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INTRODUCTION

Educational Restructuring: (Re)Thinking The Problematic of Reform

Sverker Lindblad and Tom Popkewitz

Restructuring is a major issue in education studies during the last decades. Educational systems are restructured in terms of the system aspects of education through decentralisation, deregulation, professional accountability, marketization and so forth. This is done with the goal to change the relation of the state to civil society through, for example, flattening hierarchies, increasing managerial, professional or “client” control and obtaining a more efficient and innovative organisation. The restructuring is also directed to changes in the pedagogical and teacher educational programs that focus on the relations of the child and teacher in learning communities. The changes in the curriculum are promoted in policy and research as bringing the school in relation to changes in cultural, social and economic patterns embodied in phrases such as “knowledge society” and lifelong learner.

Education restructuring is a concept with changing meaning. Here we are dealing with transformations in the governing of education—from government to governance, which implies a changing role of the state. We find a shift from bureaucratic control to the introduction of other agencies, public as well as private, in the governing of education (Dale, 1998; Hirst &
Thompson, 1999). This in turn implies changes in the management of schooling and education, often illuminated by terms such as “new managerialism,” “accountability,” and “teacher professionalism.” Restructuring is also a term that relates to changing notions of the individual who the school is assumed to have the responsibility for producing in new relations between communities, nation and global processes in which new collective memories are being forged.

In this book we seek to trouble the concept of restructuring through empirical and historical examinations of current reforms in Africa, the Americas, Asia, and Europe. We deal with controversies on and in education restructuring in different contexts as well as research traditions. The chapters speak to the following questions: What are the discursive practices that order and differentiate the practices of restructuring in different contexts and the controversies that they produce in the production of education systems and the everyday practises of schooling?

FOCUS AND LIMITS

A number of recent studies have tried to understand the meaning of education restructuring in different ways. For instance, Papagiannis, Easton, and Owens (1992) tried to understand the objectives of restructuring and the American experiences of school restructuring. Darling-Hammond and Bullmaster (1997) identify restructuring as related to increased school autonomy and new ways of managing schools in the American context. Weiler (1989) relates decentralisation measures to aspects of legitimisation. Gewirtz, Ball, and Bowe (1995) critically examine British policy that makes education as markets that respond to parental strategies and cultural capital. Halsey, Brown, Lauder, & Wells (1998) relate restructuring to the New Right ideology and consider the implications of restructuring for the teaching profession, the curriculum, and to the neglect of relations between education and democracy (Daun, 1993). Walford (1994) studies implications of parental choice on quality issues. Whitty, Power, and Halpin (1998) comparatively concentrate on the devolution of educational systems. These literatures present different aspects of education restructuring in different settings—the preconditions for and working of restructuring in relation to school management, teacher professionalism, school outcomes and so forth. Education restructuring has also been in focus for policy studies, for example, in debates about school marketization and parents as “consumers” of education.

This book has a different focus. The chapters are based on three distinct ambitions:
First, we use the notion that similar changes are occurring around the world, even if the timing and content varies between regions. For instance, the construction of markets in the U.K. was regarded as a vital ingredient in the renewal of education in the 1980s. Similar changes are introduced in Sweden a decade later. The content differs as well, for instance when considering the introduction of vouchers in education, where Sweden in turn is rather an early example. But there are a lot of familiarities in current changes labelled as restructuring throughout the world. In sum, we can talk about education restructuring as “a world movement” of cultural, social and political changes in our time (Meyer, 1999).

Second, we are interested in controversies in the restructuring of educational systems. Our use of the controversies, however, goes against the grain. Our concern is not with debates and ideological argument about what is the most appropriate restructuring of the educational system. Rather, we seek to place the arguments, procedures and programs of restructuring within historical, social and political patterns that frame and shape those restructuring arguments. That is, we are after an understanding of the rules and standards of reason that order, differentiate and distinguish the processes of restructuring across different national contexts. One of the central ambitions of this book is to ask the questions, “How is it historically and politically possible for policy makers and researchers across geographical contexts to “speak,” think, and act in the ways that they do?” “What are the rules and standards that order the objects reflected on and underlie programmatic changes?”

With this interest, our attention is directed at “thought” and reason as produced through a field of cultural practices that order and differentiate the objects of reflection and action. This entails paying attention to the ordering and differentiating principles embodied in restructuring efforts as constructing/construing ways of living, “seeing,” thinking, and feeling. But further, it is to think of the knowledge of educational reform as producing intent and purpose that is not merely of “the mind” or as normative properties that guide and judge the success or failure of a program. To place “thought” into a field of cultural practices is to focus on knowledge as produced within an amalgamation of an immense world of institutions, authority relations, stories, resemblances, memories, and fantasies. While we rarely focus on the system of reason or “thought” of reform as a material and governing practice, our concern is to recognize that the cultural practices of educational reforms are political practices that generate principles (systems of reason) that order action and participation.

