

Knowledge, Governance and Social Inclusion/Exclusion

A report from a European Union research project

Sverker Lindblad

**Institutionen för pedagogik och didaktik
Göteborgs universitet**

Introduction

In focus of this work are current changes in the governing of education and implications of that for social inclusion/exclusion. I will present a European Union research project on this issue in three aspects. The first one is about the problematic on changes in governing. The second deals with the task of researching this problematic. And the third aspect is about our conclusions. As the subtitle indicates it is a report on knowledge – issues of knowledge is at the core of our work in two senses: First that we are doing research on knowledge as part of the governing of education, and second, our work to produce knowledge is part of the making of a European (research) community.

The text presented here is based on the final report to the European Commission from this research project. I coordinated this research project together with Thomas S. Popkewitz and the

work was carried out together with a team of researchers from different European universities.¹ The research project got the name EGSIE (Education Governance and Social Integration and Exclusion) and was carried out as a Targeted Socio-Economic Research (TSER) project. Participating countries were England, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Portugal, Scotland, Spain, Sweden and Australia.

The problem of governing education and social integration

At the end of the 19th century the French sociologist Emile Durkheim dealt with transitions from a traditional society to a modern society and the implications of that for social cohesion, integration, and fragmentation. *The social division of labour* was a result of his work to understand these social transitions. In the work of Durkheim, education was considered as a means to produce social cohesion and conditions for solidarity. In many ways, we find ourselves today in a new situation, as questions of social cohesion are being reformulated and redefined through an amalgamation of institutional and political changes. Today's struggles are over identity as well as class, with a focus on minority rights and gender, for example. These struggles have produced new exclusions and taboo zones, as monolithic notions of identity within nations clash with the convictions of identities that are heterogeneous.

¹ The research project Education Governance and Social Integration and Exclusion (EGISE) has been conducted with the financial support of the European Commission, Directorate-General Research, the Targeted Socio-Economic Programme. This text is based on the final report to the European Commission which I wrote together with Thomas S. Popkewitz (Lindblad & Popkewitz, 2001; 2004). I am also referring to work carried out together with Hannu Simola and Ingolfur Johannesson on education restructuring in Nordic countries in a special issue of the *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*. What I present here is based on the work of a large number of researchers who participated in the EG-SIE project (in sum 49 persons). Thus, these researchers are acknowledged for their work that was a basis for this text.

The struggles about social inclusion and exclusion are evident within Europe and the European Union. Long-term migration patterns have long been part of the European context. But the changing complexions of nationhood and issues of citizenship in changing migration patterns have made more visible the related issues of social cohesion and progress as a policy domain. Further, changes in the work patterns and educational requirements as the post-Fordist economies of the European Union were coupled with, for example, changes in the politics of cultural movements, such as in contemporary feminism, green movements, and multi-culturalism in many European states. The problems of social cohesion, integration, and fragmentation are compounded by contradictory movements that join questions of citizenship with national and global cultural and economic practices. The European Union is a case in point.

With the issues of integration and cohesion of the citizen are anxieties, disenfranchisements, and exclusions that have made education a central policy focus. From one perspective, schooling is one of the central credentialing agencies concerned with providing access and social progress. Schooling provides transition points for entrance to or exclusion from other arenas of society, particular occupational careers.

But schooling has also performed another function that inter-relates and, at the same time, makes possible the subjectivities in which one can think of having a career in the spheres of the economic world. The world-wide institutionalization of the school since the 19th century has been formed around the socialization the family and child. This socialization is not only about a productive worker, but also about the governing principles that order the dispositions and sensitivities in which the child or the adolescent acts and participates as a citizen. In turn, this introduces a second notion of governing principles that historically relates individuality to national identities and its tales of progress. This notion of governing gives attention to the principles through which problems are formed, the objects of rectification in policy ordered and differentiated, and the classifications that shape what is

deemed as reasonable possibilities for the future paths of reform. Both notions of governing – the processes through which actors gain or are denied access to decision-making and the principles of knowledge – have important implications for the issues through which individuals are qualified and disqualified for action and participation.

From government to governance

In their influential work Hirst and Thompson (1995) distinguish between government and governance, where government deals with the institutions of the state that control and regulate life in a community, while governance:

... is the control of an activity by some means that a range of desired outcomes are achieved - is however, not just the province of the state. Rather, it is a function that can be performed by a wide variety of public and private, state and non-state, national and international, institutions and practices. (a.a. p 422).

Education restructuring can be regarded as such a shift from government to governance. Dale (1997) regards this shift in education governing (as a more general concept) from bureaucratic control to a set of governance relationships, where other agencies than the state are involved in different activities, as a process dependent on the changing role of the state. This in turn is due to increased globalisation and limits of state action in combination with new forms of particularism. Lindblad & Wallin (1993) treat them as an implication of transitions of the welfare state during late modernity.

