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RESCALING AND RECONSTITUTING EDUCATION POLICY

The Knowledge Economy and the Scalar Politics of Global Fields

INTRODUCTION

Globalisation has seen a new scalar politics emerge (Brenner, 2004, Robertson et al., 2006), reconstituting relations between nations and international organisations and provoking the emergence of a range of global fields. Bourdieu (2003), for example, speaks of a global economic field which has resulted from politics played by certain individuals, groups, businesses and organisations and a related performative construction of globalisation read only as neo-liberal market capitalism on a global scale in the post Cold war era. Bourdieu’s observation rejects a reification of globalisation, reinforcing the work of Dale (1999) and Robertson et al. (2006). All argue the necessity to understand the mechanisms of globalisation and how it works and has effects. In this chapter we also argue the need to document and understand how globalisation works through discourses, organisations and individuals and its consequent effects within nations. Tikly (2004) has made the point that globalisation effects work their way through and into different nations in different ways and illustrates his point in terms of the differences between nations of the global north and those of the global south. The impact of globalisation therefore requires empirical investigation in a way that is sensitive to both national differences and global commonalities. We suggest, drawing on Bourdieu (2003), that one way that such differences may be understood is through the amount of ‘national capital’ possessed by a given nation, which will be a significant factor in the nature and extent of such mediation. This view of national capital is akin to factors such as democratic governance, national levels of education and so on. Such factors help to secure a given nation’s positioning within geo-politics and help mediate pressures from above the nation. It is the growing importance of this hybrid mix of global and national factors that we refer to as a re-scaling of educational politics, into which national policies and their effects are increasingly drawn and reconstituted in a global field of comparison.

In this chapter we take what Held and McGrew (2002) call a “transformationalist” view of globalisation, in that we recognise that politics and processes beyond the nation have seen a reframing of both the state and policy processes within the nation. This is an account which rejects any suggestion of a straightforward emergent post-national politics, but rather one which accepts that globalisation of various kinds has produced new state modalities and production rules for policy and policy processes within nations. The nation-state nonetheless remains
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important in political and policy terms, but has been reconstituted in the context of
globalisation. Indeed, in some ways we would argue the nation-state now functions
strategically in relation to a number of global fields and international organisations.
Additionally, as part of the rescaling of policy production, we have seen the emergence of a global education policy field (Lingard, Rawolle & Taylor, 2005),
acting inter alia as a global field of comparison.

The broad changes discussed in this chapter hold similarities with recent work
that identifies a move from government to governance, from hierarchy to networks
(Atkinson & Coleman, 1992; Rhodes, 1997). Using a different metaphor to identify
these changes, Appadurai (2006) speaks of “vertebrate politics” to describe familiar
hierarchical and bureaucratic forms of government and “cellular politics” to refer
to the new more horizontal networked forms of governance. We argue that,
inevitably, both forms continue simultaneously, adding complexity to the processes
of policy and requiring the development of new methodologies for the study of its
effects. We see the latter form of cellular politics as related to a post-Westphalian
challenge to national sovereignty or at least a reconstitution of it. Again we see this
as operating simultaneously with older nation-based Westphalian international
relations, where nation-states remain significant in relationships between nations
and between nations and a broad range of international organisations. Mann (2000)
has spoken about a number of socio-spatial networks which operate simultaneously
today; he describes these as local, national, international (relations between
nations), trans-national (pass through national boundaries) and global. In this
chapter, we are concerned with the interweaving of the national with the global in
relation to policy conceptualisation and policy processes and with an emergent
global education policy field. This takes us beyond concerns with policy borrowing
and policy learning which operate in international, Westphalian ways, and which
remain important, to a consideration of the emergent global policy field in
education.