To these two ambitions is added a third. Most literature on restructuring is produced in the Anglo-Saxon part of the world (e.g., The UK, Northern America and Australia) as indicated by the references above. Since we regard education restructuring as a world movement we want to present
cases of restructuring outside this Anglo-Saxon part of the world such as in Argentina, France, South Africa, South-East Asia, and Taiwan. In this literature we are able to identify some of the conceptual difficulties of applying the analytical tools of Anglo-Saxon studies to contexts outside that sphere.

We deal with the arguments and reasoning concerning different aspects of restructuring as presentations of productive aspects of power and knowledge. What are the ideas that constrain and construct intentions and norms for action in the making and preservation of education restructuring? Thus, we understand structuring as not a “concept” applied to education, but as a word that relates to a number of different cultural and social discourses that overlap to form rules and standards that order and classify the objects of practice and the possibilities of action. We think of these rules and standards of thought as “a system of reason” (Popkewitz, 1998) that governs, normalizes, and naturalizes action. In other words, the focus of this study is not on the working of restructured education system or for example, the implications for educational outcomes over different social categories. Instead, we are concerned with the cultural practices that produce, order and make plausible education restructuring.

What are these different practices that produce meaning? What are the ordering principles that underlie how the notion of educational restructuring is used in different contexts? We can think of educational restructuring as dependent on the external circumstances through which educational systems are organized, such as local, national contexts as well as the working of international organizations and communications of educational ideas. However, restructuring also depends on the activities inside educational institutions; that is, the ways they organize themselves, their knowledge of achievement, failure and childhood that constitute their work. External as well as internal influences are both, in turn, dependent on resources, organization and how, and in what ways, they organize and position their arguments and ideas.

Here, however, our primary focus is on arguments and ideas in the making of restructuring of education. From a reflexive (we are here referring to the work of Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) point of view, controversies are something you would expect given the structure of positions in discourses as well as conflicting relations between the logic of theory and the logic of practise. Controversies, in this sense, are very useful for reflection and analysis of political debates as well as for the historical understanding of research and its results.
A NOTE ON CONTROVERSIES

In this book are different cases of educational restructuring in different national and international contexts. The contributors have researched educational restructuring from different theoretical perspectives and with different research approaches. Our interest in these different cases is to communicate about the assumptions and presuppositions of restructuring as controversies from different positions, perspectives and contexts, since this will, we hope, generate greater sets of distinctions and more nuanced arguments. We are not interested in stating rules for how to communicate in research or policy controversies. Nor are we interested in summarising educational thoughts and research in overarching ways. Here, we are using the work of Ian Hacking who has analyzed controversies, e.g., concerning diagnoses in psychiatry. He is interested in how different lines of reasoning are constructed and in what ways controversies are outlined as new objects of analysis for which treatments are invented.

Hacking (1999) presents an analysis of a social constructionism that undoes the dualism of nominalism and realism in social research. He argues that a precondition to stating that a phenomenon (X) is socially constructed is that X is commonly taken for granted or appears to be inevitable, in spite of the argument that it is not inevitable, but socially constructed—a result of a matrix of institutions, social demands, and so forth. Hacking is not arguing that there are not things of the world (a realism) but that these things that demand our attention are “actions under description” in which the discursive practices not only describe and construe but also function to “make” the worlds in which that action is directed.

Restructuring of education is, for obvious reasons, a social construction—a result of human action operating within certain institutional, social and historical circumstances. For instance political decisions on decentralisation and deregulation are based on, e.g., power relations in parliaments, ideas about options and limitations for decentralisation, communication patterns between different levels in educational systems and so forth. The implementation of markets in a school system is based on arguments concerning what markets can and cannot do, what potentials and risks there are with markets. But what is called restructuring in this context of different social, institutional and ideational relations not only creates a way of thinking about what is troubling about schooling, but also imposes sets of descriptions and categories from which to “see,” think, and act on schooling. Restructuring is a word in which programs are produced, governmental legislation enacted, and theories of school change used to order and organize action and participation. In this sense, restructuring is embodied in a range of practices that not only construe what is the problem and solu-
tions of education, but also “make” a world through which people are to act on the possibilities of education.

An important part of controversies is what Hacking calls “elevator words.” Hacking makes a distinction between objects, ideas and elevator words. Hacking differentiates elevator words from those that exist as an object: An education system or a school exists in the world around us and in that sense it can be named an object. An idea is a conception, an attitude or a theory that someone has about an object, e.g., about education restructuring. In addition to objects and ideas we have elevator words that say something about the world but are not in the world as are things that are objects or ideas. Elevator words are things that are thought of as “fact,” “truth,” and “reality” and thus produce words that are circularly defined and continually undergo substantial mutations. Hacking states:

Facts, truths, reality, and even knowledge, are not objects in the world, like periods of time, little children, fidgety behaviour, or loving-kindness. The words are used to say something about the world, or what we say or think about the world. They are at a higher level. (a. a., p 21 f)

He notes two aspects of such elevator words—they tend to be circularly defined and they tend to be free floating. A construction of a fact is something different from the construction of an object or an idea. In controversies in policy and/or research we need to be careful—or to consider carefully—the uses of elevator words.

