

# Deakin Research Online

*Deakin University's institutional research repository*

**This is the published version (version of record) of:**

Vongalis-Macrow, Athena 2005, Displaced agency : teachers in globalised education systems, in *Proceedings of the 2005 Redesigning Pedagogy: Research, Policy, Practice Conference*, [NIE], [Singapore], pp. 1-17.

Available from Deakin Research Online:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30026068>

Reproduced with the kind permission of the copyright owner.

**Copyright** : 2005, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technical University

**Athena Vongalis-Macrow**  
**La Trobe University**  
**Melbourne Australia**

## **Displaced Agency: Teachers in Globalised Education Systems**

When considering the theme of this conference of resigning pedagogy, I immediately begin to ask questions about who does the redesigning. Redesigning implies action and effort. While the focus of the conference is on innovation, research, new ways and the end results, I am wishing to focus on those who do the redesigning. By focusing on the agents of pedagogical change, I wish to continue to explore and challenge ideas that redesigning pedagogy is a matter of progress rather than a matter of politics. In the era of globalisation, educational change is synonymous with progress and modernization as a response to the pressure to “globalise or fossilize” (Johnston, 1997). Many nations around the world have been moving towards new forms of education and educational policy is peppered with globalisation jargon such as interrelatedness, innovation, network community, borderless world, marketisation to name but a few. Such terms embrace a specific meaning of globalisation as marketisation and along with it adopt a parallel technocratic image of education and schooling. In this paper, I wish to firstly, raise concerns about the uncontested way that globalisation inspired educational reforms have entered the discourse of educational policy, and secondly, how educational policy serves to validate the ideas that educational change is irreversible and happens without the cooperation of key agents, such as teachers.

The paper problematises education reforms through critical discourse analysis of global orientated educational policies. Critical discourse research contributes to the demystification of globalisation as neutral phenomena. Sample policy analyses of international organizations, such as, OECD, UNESCO and World Bank (Dale, 1999; Spring, 1998; Vongalis, 2003). These organisations are prominent players in the formulation of education policy that is influencing world-wide trends in education reforms. Such analytical research has borne fruit in shifting the locus of power back to local ownership of social change. Deacon (2005) notes a shift in global policy that he partly attributes to the work of political analysts advising international agencies. The work of epistemic communities to identify interests and analyse the politics of change are critical to ensure more desirable and equitable systems. This paper seeks to continue that analytical work by assessing the policy specific to reforming education systems. These are examined and the discussion assesses how globalisation driven reforms affect teachers’ agency. The paper concludes by identifying issues that are relevant to educators as they are engaged and are disengaged by globalized education reforms.

### ***What is globalization and why should we care about it still?***

By the 1990s, innovations in communication technologies had significant influence in transforming social relations and social and economic transactions so that these could take place across cyber space with increased velocity and consequently interaction between different bodies could occur with greater intensity (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, & Perraton, 1999 & Perraton,

1999). As these new possibilities gained shape and momentum, the restructuring of social institutions quickly followed.

Although education had been changing in ways that could be traced internationally since the early 1960s, from 1990s onwards, the term globalisation better described the influential processes fuelling educational change. Globalisation, as a concept and as sets of processes representing patterns of social change, started to have a significant influence on education systems (Ashton & Green, 1996; Green, 1997, 1999; Marginson, 1999; Spring, 1998). While the continuity of education change has been well documented (Archer, 1984; Dale, 1989; Giroux, 1983) globalisation inspired education changes were marked by uncertainty and ambiguity especially considering the contentious nature of what globalization meant in relation to education and emerging global development. The conceptual framing of globalisation, by key theorists, is discussed in order to problematise globalisation as a concept and practice from the onset. From this positioning, a critique of change in possible considering the framing reference of globalisation as contentious. However, in order to overcome getting stalled in the conceptualisation of globalisation and the prolific literature in the field that comes from debating their competing theories, the discussion focuses globalisation's problematic causal reality as it impacts on education systems and the anti-agent discourse and proposed practices that mark educational policy.

### ***Global Economy and Macro Governance***

Key globalisation theorists such as Wallerstein, Giddens and Robertson concede that globalisation is an expression of growing intensity of international relations (Giddens, 1999; Robertson, 1992a, 1992b; Wallerstein, 1991). An outcome of this intensity is the emergence of global agencies as a strengthened layer of global governance that construct social mechanisms through which international relations are made more intensive (Dale, 1999; P. W. Jones, 1992, 1998; Marginson, 1999; McNeely & Cha, 1994). This phenomena is particularly important to education because it impacts on how a national system, such as education, can be governed by supranational bodies rather than remaining a national concern. To illustrate, Wolfesohn, the World Bank president, reiterated the important link between the World Bank as a global agency and a facilitator of globalised change and its influence on education to create the conditions for economic growth. Its framework for action includes the following statement that solidifies the World Bank in education governance. He states,

As globalisation draws us all into greater proximity, it is essential that we nurture, prize, and support the diverse cultures and historical experiences of the countries in which The World Bank Group operates. We simply cannot conceive of development without cultural continuity. It must be acknowledged and must form the basis for the future. Serious attention to culture is basic to improving development effectiveness – in education, health, the production of goods and services, the management of cities. It is at the very heart of poverty reduction as well as the quality of life (Wolfesohn, 1999).

