rather than a construction of the interactions of human beings (Burr 2003).

Berger and Luckmann (1966) argue that externalisation and objectivation are moments in a continuing dialectical process. There is a relationship between human beings (the producers of artefacts) and the social world. That is "man (not, of course, in isolation but in his collectivities) and his social world interact with each other. The product acts back upon the producer" (p. 78, parentheses in the original). The result of such interaction renders three essential characterisations of the social world, namely that "*Society is a human product. Society is an objective reality.* [And that] *Man is a social product*" (p. 79, italics in the original).

The third moment in the process is internalisation, by which "the objectivated social world is retrojected into consciousness in the course of socialisation" (Berger and Luckmann 1966, pp. 78–79). Other people, including future generations, are born into and inhabit a world in which an idea already exists, and begin to internalise it as a part of their own consciousness, and understanding of the nature of the world.

Berger and Luckmann's (1966) account demonstrates how the world can be socially constructed by the social practices of people. At the same time, it demonstrates how people experience the world as if the nature of their world is pre-given and fixed (Burr 2003), rather than a construction.

The cultural backdrop of postmodernism also renders the origin of constructionism quite different from constructivism. Postmodernism questions and rejects metanarratives which attempt to describe the social world and the structures of it from particular foundational stories, such as religion and psychology (see for instance Hollinger 1994). It questions the notion of structuralism, which suggests that there are underlying structures determining the way in which people see the world (Burr 2003). Instead postmodernism emphasizes the co-existence of a multiplicity and variety of situation-dependent ways of life. Rather than metanarratives, there are individual stories that are historically and culturally bound (Horell 2003).

Structural psychology – the field from which constructivism emanates – with its emphasis on underlying structures, represents a metanarrative which is ultimately questioned and rejected by postmodernism. The epistemological stance of constructionism would, as a consequence, question and reject the notion of constructivism, understanding it to be significantly different from itself.

Ontology

Constructionism challenges the dualist ontology of constructivism. As Gergen (1985) notes, the emergence of constructionism (and in particular social constructionism) has transcended the subject-object dualism and all its attendant problems so as to develop a new framework of analysis based on an alternative and non-empiricist theory of the functioning and potentials of science. Constructionism therefore is grounded in a social ontology that conceives of the individual as one who is engaged in the world (Lave and Wenger 1991; Packer and Goicoechea 2000). Phrases such as "communities of practice" (Lave and Wenger 1991) in which the individual participates and forms her or his identity in activity in the world are indicative of the non-dualist ontology expressed in constructionism.

Therefore, in constructionist ontology, the human person is not viewed as a natural entity but rather as a social and historical product. Consequently, the human person is *made*, and not simply born. Humanness is therefore, according to Berger and Luckmann (1966) a socio-cultural variable. In other words, while it is true to say that all human beings share certain biological characteristics human nature is not biologically fixed, but is rather a socio-cultural variable:

> There is only human nature in the sense of anthropological constants…the specific shape into which this humanness is moulded is determined by those socio-cultural formations and relative to their numerous variations. While it is possible to say that man [sic] has a nature, it is more significant to say that man [sic] constructs his own nature, or more simply, that man [sic] produces himself. (p. 67)

Constructionist ontology then is one in which the human person and the social world are internally related to one another, "mutually constituting" (Packer and Goicoechea 2000, p. 234). This is in contrast with the "constituting subjectivity" of Kant and Piaget, who viewed construction only as a cognitive activity in which subjectivity applies its forms to data from a distinct and separate objective world. Cognition "serves the subject's organisation of the experiential world, not the discovery of an objective ontological reality (von Glasersfeld 1995, p. 51). Ontologically then, constructivism is quite different from constructionism.

Purpose

Constructionist inquiry is concerned with "explicating the processes by which people come to describe, explain, or otherwise account for the world (including themselves) in which they live" (Gergen 1985, p. 266). It emphasises the characteristics of social participation, relationships, the setting of activity and historical change (Packer and Goicoechea 2000). There are two fundamental purposes of constructionist inquiry. The first is to take a critical stance towards taken-for-granted knowledge (Burr 2003; Gergen 1985, 2001; Parker 1997). Burr (2003) argues that constructionism invites those who engage with it to be critical of the notion that observation of the world unproblematically yields it nature to the observer. Constructionists maintain a suspicion of assumptions in relation to how the world appears to be, arguing that the categories with which human beings apprehend the world do not necessarily refer to real divisions. Constructionism then asks one to "suspend belief that commonly accepted categories or understandings receive their warrant through observation" (Gergen 1985, p. 267).

The second is that, although it is possible to have an infinite number of conceivable constructions of the world, each brings with it, or invites, a different kind of action from human beings. In other words, knowledge and social action go together. The purpose of constructionist inquiry then should lead to social action. As Gergen (1985) notes, particular descriptions or explanations of the world themselves constitute particular forms of social action – they serve to sustain and support certain social patterns to the exclusion of others. For example, the social action appropriate for understanding "celibacy" depends upon how this concept has been constructed. Constructions of celibacy as a response in love to a vocation to follow God more closely calls for very different social action than constructions of it as a denial of one's natural human desires and inclinations. To treat other concepts, such as depression, or anxiety, as emotions from which people involuntarily suffer is to have significantly different implications than to treat them as chosen, selected (Gergen 1985). Constructions of the world are, therefore, bound up with power relations because they have implications for what might be permissible for different people, and consequently, for how they may treat others (Burr 2003).

It would seem, then, that research which adopts a constructionist epistemology is typically concerned with broad topics, such as gender, aggression, mind, causality, person, self, childhood, motivation, morality, identity (Burr 2003; Gergen 1985), story (Merrtens 1998), education (Davies 1998) and the like. Such topics are concerned with larger societal concepts that have been constructed through the processes of socialisation, and research oriented towards these topics considers the ways in which such categorical concepts might be challenged by various groups of people, including the researcher. It would also consider appropriate social action in response to the knowledge that emanates from the findings of such research.

While there are a range of research methodologies that are compatible with a constructionist epistemology, they would typically include conversation analysis and discourse analysis (see for example, Potter 1998; Wetherell et al. 2001; Willig 1998). In contrast, research that adopts a constructivist epistemology tends to be concerned with not only the ways in which the research participants have constructed meaning from their experiences (either individually or with others), but also the way in which the researcher constructs knowledge in addressing the research question *through analysing the data* that has been gathered via the research participants A range of possible methodological approaches are compatible with the constructivist epistemology, including grounded theory, ethnography, narrative ethnography, case study, phenomenology and hermeneutic phenomenology.

The analysis above then reveals that constructivism and constructionism are two distinct epistemologies. The following two sections of this chapter discern some of the implications and contributions made by each theory of knowledge to research in education, as well as a consideration of the contribution that constructionism can make to globalisation more generally.

The Implications and Contribution of Each Epistemology to Research in Education in a Globalised World

Since constructivism and constructionism are two different epistemologies, their respective contributions to research in education will be distinctive. While it would be a mistake to state emphatically that certain topics will align themselves more closely with one or other epistemology – the very thing that constructionism seeks to avoid, that is, the categorisation of people and ideas into taken-for-granted socially constructed categories (Burr 2003; Gergen 1985; Hacking 1999) – case studies, research focusing on generating theory from collected data, or describing a phenomenon in its essence are likely to be aligned with constructivism. They assume an independent world with which the researcher engages. In relation to education, examples of such research could include an examination of contemporary teaching practices (Tiilikainen et al. 2019), analysing the learning and teaching processes in courses (Tuncel and Bahtiyar 2015), evidence bases for teaching and learning (Dinham 2017), examining student responses in science classes (Appleton 1997), analysing the relationship between teachers' epistemological understanding and music teaching practice (Cleaver and Ballantyne 2013), and exploring children's faith in relation to Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (Court 2010; Agar Junker 2013), Such research, aligned with constructivism, has a distinctive contribution to make to the field of education since it generates theory where little is known about the phenomenon in question, or ascribes meaning in relation to particular phenomena associated with issues pertinent to education.

The contribution of constructionism to education is two-fold. Firstly, it challenges taken-for-granted categories, assumptions and meanings that have been ascribed through the process of socialisation. Generally, these assumptions will concern larger societal issues, such as gender, childhood, socialisation, morality, identity, and the like. Secondly, it will call for a response, or social action. In relation to education, a key example of such constructionist research is presently focused on the notion of gender fluidity, showing how perceptions of gender are constructed by individuals, challenging societal taken-for-granted conceptions of gender, and calling for appropriate social responses. For instance, Holmes (2007) promotes the advantages of using a community of practice to analyse discourses that promote repressive ideologies that punish deviations from gender norms for both boys and girls. Hester (2004) advocates for a "postgender" alternative that perceives the body an active participant and contributor to gender identification, formation and practice. Other research focussing gender fluidity using a constructionist epistemology includes Carr (1999), Wilson (2001), Morojele (2011) and Coates (2012).

The necessity of research in education being underpinned by the appropriate epistemological foundation is, therefore, a central concern for researchers in this field. Confusion in the alignment of empirical work with the correct theory of knowledge results in a category mistake, in which facts of one kind – for instance the key tenets of constructivism – are presented as if they belong to another – for instance the tenets of constructionism (see Hyde 2013 for a detailed discussion of category mistakes). The consequence of this would render the misalignment of all of the other elements of the research which stem from the epistemology – the theoretical perspective, the methodology, the data collecting procedures, the tools of analysis, and so forth. It may also result in research in this field seeking to find answers to the wrong questions, since these questions would not align with the appropriate epistemological premises.