This chapter deals with two empirical cases of policy production, set against
these new scalar politics and as exemplars of them. We draw upon these empirical
cases rather than outline the data. The first empirical case deals with knowledge
economy policy, an idea which is an exemplary example of a globalised policy
discourse (Taylor et al., 1997) and which the OECD was central to proselytising
through an influential 1996 document on the topic. This part of the chapter
documents and analyses how knowledge economy policy came to be rearticulated
in Australia and as such considers national mediation of the Australian knowledge
economy policy, The Chance to Change (Batterham, 2000). This analysis also
demonstrates not only specific national mediation of a globalised policy discourse,
the interplay between global and national educational policy fields, but also
mediatisation of the policy process in the sense of the role of the field of journalism
in its production (Fairclough, 2000) and cross-field effects (Rawolle, 2005). The
second case deals with what we call an emergent global education policy field
(Lingard, Rawolle & Taylor, 2005). Here we document the significance of a global
articulation of policy as numbers (Rose, 1999) and comparison as new form of
governance (Novoa & Yariv-Mashal, 2003) and the ways in which these two help
constitute the global education policy field through the creation of a global space of equivalence, a commensurate space of measurement (Porter, 1995, Desrosieres, 1998). The analysis in both cases uses the work of Bourdieu, which we have argued is useful to education policy analysis (Lingard, Taylor & Rawolle, 2005, Lingard & Rawolle, 2008), as has van Zanten (2005). The cases are essentially about understanding the new scalar politics of education policy production and the emergent global education policy field and how it works through cross-field effects in the national field. In this sense, the macro level concern of the chapter is with the rescaling and reconstitution of the production rules for education policy in the context of globalisation. A second level concern is to demonstrate the usefulness of Bourdieu to understanding these new scalar politics in education policy.

KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY: MEDIATISATION AND REARTICULATION IN AUSTRALIA

Our argument in this section is that one of the effects of globalisation on nations can be identified through the development of national policies that adopt, adapt and utilise policy discourses and concepts from international organisations such as the OECD. In this section we focus on the knowledge economy. But, to come back to one of our framing arguments, we suggest that the specific effects of policy concepts such as the OECD’s ‘knowledge-based economy’ should be understood relative to national pressures and policy problems for which they are offered as solutions. This is the interplay of the global and the national, the interplay of an international organisation and the nation-state in a Westphalian way, but in a context where international competitiveness is seen as the raison d’être for education policy. To this end, we focus on Australia’s adoption of a policy version of the knowledge economy, which acted as a meta-policy, collecting and coordinating a range of diverse fields, from intellectual property law, higher education, school education, research and innovation. The event that we focus on is Batterham’s Review, a policy review established in 1999 by the federal government, initially framed around the potential that Australia’s science, engineering and technology industries could play in economic growth. The end point of this review was the production of a final report, The Chance to Change (Batterham, 2000), which promoted the adoption of a meta-narrative around Australia’s future, based on the potential of knowledge production and innovation, one that went beyond the securing of market fundamentals. This marked a significant anomaly for readings of the policy direction of the Howard Government (1996-2007), whose approach to education in particular was typically associated with neo-liberalism (Marginson, 2002, 2004, 2006).

The policy use of the knowledge economy emerged during the 1990s, alongside other competitor concepts such as the knowledge society, and the more recent development of knowledge cultures (see Kenway et al., 2006; Peters with Besley, 2006). There were two fundamental connections between these competitor concepts developed and proselytised by international organisations such as the OECD and the World Bank. The first connection was a problematisation of
knowledge production, and how the governance of institutions related to the production, development and exploitation of knowledge should be managed. This problematisation related to the link between changes in the way that knowledge was produced and social and economic problems facing nations around the world. The second connection was in providing a rationale and rhetorical defences for planned investments in different levels of knowledge production, from school education, higher education, research and industry, relative to the local and national paths of development of these institutions. This defence is crucially important as a distinction from neo-liberal policy developments, in that it highlighted the possible futures that could only emerge from sustained investments in these institutions. The formation of quasi-markets may be a mechanism for such investments, but only in the pursuit of desirable, imagined economic futures. What distinguishes knowledge-economy policies from neo-liberal policies is a normative goal for investment shaped by policy agents, drawn from Government, industry and the private sector involved in creating an imaginary of a desirable future. This kind of knowledge policy can be represented as "creating policy imaginaries". In neo-liberal policy development, setting such future imaginaries represents an intervention in markets, which are viewed as a normative end in themselves. Such planning is antithetical to Hayekian inspired neo-liberal policy developments.