Based on Hacking’s work on controversies we try to find out about arguments in controversies on education restructuring—what are the objects, ideas, and especially, what are the elevator words? Since we are dealing with policy discourses we are expecting other formats of elevator words than in research discourses. Such formats could be what makes a certain option the “natural” one or turns a change into “progress.” What the elevator words are is an empirical question, which we will contend with below.

Cases and Focuses

We asked research colleagues, who are working with issues in education restructuring in different national contexts, to write about their research and present aspects of relevance for understanding controversies in their field.

The different national and comparative studies enable us to make the case of education restructuring as central to the investigation of this book. These studies deal with different levels of educational systems: with higher education in South Africa and with teacher education in England, with secondary education in European contexts, educational reforms in Argentina,
and so forth. Different aspects are focussed; discourses on globalisation, individual responsibility, parental choice, mass-media spin, and the impacts of policy-making, and so forth.

The variety in studies and their different layers of educational systems have important advantages. It makes it possible for us to cover the complexities of educational restructuring as a world movement in different settings. But the variety has its drawbacks from a traditional comparative methodological point of view. We cannot compare the different cases or relate the impact of various education measures in relation to specific operational variables. But we can compare and have argued elsewhere that there is the possibility to locate the changes through deploying theoretical entities that enable us to think about the processes of change and their implications (Popkewitz & Pereyra, 1993). That is our approach in this later part of this chapter.

In “Changing Patterns of Power: Rethinking Decentralization the Educational Reform in Taiwan,” Yang-tien Chen is presenting overarching changes in Taiwanese education. These changes are related to major cultural and political changes in the current history of Taiwan. Politics of deregulation and decentralisation are presented and reframed as new regulation patterns. Of special interest are the salvation stories in reform discourses and the alchemy of knowledge in the restructuring of Taiwanese education. Inés Dussel is questioning the welfare state nostalgia among restructuring critics in “Education Restructuring in Argentina: Hybridity, Diversity and Governance after Welfare.” She focuses on new patterns of governance—on demands of personal responsibility and self-government among students and restrictions in self-government in hybrid discourses on schooling. Dussel also shows how diversity is constructed as the opposite to responsibility in current discourses on education in Argentina.

In “Governance by Spin: The Case of New Labour and Education Action Zones in England” Sharon Gewirtz, Marny Dickson and Sally Power present and analyze how potential controversies in education policy are managed by spin. By spin is meant impression management in news and political communications. The authors argue that spin is a growing phenomenon due to the growing importance of media in policymaking and an increased politicalisation of media in combination with ongoing professionalisation of news management in political parties. Based on Education Action Zones as an example of spin in educational policy, the authors argue that spin is not only part of the presenting of news, but also part of the constitution of policy. Meg Maguire is presenting a case in an English context as well, but with quite a different focus. The text, “The Modern Teacher: A Textual Analysis of Educational Restructuring” is based on analyses of significant New Labour government documents focussing on the need to modernise the teaching profession. In these documents are
demands of modernisation related to demands of raising standards of schooling and to reward the good teacher. The good in traditional teaching is to be preserved and integrated into modern teaching according to the documents analysed.

Agnès van Zanten is dealing with other education actors in “Education Restructuring in France: Middle-class Parents and Educational Policy in Metropolitan Contexts.” Her focus here is education restructuring in relation to middle class parents’ educational strategies in a restructuring educational system with public as well as private alternatives of schooling. These strategies are related to different expectations of education as well as to parents’ positions in the public or the private sector. Of special concern are exclusive strategies on one side to preserve and improve the social position of the family, and on the other side the concern of social integration and solidarity. Policy is regarded not only as official decisions, but also as practice. Parent expectations influence policy in three different ways; first as aggregated implications of individual choice, second, due to interaction with school affairs, and third through parental associations. In sum, parental educational strategies are a constitutive part of educational policy-making.

Barry Franklin presents a study on restructuring in a longer time perspective and with a focus on Detroit High School and race conflicts in “Creating a Discourse for Restructuring in Detroit: Achievement, Race, and the Northern High School Walkout.” He shows how a discourse on race and segregation is replaced by a discourse on social mobility and the implication of this for policy-making.

Joe Muller’s text, “Responsiveness and Innovation in Higher Education Restructuring: The South African Case” provides a particular case study to examine the problematic of restructuring as that word travels through various iterations of policy borrowing and translations, recontextualization and transformations in reforms of South African universities. He examines the contradictory ensemble of logics of equalization and differentiation as universities embody a contradictory ensemble of “markets” of which state policy is placed into a network and flow of scientific disciplines and its systems of knowledge production. The results do not change cognitive or epistemic structures, but shore up basic research programs, but clothe their usual research practices in the lineaments of the new relevance.