This comment by the World Bank president shows that a global organisation such as the World Bank pays serious attention to how education develops as part of the broader social development agendas. The World Bank is not representative of any one country, but can be seen as representing macro-governance in which its policy and agendas target clusters of countries that

receive aid and assistance from the World Bank. This means that the World Bank constructs macro policy with global scope that it is relevant to groups of countries. National governments of those countries are more likely to concede national concerns and interests to the governance capacity of global organisations, in this case, the World Bank. It appears that global organisations have the capacity to situate common national problems within global trends and provide a way to address these concerns that is timely and relevant to clusters of nations undergoing similar experiences. In this way, global and local interests are addressed to frame and manage national social and economic change (Amen, 1999; Dale, 1999; OECD, 1997; Sklair, 1997; Tiruneh, 2000).

Whether this capacity is indicative of the disappearance of the nation state in constructing social policy is a contentious point and one that is highly debated (Albrow, 1996; Amen, 1999) (Appadurai, 1990; Deacon, Hulse, & Stubbs, 1997) but the point to be made is that globalisation reflects the increased governance role played by global agencies to construct policy on behalf of national governments. That global education policy travels globally across national boundaries creates complex tensions for how that policy is interpreted and put into practice at the local level (K. Jones & N. Alexiadou, 2001).

Anthony Giddens suggests that globalisation is a dialectical process, historically linked to modernity. He states,

Globalisation can thus be defined as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa. This is a dialectical process because such local happenings may move in an obverse direction from the very distanced relations that shape them. Local transformation is as much a part of globalisation as the lateral extension of social connections across time and space (Giddens, 1990:64)

According to Giddens part of the impetus for forming new intensive relations that link individuals and groups in a global membership, is through more extensive global capitalism. Participation in the global economy transcends national boundaries and creates a virtual neighbourhood of individuals and groups (Giddens & Hutton, 2000). Giddens' view is of globalisation as a juggernaut that is, a process of global market-driven change that is inevitable, irreversible, and universal in its implementation. The Giddens' perspective is ubiquitous in education policy. Globalisation has become synonymous with global capitalist economic growth creating an interdependence of national economies in a more integrated and emerged global economy (OECD, 1992).

Within the global economy, economic capital drives development towards the 'weightless' economy and the emergence of knowledge capitalism or the trade in knowledge. Giddens (Johnston, 1997) sums up this new aspect of creating financial capital through knowledge this way,

The weightless economy means that increasingly economic value on a global level depends upon the trading of information rather than the trading of material goods. The whole financial economy is a weightless economy, but many other aspects of production and especially the

trading of services are now weightless, depending upon information which you trade and exchange, not upon the manufacture of material goods (Giddens, 1999b Lecture1).

The reliance on conceptual skills and knowledge coupled with advances in technology has opened up trade in information, knowledge and ideas (Barber, 2000). Within this economic activity a fundamental resource is information and knowledge that includes the ability to produce as well as consume it (Tedesco, 1997). Knowledge, as an inexhaustible good (Tedesco, 1997) is used and reused, with limitless creative outcomes. The impact that this view of knowledge has on education is to shift the focus of education towards a good and service that complements and compliments knowledge capitalism (Carnoy & Castells, 1999; Marginson, 1999). Education systems train and educate new generations for technical and knowledge competence required for working and living within the global economy and its knowledge production and consumption (Henry, Lingard, Rizvi, & Taylor, 1999; Sinclair, 1999; Spring, 1998).

Globalisation relies on global competition and the immediacy of adjusting to the exigencies of the market. It encourages flexibility, deregulation and the maintenance of continued and foreseeable market confidence to facilitate future global investments and profitability. The profit making potential from heightened market activity, coupled with global deregulation of finance and trade, gives impetus for many policy changes in order to accommodate the demands of global market competitiveness. For example, market competitiveness searches for cheaper labour, more flexible labour and labour that is skilled to operate within a technological and competitive economy. This competitive advantage has become a standard labour policy (Wood, Meiksins, & Yates, 1998). The link between education and the emergence of such flexible capitalism continues to play a significant role in directing and regulating education change and the training of the next generation of individuals able to participate in a competitive global market by having the necessary skills demanded by the new workplace (Duan, 1997; Lauder & Brown, 1997).