The Contribution of Constructionism to Globalisation

In terms of globalisation more generally, constructionism has an important contribution to make. Since globalisation is commonly perceived as a process rather than a condition or single event, the ways in which individuals create and then sustain this social phenomenon through social practice becomes important. Those who operate from a constructionist epistemology perceive globalisation in ways beyond the corporate ethos of the efficiency, performance-based, and profit-driven managerialism. Rather, they see globalisation as process of creating new world order, complete with new institutions and culture, such that solutions to world problems that have been created by asymmetrical power relations are founded in the reconstruction of the new global order (Efanodor et al. 2017).

Constructionism further contributes to globalisation in so far as it presents the possibility of taking a critical view in relation to the taken-for-grantedness of many of the globalisation discourses. Globalisation itself contains a particular discourse concerning the international reality that might be uncovered through constructionism with its focus on the social construction of reality (Risse 2007). Further, a constructionist understanding of globalisation places emphasis on the non-material forces at work in this phenomenon and focuses on the process of meaning construction and interpretation as constitutive for globalisation, as well as emphasising the possibility for change instead of the inevitability of global processes due to its scrutiny of taken-for-granted discourses (Risse 2007). In this way constructivism assists people to critically examine the claims espoused by proponents of deliberative democracy on a global scale.

Thus, while not offering a theory of globalisation, constructionism serves as a critical perspective that enables those who study the process of globalisation processes which to call into question the conventional wisdom in both scholarly and the wider public discourses that are associated with globalisation. Importantly, Risse (2007) points out that constructionists are likely to highlight that globalisation, itself a dominant discourse, will tend to reify existing power structures.

Conclusion

As theories of knowledge, both constructivism and constructionism offer valuable epistemological premises for research within education, with constructionism offering particular possibilities for a thorough of the process of globalisation. However, each epistemology is quite distinct. Within the field of education, researchers need to be able to distinguish clearly between these two terms and to appropriately align their research projects with most appropriate epistemology. The categories of comparison utilised in this chapter have sought to provide such clarity in relation to these two epistemologies, thereby assisting researchers in the higher education sector in their discernment of an appropriate choice of epistemology in their quest bring about educational reform in an increasingly globalised world.

References

Agar Junker, D. B. (2013). Zone of proximal development, liminality, and communitas: Implications for religious education. *Religious Education, 108*(2), 164–179.

Allison, H. E. (1983). *Kant's transcendental idealism: An interpretation and defence*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Appleton, K. (1997). Analysis and description of students' learning during science classes using a constructivist-based model. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34*(3), 303–318.

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Middlesex: Penguin.

Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. G. (1993). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Carr, C. L. (1999). Cognitive scripting and sexual identification: Essentialism, anarchism and constructionism. *Symbolic Interactionism, 22*(1), 1–24.

Cleaver, D., & Ballantyne, J. (2013). Teachers' views of constructivist theory: A qualitative study illuminating relationships between epistemological understanding and music teaching practice. *International Journal of Music Education., 32*, 228–241. https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761413508066.

Coates, J. (2012). Gender and discourse analysis. In J. P. Gee & M. Hanaford (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Court, D. (2010). What happens to children's faith in the zone of proximal development and what can religious educators do about it? *Religious Education, 105*(5), 491–503.

Davies, B. (1998). Psychology's subject: A commentary on the relativism/realism debate. In I. Parker (Ed.), *Social constructionism, discourse and realism* (pp. 133–154). London: Sage.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier.

Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education*. New York: Free Press. (Original work published 1916).

Dinham, S. (2017). The lack of an evidence bases for teaching and learning: Fads, myths, legends, ideology and wishful thinking. *Professional Voice, 11*(3), 17–25.

Efanodor, A. E., Harriet, O., & Ofordum, C. M. (2017). Feminisation of globalism and globalisation of feminism: The impacts of women. In E. A. Obi (Ed.), *Gender politics in Nigeria: A reader*. Bookpoint Educational: Onitsha.

Galperin, P. I. (1969). Stages in the development of mental acts. In M. Cole & I. Maltzman (Eds.), *A handbook of contemporary Soviet psychology* (pp. 34–61). New York: Basic Books.

Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist, 40*(3), 266–275.

Gergen, K. J. (2001). *Social construction in context*. London: Sage.

Hacking, I. (1999). *The social construction of what?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hester, D. (2004). Intersexes and the end of gender: Corporeal ethics and postgender bodies. *Journal of Gender Studies, 13*(3), 215–225.

Hoban, G., Nielsen, W., & Carceller, C. (2010). Articulating constructionism: Learning science through designing and making "slowmations" (student-generated animations). In C. Steel, M. Keppell, P. Gerbic, & S. Housego (Eds.), *Conference of the Australasian society for computers in learning in tertiary education* (pp. 433–443). Brisbane: University of Queensland.

Hollinger, R. (1994). *Postmodernism and the social sciences: A thematic approach*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Holmes, J. (2007). Social constructionism, postmodernism and feminist sociolinguistics. *Gender and Language, 1*(1), 51–65.

Horell, H. (2003). Cultural postmodernity and Christian faith formation. In T. Groome & H. Horell (Eds.), *Horizons and hopes: The future of religious education* (pp. 81–107). New York/ Mahwah: Paulist Press.

Hyde, B. (2013). A category mistake: Why contemporary Australian religious education in Catholic schools may be doomed to failure. *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 34*(1), 36–45.

Kafai, Y., & Resnick, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Constructionism in practice: Designing, thinking, and learning in a digital world*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kant, I. (1952). *The critique of pure reason* (J. M. D. Meiklejohn, Trans.). Chicago: Encyclopedia Brtiannica. (Original work published 1781).

Karpov, Y. V., & Hayward, C. H. (1998). Two ways to elaborate Vygotsky's concept of mediation. *American Psychologist, 53*(1), 27–36.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lindsay, J. (2017). Connecting beyond the classroom – Move from local to global learning modes. *Scan, 36*(2), 27–38.

McLean, H. (2018). This is the way to teach: Insights from academics and students about assessment that supports learning. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 43*(8), 1128–1240.

Merrtens, P. (1998). What is to be done? (with apologies to Lenin!). In I. Parker (Ed.), *Social constructionism, discourse and realism* (pp. 59–73). London: Sage.

Morojele, P. (2011). What does it mean to be a girl? Implications of girls' and boys' experiences of gender roles in rural Lesotho primary schools. *Education as Change, 15*(1), 133–147.

Oldfather, P., West, J., White, J., & Wilmarth, J. (1999). *Learning through children's eyes: Social constructivism and the desire to learn*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Packer, M. J., & Goicoechea, J. (2000). Sociocultural and constructivist theories of learning: Ontology, not just epistemology. *Educational Psychologist, 35*(4), 227–241.

Parker, I. (1997). Realism, relativism and critique in psychology. In I. Parker (Ed.), *Social constructionism: Discourse and realism* (pp. 1–9). London: Sage.

Parmaxi, A., & Zaphiris, P. (2014). The evolvement of constructionism: An overview of the literature. In P. Zaphiris & A. Ioannou (Eds.), *Learning and collaboration technologies: Designing and developing novel learning experiences* (pp. 452–461). Cham: Springer.

Piaget, J. (1967). *Biologie et connaissance* (Biology and knowledge). Paris: Gallimard.

Piaget, J. (1972). *The principles of genetic epistemology* (W. Mays, Trans.). New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1970).

Piaget, J. (1988). *Structuralism* (C. Mashler, Trans.). New York: Harper & Row. (Original work published 1970).

Piaget, J. (2000). *The construction of reality in the child*. London: Routlege. (Original work published 1954).

Potter, J. (1998). Fragments in the realisation of relativism. In I. Parker (Ed.), *Social constructionism, discourse and realism* (pp. 27–45). London: Sage.
Risse, T. (2007). Social constructivism meets globalisation. In A. McGrew & D. Held (Eds.), *Globalisation theory: Approaches and controversies* (pp. 126–147). Cambridge: Polity Press.
Rogoff, B. (1994). Developing understanding of the idea of communities of learners. *Mind, Culture and Activity, 1*, 209–229.
Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press.
Rogoff, B., & Lave, J. (1984). *Everyday cognition: Its development in social contexts*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Tiilikainen, M., Karjalainen, A. T., Lepola, J., & Husu, J. (2019). The complex zone of constructivist teaching: A multi-case exploration in primary classrooms. *Research Papers in Education, 34*(1), 38–60.
Tuncel, I., & Bahtiyar, A. (2015). A case study on constructivist learning environment in content knowledge courses in science teaching. *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences, 174*, 3178–3185.
Ultanir, E. (2012). An epistemological glance at the constructivist approach: Constructivist learning in Dewey, Piaget, and Montessori. *International Journal of Instruction, 5*(2), 195–212.
Urzua, R. (2000). Globalisation. *International Social Science, 165*, 421.
von Glasersfeld, E. (1995). *Radical constructivism: A way of knowing and learning*. London: The Falmer Press.
Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Wetherell, M., Taylor, S., & Yates, S. J. (2001). *Discourse theory and practice: A reader*. London: Sage.
Willig, C. (1998). Social constructionism and revolutionary socialism: A contradiction in terms? In I. Parker (Ed.), *Social constructionism, discourse and realism* (pp. 91–104). London: Sage.
Wilson, E. (2001). Organisational behaviour and gender. In E. Wilson (Ed.), *Organisational behaviour reassessed: The impact of gender* (pp. 1–16). London: Sage.
Xerou, E., Papadima-Sophocleous, S., & Parmaxi, A. (2016). A social constructionist approach to teaching and learning vocabulary for Italian for academic purposes. In S. Papadima-Sophocleous, L. Bradley, & S. Thouësny (Eds.), *CALL communities and culture – Short papers* (pp. 485–489). Dublin: Research-publishing.net.
Young, R. A., & Collin, A. (2004). Introduction: Constructivism and social constructionism in the career field. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 64*(3), 373–388.
Zajda, J. (2018). Effective constructivist pedagogy for quality learning in schools. *Educational Practice & Theory*, *40*(1), 67–80. https://auscathuniaus.library.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/jnp/ept/2018/00000040/00000001/art00005