Sverker Lindblad and Thomas S. Popkewitz in “Education Structuring: Governance in the Narratives of Progress and Denials” draw from research on education governance and social inclusion/exclusion in eight countries of the European Union study. They consider how policy and education system knowledge (“the systems of reason”) circulate among various institutional settings to create patterns of social cohesion and collectively, and that simultaneously produce divisions related to social exclusion. Restructuring is viewed as a salvation narrative of progress, rescue and redemption that ties the well-being of the individual to that of collective commitment.
and belonging. But the salvation narratives involve particular management procedures, population reasoning, and narratives that govern who the citizen is, should be, and who is outside of the pall of progress and thus to be rescued and redeemed. Fazel Rizvi in “Theorizing the Global Convergence of Educational Restructuring” explores the processes of global convergence that is occurring within educational restructuring. This involves the circulation of ideas and ideologies, international conventions and consensus that guide educational reforms; its international practices of cooperation and competition; and formal bilateral and multilateral contracts that include international agencies. The concept of neoliberalism is given a nuanced character that relates the global and the local in consider differential conditions in which convergence occurs.

To end this short review: In “Education Structuring: Governance in the Narratives of Progress and Denials” we present a discussion of an international study on education governance and social inclusion/exclusion that we carried out with the support of the European Commission. In focus are the systems of reason that order current discourses in different locations. We captured narratives about change in education governance in policy texts and in interviews with actors operating at different levels of European education systems.

In Table 1 we present an overview over the different cases. These cases give a rich picture of education restructuring. Earlier we noted that there is a convergence in reform practices in the language of reform in different contexts. However, we want to make two notions in relation to that convergence. First, the notion of convergence exists in relation to distinctions and differentiations of restructuring that give meaning within the different cases with their specific historical backgrounds. Second, scholarship requires that we rethink the notion of structure and restructuring so as not to shortcut the analysis; that is, not to accept the overt practices as the focus of investigation and allow the political discourses of reform to form the conceptual apparatus for investigation.

Our comments will be presented in four sections. We start with a note on elevator words in policy discourses. Then we present some notions on ways of thinking about restructuring. This is followed by a few methodological reflections. The construction of the others in educational restructuring is in turn followed by some thoughts on the uses of standards in restructured educational systems. Based on these comments, we have a few final words on the systems of reason in education restructuring.

**Elevator Words, Topoi and Planet Speaks**

What elevator words do we find in the discourses presented in the different cases? These words are presented as words that suggest that they repre-
Table 1: An Overview of Chapters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Aspects in focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sverker Lindblad &amp; Tom Popkewitz</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Cases and controversies in education restructuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang-tien Chen</td>
<td>Changing Patterns of Power: Rethinking Decentralization in Taiwan</td>
<td>Transformation of education governing in relation to political and cultural changes. Decentralization and the changing patterns of governing are placed in an historical context that includes internal shifts in the foci of education to international, cultural, and social relations to China, Japan, and the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inés Dussel</td>
<td>Educational Restructuring and the Reshaping of School Governance in Argentina</td>
<td>Explores how global discourses of neoliberalism are brought into and relate to national discourses and political contexts in which Institutional and individual responsibility and diversity are constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sverker Lindblad &amp; Tom Popkewitz</td>
<td>Education Restructuring: Governance in the Narratives of Progress and Denials</td>
<td>Using a 10 country study of educational governance, inclusion and exclusion, the restructuring of education are explored as stories of progress that relate to changing notions of teaching and the child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fazal Rizvi</td>
<td>Theorizing the Global Convergence of Educational Restructuring</td>
<td>Globalization of the policy discourses of globalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Gewirtz, Marny Dickson &amp; Sally Power</td>
<td>Governance by Spin: The Case of New Labour and Education Action Zones in England</td>
<td>Focuses on ways in which the labour government uses the mass media in policy-making related to the Education Action Zones. A central concept is “spin,” the turning of negative or controversial issues into positive stories that is to manage how reforms are to be perceived and government programs understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Maguire</td>
<td>The Modern Teacher: A Textual Analysis of Educational Restructuration</td>
<td>Teacher Education reform in England. An analysis of how the notion of Modernisation of Teachers as presented in New Labour texts, with its different sets of meaning and implications for schooling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part One: Internationalization and Globalization of Education

Part Two: Education Restructuring in Different Contexts
sent reality, are facts, and serve as truthful statements that need no further exploration or any reference to an author as they stand as unquestioned objects in need of action. The elevator words differ somewhat in the different cases, but there are striking similarities as well. The English case on spin and the Education Action Zones, for example, can be read as identifying terms such as “social justice” and “business” as elevator words. The words seem to move the particular policy into a realm of a higher “truth” about reality and fact in which there is no controversy or ambiguity. There is similar talk in the text on education restructuring in France, where notions of social integration, social mix, and new solidarity between social classes are presented and to some extent contrasted to consumerist attitudes. In the Argentine case “democratisation” and “deregulation” are combined with notions on “personal responsibility” in ways that are quite similar to the Taiwanese case. In sum we get a mixture of elevator words presented in different restructuring cases.