Another important theoretical perspective to consider in order to identify the impact of globalization on education is through Wallerstein's view of globalisation (Wallerstein, 1991). He developed world system theory (Wallerstein, 1976) and argues that globalisation is a continuation of the political struggles inherent in the capitalist world economy as a world system. Wallerstein's premise that globalisation is a continuation of political struggle is based on the ideas that both nationalism and internationalism are historical developments of capitalism. In both cases, the nation-state is the locus for ideological and political struggle under the capitalist world system. Wallerstein proposes that nation states are capitalist constructs and nationalism is an ideology with an emphasis on regional and cultural claims. Continuing political struggle, manifest in the capitalist world economy as a world economic system now shapes these cultural claims. The effect is to divide the world into economic zones, replicating capitalist struggle in movement towards one world and one ideological and economic system. Moreover, this underpins serious social conflicts arising from class conflict and exploitation. As global communities are increasingly linked through global macro policies and participation in a global economy, an outcome of this trend is the growing political and social divides referred to as the global north and south. The global south refers to lesser-developed countries (LDCs) characterised by,

Per capita GNP of less than U.S. \$9,656 (the current World Bank definition of low- and middle-income economies); Recent or relatively recent economic liberalization (including, but not limited to, a reduction in the state's role in the economy, privatization of previously state-owned

companies, and/or removal of foreign exchange controls and obstacles to foreign investment); Debt ratings below investment grade by major international ratings agencies and a recent history of defaulting on, or rescheduling of, sovereign debt; Recent liberalization of the political system and a move towards greater public participation in the political process; and Non-membership in the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (EMTA, 2000).

Issues of power and interests stir the type of political questions that, according to Lawn (1996), are central in the establishment of a new social group and how this group fits into an emerging structure. Education has become a site to politicise the social and economic values underpinning the control and management of education in response to globalisation. Wallerstein's view of globalisation is pertinent because he problematises the outcomes of the global economy to argue that there are more inherent problems that result from global capitalism than problems of control as suggested by Giddens. Wallerstein links these with the continual struggle of poorer, less developed nations and less powerful nations to compete with more developed nations in the global market. This view of globalization politicises social change as a way to counter arguments that globalisation is a neutral process of modernization (Albrow, 1996).

Critics of overt market reforms point out the neo-liberal nature of reforms that are fraught with democratic and economic injustices (George, 1999; Wallerstein, 1997). The arguments illustrate how neo-liberalism dominates social policy and social change having devastating affects on those not able to participate in the competitive, market driven societies where "social acts are turned into market transactions"(Treanor, 1999):1). The juggernaut of globalisation is in fact the dominance of neo-liberalism as a means to control the development of a high modernity.

Giddens retorts that new working relationships are emerging from globalization because of structural changes and that these are based on reflexive re-ordering of social relations (Giddens, 1994). He emphasises social action across time and space compression underlying a greater autonomy of people to construct their working environments. Yet the evidence suggests that the outcome of neo-liberalism has seen stricter controls over labour, less priority of personal development and work satisfaction, increased working hours and for the majority a reduction in wages (Antonopoulou, 2000; Treanor, 1999; Went, 2000; Wood et al., 1998). When applied to education, this line of argument highlights the effects of restructuring education in the light of neo-liberal social reforms and re-formation of teacher agents. It raises questions about the purpose of education, what drives reform, how agents are embedded and respond to change. Political issues about power and control come to the fore.

The emergence of international organisations, as prominent players in the formulation of education policy, presents a significant shift in the reconstruction of education systems across the globe. This shift is a key phenomenon of globalisation and global markets. To consider how this prominent role of global agencies has evolved, the work of Robertson is important. Robertson (1992b) refers to globalisation as processes by which people's awareness of the world becomes more acute as there is a growing intensity and commonality in how the world is constructed. He argues that the growing prominence of international agencies as centres for constructing common and explicit social and economic goals signals a distinct shift towards a global perspective in social analysis. This movement towards global policy construction was analysed by Robertson early in the 1960s when he outlined the features of a globally orientated system using the AGIL framework. Globally orientated policy is required to address environmental issues (A);

establish practices and strategies for attaining goals (G); integrate exchanges between the parts of a system (I); and finally, target restructuring and the reproduction of the system over time (L). In short, the AGIL framework shows global system policies are intentional plans to pursue a particular function and operational mode of governance on a global scale (Waters, 1995).

The escalation in the global market for particular education outcomes along with the predominance of global agencies in social policy are key features of manifesting globalisation. In the sense that 'doing' globalisation involves an interlocking of shared interests through the governance agenda of international organisations. Despite the apparent convergence of policy interests, Robertson criticizes the homogenising patterns of change (Robertson, 1997). According to Robertson, a consequence of the interrelatedness of globalising forces is that they help define the local because communities select the global social and cultural practices that are valuable and important to the identity of the locality. The act of selection is loaded with potential conflict and tensions that may result when global agendas clash with local demands (Robertson, 1997). Robertson stresses the politics of global change.

While the idea that globalisation is synonymous with global capitalism, this conceptualisation of globalization gives rise to mythologizing about globalisation as a process of development removed from the agendas of those doing the developing. This argument resonates in the education reform debate when researchers and educators question the nature and scope of reforms and redesigns.