Ironically, the emergence of these competitor concepts in a global field of policy producers connected together and made visible the very different literatures and assumptions in economics, knowledge management and sociology that underpinned each concept's development. Though semantically similar and used in similar ways in policy aphorisms (Lingard & Rawolle, 2004), the conceptualisation of the knowledge economy and the knowledge society mark divergent disciplinary paths taken by different strands of intellectual thought around the significance of different forms of knowledge and knowledge production. In short, the knowledge economy focuses on the importance of different institutions to innovation, and to the development of systems that embed and enable innovation to take hold. In contrast, the policy conceptualisation of the knowledge society focuses on the different social consequences that result from an increased focus on skills, education and technological development, including social exclusion, social capital and their distribution across and within nations. Given these differences, there is a separate issue of the use-value of each policy concept for nations employing them. The location and use of policy concepts such as the knowledge economy in global and national policy fields refracts the meaning ascribed to them in disciplinary traditions according to the logics of practice of each level of policy field. In brief, such policy fields act as a social space of competition, within which agents compete for certain stakes, such as the priority of social problems, and follow a set of social rules. We argue that the national differences between policy fields also act to inflct the associations of national policy discussions around knowledge production.

There are two interconnected ways that the knowledge economy links to globalisation. The first connection is in the kinds of processes identified in knowledge economy policy documents and academic literature around the knowledge economy. Though there are many processes, we will deal with only one example
related to flows of ideas and people (a broader discussion of these developments is discussed in Peters with Besley, 2006). The growth of different information and communication technologies, and in particular the computer technology revolution, enabled increased interconnectivity between people engaged in knowledge production in different nations around the globe. This has resulted in an increasing rate of knowledge production in multiple disciplinary fields, and movement of researchers to nations and locations of research strength (the 'brain drain' and 'brain gain'). Concurrent with this growing potential to produce knowledge has been a commensurate growth in interest in securing and protecting intellectual property rights, so that the transfer of knowledge is not free, but incurs a cost on consumers of knowledge, and a benefit to producers. One of the major outcomes of this move has been a 'globalisation of regulation' (Drahos and Braithwaite, 2000), exemplified through policies such as the Agreement on Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), which attempts to coerce different nations to accept the legal validity of US patents and copyrights. As Story (2002) has argued, education is something of a 'sleeping giant' in discussions around TRIPS. These processes involving flows of ideas and people can also be found in discussions of globalisation (Appadurai, 1996). Such moves, founded principally on new economic stakes in applications of new knowledge and emerging ways to structure knowledge production, invoked the OECD and other researchers to claim that a distinct and new economic field was emerging, and increasingly important for national economic growth and global economic competitiveness: the knowledge economy. One of the effects of this emergent economic level is that the capacity of individuals to understand, consume, produce and benefit from new knowledge becomes crucial to a nation's economic future. Hence, education becomes a much more prominent location for policy intervention, because of its role in developing the capabilities of individuals necessary to be a part of the knowledge economy.

The second connection of the knowledge economy with globalisation is much more direct and relates to the role that international organisations such as the OECD have started to play in representing relevant policy problems for nations and offering their own policies as solutions. The development and promotion of the knowledge-based economy by the OECD highlights the distinctly activist stance such organisations have increasingly favoured (Henry et al., 2001, Rizvi and Lingard, 2008), not only within internationally less powerful nations, but also within affluent nation-states such as Australia. Such involvement of international organisations in national policy developments would appear to compromise the sovereignty of nation-states in dealing with policy and political problems. These two connections between globalisation and the knowledge economy illustrate both the development of policy conceptualisations by international organisations and the underlying social problems that changes in knowledge and knowledge production provide for national governments.

Despite the connections between knowledge production and globalisation, these do not, on their own, explain the way that individual nation-states come to adopt policies related to the knowledge economy, and the effects of these policies. At best, they are pre-conditions for the national adoption of knowledge policies, and
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offer broad explanations of the policy terrain around knowledge production at the time when nations adopt particular versions of policy concept. In order to understand the local effects of knowledge economy policies, we now turn to a brief outline of a case study of the emergence of knowledge economy policies in Australia. Batterham’s Review provides one instance of the emergence of knowledge economy policies in a national context (Australia), and the subsequent translation of knowledge economy discourse to a specific set of national circumstances (Peters with Besley, 2006).