What role do these words play? Of course, they are written in order to convince and legitimate. They are what Antonio Nóvoa (2002) calls “planet speaks,” as magical concepts that are the roots of all evil or the solutions to all problems. Planetspeak involves a new expert who creates and circulates international discourses that seem to exist without structural roots or social locations. Nóvoa calls such discourses as a “worldwide bible” whose vocabu-
lary has no known origin and serve as a magic concept as they seem to cover the solution for all problems: globalisation, flexibility, new economy, exclusion, zero tolerance and multicultural.

One type of elevator word can be considered as topoi. In Portugal, the topoi embodied in works such as life-long education and training, the knowledge society, and globalization. These words are accepted as singular and universal terms that refer to some fact or reality and do not need to be explained. In Britain, the topoi are expressed in policy statements such as “Social exclusion is about income but it is about more. It is about prospects and networks and life changes.” Or “You can’t choose between a successful and stable economy on the one hand, and confronting poverty and its causes on the other” and the use of the term “zero tolerance.” These words and phrases serve as banalities universally accepted as truths that do not need to be questioned. Such topoi support reasoning with no author of the words and a seeming consensus about what is to be done.

But the topoi of restructuring are words embedded in and overlapping with social and cultural discourses that give an order to the world and self. The topoi acquire a specification as they relate to different categories of children and families, for example who are to be rectified so as to gain access to employability and for social and cultural participation. The topoi of reforms embody discourses of individualization, categories of social disintegration, new monitoring strategies of the child, and changing roles of the teacher and school leaders.

It is the intersection of these different discourses that we can better understand restructuring as a system of reason that governs through its principles of ordering and differentiating. If we take one of the elevator words, individualization, there is an irony of the new reform practices of schooling. There is a “renaissance of individuality” that intersects with those of managing the practices of centralization/decentralization. The topoi emphasizes the value of the individual as opposed to that of collective equality, related to global competition and increased investment of education for the gifted child as in Finland. But this “renaissance” is not a rebirth but articulates particular historical formations that relate the state, schooling and the individual. The discourses no longer place the school in a socio-historical and cultural context in discussing issues of equity and justice. These have disappeared from state educational discourse and in their place are de-contextualized discourses about individualization that ties psychology to pedagogical innovation. Few teachers or system actors in Finland, for example, mentioned structural characteristics of social exclusion. Teachers used a common vernacular to describe those who are excluded. They were called troublemakers, truants, and children with learning difficulties. Which is a way to individualize and to personalize exclusion by means of categorizations.
Ways of Thinking About Restructuring

We are thinking about restructuring as not a project explained solely by its consequences and outcomes, but as an elevator word that interrelates with particular discursive practices to construct sets of relations and principles for ordering how the objects of schooling are seen, talked about, acted on, and felt. Our example of individualization above, for example was not about the individual per se, but of practices that disciplines who the individual is and should be. In this sense of constructivism, restructuring is the event to be understood and problematized rather than studied to see its effects.

Neoliberalism as an Elevator Word

One common elevator word of contemporary policy analysis is neoliberalism. Neoliberalism is planet-speak, a magical concept that is seen as the solution to all problems or as the evil that creates those problems. The word serves as a central “marker” about the promises of progress from conservatives and as the roots of the evil that the left sees as taking away all of the won benefits of the security nets of welfare state in care for its populations. The use of neoliberalism as a conceptual framework to understanding the social and historical transformations is clearly problematic when one considers the alliances between minority groups and conservative politicians in supporting school choice in the U.S. or the election of social democratic and Labour governments that maintained related policies but with different rhetorical configurations.

Neoliberalism is a symptom and not a cause. That is, the word never stands by itself as it is itself embedded in a number of historical patterns that exist prior to its formal label of neoliberalism and which need scrutiny. For example, neoliberalism is used in different places and with different political and cultural agendas that seem, as first glance, as strange bedfellows. If we move to Russia, although not a focus of this book, the strategies of marketization are embodied in a field of social and political practices that include a skillful Communist apparatus that moves within a shadow of strong state with little concern form democratic society agenda. As Dussel argues in this book in relation to Argentinian reforms, neoliberalism is not a “cause” but is theoretically part of the event to analyse. That is, current practices of restructuring embody a double technology that empowers and disables—includes and excludes. To understand the double technology is to investigate, as Dussel argues, a “combinatory repertoire” that relates to new patterns of governance based on personal responsibility and self-government. Fizvi, as well, argues in his chapter that neoliberalism stands as
seemingly ubiquitous idea of a global context as education responds to the functional prerequisites of capitalism. This functional notion, he continues, is inadequate for considering the relation of global and educational change, as they are located in different patterns of political activity and power play, and within varied consequences.