### ***International organisations and key educational reforms***

Research illustrates the array of social policy being deferred to global agencies, that are assuming greater responsibility for framing global social policy (Amen, 1999; Deacon, 2005; Deacon et al., 1997; Djelic, 2005). Within the parameters of social policy, the restructuring of education has become part of the governance agenda that seeks to build a systematic and controlled form of social and education change (Good & Prakash, 2000; Green, 1997; Henry et al., 1999; Levin, 1998; Spring, 1998). As social and economic contexts shift local boundaries to global parameters, education change reconfigures to respond to the new economic conditions that impact on education, knowledge and learning (Ashton & Green, 1996; Carnoy & Castells, 1999).

Current education policy from the mid 1990s onwards, highlights the role of globally orientated organizations to increasingly incorporate education as part of the ongoing economic development agenda in the global era (CERI, 1998; Wood et al., 1998; WorldBank, 1999, 2000). This trend, identified earlier by McNeely and Cha (McNeely & Cha), has launched debates about the role of education in the current context and raised issues about the nature and scope of reform. The question raised by McNeely and Cha as well as Green (Green, 1999) seeks to clarify whether the global agenda of international organizations is forcing a convergence of educational systems and the erosion of more localized input. Political struggles are about language of policy and domination (Fairclough, 2000) and as such the way international agencies popularize and globalise their agenda manifests in the discourse of policy. Policy identifies the action needed to materialize globalisation, policy identifies the need to redesign, however, does policy identify agency and action?

## Research Findings: Locating global policy

In his extensive research into the World Bank, Phillip Jones (P. W. Jones, 1992) confronted the complexity of trying to unpack policy from global organisations and suggested two ways to arrive at a generalised policy position. Policy analysis could be framed by tracking input and output by following the money and making assumptions about based on the way policy supports specific actions. The other way is to construct analysis through the rhetoric of policy through which education change is explained and justified. Analysing the rhetoric of policy was an accessible way to understand how organisations conceptualise globalisation and how they enter the education policy debates. More recently, Stiglitz refers to “aggregate behaviour” (Stiglitz, 2002:27) as a way to make assumptions about macro policy behaviours. These recommendations have underpinned the way evidence has been collected for the research.

In order to provide a snapshot of the local distribution point from which global policy travels in order to better understand how change is actioned in policy, the research involved gathering policy data from a selection of range of policy texts from OECD, UNESCO and World Bank. The prime source of data and information was from documents (speeches, reports, and working papers) from 1996-2000. The following is an aggregate summary that frames the relationship between globalisation and education in policy discourse.

OECD	UNESCO	World Bank
Age of globalisation: World economy based on knowledge, technology and flexibility; New pattern of demand for skilled labour; Sustainable capital development; Decline in stable social influences: social winners and losers; Globalisation cannot materialize automatically; Human capital and life time learning skills.	Globalisation intensifies awareness, new opportunities but paradoxical and incomplete; Mismatch between the supply and demand of labour market; Globalisation dominated by economic, financial and market principles underpinned by technological and scientific revolutions; Internationalisation of standards of educational performance.	Flowering of globalisation; Capital market flows driven by knowledge in other words, capitalism; Workers meet changing labour market needs to compete in global market; Global capital seeking favourable opportunities; Educated and skilled citizens who can operate in a democratic society; Building up supportive domestic institutions and policies to reduce risks of financial crisis.

**Table 1: Aggregate summary of globalisation and education policies**

The discourse of policy constructs globalisation as an umbrella term for technocratic world economy that is highly reliant on new skills and knowledge disseminated through a responsive education system. Thus, development, technology, markets, skills and knowledge, global capital, and education are relevant concepts to globalisation. That the relationship between these concepts and globalisation has traveled to local policies on educational reform is evident in European countries. Rinne (2000) sums up the trend in education development in the global era.

Even though the school and educational policy undoubtedly have their own partially autonomous possibilities to affect the development of mankind and the world view, pattern of thought and functional models

of growing generations, it looks inevitable that the limits and structure of education are determined by powers which are greater supranational economic and social structures (Rinne, 2000: 338).

Buenfil-Burgos(2000) outlines similar trends in Mexico and Rhoten (2000) discusses changes in Argentina that have a striking similarity. Education reform in China took on a decidedly globalised template in the context of a distinct political culture (Hawkins, 2000).