Such a shift in governing implies changing ways in school management and steering. This includes greater use of private sector management practises, explicit and measurable standards of performance and so forth. In sum we can talk about a ‘new managerialism’ in education with such key-words as leadership, professionalism, accountability, and evaluation as well as consumer choice (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Gewirtz et al, 1995).

Considering such a shift in governing of education we are concerned about the consequences in terms of social integration. We are dealing with recent and internationally widespread changes of education governing that often are described as a transition from a system of steering from behind towards a system of steering by means of goals and results. These transitions are coupled to patterns of deregulation and decentralization, and sometimes also to school choice and privatization of education. What are the implications of this for social inclusion and exclusion?

A European Union research project

The social and historical context outlined above made it important to study and clarify relations between changes in education governance on the one side and social inclusion and exclusion on the other side in order to consider changes that relate school, culture, and society to each other in European contexts. We, as a group of researchers, put forwards two main empirical questions are:

- What characterises the new governing structures of educational systems in different European countries and what are the conceived implications of this for social integration and exclusion?
- What are the implications of different national contexts for the social meaning of restructuring measures and the consequences of these measures in these contexts in terms of integration and exclusion?

These questions made us organise an international research project with partners from a variety of European contexts: the Nordic welfare states of Finland, Iceland, and Sweden; the Anglo-Saxon cases of England and Scotland; the Continental and unified Germany; and the Mediterranean cases of Greece, Portugal and Spain. Furthermore, our studies were carried out in co-operation with an Australian research team which we regarded as close to the Anglo-Saxon cases.

Research problematics

How about changes in governing and social inclusion and exclusion in research? Here we put forwards three aspects. First, education governing and education restructuring are issues widely discussed in the research literature, and the same is true for social inclusion and exclusion. However, research combining these two fields is not very frequent, according to the research reviews carried out in our research project in different national contexts as well as in the international research literature (Popkewitz & Lindblad, 2000). Thus, research on transformations in the governing of education was in practice isolated from research on social implications of education. Second, in the work of conceptualising our research, we considered research about governing in relation to social inclusion and social integration to have some inherent difficulties. We found no conceptual discussion of governing or governance in educational research; rather, governance was assumed and not theorised. Governance was taken as a matter of technicalities focussing on actions towards predefined ends rather than to ask about the assumptions and rules of the interpretative practises embedded in policy discourses. And third, categorisations used in definitions of social integration and exclusion also contained severe difficulties (cf. Silver, 1994; Goodwin 1996). Thus we began to use the concept duplet ‘social inclusion/exclusion’ as a way to capture the relative character of definitions of social inclusion, where inclusion is defining exclusion and vice versa.

Based on conceptual analyses of relations between governing and social inclusion/exclusion, we stated that our study had two qualitative different problematics: an equity problematic and an knowledge problematic.

- The *equity problematic* focuses on the means by which activities are controlled or directed to deliver an acceptable range of outcomes in accordance with some established social standards. This has been central to the politics of representation of access of individuals and groups that

have been denied full participation in educational and social fields. The problem of governance in this respect is the administrative practises that limit or promote social, cultural or economic access or integration of these individuals or groups. Thus, a central problem of social inclusion/exclusion is a problem of representation: to what extent are individuals or groups with certain characteristics having access to educational measures? What practises produce or eliminate exclusion of these individual and groups?

- The *knowledge problematic* focus on the rules and standards of reason that ‘make’ the actor who is represented in the equity problematic, such as the grouping of a child to be seen as a minority, or as ‘at risk’, or as belonging to a family that is deviant. Such systems of reason govern the ways through which actors are classified, represented and normalised for action and participation. It is in the governing practises of knowledge that we can entertain a way of understanding how the systems of inclusion/exclusion function in modern educational systems. The normalising and dividing practises simultaneously place the processes of exclusion with those of inclusion.

At this point, then, we can differentiate between the problematic of equity and the problematic of knowledge, as the following: The equity problematic treats governance of inclusion and exclusion as a problem of access and participation in the representation of groups or populations, typically classified through categories of race, class and gender. The knowledge problematic considers the construction of the ‘qualities’ that distinguish and differentiate the individual being for action and participation. It is not gender or class that is the central concern of research, but the production of gender-ness or class-ness of individuality. The knowledge problematic governs through the distinctions, differentiations and categories that construct identities for action and participation. The exclusion and inclusion joined (i.e., inclusion/exclusion) is

embedded in principles of reason (the distinctions, differentiations and categories of knowledge) as divisions that simultaneously create an inside and an outside.