Chapter 9
Reflections on the Legacy of Nelson Mandela and the Relevance for Educational Transformation Globally

Diane Brook Napier

Abstract This chapter offers reflections on selections of Mr. Mandela's words, with reference to their relevance for the path taken for educational reform and transformation in general in South Africa. Examples of pedagogical approaches reported by Jansen (2009) and Soudien et al. (2015) who illustrated the manner in which some elements of Mr. Mandela's message might be operationalised to inspire students to engage in self-reflection and reconciliation in educational settings. The chapter offer analysis of the two aspects of concern over the vulnerability of Mr. Mandela's legacy. First, in the so-called "born free" generation, the post-apartheid generation of South Africans whose profile reveals significant evidence of how many more "hills to climb" there are in the overall route to transformation in South Africa. Secondly, is Mr. Mandela's legacy vulnerable to political expediency and to societal amnesia?

Introduction

The legacy of Nelson Mandela remains a powerful force as South Africa moves through the third decade of democracy. He was the new nation's first President and champion of a non-racial democracy for a better life for all. Mr. Mandela's words in speeches, writings and observations galvanised sentiment over the goals for transformation, and how these might be achieved in all sectors including education. His words contained insights with powerful relevance for research and other endeavours in the field of comparative and international education, and in many other fields of scholarship.

In this chapter, I examine some of the lessons and insights contained within a selection of Mr. Mandela's words, and the example he set in his own life and actions.

D. B. Napier (✉)
Comparative and International Education, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA
e-mail: dnapier@uga.edu

J. Zajda (ed.), *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms*, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 20,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1743-2_9

These lessons and insights have proved to be enduring and relevant to post-apartheid transformation and educational reform in South Africa, to struggles for democracy worldwide, and also to the universal human struggle for freedom and a better life.

Mr. Mandela was prescient in many of his statements, since he was correct in noting in 1999 that the "long walk continues" (quoted in Asmal et al. 2003, p.176). In the years to follow, the path of transformation and non-racial democracy was to remain a challenging one in education, but in other sectors too. Mr. Mandela's wisdom was to prevail. In his own life and actions, Mr. Mandela set an example of taking the high road and of being realistic about the challenges. His urgings to all were for developing an awareness of self, of the individual's role in transformation, and of the need to continue learning throughout life.

First, I present reflections on selections of Mr. Mandela's words with reference to their relevance for the path taken for educational reform and transformation in general in South Africa. I begin my reflections with a quotation of Mr. Mandela's words that was to become immensely significant to me in my own work and I provide an overview of salient features of the educational reform and transformation story. Next, I cite examples of pedagogical approaches reported by Jansen (2009) and Soudien et al. (2015) who illustrated the manner in which some elements of Mr. Mandela's message might be operationalised to inspire students to engage in self-reflection and reconciliation in educational settings. Taking different approaches, they explored the question: how can students and educational leaders honour Mr. Mandela's legacy by acting to participate in personal learning leading to reconciliation? Then I reflect on some aspects of the universal relevance of Mr. Mandela's emphasis of the importance of education, and education as a vehicle for social change worldwide.

Following this, I offer commentary on two aspects of concern over the vulnerability of Mr. Mandela's legacy. First, in the so-called "born free" generation, the post-apartheid generation of South Africans whose profile reveals significant evidence of how many more "hills to climb" there are in the overall route to transformation in South Africa. In education, with connections to the dynamics in larger society, there are fresh concerns over the real progress made in race relations, and in non-racial democratic transformation and in this younger generation. There emerges a question of whether or not the legacy of Mr. Mandela is at risk of being overlooked or forgotten if, today, students and other youth—or society and its leadership—fail to remember, or are ignorant of, the massive progress achieved in earlier decades, and if a resurgence in bitterness and race animosity overrides the ongoing need for reconciliation and transformation. Secondly, is Mr. Mandela's legacy vulnerable to political expediency and to societal amnesia? I illustrate with an example from recent threats by former-President Zuma to withdraw South Africa from the International Criminal Court (ICC), juxtaposed with a return to optimism under a new President. I conclude with some thoughts on the lessons inherent in Mr. Mandela's life, his actions, and his words, as well as the hope for the future regarding his legacy.

Education and Transformation in South Africa

Mr. Mandela closed his autobiography with reflections on his own life to that point, on his personal struggles and experiences in the liberation struggle, and on the achievements and challenges remaining:

> I have walked the long road to freedom. I have tried not to falter. I have made mistakes along the way. But I have discovered the secret that after climbing a great hill, one only finds that there are many more hills to climb. I have taken a moment here to rest, to steal a view of the glorious vista that surrounds me, to look back on the distance I have come. But, I can rest only for a moment, for with freedom comes responsibilities, and I dare not linger, for my long walk is not yet ended (Mandela 1994 p. 544).

These words contained a powerful message of hope but also of the realities of the challenges that he faced in his own life, and that the nation faced in the struggle for liberation. In earlier writings I explained that these words "helped me retain perspective while investigating the complexities of educational transformation in South Africa" (closing quote in Brook Napier 2003a, p. 70; also see Napier 2014, p. 969). Hope and uncertainty were recurring themes in my research, in the perspectives of educators at all levels in the reforming system. On my choice of this quotation as a defining focus for my writing in an earlier publication (see Footnote 1), Soudien added his comment (in the introduction) that:

> A realisation of this - 'there are many more hills to climb' – brings Mandela to a central insight about the *self*. Interesting about this *self* in Mandela is the centrality of education. This *self* had to make a commitment to never stop learning. It is this commitment, interestingly, from which *hope* springs because it is through learning that alternatives present themselves to one (Soudien 2014, p. 969).

Commenting on his own hopes and those for the nation, Mr. Mandela observed "Many of us will have to pass through the valley of the shadow of death again and again before we reach the mountain-tops of our desires" (quoted in Crwys-Williams 1997, p. 37). Likening his own life struggle to the wider struggles for the nation, in 1999 he urged: "Together we must continue our efforts to turn our hopes into reality.... The long walk continues." (Quoted in Asmal et al. 2003, p. 176). He also emphasised the importance of grassroots involvement. Referring to the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), the sector-wide blueprint for the first years of post-apartheid reforms, and to the Freedom Charter manifesto for "A Better Life for All" that became the ANC's campaign slogan, Mr. Mandela urged South Africans that "We cannot do it all for you, you must do it yourselves" (Mandela 1994, pp. 534–535). These messages remain ever relevant today.

Regarding education, Mr. Mandela had strong words about the apartheid-era Bantu education system. He called it "intellectual *baasskap*, a way of institutionalizing inferiority" (p.145). At the time, Hartshorne (1992) detailed the challenges of destroying that monolithic system. While achievements over the past two decades *did* destroy that system, "many more hills to climb" remain today. In the early years of transformation Johnson (1995, p.134) identified the many "barriers to participation". Many of the old apartheid-era inequities persisted as "backlogs" of exclusion in the early years of reform (Brook 1996, p. 212), and then also in more recent years for instance in persistently impoverished remote-area and township schools, and in loss of earlier gains in teaching indigenous languages. This is so despite the huge gains and improvements in the overall system. I have documented these persistent issues in much of my writing in subsequent years to the present era (see citations in Footnote 2 and elsewhere in this chapter). The indicators of persistent inequities were reported in the research cited below, and updated more recently by Ndebele (2016, 2017).

The words of Mr. Mandela quoted previously are but a few of his many statements with relevance for educational transformation, as the "long walk" in education proved to contain many highs and lows, cycles of hope and uncertainty, and consistent need for grassroots involvement. A sampling of illustrations follows. Hopes were high during early transition, 1994–1999. Christie (1990), Hartshorne (1992), Jansen (1997), and McGurk (1990) were among those who articulated the daunting challenges to create a new non-racial education system. The achievements included pioneering efforts in progressive "open" schools, restructuring of all government schools, and massively expanding access to schooling. Uncertainty set in early as inequities persisted, strikes dogged the reform effort, and new problems surfaced. The South African Schools Act of 1996 has been one piece of landmark legislation lacking the specificity to deal with much situation-specific implementation. "Rationalisation," policies to collapse colleges and other institutions into one system, provoked much local anxiety and resistance. Successive rounds of curriculum reform and the dilemma of how best to train and *retrain* teachers presented other challenges. The imported system of Outcomes Based Education (OBE) became highly contested, as Jansen (1997) described. Top-down mandates often faltered due to woefully insufficient support and training of teachers, unrealistic implementation timelines, and lack of local support. As Jansen (2004, p. 216) noted, "the entire system was woefully underprepared for the complexities of this new approach to education." Brook (1996), Brook-Napier (2003b, 2009), Jansen (2009), Jansen and Christie (1999), Sayed (2004) and many others documented the rocky road of educational transformation.