In developing this argument, we draw on Bourdieu’s theory of social fields, which highlights the connections between different social fields, including policy fields, and what we refer to as ‘cross-field effects’ (Lingard & Rawolle, 2004; Rawolle, 2005, 2008; Lingard, Rawolle & Taylor, 2005). While there is not room for an extended treatment of how policy can be understood in relation to social fields (see Rawolle, 2008), for now we will use fields as a nomenclature for different social areas, in which agents compete for specific stakes. In the discussion that follows, we will discuss the ‘field of print journalism’, indicating the space of competition between journalists in national newspapers in Australia, the ‘field of policy’, the ‘field of politics’, the ‘field of higher education’ and the ‘field of business’. Cross-field effects are used here as a way of highlighting the effects that policy developments produce in fields beyond the policy field and vice versa. We will focus specifically on a subclass of cross-field effects which we call ‘looping effects’, drawing on Ian Hacking (1997, 1995, 2003, 2004) and its development in some research by one of us (Rawolle, 2008). What we call looping effects are cross-field effects that result from agents in one field (for example, the policy field or the field of print journalism) diagnosing specific social problems which involve the naming groups of agents, a categorising of their roles and an imperative to intervene and change the practices of some named groups. The reason these are described as looping effects is that the reactions of groups of people to their diagnosis are in fact the effects in practice. This model represents one kind of causal mechanism to explain and explore some policy effects.

In thinking about what the concept of the knowledge economy allows policymakers to do, we make the argument that policy development “is an attempt to arbitrate in matters where there are disputes within fields or between fields that have led to tensions between fields and pressures within fields” (Rawolle, 2008, p. 7). From this perspective, it is necessary to describe the specific tensions and pressures between different fields in which Batterham’s Review can be represented as an intervention, and from which Australia’s version of the knowledge economy emerged. Without understanding these tensions and pressures, it would be difficult to study and explain the kinds of cross-field effects produced by Batterham’s Review.

The major source of tensions that Batterham’s Review sought to resolve were provoked by a series of newspaper reports from a range of journalists and newspaper that documented considerable dissatisfaction with the government’s funding of research, higher education and innovation. These were carried in the field of print journalism, but reflected concerns from the fields of higher education,
business, science and industry. While some of this dissatisfaction resulted from the government’s seeming refusal to offer increased funding, one recurring theme was that, on measures used by the OECD, Australia’s performance in knowledge production and innovation was falling behind other OECD and competitor countries. Through the practices of journalists, Australia’s policies on higher education were drawn into a global policy field through emerging themes carried in articles. The effects of comparisons with other nations were a perceived decline in Australia’s capacity to compete with other OECD nations in knowledge based industries. This is the globe as a commensurate space of measurement linked to the emergent global education policy field, which we will discuss in the next section of this chapter. Yet, despite the seemingly comprehensive decline in Australia’s position on these OECD measures, when Batterham’s Review was announced, the terms of reference were limited to the extent to which Australia’s science, engineering and technology capabilities could contribute to the economy.

The diagnosis offered by Batterham’s terms of reference suggested that the ‘science base’, inclusive of Australia’s science, engineering and technology institutions, was the vital connection between innovation, knowledge production and the community, rather than other aspects of education or even other disciplines in higher education. Throughout the course of Batterham’s Review, however, emerging themes carried in newspaper articles continually challenged these limited terms of reference. Consistently these terms of reference were challenged with updated figures released by the OECD, adding additional pressure on the national field of politics from an international organisation, and drawing the mediated policy debate into a global field of comparison. Notably, though, the diagnosis of problems in the terms of reference held looping effects on the kinds of journalists who wrote reports and articles about Batterham’s Review. Reporting about Batterham’s Review was initially limited to science journalists and business journalists, and then subsequently higher education journalists. It was only after the consultation phase of Batterham’s Review had been concluded that a wider section of journalists contributed to coverage; this occurred once the backing of the Prime Minister (then John Howard) highlighted the potential political importance of the review.