While supranational policy creates a template for educational redesign, the reforms are contentious and bring to the fore the concerns raised by Roberston and Wallerstein in globalisation theory. Education reform is criticised for its economic imperative that buys into the need to materialize a distinct form of neo-liberalism and the marketisation of education (George, 1999; Karsten, 1995; Levin, 1998a; Salt, Cervero, & Herod, 2000). Educationalists argue against education as an utilitarian tool for the knowledge economy which repackages education repackaged as a commodity for sale in the global economy (Power & Whitty, 1997; Spring, 1998). This definition of globalisation underpins the conceptualization and actioning of education as an instrument of economic reforms (Marginson, 1999; M. Young, 1998). The unease about the direction of education reform is identified by Duan (1997) who cautions,

The process of globalisation may be presenting us with two models of human behaviour that will be common place. On the one hand, the individual- orientated, egoistic and competitive and on the other hand, the collectively orientated, altruistic and cooperative (Duan, 1997:38)

The impetus for globalised educational policy is premises education as the backbone for growing the knowledge economy and preparing workers for the new age. Policy becomes a way of identifying what needs to be done to this end. Examining the definition of policy from The World Bank, the operational purpose of policy is emphasised. The World Bank describes policy as sets of guidelines controlling how monies are allocated and the process that would be put into place to disburse monies (WorldBank, 2001). The Work Bank definition of policy suggests that policy enables infrastructure, supports specific goals and outcomes, checks work and money flows, and ensures some quality control. This operational definition of policy focuses on the outcomes and achievements policy rather than justifying a particular view of globalisation. Policy becomes a functional, operational strategy rather than a contested arena for educational positioning.

However, Duan's two models, the free market capitalist model of education measured against the community minded model underscores the politics of traveling educational policy. Globalisation is a political and highly contested notion, and any form of educational change carries the legacy of contention in its proposed actions. The following sections continues to challenge the way globalisation is constructed in the policies of UNESCO, OECD and the World Bank by specifically examining policy relevant to educational actions.

### ***Reform measures of globalised education systems***

The overview of the policies from UNESCO, OECD and World (table 2) further delve into the policy positions outlined in table 1. This table specifically summarises reform measures though which globalisation policy is made operational in education systems. When taking systemic view

of education, it can be expected that policy specifies actions for structural redesign and agency. However, what appears to be paramount in policy are structural reform actions where the causality of agency, that is who does what, is blurred. Policy references structural changes provide a blueprint for actioning the reform processes. Reoccurring references to structural reforms in the policies of UNESCO, World Bank and OECD are tabled below.

OECD	UNESCO	World Bank
Decentralisation: diffuse education system.	Anti Neo-liberalism ideology; 'Real' Decentralization and autonomy of education not prompted by cost reduction.	Education to meet changing market needs; A human capital investment; produces social cultural and economic improvements.
Devolution to school level and head teacher.	Resource and financing of education in hands of individual governments.	Devolved financial control of decision making, fiscal discipline to deliver more quality and efficiency; Explore private funding options.
Life long learning; Utilization of Technology, knowledge & know-how; Meet the demands of the employer and individual; Improve currency value of life long learning.	Education enlarged/customized; Learning to learn; A process giving all the possibility of learning throughout life; Prioritise social and cultural cohesion; Inclusive education system; Education heart and head; Need to update and innovate.	Governmental centralized decision making on curriculum and assessment; Foundation skills (life skills), citizenry and proper ethical values; Tomorrow's workers will need to be able to engage in lifelong education, learn new things quickly.

**Table 2: Aggregate policy about reforming education**

Specific structural changes are embedded in the policy documents. These structural changes include decentralization, devolution, continuous, life-long education, and changed funding arrangements. Redesigning education around these structures suggests a prescription for globalised education.

Redesigning education systems in order to operationalise structural changes brings to the fore the role of politics in the development strategies. How the global agencies steer reforms suggests underlying tensions around responses to globalisation, partly due to disagreement over how globalisation is constructed. When UNESCO policy specifically takes an anti-neoliberal stance, implications are that other agencies are neo-liberal in their policy. Thus, UNESCO advocates 'real' democracy that accounts for social and cultural differences while World Bank discourse is grounded in the language of neo-liberal efficiency criteria. From the onset, redesigning education is problematic in the way that some structural changes support a neo-liberal view of globalisation. Just as theorist argue about the implications of globalisation, so the three agencies, UNESCO, OECD, and the World Bank differ in the way they conceptualise the globalised future. The prevalence of Lifelong learning, as an educational objective also highlights policy tensions. Life long learning can provide a basis for updating knowledge and skills across cultures and contexts, however, depending on the underlying agenda of implementation, lifelong learning is also a way in which employers can have a more direct input into the education system. It is important to

note that policy from global agencies differs and that a contested conceptual construction of globalisation shapes educational reform.

International organisations propagate a view of globalisation and this reinforces the redesign of institutional forms. Table 1 showed that OECD policy stressed that *globalisation cannot materialize automatically*; that it needs *human capital and life time learning skills*. As a result OECD educational change aims towards this end. Policy emphasizes technical knowledge, employability, on going learning and a new responsive, diffuse system. UNESCO position in terms of globalisation varies, *Globalisation intensifies awareness, new opportunities but paradoxical and incomplete*; therefore educational responsiveness is laden with caution against extreme Neoliberalism in order to prevent the exacerbation of difference. Hence, policy stresses customization and locality in the way education reforms. UNESCO relies on governments to keep state control over globalised systems unless there is a 'real' democratic need to decentralize control and power. For the World Bank globalisation is a *flowering* of monetary opportunity. Education reforms reflect this monetary agenda therefore structural changes optimize education investment.