In this volume, we view neoliberalism as a concept brought into being through policy discourses and thus a concept to be explored by placing its uses within historical configurations that make such a concept possible. Neoliberalism embodies a calculus of intervention and salvation that involves a field of cultural practices that overlap with but are not determined by the State policies associated with Reagan and Thatcher nor the Hayekian and Friedman economics. Thus, while some of the chapters in this book use the phrase Neoliberal, those policies of marketization are historicized in a manner that enables an inquiry into more complex and more profound changes occurring in the restructuring of education.

The chapters enable us to think about the notions of marketization and privatization as words that are, in some respects, empty signifiers whose content and substance are “filled in” through a range of practices at multiple levels of educational systems across different historical contexts. For example, the notions of marketization and choice appear in the British chapters as related to rhetorical devices tied to a Labour government and arguments about democratisation. Van Zanten’s chapter tells about the choice of the French middle class, for example, but that notion of choice is less of a theory about marketization and more about how a fractionated middle class seeks to consecrate their social position through strategies that differentially construct school cultures. Managerial and professional groups, for example, have different priorities about what knowledge is most worthwhile for their children in schooling and in effect produce practices that make for the policy of the French State educational system.

**SALVATION STORIES, NORMALIZING PRACTICES AND SOCIAL INCLUSION/EXCLUSION**

We can think of schooling as embodying salvation themes. Policies and research about school reforms speak about saving or delivering the nation through the education of the child. These themes are today about democracy, equality and economic progress. There are global discourses about change in curriculum and teaching as insuring the future of the nation in the new world that is called “global” and “a knowledge-based” society. The reforms to restructure “tell” of individual and collective progress and the social obligation to rescue those who have fallen outside the narratives of progress. Neoliberal policies of privatization and marketization, for exam-
ple, call for a better world through challenging the bureaucracies of the institutions of the Welfare State and prompting individual involvement in the local agencies that directly affect their lives. The modern secular salvation themes, are meant to bring progress to society and to redeem the individual who is empowered and self-actualized in the process. Traveling through the different ideological scenarios is the professional teacher who revives democracy by working more directly with parents and communities.

The salvation themes of rescue and redemption are not recent but are part of the worldwide institutionalization of schooling since the 19th century (Meyer et al., 1997). Our discussion is not to quarrel with the salvation stories but rather to interrogate historically the contemporary field of cultural practices in which they are deployed.

The salvation stories are today of an active sense of “self” whose emotional bonds and self-responsibility are circumscribed through networks of other individuals—the family, the locality, and the community. Freedom is talked about as the empowered individual who continually constructs and reconstructs one’s own practice, and the ways of life through a perpetual intervention in one’s life through working actively in “communities” of learning. Life becomes a continuous course of personal responsibility and self-management of one’s risks and destiny as a problem-solving lifelong learner. Problem solving is not a natural process found in the child but a fabrication that responds to a humanitarian impulse of schooling that is translated and transported into particular psychologies of the mind and social interaction of the child in pedagogy. But the problem solving is a fabrication just the same, as the categories function as both “fictions” and “making” of kinds of people.

The location of responsibility is no longer traversed through the range of social practices directed toward a single public sphere—the social, but in diverse and plural communities that constitute the common good. The struggle for the soul is now in the “autonomous” learners who are continuously involved in self-improvement and ready for the uncertainties through working actively in “communities of learning.” Change, contingencies and uncertainties of daily life are tamed through the rules and standards of reason of a re-visioned neo-pragmatism in which diverse communities negotiate the common good.

The school remains a site of school-family connections that re-calibrate political aspiration within the individual. Children work in “learning communities or “communities of discourses.” Teachers are now asked to go into the “community,” to become part of communities to “better know” their pupils and their families, to become trusted, or to “know” what they should include from “community knowledge.”

The unfinished lifelong learner is also that of the teacher who is also classified as a lifelong learner. The teacher is self-actualized by remaking
one’s biography. That biography is continually calculated through researching one’s self as the teacher. The “reflective teacher,” for example, assesses the child through life histories or portfolios, and makes and remakes his or her own biography through personal assessment of self-development and self management (see Fendler, 2001).

The problem of restructuring is to consider the characteristics of this individuality that circulate as the future individual that will secure the progress of the nation. The site of change is still a soul and its rules of conduct the conduct of conduct. It is in this construction of human kinds that we can consider the rhetorical meaning of the welfare state as also embodying governing practices and thus seek rhetoric as not merely language to convince but also embodied in discourses that not only construe but also make human kinds. The materiality of discourse that is language thus construes and constructs, or fabricates in its dual sense.

Our study of education governance and social inclusion/exclusion, for example, continually “saw” policy as speaking about education as employability and preparing students for the labour market. But that planet-speak was placed in a discursive field that gave priority to cultural disorganization, social location and a need to correct and normalize deviant populations—groups defined as minorities, new immigrants, ethnic groups and so on—that were inscribed in the policy as threats to national cohesion, social harmony and stabilities.