The continual reworking and challenge of journalists throughout Batterham’s Review highlighted some ways that the field of print journalism was able to re- represent the diagnosis offered by the terms of reference and to offer alternative diagnoses. This is one aspect of the mediatisation of policy, indicating the way that the logic of the field of print journalism acted on and influenced the field of policy over the duration of Batterham’s Review. Yet, Batterham resolved the tensions between the field of politics and the field of print journalism by offering an alternative diagnosis, with direct associations with the OECD’s knowledge-based economy policy. In dealing with the emerging themes from the fields of print journalism and the field of politics, Batterham represented the problem to be a series of blockages that prevented innovation from occurring. One location of these blockages was represented as the government viewing funding to the science base and other knowledge institutions as an expenditure without returns, while Batterham
argued that such funding should be viewed as an investment with specific and measurable returns. Another location of these blockages was the lack of incentives for interactions between people situated at different points within Australia's innovation system, so that much new knowledge produced in Australia's research institutions did not have an avenue for commercialisation. Batterham's resolution was to aim for increased funding, with the intention of keeping Australia competitive with other OECD nations, but to be strategic in the allocation of funds so that the benefits of funding research funding would lead to commercialisation and more researchers staying in Australia.

What this case has demonstrated is how policy production in Australia around the concept of knowledge economy was mediated by the field of journalism, demonstrating particular cross-field effects, namely looping effects. This can be seen to be the mediatisation of policy production in Fairclough's (2000) sense, in that it suggests "a new relationship between politics, government and mass media... which means that many significant political events are now in fact media events" (p. 3) and is an important development in the production of contemporary policy. The case also shows how comparative indicators from the OECD in relation to Australia's investment in the science base was a factor in the final policy outcome, as was the need to justify investment in the science base and higher education. This latter justification was framed by and linked to the globalised discourse of science and education investment as being central to the global competitiveness of the national economy, a discourse proselytised by a range of international organisations, including importantly in this case, the OECD. We would note as well the more policy activist role of an international organisation such as the OECD in the context of globalisation and the rise of supranational entities such as the EU and the emergence of a global education policy field, to a consideration of which we now turn.

AN EMERGENT GLOBAL EDUCATION POLICY FIELD

The previous case dealt with the interplay of the global and the national in policy production in a number of ways. In this section we will consider in broad outline the features of what we see as an emergent global education policy field, which operates in addition to the relationships considered in the previous section, as part of the rescaling of policy production accompanying globalisation. Our specific usage of field here is derived from Bourdieus's concept of field to refer to a space of relations with particular logics of practice, requiring particular habits and involving contestation over various capitals. This emergent global education policy field, the skeletal features of which will be outlined here, is an important element of the rescaling of education policy, just as the Batterham case provided evidence of the ways that nations today in policy production have to position themselves strategically in relation to the global and are also positioned by globalisation. The outline of the global education policy field ostensibly draws on two research projects (Henry et al., 2001, Gere et al., forthcoming).
As the global economic field has emerged in the post Cold War era and as globalisation has performatively and politically been constructed as neo-liberal economics with more power granted to the market and less to the state (Bourdieu, 2003), education has become a central economic policy tool for nations. Education as the production of the requisite human capital for a knowledge economy is seen as central to national economic policies and national economic well-being. This broad framing of education has witnessed some policy convergence across the globe, but always reframed by what Appadurai (1996) calls ‘vernacular globalisation’ to pick up on the ways in which global pressures – globalisation from above – are always mediated to a lesser or greater extent by local and national polities, cultures and histories – globalisation from below. This economistic reframing of education policy has also seen a need within nations for comparative performance data and comparative indicators in relation to national education and training systems (Brown et al., 1997) as a measure of likely economic prosperity and success of economic policies. This is where a globalised version of what Rose (1999) has called policy as numbers comes into play and which is intimately linked to the global education policy field.

In the context of globalisation, the nation-state has been restructured under New Public Management, which now steers at a distance by setting broad strategic goals and then ‘ensuring’ their achievement through a plethora of outcomes and indicator measures. This reinforces Rose’s (1999) argument about policy as numbers linked to various forms of accountability and quality control. Our argument here, though, is that this policy as numbers approach within nations has now also been globalised, as a way of nations measuring and comparing their educational performance globally against that of other nations. We would also argue that the OECD, seeking a new role for itself in the context of globalisation, has also moved to establish itself as the international organisation par excellence in terms of international educational indicators and measurement of educational performance globally (Rizvi and Lingard, 2008). This globalised policy as numbers is central to the global education policy field.