These sample analyses of policy responding to globalisation raise questions about whether globalisation driven reforms are representative of particular values and principles and exclusive of others. If there is disagreement about globalisation then what does that mean for educational change? If change is proceeding without addressing this fundamental conceptual issue then educational reform adds to the mythology that globalisation is unavoidable, external and increasingly constraining phenomena in which actors are obligated not to fall behind. As discussed earlier, both Robertson and Wallerstein problematise the idea of globalisation as a juggernaut of change. Wallerstein extrapolates on potential economic and social disparity when particular perspectives are excluded from policy discourse and Robertson questions the capacity of the local to shape external dictums. The current research questions whether the governance role of international agencies, which have a downwardly causal reality in local educational policies, makes for an inclusive and equitable education system? To consider the question of equity and inclusion, the capacity of teachers within globalised systems is analysed. Critical agents in the operational implementation of traveling policy are teachers, therefore the next section considers teachers' positioning in globalised policies and how involved they are in redesigning their work and organisations.

### ***Implications for teachers***

It is argued in this paper that global organisations use education to promote a view of globalisation. This construction of globalisation influences how education systems are shaped. Reform measures such as decentralization, devolution, continuous, life-long education, and changed funding arrangements affect teachers. It is interesting to consider teachers' agency in relation to these structures and how teachers' actions are constructed in enabling policy recommendations. The following table (3) is an aggregate summary of teachers' position in educational reform policy.

OECD	UNESCO	World Bank
Important for teachers to attend refresher courses, especially those teaching scientific or technical subjects;	Teachers as custodians of education as a public resource; A public resource; Technology and social change	Teaching is a complex professional activity; Deploying a professional teaching force;

The ideal of life-long learning is as relevant to teachers as to other members of society teacher-as-learner; Teachers as ‘collaborators’ need to break with the past; Teacher reform part of wider enterprise to adapt education to society; Cost of teachers underscores reform.	means the quality of teachers be more in demand; Status of teachers to reflect the important role; Teachers need to be more dynamic and responsive to changing world of work; Teacher development crucial and a determining factor in quality education.	Sustainability of teacher development; Effective teachers; Teacher development related to student achievement; Teachers as a component of quality provision of educational goods/products.
---	---	---

**Table 3: Teachers' positioning in globalised education policies**

Firstly, the table shows how teachers’ agency is embedded in the discourse of policy. While policy suggests actions for change, one could assume that key actors have a significant role in shaping educational reforms. Local designs and hybridization of global policy is dependent on turning global actions into local practices. If policy were inclusive and then the local actors would be “closely involved, enmeshed and entwined in the process of transnational rule making and institutional building” (Djelic, 2005:71).

World Bank education reforms, reflecting a monetary agenda, conceptualizing globalisation as a flowering of global capitalism which can be optimized through education investment, engages teachers as a component of the quality provision of educational goods/products. Teachers need to be effective and the outcomes of student achievement are key indicators of quality teaching. For the OECD materializing globalisation means an emphasis on technical knowledge, employability, on going learning and a new responsive, diffuse system. Teachers model this scenario through their work. UNESCO policy emphasizes paradoxical nature of globalisation to prompt interrelatedness with the potential to exploit difference. Teachers occupy this ambiguous role to support elements of change while acting as gatekeepers to more exploitative measures. They have custodial role is ensuring equality and tempering difference that may be exploited in more neoliberal reforms. Further examination of teachers’ position in policy from the OECD, World Bank and UNESCO undertaken by the author (Vongalis, 2003; Vongalis & Seddon, 2001) can be summarized by table 4.

Teacher actions	Organisations
Be accountable	OECD, World Bank
Collaborate	OECD
Model	OECD, World Bank UNESCO
Reproduce	OECD, World Bank UNESCO

**Table 4: Teachers' agency in globalised education systems**

When answering the question about inclusiveness and in whose interests are globalised reforms, critical agents such as teachers are not core actors in the redesign process. On the whole, teachers are more regimented, especially in OECD and World Bank policy, and their agency finely tuned towards ensuring that policy persists in local practices. The operational capacity of teachers to model, reproduce, account and collaborate with globally constructed policy leaves

little room for new professional judgements, interventions, and redesigning of education and the profession in light of contested globalised policies.

By regulating the educators' agency to largely passive, responsive role then a problematic hurdle is overstepped. Educators, who may criticize the way globalisation is constructed, and thus challenge the politics of a particular type of redesign, have their role minimized and controlled. Their capacity to influence and challenge the assumptions about globalisation and education systems is limited when considering that their actions and interactions nominally implement policy and procedure rather than critically evaluate or reflect on change. The underprivileged status of educators in the redesigning of policy and pedagogy is reflected in teachers' heavily reduced access to real power decision-making that influences the structure and control of the distribution of resources and the construction of structures that regulate and implement the decisions (Archer, 1995). When summarising their actions and interactions, where teachers must account, collaborate, model and reproduce globalised education, what emerges is the lack of control and decision making capacity in determining how the profession develops and responds to globalisation.