The notions of deviance and normality existed in relation to particular human kinds. First there is the narrative of the child and teacher who can participate in the global world and produce the progress of the nation. Today’s world of progress is embodied in a decentralized individual. The decentralized individual, an unfinished cosmopolitan, is categorized as a “lifelong learner.” The lifelong learner is flexible, continuously active, and works collaboratively. These inner characteristics are cosmopolitan in the sense of an individuality that can chase desire and work in a global world in which there is no finishing line. The child is someone who can choose to refuse allegiance to any one of the infinite options on display, except the option of choosing. A child is, to use the planet-speak, one who is flexible, ambitious, part of a learning society. A child and teacher who relishes change for change sake. In the Meg Maguire chapter from the UK, for example, the policy of the British Secretary of Labour, wants the child to relate to business ambitions with a “competitive individualism,” and as “a team member” in the learning society. The teacher who is to produce this new child is a “modern teacher who needs to be creative and imaginative.”

But as this model of the child and teacher is read, its use of business language is not of business but of cultural norms relate to images and narratives that deploy the elevator of “the modern.” In these instances, as Wagner (1994) suggests, it would be historically incorrect to understand
the economic language without considering how that language works as cultural practices.

But embodied in the discourses of the lifelong learner and the new cosmopolitanism are links between the local and the global. The characteristics of the lifelong learner are considered global and narrated as representative of the new humanity of progress. But those distinctions are locally produced and related to its opposite - the needy as those who do not embody the characteristics inscribed for participation. That is, embedded in the distinctions and differentiations of the lifelong learner and the decentralized individual are normalizing practices that order and divide people. Dussel’s chapter, for example, focuses on how the term “needy child” produces differences and divisions. The discourses of reform and restructuring are expressed through salvation themes of justice and equity. But the concrete reform practices produce differences in which the needy (who are poor) stand in opposition to the norm individual who has self-responsibility. However, the needy is not only a single category but are present in overlapping discourses which inscribe not only economic categories related to poverty but also cultural and social discourses about rectifying moral disintegration. One can also read van Zanten’s chapter as a nuanced discussion of how different segments of the middle class inscribe their social positions in the cultural distinctions and differentiations that orders school programs.

In the overlapping of categories and distinctions of the different segments of the middle class, as they relate to categories of the “needy,” or the “at-risk” or “disadvantaged youth,” we are provided a way to consider the relation of inclusion and exclusion. Finer and finer distinctions are produced about the inner characteristics and capabilities of the child who lies outside of normalcy: the youth who can never be of the average because that youth is addicted, has early pregnancies, is a child of a single parent (mother), and is incapable of personal discipline. It is in the relation of these different categories and distinctions that divisions are produced and principles are presented that order the “reasonable individual” from those who do not possess reason. And it is in the rules and standards of reason that we can also begin to consider how individuals are qualified and disqualified for action and participation. That is, embodied in systems of inclusion are their opposites, the distinctions about those not qualified to be of the average. Again, inclusion cannot be considered outside of the problem of exclusion as they reside in the same mapping of the child.

The restructuring of schooling, then, is not only in the overt policies and practices that are to organize institution. Our purpose in this book is to see reforms in this double sense of restructuring. To understand how institutions are changing but also to understand the conditions of governing and thus the materiality of discourse; that is language construes and
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constructs, or fabricates in its dual sense. Thus, we can think about the notion of spin in relation to the discussion of the ways in which modernization is rhetorically deployed in the policies of the British government in this book. Spin, again, is a political strategy in which politicians in Britain and also the U.S. seek to provide a language in which their policies are placed in their best light, turning negative words into positive (protecting social retirement schemes by privatizing rather than fostering more business, non-public involvement in state actions) or countering negative publicity by stressing a particular aspect of the problem that would leave other parts as not part of the public debate.) But when reading these spin strategies and the topoi of policy, one quickly becomes aware of the different discourses mobilizing particular human kinds, to borrow from Hacking. For example, the use of modernization in Maguire’s chapter, is not only a word that travels along with particular notions of an individual who is flexible, and a lifelong learner, but also a word that represents the “others”—the not so flexible, the non-learners.

RE-THINKING THE PROBLEM OF RESTRUCTURING

Restructuring, in the sense of this book, involves thinking of changes in education as it relates the state, society and culture. This entails two notions of the state. One is that of the changes in institutional and organizational practices, such as shifts to new relationships of the centre to the local that have occurred in the past few decades through changes, for example, to goal steering. These changes have been considered often, particularly in European contexts, as changes in the welfare state and its pact with its citizens to protect against risk. Esping-Anderson (1996), for example, has presented a topology of states that focus on its welfare policies and degrees of involvement in social security and employment among its populations. Thus, one can classify the Nordic Countries as a strong welfare state and places as the U.S. as a liberal or non-welfare state. In using such topologies, restructuring is modelled in light of the movement of government involvement as they relate to the classifications embodied in the topologies. Thus, research that compares Britain and Nordic Countries can talk about the end of the welfare state as new individualistic tendencies emerge in and as social policy.