In a most insightful paper, Novoa and Yariv-Mashal (2003) have argued that comparison has become central to contemporary forms of governance and that comparison today is global as well as operating inside nations and at both levels works through numbers. In their terms, the ‘national eye’ today governs through comparison with the assistance of the ‘global eye’, a globalised policy as numbers. At another level, all of this data, national and international, which is reflective of policy as numbers, is also linked to the rise of what Power (1997) has called the “audit culture”, which accompanies quality assurance and the steering at a distance of the new public management, which has eviscerated the old bureaucratic structures of the nation-state. These data can also be seen to be a central component part of what Nigel Thrift (2005) has called “knowing capitalism”, the ways today management and social science knowledges, discourses and data have become important sources as capitalism seeks to manage risk and use knowledge about itself as tools for managing the system, which is permanently “under construction” (p. 3). In many ways though, this knowing has thinned out what is regarded as
being central to know, particularly in the field of education policy. As Power (1997) notes, management literatures have become more significant in relation to the audit explosion than social science ones, and the system is now managed more through the gaze of top-down quality and audit procedures reliant upon numbers and indicators than inspection at the site of practice. The point here, though, is that such audit now has a global framing as well – the global eye is important and evident in the global education policy field and also assists the national eye in governance.

As indicated earlier, in talking about the rescaling of politics in the context of globalisation we must avoid reifying globalisation. How then has a global education policy field been created: who are the players and organisations involved? We believe some insights can be gained from a brief consideration of the histories of statistics and their imbrication with the emergence of state administrative structures and that an analogy can be made to the emergence of a global education policy field though globalised policy as numbers.

Histories of statistics have demonstrated the interwoven connections between the emergence of state administrative structures at the national level – what Latour (1987) has called a “centre of calculation” – and the development of standardised methodologies and related cognitive schemes inherent in statistics (Porter, 1995; Desrosieres, 1998). Desrosieres (1998, p. 8), for example, observes: “As the etymology of the word shows, statistics is connected with the construction of the state, with its unification and administration.” Both Porter and Desrosieres demonstrate the symbiotic relationship between the modern state and statistics. The unification of the space which is the nation, its constitution as a “space of equivalence” (Desrosieres, 1998) is central to policy as numbers through statistics, indicators and the like. Indeed, Porter (1995, p. ix) argues that “quantification is a technology of distance.” Similarly Desrosieres (1998, p. 324) points out:

The construction of a statistical system cannot be separated from the construction of equivalence spaces that guarantee the consistency and permanence, both political and cognitive, of those objects intended to provide reference for debates. The space of representativeness of statistical descriptions is only made possible by a space of common mental representations borne by a common language, marked mainly by the state and the law.

There are at least two binaries at work in relation to statistics/numbers and these spaces of equivalence. On the first, Desrosieres (1998) talks about the realist/nonrealist debate to pick up on questions of validity and reliability. Whatever one’s epistemological position (objectivist or relativist), the point to note here though, is that “the measures succeed by giving direction to the very activities that are being measured” (Porter, 1995, p. 45). Porter (1995) also writes about a second binary, notably, the standardisation/accuracy debate. He suggests that: “There is a strong incentive to prefer precise and standardisable measures to highly accurate ones. For most purposes, accuracy is meaningless if the same operation cannot be performed at other sites” (p. 45). Rose (1999) also argues, in a Foucauldian fashion, that numbers, indicators, statistics are inscription devices, which in some ways constitute
that which they seek to represent. Single numbers, he suggests, also ‘black box’, that is, render invisible the judgements and so on which go into the technical construction of a scale. Such statistics, numbers and indicators make a space legible for governing.

Now, our argument here is that the creation of a global education policy field has occurred, or perhaps more accurately is occurring, through creation of a global space of equivalence in relation to student education performance and to a whole raft of educational indicators. The OECD in its more recent activist phase in global education policy processes has established a niche as the centre of technical excellence for international educational indicators and for international comparative measures of student performance. This globalised policy as numbers has begun to constitute the globe as a space of equivalence for measuring the performance of national education systems. This makes the global space legible and as such helps constitute a global education policy field. The creation of the global education policy field thus has occurred in ways analogous with the symbiotic relationships between statistics, state administrative structures within nations and the constitution of the nation as a space of equivalence. This is the post-Westphalian character of this aspect of the rescaling of politics and policy production in education.