### ***Issues for teachers and pedagogy.***

When considering the art and science of teaching as an art and science removed from the hands of the practitioner, one can liken this to having the patron's hand moving the hand and brushstrokes of the artist. When teaching and pedagogy are redesigned without significant input from the teaching profession then a real injustice is in progress. Globalised policy, which prepackages and redesigns education systems without insisting on the considerable professional expertise of teachers, creates the potential for the further destabilization of education systems. Issues related to teacher morale, teacher initiative, and teacher professionalism are implicated when considering the uncontested nature of globalised education policy and its subsequent reshaping of teachers' work. Under stringent regulation and control in globalised systems, teachers' autonomy to reshape their work and redesign the teaching future is left in the hand of those who are removed from the profession. If the intention is to alienate teachers from the complex social, educative and professional role that they inhabit in education systems, not contesting the neutrality of globalisation inspired reforms creates the potential crisis when the full impact of teachers' displacement is felt. Good organizational change theory stipulates the full involvement and ownership of change by key agents. Globalisation theorists stress the problematic nature of presenting globalisation as uncontested phenomena so that the redesigning of education in the global era demands that the process is challenged from the onset. Global organisations configure globalisation to reflect their own development agendas. From this loaded positioning, policy travels to reframe education systems reforms by pushing particular structural forms as more relevant to a particular perspective of globalisation. Professional educators are being prevented by the work practices advocated in such policies, to critique the assumptions underlying globalised reforms and to 'interrupt' (Au & Apple, 2004) potentially inequitable reforms in order to ensure that education is not hijacked by the globalisation agendas but remains an emancipatory and engaging public good for all.

Reference:

- Albrow, M. (1996). *The Global Age : State and Society Beyond Modernity*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Amen, M. M. (1999). Borrowing Authority: Eclipsing Government. In M. Hewson & T. J. Sinclair (Eds.), *Approaches to Global Governance Theory*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Antonopoulou, S. N. (2000). The Process of Globalisation and Class Transformation in the West. *Democracy and Nature*, 6(1), 37-54.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Economy. *Public Culture*, 2(2).
- Archer, M. S. (1984). *Social Origins of Educational Systems*. London: Sage Publications.
- Archer, M. S. (1995). *Realist social theory: the morphogenetic approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ashton, D., & Green, F. (1996). *Education, Training and Global Economy*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Au, w., & Apple, M. (2004). Interrupting Globalization as an Educational Practice. *Educational Policy*, 18, 784-793.
- Barber, B. R. (2000). Challenges to the common good in the age of globalism. *Social Education*, 64(1), 8-13.
- Buenfil-Burgos, R. N. (2000). Globalization, education and discourse political analysis: ambiguity and accountability in research. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(1), 1-24.
- Carnoy, M., & Castells, M. (1999). *Globalization, the knowledge society, and the network state: Poulantzas at the millennium*. Retrieved June 2001, 2001
- CERI. (1998). *STAYING AHEAD: In-Service Training and Teacher Professional Development*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Dale, R. (1989). *The State and Education Policy*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Dale, R. (1999). Specifying globalisation effects on national policy: a focus on the mechanisms. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14(1), 1-17.
- Deacon, B. (2005). From 'Safety Nets' Back to 'Universal Social Provision'. *Global Social Policy*, 5(1), 19-29.

- Deacon, B., Hulse, M., & Stubbs, P. (1997). *Global Social Policy International Organisations and the future of welfare*. London: Sage Publications.
- Djelic, M.-L. (2005). From Local Legislation to Global Structuring Frame. *Global Social Policy*, 5(1), 55-76.
- Duan, H. (1997). National Forces, Globalization and Educational Restructuring: Some European response patterns. *Compare*, 27(1), 19-42.
- EMTA. (2000). *What is an Emerging Market?* Retrieved July, 2002, from <http://www.emta.org/emarkets/faq.html>
- Fairclough, N. (2000). *New Labour, New Language?* London; New York: Routledge.
- George, S. (1999, 24-26 March). *A Short History of Neo-Liberalism: Twenty Years of Elite Economic and Emerging Opportunities for Structural Change*. Paper presented at the Conference on Economic Sovereignty in a Globalising World, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (1994). *Beyond Left and Right the future of Radical Politics*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1999). *Runaway world: The Reith Lectures revisited* (Lecture series No. 1 lecture). London: BBC Reith Lectures 1999.
- Giddens, A., & Hutton, W. (Eds.). (2000). *On the Edge: Living with Global Capitalism*. London: London School of Economics.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and Resistance in Education*. Massachusetts: Birgin and Garvey.
- Good, R., & Prakash, M. S. (2000). Global Education. In D. A. Gabbard (Ed.), *Knowledge and Power in the Global Economy: Politics and Rhetoric of School Reform*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Green, A. (1997). *Education, Globalization and the Nation State*. London: MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Green, A. (1999). Education and globalization in Europe and East Asia: convergent and divergent trends. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14(1), 55-71.
- Hawkins, J. N. (2000). Centralization, decentralization, recentralization-Educational reform in China. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(5), 442-454.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Oxford: Polity Press.