In recent years, the "skills crisis" became a priority, related to shortfalls primarily in mathematics and science, intersecting with language-related disadvantage for non-English speaking learners (see for example Mbekwa and Vuyokazi 2013). The need for local support was seen again in implementing the Integrated Framework for Teacher Education and Development—a blueprint to 2025 (Department of Basic Education 2005). But hope also returned from time to time, such as during the 2010 World Cup festivities that highlighted all achievements in the new South Africa. That euphoria was short lived, as talk of "schools in crisis" arose with resurgent racism in some schools, high unemployment, crippling strikes, and still-sparse evidence of transformation in remotest-area schools (Brook Napier 2012). Mr. Mandela's references to "many more hills to climb" continue to have relevance for the path of transformation in education and other sectors.

By 2016, the record confirmed this again. Cronje (2016) summarised the suite of problems facing the education sector, noting first the "turmoil in universities and growing concern about South Africa's economic prospects" and itemising the educational concerns including high dropout rates and low throughput rates, only 4 in 10 schools having a computer facility, and only 2 in 10 having a laboratory, only 11% of grade 9 pupils having numeracy rates as expected, and the overall rate of pupils passing mathematics with 70% or higher having fallen by 30% since 2008. Further, Cronje mentioned the persistent issue of racial inequalities that leave African pupils still disproportionately disadvantaged over all other groups and that suffer from disadvantaged living conditions that impact educational performance. Cronje noted many successes however, such as in higher education transformation, enrolment and output, but he added that the real progress tends to benefit only a small number of Africans who were well schooled.

The "hills to climb" might be viewed as the gaps in the overall progress landscape, as illustrated by the following statistics drawn from Ndebele (2016). There are measurably huge gains in prominent indicators of progress such as expanded participation rates in the high 90% range for pupils in public schools, and in degrees awarded to Africans showing an increase of over 400% in 1991–2013 (p. 550). In 2015 staff vacancy rates (teachers, deputy principals and principals) in government schools were zero or miniscule (<10%) in the urbanised provinces such as Gauteng and the Free State, while in rural provinces such as the Eastern Cape and North West Province the rates were much higher (for example 10.9% teacher vacancies in Eastern Cape, 17% principal posts in North West Province). Vacancy rates such as theses mean that classrooms and learners are not served and affected schools lack leadership personnel) (pp. 474–475). Public schools that lack stocked libraries were still noticeably high in the rural provinces—91.6% in the Eastern Cape; 93.5% in Limpopo for instance (p. 482). While many more learners were in school than ever before and one must never underestimate the huge overall gains in expanding education to learners of all races, low throughput rates dogged the overall vitality of the system. Throughput rates are measured as the proportion of learners enrolled in grade 1 in 2003 who stayed in school to grade 12 in 2014—only half the learners made this progression: 1,277,499 versus 571,819 learners. Further, of that 2003 cohort of grade 1 learners, a severely reduced number actually earned matric and bachelor's passes (11.8% in the case of the latter passes) and the pass rates were consistently higher for white pupils (98.3%) than the total which included all and therefore black pupils (75.8%) with stark differentials by province where pass rates in the rural provinces of Eastern Cape and KwaZulu Natal were only 65.4% and 69.7% respectively (p. 492). In addition, throughput rates have actually declined somewhat. In comparisons of the 1995–1997 and 2012–2014, the throughputs of grade 10 learners who became matric or National Senior Certificate candidates were 5% lower in the latter period (p. 500). Overall inequities exist in government schooling. Meanwhile, independent schools offering allegedly better schooling have risen in number quite notably from a total of 971 in the year 2000 to 1681 in 2014 (an increase of 73.1%). Interestingly, the largest increases were in rural provinces suggesting some filling in of the educational provision gaps in these provinces, for example a 356.4% increase in Eastern Cape and a 145% increase in Limpopo (p. 486). By 2016, the unemployment rate among those who had completed secondary education was 27.3%, while it was 12/2% among those who had completed tertiary education, both statistics serving as indicators of the education-employment gap that persists despite progress made over the past years (Ndebele 2017). In short, the story in education remains a validation of Mandela's words of caution and his words of wisdom about the practicalities and challenges of transformation.

Education and Societal Change for Reparation and Reconciliation: Working with Students

Jansen (2009, p. 203) offered compelling illustrations of how important education was for Mr. Mandela, for bringing about change in South Africa. As the Dean of Education at the former all-white Afrikaans University of Pretoria, Jansen noted that the "challenge facing us as a Faculty of Education was as complex as it was clear: how to do reparation and reconciliation at the same time." He found in the example of Mr. Mandela strong guidance to commit himself to doing both of these. This approach, he said, "found its echo in the broader terms of social transition, one represented in the incomparable example of Nelson Mandela. …the process I was to lead within the institution would find its political corollary within the surrounding society, and this knowledge gave me courage and direction" (ibid).

Reflecting on the importance of hope, Jansen (2009) suggested a pedagogical strategy for assisting students to participate in the processes of and reparation and reconciliation:

> One pedagogical story told by a black parent to the next generation might be to see Nelson Mandela imprisoned for his beliefs by evil white captors: a complementary way of telling the story is to show how he imprisoned his white guards by the sheer force of his moral authority and his political cause. On its own, the first story leads to despair: the second story signals hope (Jansen 2009, p. 272).

More recently, Jansen (2016) made the argument that, in universities, educational leaders (faculty and administrators) need to set the tone and the example, in the spirit of reparation and reconciliation. Jansen described the "messiness of change" and the need to communicate the "true non-linearity of change" (p. 216) in university settings as educational leaders struggle to provide learning environments conducive to transformation in all respects. These characterizations are akin to Mr. Mandela's warnings about change and "more hills to climb" (Brook Napier 2017).

Jansen offered a series of recommendations to university personnel. His message was particularly aimed at those involved in desegregating former white university campuses, but the recommendations have general relevance for sound educational administrative policy and program development both in South Africa and in other countries. Among others, Jansen's recommendations were to "adopt a set of simple, strong and consistent entry messages" (setting an appropriate tone in the institution), design carefully a "co-curriculum (including addressing difficult issues such as racism often not taught in regular curricula or programs of study)", and "model what is wanted from students in one's own leadership choices and example" (pp. 203–206). One might suggest that the approach of engaging directly over issues such as race divisions and tensions recommended by Jansen today evokes sentiments voiced by Mr. Mandela on many occasions in earlier years. For instance, at a rally in Cape Town in 1990, Mr. Mandela stated: "I appeal to young people and all those on the ground: start talking to each other across divisions of race and political organizations." ... "I pay tribute to the endless heroism of youth" (Quoted in Crwys-Williams 2010, pp. 143–144). In the spirit of reconciliation and moving forward, Jansen's contemporary context strategies for achieving these would apply equally at lower levels in any education system, not just at university level.

In keeping with the pedagogical example set by Mandela that Jansen described, Soudien et al. (2015) reported on another pedagogical approach, in which university students write and reflect to articulate their identities in post-apartheid South African society and in Africa. These authors reported that their research findings demonstrated how many students struggle to grasp where they fit in the society, how they see themselves in a reconfigured societal makeup, and what role they see for themselves. This approach too has potentially wide applicability both in other university settings in South Africa and elsewhere but also in school settings and programs.

The Overarching Need for Education in South Africa, and Everywhere

In most general terms, Mr. Mandela emphasised the overarching need for education in South Africa. In 1998 in a speech at the opening of a new senior secondary school in Qunu, South Africa, he stated: "Among the steps government has taken to upgrade our education system, the Culture of Learning, Teaching and Services Campaign is one of the most important. I urge teachers and learners to commit themselves to education and to ensure discipline in schools." (Quoted in Asmal et al. 2003, p. 256). At the launching of the South African Democratic Teachers' Union (SADTU) in October 1990, in his keynote address Mr. Mandela noted that "SADTU should be a professional teacher body that encouraged the teaching of pupils in the classroom" (quoted in Hartshorne 1992, p. 322). Mr. Mandela's calls remain urgent today, as this "culture" has proven very difficult to cultivate uniformly in all schools, and in teacher training and practice in South Africa (see for example Mbekwa and Vuyokazi 2013; Sayed 2004; Jansen 2009: 218; Jansen 2016).

In addition, Mr. Mandela's sentiments about the importance education truly had universal relevance. Being acutely aware of the most micro-level of needs in South Africa he urged to "make every home, every shack or rickety structure a centre of learning" (quoted in Crwys-Williams 2010, p. 36). This call in the South African context evoked what was to become a worldwide goal of Education for All in which education was to be recognised as a fundamental human right everywhere. The global reach of his message and example has extended to many countries, particularly to post-colonial states facing the challenges of developing and democratising their education systems and of overcoming a legacy of racism. Invariably, education has a key role to play in the broader processes of democratization and transformation in other countries, as in South Africa. Programs to effect reconciliation and social transition and to promote more harmonious race relations (including and especially in education) commonly invoke the ideals promoted by Mr. Mandela (Brook Napier 2017). Illustrations of such educational reform undertakings in Cuba, New Zealand, Australia, Kenya and Brazil—among others—are documented in Brook Napier (2005, 2010, 2015a, b). Among all of the instances worldwide, Cuba is a most prominent example of a country undertaking democratic transformation and deracialisation, with close ties to Mr. Mandela's legacy and influence. Turner Marti et al. (2015) described the educational reform process in Cuba and the importance of education in overcoming that country's history of racial discrimination. The Cuban case contains a heavy presence of Mr. Mandela's message and example, given his long-term close relationship with President Fidel Castro, the Cubans' recognition of Mandela's contributions to human rights struggles (he was awarded the Jose Marti Prize in Matanzas, Cuba during a visit in 1991), and a history of ties between the two countries that share legacies of slavery and racial inequality, colonial domination, and underdevelopment. A more detailed account of the longstanding connections between the two countries and of the relationship between Presidents Castro and Mandela can be found in Brook Napier (2006).