Elsewhere we have elaborated the story of the OECD’s educational indicators which are published annually now in Education at Glance (Henry et al., 2001) and which also seek to deal with input-outcomes relationships in education systems. The OECD is also involved with the World Bank, and UNESCO in the creation of World Education Indicators, a project which seeks to create indicators in education for nations of the global south, as a complement to its educational indicators which deal largely, but not wholly, with its thirty member nations. We would also note the alignment of statistical categories across the OECD, Eurostat, the EU’s statistical agency and UNESCO.

The OECD’s Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), which was established by the OECD in the late 1990s in the broad global policy context outlined earlier, has been conducted three times now (2000, 2003, 2006) and seeks to measure students’ literacy, numeracy, science literacy and problem solving capabilities and potential for lifelong learning at the end of compulsory schooling (approximately aged 15 years). In 2006, 57 countries participated, while in 2009 the number will be almost 100. These tests, commissioned from experts and expert agencies, purport to be non-curricula based. In a way they constitute the globe as a space of equivalence with the emphasis being upon standardised measures rather than on accuracy of measurement, even though we would concede that the tests are probably as technically good as they could be, as is the analysis of them. However, their policy use as points of comparison within nations gives priority to their standardisation over their accuracy.

The global education policy field then is being constituted through a globalised approach to policy as numbers. We have tentatively and skeletonly outlined the way these processes are occurring and paid attention to the role that the OECD has played in relation to its emergence. However, more empirical research and theorising are required into this specific element of the rescaling of education.
policy production. Consideration would also need to be given to policy as numbers approaches at other supranational levels, for example, in the indicators work in relation to education within the EU (Grek et al., forthcoming). There are also a range of other international comparative measures of educational performance. However, we have concentrated in this brief case study on the OECD's indicators and PISA work, because it is the OECD which has sought to create a global space of equivalence through both.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have begun to outline the contours of the new scalar politics as evident in the new production rules for education policy and in the strategic education policy work of nations today. In so doing, we have also sketched the emergent global education policy field.

The first policy case presented an account of the ways in which national policy fields draw on the resources offered by the global education policy field as a template for designing national policies, and as a way of attempting to resolve tensions between national fields. The focus of this case was on the OECD's concept of a knowledge based economy. This case outlined ways in which both the field of policy and the field of print journalism drew on the scale of policy and numbers of comparison offered within the global education policy field to challenge the then government's representation of problems related to knowledge production. The role of the field of print journalism over the course of this review illustrated what, after Fairclough (2000), we called the mediatisation of policy, in that media coverage offered alternative diagnoses of problems facing knowledge production in Australia, but also introduced emerging themes around the importance of global comparisons of performance for the Batterham review. We would argue that the mediatisation of education policy is a relatively new phenomenon, which also requires more research in critical education policy studies.

The second case of this paper proposed an argument more directly about the development and importance of an emergent global education policy field, which acts as a global field of comparison, in which the performance of nations is reduced to a limited range of numbers and indicators. Testing, indicators and metrics developed by international organisations take on a much broader political significance as a result of the emergence of this field, which is constituted by their policy as numbers work, and which reconstitute national education policy against and within a new scale of equivalence, while simultaneously removing traces of values and conflict embedded in the development of the relevant numbers and metrics. This global space of equivalence is central to the global education policy field, which is an important instance of the new scalar politics and Post-Westphalian practices affecting education policy production rules today.

Both cases have also demonstrated how globalisation has affected international organisations and their modus operandi. Specifically, we have illustrated the more activist role of the OECD in proselytising global education policy discourses such
as knowledge economy (and lifelong learning) and in relation to the constitution of the global educational policy field.

The final point we would make is that Bourdieu’s bundles of concepts including social field, habitus, capitals and logics of practice can be usefully applied in education policy studies (Lingard, Taylor & Rawolle, 2005, van Zanten, 2005, Lingard & Rawolle, 2008). This has been illustrated through consideration of education policy as a field and through the concept of cross-field effects in the first policy case and in the concept of the global education policy field in the second. The concept of logics of practice, which defines any given social field, would also seem to have real purchase for understanding education policy as a field and its rescaled character, as well as failures of implementation across fields, including global and national fields.
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