- Henry, M., Lingard, B., Rizvi, F., & Taylor, S. (1999). Working with/ against globalization in education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14(1), 85-97.
- Johnston, D. J. (1997, August/September 1997). A New Global Age. *The OECD OBSERVER*, 4.
- Jones, K., & N. Alexiadou, N. (2001). *The Global and the National: reflections on the experience of three European states*. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Lille.
- Jones, P. W. (1992). *World Bank Financing of Education*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Jones, P. W. (1998). Globalisation and Internationalism: democratic prospects for world education. *Comparative Education*, 34(2), 143-155.
- Lauder, H., & Brown, P. (1997). Education, globalization and economic development. In A. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown & A. S. Wells (Eds.), *Education Culture Economy Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lawn, M. (1996). *Modern Times? Work, Professionalism and Citizenship in Teaching*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Levin, B. (1998). An Epidemic of Education Policy: (what ) can we learn from each other? *Comparative Education*, 34(2), 131-141.
- Marginson, S. (1999). After globalisation:emerging politics of education. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 14(1), 19-31.
- McNeely, C. I., & Cha, Y.-K. (1994). Worldwide Educational Convergence Through International Organizations: Avenues for Research. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 2(14), 11.
- OECD. (1992). *Globalisation, Corporate Citizenship and Industrial Policy* (Report No. OCDE/GD (92) 171). Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- OECD. (1997). *Globalisation: What Challenges and Opportunities for Governments?* (Report). Paris France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Rhoten, D. (2000). Education decentralization in Argentina: a 'global-local conditions of possibility' approach to state, market , and society change. *Journal of Education Policy*, 15(6), 593-619.
- Rinne, R. (2000). The Gobalisation of Education: Finnish Education on the Doorstep of the new EU Millenium. *Educational Review*(September 2000), p131.
- Robertson, R. (1992a). Globality and Modernity. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 9, 153-161.

- Robertson, R. (1992b). *Globalization : social theory and global culture*. London: Sage.
- Robertson, R. (1997). Glocalization:Time- Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity. In M. F. a. R. Robinson (Ed.), *Global Modernities* (pp. 25-44). London: Sage.
- Sinclair, T. J. (1999). Synchronic Global Governance and the International Political Economy of the Commonplace. In M. Hewson & T. J. Sinclair (Eds.), *Approaches to Global Governance Theory*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Sklair, L. (1997). Social movements for global capitalism: the transnational capitalist class in action. *Review of International Political Economy*, 4(3), 514-538.
- Spring, J. (1998). *Education and the Rise of the Global Economy*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.,.
- Tedesco, J. C. (1997). *Teachers in the Change Process*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Tiruneh, A. (2000). *Globalization of Capitalism*. Retrieved 23/10/2001, 2001
- Treanor, P. (1999, 04 June 2002.). *liberalism, market, ethics, nationalism, geopolitics, the state, the future of Europe, urban planning theory*, 2001, from <http://web.inter.nl.net/users/Paul.Treanor/neoliberalism.html>
- Vongalis, A. (2003). *Deployed to Deliver: The displaced agency of teachers in globalised education systems*. Unpublished manuscript, Monash University, Melbourne.
- Vongalis, A., & Seddon, T. (2001, 27-29 June 2001). *Futures for teachers? Unravelling global agencies development agendas in education and training and lifelong learning*. Paper presented at the Travelling Policy/Local Spaces:Globalization, Identities and Education Policy in Europe, Keele University.
- Wallerstein, I. (1976). *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (1991). *Geopolitics and geoculture : essays on the changing world-system*. Cambridge ; New York : ; Paris : Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme,; Cambridge University Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (1997). Liberalism and Democracy: Freres Ennemis?
- Waters, M. (1995). *Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Went, R. (2000). *Globalization*. London: Pluto Press.
- Wolfensohn, J. D. (1999, October 4-7). *Culture and Sustainable Development: A Framework for Action: Foreword by the President James D. Wolfensohn*. Paper presented at the

Culture Counts: A Conference: on Financing, Resources and the Economics of Culture in Sustainable Development, Florence, Italy.

Wood, E. M., Meiksins, P., & Yates, M. (1998). *Rising from the Ashes? Labor in the Age of "Global" Capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

WorldBank. (1999, 17/9/99). *Development News*. Retrieved June, 2000

WorldBank. (2000). *Assessing Globalization What is Globalization?* Retrieved February 2001, 2001

WorldBank. (2001). *Definition of Policy*. Retrieved May 2001, 2001, from [www.ecdgroup.com/policy.htm#policy](http://www.ecdgroup.com/policy.htm#policy)