In short, Mr. Mandela became more than a national leader championing human rights, non-racism, and democracy in all respects in South Africa: he became a global leader and icon, someone whose message resonated with people involved in liberation struggles worldwide, and whose contributions were widely recognized including in his being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1993 (with then-State President FW de Klerk). In like vein, Mr. Mandela's legacy and calls for universal and democratic education transcended the national level to become part of the global level imperative for the advance of education as a key component of a better life for all people. Whether implicitly or explicitly, Mr. Mandela's call to "make every home, every shack or rackety structure a centre of learning" (cited above), and his legacy and influence, might be viewed as a part of the foundation underlying the contemporary global level undertakings such as in Education For All (EFA), the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and the Global Education First Initiative (GEFI) (United Nations 2007, 2014; UNESCO 2012). Specific cases and examples can be found in Soudien (2017) who offered a collection of reflections on the significance of Mandela's legacy for education both in South Africa and elsewhere.

Considering the issues of transformation, societal change, and working with students, in the following section some issues and concerns are presented, related to the security and durability of Mr. Mandela's legacy. Where does the legacy of Mr. Mandela stand when it comes to South Africans who did not live under apartheid and who do not have the same frame of reference for his example and message? How durable is Mr. Mandela's legacy of leadership and example regarding justice and human rights in general?

The Born Free Generation, Political Expediency, and Mandela's Legacy?

Is Mr. Mandela's legacy under threat, at risk? Unfortunately, in recent years there has emerged some indication of threat to the power of his legacy. First, there is the risk that his legacy might be overlooked or ignored in part or in whole. In this regard, there is an issue related to the so-called "born free" portion of the population. These are generally considered to be those children and young people in South Africa who were born in the post-apartheid era, including the 0–19 age group, but also those in the 20–24 age group who are considered too young to have clear memory of the apartheid system that was being dismantled when they were born. Considering this generation in the context of Mr. Mandela's legacy is important for several reasons. First, he remarked on his own life history with regard to "youth." In one example, in a speech on Bastille Day in Paris on 14 July, 1996 he remarked: "I admire young people who are concerned with the affairs of their community and nation perhaps because I also became involved in struggle whilst I was still at school" (Quoted in Crwys-Williams 2010, p.143). Second, people in this generation number 27 million, amounting to half the country's population, and of this total, some 3.24 million are orphans having lost one or both parents. Issues pertaining to this generation are of special importance with regard to the future of the country and its development. Third, the work of Soudien et al. (2015) and of Jansen (2016) mentioned earlier in this chapter is pertinent since these authors addressed issues for students who are members of this generation.

Reporting on current statistics and societal issues, Cronje and Kane-Berman (2015) examined the demographic profile, and the needs related to this generation of South Africans. They document information with regard to the improved life that many of these persons do lead in many respects, but also regarding the overriding problems that many members of this generation experience including high unemployment, persistent disadvantage in schooling, and resulting inability to participate economically. The disadvantage remains disproportionately among African youth, the largest demographic group, despite significant gains in many respects during the post-apartheid era. For instance, while Africans account for more than two thirds of all university students, only 16% of Africans in the 20–24 year age bracket are enrolled in universities. Overall, the suite of negatives impacting vast numbers of born frees leads them to feelings of exclusion, alienation and frustration. The Youth Desk in the Presidency reported that young people feel politically excluded because of high unemployment and their inability to be participants in the economy of the country (cited in Cronje and Kane-Berman 2015, p. 2). Proposals in this report included calls for a predictable array of reforms in local government, education, labour laws, economic growth, and so on. The final proposal focused on "*self-help*" with a recommendation that "Critically, 'born frees' have to develop the capacity to drive these processes themselves through the skilled exploitation of democratic institutions" (p.34). This is interesting if one recalls the quote of Mr. Mandela cited early in this chapter, i.e. "We cannot do it all for you, you must do it yourselves" (Mandela 1994, pp. 534–535). His spirit and message prevail.

There arises a concern regarding the born free generation, that they do not possess the same direct frame of reference for Mr. Mandela's wisdom and influence. Having been born after the apartheid era, they have a removed—indirect, if at all—frame of reference for the struggle and for his leadership and example within it. The concern surfaces in considerations of the student protests and actions on university campuses in recent years. For example, Jansen (2016) reported at length on the so-called Reitz scandal that rocked the former white university where he is a top administrator. The events in that scandal went viral on video worldwide, showing white students engaging in blatantly racist actions. On other campuses and at other times in recent years, former white universities have experienced significant rounds of student protests over an array of grievances that the protesters presented as perceived persistent injustices and racial inequities that kept black students victimised. Protests have taken on various forms of race resentment as well—white against black, and also anti-colonial or anti-whiteness. For a recent example, see the Economist (2016a) on "whiteness burning" and "anti-colonial" backlash against symbols of white or colonial power such as statues and art.

A second example of a concern over the vulnerability of Mr. Mandela's legacy emerged in an issue related not to education but to South Africa's membership in the International Criminal Court (ICC) (www.icc-cpi.int) established to try individuals for war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity. The Court was established under the Rome Statute in 2012 and ratified by 124 countries including South Africa. As summarised below, Campbell (2017) outlined the basic ingredients of a case that essentially violated the legacy of Nelson Mandela, his track record of championing justice and human rights, and his role as one of the founders of the ICC. The ANC government incorporated the Treaty of Rome into South African law making a violation of the ICC also a violation of South African law. Under the Treaty of Rome, if a person indicted by the ICC falls into the hands of one of the signatory states, that state is obligated to turn the person over to the court. Sudanese leader Omar al-Bashir visited South Africa in 2016 for an African Union summit meeting. Bashir was indicted by the ICC for crimes in Darfur, and the ICC issued a warrant for his arrest in 2009, but he was not detained by then-President Zuma during his visit to Pretoria, and further Zuma facilitated his quick departure in the face of South African courts moving toward arresting Bashir. By his actions, South Africa's President Zuma had contravened the provisions of the ICC. On 19 October 2016, the United Nations treaty office confirmed receipt of South Africa's notification of intent to withdraw from the ICC—President Zuma announced his intent to withdraw South Africa from membership in the ICC, without Parliamentary approval. and/or possibly to deflect attention from his own problems at home. In February 2017 the South African High Court declared such departure would be "unconstitutional and Invalid" since only Parliament could change the law to allow South Africa to leave the ICC. As noted by Campbell, many South Africans regard the ICC as part of Mandela's legacy of non-racial democracy and the rule of law. Similarly, Goldstone, chair of the Coalition for the ICC's advisory board noted that "It is an act that is demeaning of our Parliament and of the people of South Africa. From a moral standpoint, it detracts from the inspiring legacy of the administration of President Nelson Mandela that so strongly supported the ICC and all of the mechanisms of international justice" (Quoted in Global Justice 2016). A plethora of other reports and commentary pieces appeared in the international and South African press (for sampling, see du Plessis and Allison 2016; Seils 2017; Sieff and Mahr 2016; Economist 2016b). While the South African High Court blocked the move as unconstitutional, and at the time of writing this paper there had been no further action regarding withdrawal, the entire episode pointed to an abandonment of Nelson Mandela's principles, and to a potential threat to justice and human rights on a larger scale. The issue emerged as a stark example of how easily Mr. Mandela's legacy of leadership appears to be vulnerable to political expediency on the part of subsequent leaders.

Is the message of Mr. Mandela at risk of being forgotten or dismantled in the midst of such events and actions? Are the tremendous victories and gains of the more than two decades of democracy being forgotten or ignored? Hopefully not, but it is worrying to contemplate the degree of bitterness erupting in such events as the student protests mentioned above. What role is there for educational leaders (teachers and administrators alike) to keep alive the legacy of Mr. Mandela in the hearts and minds of the born free generation (too)? Can leadership and actions such as those recommended by Jansen be harnessed to address the need? The legacy of Mr. Mandela should hold special promise for the born frees and through education and leadership his example surely needs to be remembered and followed. Additionally, how can his wider legacy be protected against dismantling by actions motivated by political expediency at the highest level, such as occurred in the ICC case described above? Following the re-election of Cyril Ramaphosa as President in mid-2019, it remains to be seen whether or not the negative impacts of the Zuma era will be overcome, and whether or not Nelson Mandela's legacy might prevail once more.

However, there emerged fresh hope in the developments of late 2017 and early 2018 when President Zuma was ousted and Cyril Ramaphosa assumed the Presidency, elected as leader of the ANC in December 2017. The country, and the international community, quickly jumped on these dramatic developments. In the international press the concept of "hope" featured once again, investing hope in Ramaphosa to turn around the negative legacy of the preceding years of rule. As noted in one international report, "The prospect of his (Ramaphosa's) presidency has already inspired some of the optimism that greeted that of Nelson Mandela, who was elected president in 1994 and who had wanted Mr Ramaphosa to be his successor"... further that "Optimistic South Africans speculate that he may pick up Mandela's mantle" (Economist, February 15, 2018a, b). As before, the optimism comes tinged with reservations about schisms within the ANC as well as the uncertain effectiveness of the opposition Democratic Alliance (DA) to help steer a path for change (Economist, April 13, 2018a).