But in the restructuring of education is also another notion of the welfare state. One can think of all modern states as welfare states in that it is, to borrow from DeSwann (1988), the placing of populations in care of the state through governing the conduct of conduct. The modern state is a welfare state not only through providing for health and social security, but also through ensuring progress through the production of the self-respon-
sible and self-motivated citizen. This notion of all states as welfare states directs attention to restructuring as related to changing patterns of governing through the systems of reason that orders the conduct of the citizen. The complexity of restructuring to a myriad of global/local, state/civil society that cannot be accounted for by institutional models of the state is clearly illustrated throughout this book. If we take Muller’s argument about the relation of the university and its structuring of disciplines to notions of markets, or Rizvi’s discussion of the ways in which global convergence in restructuring are ordered through the consideration of differential conditions and networks. This latter sense of governing focuses on restructuring as an ensemble of institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, calculations and tactics that connect personal conduct with specific governmental apparatuses.

The question of research is to locate the “restructuring” of the knowledge that orders and classifies in policy to construct the object of intervention and action. Thus, we can return to a previous characterization of the reforms as producing a greater individualization. The concern is not with the abdication of governance by the state, but of the new conditions of the state in governing who we are and should be. That is, the new senses of governance in which individualization occurs, embodied new relations between the state and individuals that some theorists have called “governing-at-a-distance.” That is, if we think of the possibility of the welfare state as the conditions of the care of individuals, the children and teachers in the school are sites of governing that embody the multiple and heterogeneous discourses that revise the state as a condition of governing. What is significant in understanding restructuring, then, is not the seemingly economic reductionism of policy nor to place the role of the state as an institutional “body” whose rules and policies are governing, but to consider how principles are produced to order and govern the actions and participation of the subjects.

Nostalgia

The notion of nostalgia is one way to think about the discourses of restructuring. Nostalgia (from nostos-return home, and algia-longing) is a longing for a home that no longer exists or has never existed. But as a discourse of the social, nostalgia embodies a double, a looking to the past and to the future (Boym, 2001). It is a sentiment of loss and displacement, but it is also a romance with one’s own fantasy that is to make for the progress of the future. Nostalgia expresses a gap between the past and the future that present action can close. Nostalgia is continually placed in relation to progress in modernity (see, e.g., Wagner, 2001; particularly chapter 4).
Wagner (2001) talks about the inescapability of the double evocation of the past in which there is a continuous claiming of origins, and the economic and cultural “globalism” that is allegedly to clear a way the disruptions produced by the traditions of the past.

One can think of this as an occurrence of modernity, which assumes a rupture in time that produces a relation between the past as tradition or in origins, as a central part of social theory and also social policy. Thus it is possible to talk about school reforms as a “back-to-basics” that entails a search for origins that are to be identified and specified in order to affirm or deny progress itself. Nostalgia stands as a double and it is both seductive and manipulative in policy documents. In current restructuring efforts, to borrow from a Russian saying, “the past has become much more unpredictability than the future” (Boym, 2001, p. xvi).

Nostalgia in the context of this book provides a way to think about restructuring as articulating a sentiment of loss and displacement, but also the construction of national fantasies that relate to inclusion and exclusion. The discussion of the modern and modernization in the policy statements that McGuire discusses is one such example. The British policies position state reforms as looking forward to the future in the present, and identifying the past and new “barbarians” coming through the gates of the nation. There is a longing for the past to invent new futures in the rhetoric of the Third Way in Britain, for example. Anthony Giddens and other major intellectuals speak for the future of nostalgia as they talk about the need to “move beyond tradition” into the formation of new sets of civil relations. Giddens argues, for example, that tradition is part of renewing the present to make possible a better future. The middle class parents that van Zanten discusses, as well, mobilize notions of nostalgia as a way of thinking about the remodeling and transforming of the public school. The nostalgia involves fantasies about what the school was, that are now devalued in the public schools that foster social disintegration, anonymity of relations, and a return to some origin of the notion of childhood in private schools that can produce the socialization necessary for maintaining their class position.

Nostalgia provides a relationship between the space of experience and the horizon of expectations. Boym suggests that one can think of nostalgia as having two different forms. One is that of restorative nostalgia that establishes a new memory of the origin for continuity and social cohesion in the transformation occurring. Restorative nostalgia is the promise of rebuilding the ideal home by a return to origins that lies at the core of many powerful ideologies today. Its danger is to relinquish critical thinking for emotional bonding. Restorative nostalgia is at the core of recent national and religious revivals and has two main plots: return to origins and the conspiracy. But the second form of nostalgia can be described as reflective, as Boym sug-