Conclusion

In the selection of Mr. Mandela's words presented in this paper, and in the example he set for reconciliation and for future development, one sees several lessons: to retain sight of the overarching goals for educational (and other) transformation, in societal context, and despite setbacks linked to the minutiae of reforms; to retain hope; and to face the challenges with dignity and tenacity. There is even a lesson in Mr. Mandela's choice of words. He articulated his messages in plain language: he reached a wider audience as a result. Perhaps one of his most far-reaching and most often voiced messages was to retain hope but also to accept the past. For example, in an address to the Joint Houses of Parliament on 11 July 1996 he noted that: "No society emerging out of the grand disaster of the apartheid system can avoid carrying the blemishes of the past" (Quoted in Crwys-Williams 2010, p.123). Recent surveys of race relations in South Africa documented public opinions on a variety of indicators that all groups of South Africans have actually moved toward a more harmonious overall race relations landscape and that there is indeed reason for hope despite the challenges remaining (SAIRR 2016, 2018). In the latter survey, one key finding was that 77% of African respondents reported that they had never experienced racism directly aimed at them. Echoing Mr. Mandela's earlier calls, the same percentage of African respondents reported that the key issues for progress and reducing differences between the races are better education and more jobs. However, the survey results in 2017 reiterated concerns about ongoing racial animosity and racial division (SAIRR 2018, p. 3).

Even before his death in December 2013, people pondered how Mr. Mandela's legacy would be honoured in South Africa among all South Africans, also across Africa and worldwide. On the question of how he wanted to be remembered, Mr. Mandela remarked that: "Whatever my wishes might be, I cannot bind future generations to remember me in the particular way I would like." (Quoted in Crwys-Williams 2010, p. 51). In 1999, upon returning to his home in Qunu, Mr. Mandela commented: "On my last day I want to know that those who remain behind will say: 'The man who lies here has done his duty to his country and his people.'" (Quoted in Crwys-Williams 2010, p. 59). One hopes that Mr. Mandela's legacy, and his words and example, will indeed be remembered and will offer inspiration for a long time to come. Equally, one hopes that the generations of South African students who did not directly experience the liberation struggle, and who therefore have a different frame of reference for Mandela's legacy, will nonetheless pay heed to his wisdom in terms of education and transformation, and in terms of how individuals might engage in both reparation and reconciliation. There emerges an imperative to keep his legacy alive and intact, and to act on it not only in education but also in all spheres of life in the future years, and at all levels of society.

References

Asmal, K., Chidester, D., & James, W. (Eds.). (2003). *Nelson Mandela: From freedom to the future. Tributes and speeches* (pp. 172–176). Cape Town: Jonathan Ball.

Brook, D. L. (1996). From exclusion to inclusion: Racial politics and South African educational reform. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 27*(2), 204–231.

Brook Napier, D. (2003a). Chapter 2 Language issues in South Africa. In P. M. Ryan & R. Terborg (Eds.), *Language: Issues of inequality* (pp. 41–75). Mexico City: Universidad Nacionale Autonoma De Mexico (UNAM).

Brook Napier, D. (2003b). Chapter 2 Transformations in South Africa: Policies and practices from ministry to classroom. In K. Anderson-Levitt (Ed.), *Local meanings, global schooling: Anthropology and world culture theory* (pp. 52–74). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brook Napier, D. (2005). Chapter 3 Implementing educational transformation policies: Investigating issues of ideal versus real in developing countries. In D. P. Baker & A. W. Wiseman (Eds.), *Global trends in educational policy* (International perspectives on education and society) (Vol. 6, pp. 59–98). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.

Brook Napier, D. (2006). Education, social justice and development in South Africa and Cuba: Comparisons and connections. *Education and Society, 24*(2), 5–23.

Brook Napier, D. (2009). South Africa's struggles to compete globally, and to meet internal educational needs. *Curriculum and Teaching, 24*(2), 27–52.

Brook Napier, D. (2010). African socialism, post-colonial development, and education: Change and continuity in the post-socialist era. In I. Silova (Ed.), *Post-Socialism is not dead: (Re)reading the global in comparative education* (International perspectives on education and society) (Vol. 14, pp. 369–399). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing, Limited.

Brook Napier, D. (2012). Globalization and transformation in South Africa: The hosting of the world cup. *Education and Society, 30*(1), 53–73.

Brook Napier, D. (2015a). *International perspectives on race (and Racism): Historical and contemporary considerations in education and society*. Hauppauge/New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

Brook Napier, D. (2015b). Chapter 1 race and racism worldwide: A panorama of perspectives and contextual complexities. In D. Brook Napier (Ed.), *International perspectives on race (and Racism): Historical and contemporary considerations in education and society* (pp. 1–36). Hauppauge/New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

Brook Napier, D. (2017). "Chapter 12 … many more hills to climb": Reflections on the legacy of Nelson Mandela and the relevance for educational transformation. In C. Soudien (Ed.), *Nelson Mandela: Comparative perspectives of his significance for education* (pp. 151–164). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Campbell, J. (2017). *South African high court blocks South Africa's departure from the ICC*. Council on Foreign Relations, blog post March 2, 2017. www.cfr.org/blog/south-african-high-court-blocks-pretorias-departure-icc. Accessed 1 June 2017.

Christie, P. (Ed.). (1990). *Open schools: Racially mixed Catholic schools in South Africa, 1978–1986*. Johannesburg: Ravan.

Cronje, F. (2016). Schools Drag South Africa Down. *Fast Facts* No. 2, February 2016, Issue 294. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

Cronje, F. (Ed. in Chief), & Kane-Berman, J. (2015). *Born free but still in chains: South Africa's post-apartheid generation*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

Crwys-Williams, J. (Ed.). (1997). *In the words of Nelson Mandela: A little pocketbook*. Sandton: Penguin Books South Africa.

Crwys-Williams, J. (Ed.). (2010). *In the words of Nelson Mandela*. New York: Walker &.

Department of Basic Education and Higher Education and Training. (2005). *Integrated strategic planning framework for teacher education and development in South Africa, 2011–2025*. Pretoria: Departments of Basic Education and Higher Education and Training.

du Plessis, A., & Allison, S. (2016). *By leaving the ICC, South Africa has abandoned Nelson Mandela's principles*. Retrieved from http://www.newsweek.com/leaving-icc-south-africa-has-abandoned-nelson-mandelas-principles-512564

Economist. (2016a). Whiteness burning: Students are throwing "colonial" art on the pyre. *The Economist,* February 20–26, 2016, pp. 42–43.

Economist. (2016b). The International Criminal Court: Exit South Africa. A terrible blow for the court, and for a beleaguered country. *Economist Online*, October 27, 2016. www.Economist.com. Accessed 1 June 2017.

Economist. (2018a). Jacob Zuma resigns. The disastrous legacy of Jacob Zuma. South Africa's lost decade. *Economist online*. Retrieved from https://www.economist.com/news/middle-east-and-africa/21737023-south-africas-lost-decade

Economist. (2018b). No one to gripe about: With Zuma gone, South Africa's opposition needs a new scapegoat. April 14, 2018. *Economist online*. https://www.economist.com/news/middle-east-and-africa/21740476-they-can-longer-define-themselves-their-disgust-terrible-president. Accessed 13 Apr 2018.

Global Justice. (2016). *Mandela legacy on the line as South Africa moves to leave ICC*. Global Justice blog, posted October 21, 2016. https://ciccglobaljustice.wordpress.com/2016/10/21/mandela-legacy-on-the-line-as-south-africa-moves-to-leave-icc/

Hartshorne, K. (1992). *Crisis and challenge: Black education 1910–1990*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Jansen, J. D. (1997). Can policy learn? Reflections on "Why OBE will fail". In *Outcomes education and the new curriculum*. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand, Education Policy Unit, Educational Seminar Series, unpublished document.

Jansen, J. D. (2004). Importing outcomes-based education into South Africa: Policy borrowing in a post-communist world. In D. Phillips & K. Ochs (Eds.), *Educational policy borrowing: Historical perspectives* (pp. 199–220). Oxford: Symposium.

Jansen, J. D. (2009). *Knowledge in the blood: Confronting race and the apartheid past*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Jansen, J. D. (2016). *Leading for change: Race, intimacy and leadership on divided university campuses*. Abingdon/Oxford: Routledge.

Jansen, J. D., & Christie, P. (Eds.). (1999). *Changing curriculum: Studies in outcomes based education in South Africa*. Cape Town: Juta.

Johnson, D. (1995). Introduction: The challenges of educational reconstruction and transformation in South Africa. *Comparative Education, 31*(2), 131–140.

Mandela, N. R. (1994). *Long walk to freedom: The autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. Boston: Little Brown.

Mandela, N. R. (1998). Leaders of tomorrow. Speech at the opening of Dalindyebo Senior Secondary School, Qunu, 14th August 1998. In K. Asmal, D. Chidester, & W. James (Eds.), *Nelson Mandela: From freedom to the future. Tributes and speeches* (pp. 255–256). Cape Town: Jonathan Ball.

Mandela, N. R. (1999). The long walk continues. Speech at the final sitting of the first democratically elected Parliament, Cape Town, 26 March, 1999. In K. Asmal, D. Chidester, & W. James (Eds.), *Nelson Mandela: From freedom to the future: Tributes and speeches* (pp. 172–176). Cape Town: Jonathan Ball.

Mbekwa, M., & Vuyokazi, N. (2013). Chapter 8 voices from the classroom: Teacher and learner perceptions on the use of the learners' home language in the teaching and learning of school mathematics and science. In D. Brook Napier & S. Majhanovich (Eds.), *Education, dominance and identity* (pp. 133–152). Sense: Rotterdam.

McGurk, N. J. (1990). *I speak as a white: Education, culture, nation*. Marshalltown: Heinemann Southern Africa.

Napier, D. (2014). … many more hills to climb': Reflections on the legacy of Nelson Mandela and its relevance for educational transformation.' In Soudien, C (Ed.) Thinking about the significance of Nelson Mandela for education. *Compare, 44*(6), 969–973.

Ndebele, T. (2016). Education. In *South Africa Survey 2016* (pp. 437–558). Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

Ndebele, T. (2017). Education statistics and summary. In *South Africa Survey 2017* (pp. 459–581). Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

Sayed, Y. (2004). The case of teacher education in post-apartheid South Africa: Politics and priorities. In L. Chisholm (Ed.), *Changing class: Education and social change in post apartheid South Africa* (pp. 247–266). New York: Human Sciences Research Council.

Seils, P. (2017). Op-Ed: In South Africa's date with ICC destiny, Mandela's legacy is a beacon to follow. *Daily Maverick: Africa, 17*(04). Retrieved from www.dailymaverick.co.za.

Sieff, K., & Mahr, K. (2016). South Africa says it will quit the International Criminal Court. *Washington Post/Africa* online. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/.../0eb8aa66978f11e69cae2a3574e296a6_story.ht. Accessed 1 June 2017.

Soudien, C. (Ed.). (2014). Thinking about the significance of Nelson Mandela for education. *Compare, 44*(6), 969–973.

Soudien, C. (Ed.). (2017). *Nelson Mandela: Comparative perspectives of his significance for education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Soudien, C., Sayed, Y., & Pillay, S. K. (2015). Chapter the making of identity and Africa: Voices in the struggle to be African in South Africa. In D. Brook Napier (Ed.), *International perspectives on race (and Racism): Historical and contemporary considerations in education and society* (pp. 159–176). Hauppauge/New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

South African Institute of Race Relations. (2018). *Race relations in South Africa: Reasons for hope, holding the line*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations. March 2018 report on survey commissioned in December 2017 by Victory Research.

South African Institute of Race Relations. (2016). *Race relations in South Africa: Reasons for hope*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations. March 2016 Report.

Turner Marti, L., Martin Sabina, E., & Enriquez O'Farrill, I. J. (2015). Chapter 13 The role of Cuba's educational system towards eliminating racial discrimination. In D. Brook Napier (Ed.), *International perspectives on race (and racism): Historical and contemporary considerations in education and society* (pp. 269–291). Hauppauge/New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

UN (United Nations). (2007). *Education for all by 2015: Will we make it? EFA global monitoring report 2008*. Paris: UNESCO/Oxford University Press.

UN (United Nations). (2014). *Millennium development goals report*. New York: UN.

UNESCO. (2012). *Global education first initiative: The UN secretary-general's global initiative on education*. Paris: UNESCO. Retirieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/global-education-first-initiative-gefi/

Chapter 10
Research Priorities and Developments in Education Reforms Globally

Joseph Zajda

Abstract The chapter offers a synthesis of current research findings on globalisation and education reforms, with reference to major paradigms and ideology. The chapter analyses the shifts in methodological approaches to globalisation, education reforms, paradigms, and their impact on education policy and pedagogy. The chapter critiques globalisation, policy and education reforms and suggests the emergence of new economic and political dimensions of cultural imperialism. Such hegemonic shifts in ideology and policy are likely to have significant economic and cultural implications for national education systems, reforms and policy implementations. The chapter also evaluates discourses of globalisation, and the ubiquitous trend towards the international large-scale assessment, and global educational standards. It is suggested there is a need to continue to explore critically the new challenges confronting the global village in the provision of authentic democracy, equality, social justice, against the background of education reforms.

Keywords Academic achievement · Authentic democracy · Business-oriented model of education · Competitive market forces · Critical discourse analysis · Cultural imperialism, discourses of globalisation · Economic inequality · Education reforms · Global citizenship · Globalisation · Human capital · Human rights education · Ideology · Intercultural understanding · Macro-social perspective · Marketisation · Neo-conservatism · Neo-liberal ideology · Paradigms · Performance indicators · Progressive pedagogy · Quality education for all · Social inequality · Social justice · Social stratification · Transformative pedagogy

J. Zajda (✉)
Faculty of Education & Arts, School of Education, Australian Catholic University, East Melbourne, VIC, Australia
e-mail: joseph.zajda@acu.edu.au

J. Zajda (ed.), *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms*, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 20,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1743-2_10

Research Priorities and Developments in Education Reforms Globally: Introduction

Economic, political, cultural and social dimensions of globalisation continue to have a profound effect on education and society, both locally and globally. The ongoing economic restructuring among nation-states, together with the current education hegemonies shaping dominant discourses as to how education policy, standards and curriculum need to be reformed, in response to the ubiquitous global monitoring of educational standards and quality are some of the outcomes of the globalisation process. In critiquing globalisation and its impact on education, we need to know how its 'ideological packaging' affect education practices around the world. As Carnoy and Rhoten (2002), wrote, there was a need to assess a possible nexus between globalisation, ideology, education reforms and their impact on schooling:

> In assessing globalization's true relationship to educational change, we need to know how globalization and its ideological packaging affect the overall delivery of schooling, from transnational paradigms, to national policies, to local practices. (Carnoy and Rhoten 2002, p. 3)

Globalisation impact on educational reforms strategies have resulted in at least **four** macro-social policy responses of the higher education sector globally, to the market forces and competitiveness:

- Competitiveness-driven reforms due to shifting demands for skills, commodities and markets
- Finance-driven reforms in public/private sectors, budgets, company income, cuts in educational spending
- Equity-driven reforms to improve the quality of education and its role as source of upward social mobility) to increase equality of *economic opportunity*
- Market forces–driven reforms for dominance globally. (see also Carnoy 1999)

Globalisation and Competitiveness-Driven Reforms

Globalisation, marketization and *competitiveness-driven* reforms both locally and globally were productivity-centred, involving privatization, decentralization, standards and improved management.

Globalisation and Finance-Driven Reforms

Globalisation resulted in increased competitiveness among nations and adjustment to a new globally dictated "structural" reality – structural adjustment. The main goal is to reduce public spending on education. In competitiveness-driven reforms the goal is to improve the productivity of labour and efficiency of resource use.

Market Forces–Driven Reforms for Dominance Globally

Globalisation resulted in competition for global dominance among nations. It has created economic leagues tables, favouring the few major economies and promoting academic elitism.

Equity-Driven Reforms

The main goal of equity-driven reforms in education and society is to increase economic capital and economic opportunity for all. Because educational attainment is a crucial factor in determining earnings and social positions, equalizing access to high-quality education can play a significant role here. Globalisation-driven higher education reforms tend to "push governments away from equity-driven reforms" (Carnoy 1999, p. 46; Zajda 2015a). This is due to two reasons. Firstly, globalisation tends to increase the pay-off to high-level skills relative to lower-level skills, reducing the nexus between equity and competitiveness-driven reforms. Secondly, finance-driven reforms dominate education and policy reforms in the global economy, and consequently increase inequity in education.

Globalisation has resulted in an aggressive competition for global dominance among nations. This is characterized by a relentless drive towards performance, global standards of excellence and quality, globalization of academic assessment (OECD, PISA), global academic achievement syndrome (OECD, World Bank), global academic elitism and league tables for the universities, and academically performing secondary schools. The latter signifies both ascribed and achieved status, the positioning of distinction, privilege, excellence and exclusivity. In recent education policy documents in the OECD, the World Bank, and elsewhere, policy reforms appear to be presented as a given, and as a necessary response to economic globalization and global competitiveness.

The impact of globalisation on education policy and reforms around the world has become a strategically significant issue, for it expresses one of the most ubiquitous, yet poorly understood phenomena of modernity and associated politico-economic and cultural transformations. There is sufficient evidence to suggest that forces of globalisation have contributed to a new dimension of socio-economic stratification, which offers immense gains to the very few of the economic elite in developed nations and in the emerging economies, especially in Brazil, the Russian Federation, India, China, and South Africa (BRICS). At the same time, it creates a growing and visible socio-economic divide between the rich and the poor globally, thus planting seeds of discontent and conflict for the future.

Standards-Driven and Outcomes-Defined Policy Change

One of the effects of economic forces of globalisation is that educational organisations, having modelled its goals and strategies on the entrepreneurial business model, are compelled to embrace the corporate ethos of the efficiency, accountability and profit-driven managerialism. Hence, the politics of education reforms in the twenty-first century reflect this new emerging paradigm of standards-driven and outcomes-defined policy change (Zajda 2015a, 2016, 2018). Some policy analysts have criticized the ubiquitous and excessive nature of standardization in education imposed by the EFA framework (Carnoy 1999; Torres 1998).

> Whether one focuses on their positive or negative effects, at the bottom line, there was an agreement that the policies and practices of educational development had converged along the consensus built at the multilateral forum. (Carnoy 1999)

Globalisation and the competitive market forces have generated a massive growth in the knowledge industries that are having profound effects on society and educational institutions. In the global culture, the university, as other educational institutions, is now expected to invest its capital in the knowledge market. It increasingly acts as an entrepreneurial institution. Such a managerial and entrepreneurial re-orientation would have been seen in the past as antithetical to the traditional ethos of the university of providing knowledge for its own sake (see also Sabour 2015; Zajda 2015a). It can be said that globalisation may have an adverse impact on education. One of the effects of globalisation on education in all spheres, is that it is compelled to embrace the corporate ethos of the efficiency and profit-driven managerialism. This is particularly evident in higher education. The new entrepreneurial university in the global culture succumbs to the economic gains offered by the neo-liberal ideology (Zajda 2015b).

The emerging challenges for education and policy reforms include a drive towards improving academic achievement in secondary schools. Our key findings indicate that current trends in most BRICS countries' treatment of governance in education rely on the discourses of accountability, performance and output driven schooling, and that they are characterized by the new high-stakes testing through the final year tests in secondary schools. The drive for global competitiveness means that recent education policy reforms in secondary education tend to be standards- and (global) accountability- driven. BRICS governments' and MoEs' push for high academic achievement in secondary schools has been influenced by the emerging standardizing regimes of global educational governance such as the OECD PISA assessment.

Globalisation, Marketisation and Quality/Efficiency Driven Reforms

Globalisation, marketisation and quality/efficiency driven reforms around the world since the 1980s have resulted in structural and qualitative changes in education and policy, including an increasing focus on the "lifelong learning for all", or a "cradle-to-grave" vision of learning and the "knowledge economy" in the global culture. Governments, in their quest for excellence, quality and accountability in education, increasingly turn to international and comparative education data analysis. All of them agree that the major goal of education is to enhance the individual's social and economic prospects. This can only be achieved by providing quality education for *all*. Students' academic achievement is now regularly monitored and measured within the 'internationally agreed framework' of the OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). This was done in response to the growing demand for international comparisons of educational outcomes (OECD, *Education policy outlook 2015: making reforms happen*). Yet, not all schools are successful in addressing the new academic standards imperatives, due to a number of factors, both internal and external. Cohen (2011), for instance, attributes failure of education reforms in the USA due to fragmented school governance and the lack of coherent educational infrastructure.

To measure levels of academic performance in the global culture, the OECD, in co-operation with UNESCO, is using *World Education Indicators* (WEI) programme, covering a broad range of comparative indicators, which report on the resource invested in education and their returns to individuals (OECD 2019 *Education at a Glance* – OECD *Indicators*). Since the 1980s, higher education policy and reforms globally have been influenced by the grand narratives of globalisation, neo-liberalism, human capital and economic rationalism. Higher education policy reforms in the 1980s represented a drive towards economic rationalism, where the increasingly traditional role of the university was replaced by a market-oriented and entrepreneurial university. It has led to entrepreneurial university awards. For instance, the University of Huddersfield has been awarded the prestigious *Times Higher Education* Entrepreneurial University of the Year award for 2013. The neo-liberal university, as noted by Saunders and others, emphasizes the "role of the faculty not as educators, researchers, or members of a larger community, but as entrepreneurs" (Saunders 2010, p. 60). Accordingly, the current redefinition of academics into "entrepreneurs is widespread and is consistent with neo-liberal ideology as is the commodification, commercialization, and marketization of the fruits of faculty labour" (Saunders 2010).

Current Developments in Education Reforms: Case Studies

In addressing the nexus between globalisation, ideology and politics of education reforms, Johansson analyses the international large-scale assessments (ILSA), which have been criticized for spreading isomorphic ideologies. He discusses the use and possibilities of ILSA data and how results on ILSA's impact education and policy reforms world-wide. Rinne also suggests that states are increasingly incorporated into the global accountability regime, which defines academic achievement, standards and desirable educational outcomes. Wright, on the other hand, critiques PISA, as an instrument of the OECD, and suggests that it needs to provide better information to participant countries about the strengths and weaknesses of students in relation to the assessment frameworks, be more transparent about its methods, including the items used, and how measurement error is calculated, and broaden the assessment focus to include a broader range of competencies. Daun in his case study, analyses the results of almost 30 years of education reforms in Sweden, and notes that the most apparent feature is declining results in the international tests. In another comparative case study, Michael H. Lee & S. Gopinathan provide a critical review of education policies and reforms in both Singapore and Hong Kong to see how they can be refined and adjusted in order to cope with challenges facing both education systems. Both Singapore and Hong Kong have been ranked top (first and second) in international rankings such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), Progress in International Reading Literacy Studies (PIRLS), and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) in recent years. As such they are thus widely admired as high performing education systems (HPES) and, not surprisingly, among the best education systems in the world. The success stories of Singapore and Hong Kong education have aroused widespread attention among different stakeholders such as policymakers, researchers and practitioners internationally.

Zajda is moving away from assessment instruments and discusses current and dominant models employed in values education in schools. It is suggested that values education, in addition to focusing on moral education, is connected to democracy, active citizenship education, social justice and human rights education. Drawing on current research, he suggests how to improve the effectiveness values education in classroom pedagogy. Hyde, with reference to constructivist pedagogy, notes in particular, the positive contribution of constructionism in bringing about educational reforms and in taking a critical view towards the taken-for-granted notion of globalisation discourses. Vissing, with reference to human right education, analyzes how for-profit honor societies target vulnerable students around the world. Many such organizations are run under different names by the same individuals. The government does not monitor or penalize them for their exploitative activities. Original data from admissions and financial aid departments at dozens of highly prestigious universities indicate these "honors" are worthless and never considered as part of the college application or financial aid process. Such practices are in violation of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Brook-Napier, on the other hand, offers her analysis of the two aspects of concern over the vulnerability of Mr. Mandela's legacy. First, in the so-called "born free" generation, the post-apartheid generation of South Africans whose profile reveals significant evidence of how many more "hills to climb" there are in the overall route to transformation in South Africa. Secondly, is Mr. Mandela's legacy vulnerable to political expediency and to societal amnesia?

Finally, Zajda, offers a synthesis of current research findings on globalisation and education reforms, with reference to major paradigms and ideology. The chapter analyses the shifts in methodological approaches to globalisation, education reforms, paradigms, and their impact on education policy and pedagogy. The chapter critiques globalisation, policy and education reform and suggests the emergence of new economic and political dimensions of cultural imperialism. In analysing the shifts in methodological approaches to globalisation and education reforms and their impact on education policy and pedagogy, by the above authors, we can make the following observations. First, some authors discuss international large-scale assessments (ILSA). They discuss how results on ILSA's impact education and policy reforms world-wide (Johansson 2020; Rinne 2020; Wright 2020). Second, some authors, like Lee & Gopinathan, provide a comparative case study of education policies and reforms in both Singapore and Hong Kong, and their impact on standards. Third, some examine international models of values education, and the use of constructionism in bringing about educational reforms globally. Others focused on more specific topics such for-profit honour societies and how they target vulnerable students around the world, and the relevance of Mandela's legacy for social reconstruction and transformation in South Africa. All of these authors, in one way or another, debate the nexus between ideology and education reforms, and their impact on educational policy, and academic standards.

Conclusion

The above analysis of education policy reforms in the global culture shows a complex nexus between globalisation, ideology and education reforms – where, on the one hand, democratisation and progressive pedagogy is equated with equality, inclusion, equity, tolerance and human rights, while on the other hand, globalisation is perceived (by some critics at least) to be a totalising force that is widening the socio-economic status (SES) gap and cultural and economic capital between the rich and the poor, and bringing power, domination and control by corporate bodies and powerful organisations. Hence, we need to continue to explore critically the new challenges confronting the global village in the provision of authentic democracy, social justice, and cross-cultural values that genuinely promote a transformative pedagogy.

References

Carnoy, M. (1999). *Globalization and educational reform: What planners need to know?* Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Carnoy, M., & Rhoten, D. (2002). What does globalization mean for educational change? A comparative approach. *Comparative Education Review, 46*(1), 1–9.

Cohen, D. (2011). *Teaching and its predicaments*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Johansson, S. (2020). On the (mis)use and consequences of international large-scale assessments. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Globalisation, ideology and education reforms: Emerging paradigms*. Dordrecht: The Netherlands.

OECD. (2019). *Education at a glance – OECD indicators*. Paris: UNESCO.

Rinne, R. (2020). The unintended consequences of governance of education at a distance through assessment and standardization. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Globalisation, ideology and education reforms: Emerging paradigms*. Dordrecht: The Netherlands.

Sabour, M. (2015). The impact of globalisation on the mission of the university. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *The international handbook of globalisation and education policy research*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Saunders, D. (2010). Neoliberal ideology and public higher education in the United States. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 8*(1), 42–77.

Torres, C. A. (1998). Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world. *Comparative education review, 42*(4). Retreived from https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/447522?journalCode=cer

Wright, V. (2020). Crisis in economic theory and the implications for PISA derived education policy. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Globalisation, ideology and education reforms: Emerging paradigms*. Dordrecht: The Netherlands.

Zajda, J. (2015a). Globalisation and its impact on education and policy. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Second international handbook of globalisation, education and policy research* (pp. 1–13). Dordrecht: Springer.

Zajda, J. (2015b). Global trends in education and academic achievement. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Second international handbook of globalisation, education and policy research* (pp. 105–125). Dordrecht: Springer.

Zajda, J., (Ed.) (2016). *Globalisation, ideology and politics of education reforms*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9783319195056

Zajda, J. (2018). *Globalisation and education reforms: Paradigms and ideologies*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9789402412031

Index

J. Zajda (ed.), *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reforms*, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 20,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1743-2