Each problematic embodies different notions of change. The equity problematic is to scrutinise the points of access and organisational processes through which access and participation occurs. The positive outcome of policy is to eliminate exclusion through full inclusion. The problem of governance in the knowledge problematic is related to the duality of inclusion/exclusion. Change is tied to the diagnostic of the present, that is, to disturb ‘that which forms that groundwork of the present, to make once more strange and to cause us to wonder how it came to appear so natural’ (Rose, 1999, p. 58).

What is educational restructuring can be understood in many ways. We look at different notions of restructuring phenomena in education, as we see them in transition not necessarily from one state to some other defined state but as a movement. We ask our questions not find out if there is a progress but rather what are the reasons and considerations that are part and parcel of transitions in governance. Thus, we need to describe and analyse arguments and facts used for restructuring education. And since social inclusion and exclusion brings our focus to subjects and groups, it is of vital importance to learn about the subjects who are to be included or excluded in the reasoning about education governance.

As pointed out in several texts, the restructuring of education is related to financial measures – mostly in terms of cuts and to look for alternative funding of education (e.g. Dale, 1997). Looking at the financing of education during the period of restructuring we mostly find large cuts in finances. In Sweden, for instance, the cuts were considerable during the 1990s in general, and especially for children outside the main stream (e.g. 29 percent less hours in special teaching, 39 percent less hours in teaching in students’ mother tongue). Though there is not a one to one relationship between education resources and social inclusion/exclusion, this specific period means, that measurements of education restructuring in terms of social exclusion of individuals to a large extent

could be explained by these cuts and that changes in the construction of education would be “hidden” by the specific financial context. Thus, it seemed to be fruitful to emphasise other aspects of restructuring. Instead we focussed on the systems of reason (Popkewitz & Lindblad, 2003) that was used to implement and manage changes in education governance as well as to deal with the practices inside education. This focus is due to the fact that education is a social construction where conceptions, distinctions and categories matter in the production and reproduction of such a system (Giddens, 1984; Hacking, 1999).

Theoretical questions on governing and social inclusion/exclusion

Based on considerations above we put forwards three main theoretical fields of research on educational governing and social inclusion/exclusion:

- *Constructing narratives*: What are the stories of progress and denials in the restructuring of education? What are the images, myths and sagas that are to place people in a collective whole?
- *Constructing subjects*: What are the conceptions of the individual to be included or excluded? What are the silences in these constructions?
- *Constructing governance and social inclusion/exclusion*: How do the constructions of narratives and subjects produce systems of governance and social inclusion and exclusion? What are the conceived or constructed relations between systems of governance and social inclusion/exclusion?

These research questions are put forwards mainly to describe and analyse the knowledge problematic related to transitions from government to governance and their implications for social inclusion and exclusion.

Research trajectory

How then to build a research project in order to answer these questions? The EGSIE research was carried out as a set of work-packages with different functions in the total research process, as presented in table 1.

Table 1: Work organization in the EGSIE project.

Label	Content and references
1. National case studies:	Descriptions of national cases with a focus on recent educational reforms and changes in education governance (Lindblad & Popkewitz, 1999).
2. Research review:	The research review focused on conceptual issues (Popkewitz & Lindblad, 2000a). This review led us to formulate two basic and qualitatively different research problematics on equity and knowledge.
3. Text analysis of policy discourses:	A careful selection of important policy documents (n = 54) in each national and local context was subject to text analysis. By necessity different types of texts were selected in different contexts (Lindblad & Popkewitz, 2000b).
4. Listening to education actors:	Interviews with system actors (politicians and administrators at central and local levels) and school actors (teachers, head-teachers, and e.g. school nurses) working on different education levels. In sum 516 actors were interviewed (Lindblad & Popkewitz, 2001a).
5. Analysis of national and international statistics:	Uses of statistics in texts and among education actors were empirically identified. Based on these uses collection and analysis of international and national statistics were carried out. Of vital importance here is statistics as a system of reason (Lindblad & Popkewitz, 2001 b).
6. Survey studies of youth in four national cases:	A survey of students (n = 3 008) about to leave compulsory school in different national and local contexts was carried out. Results of analyses based on research-informed hypotheses are presented (Rinne, Kivirauma, Aro & Simola, 2000).
7. Summarising and concluding research:	Texts focusing on answers to theoretical questions in different national and local contexts in combination with overarching conclusions on transitions in education governance. (Lindblad & Popkewitz, 2001c, d).
8. Dissemination of results:	Results were disseminated to system and school actors in various ways. This is still in process in accordance with our plan.

Summarising research

Here, I will shortly summarise the result of our studies. I will not deal with the youth study mentioned above. The summaries will present major conclusions in different studies without going into detail about the empirical evidence for these conclusions. Those interested in these issues are welcome to study our reports – in sum around 1 500 pages.

Case studies – educational reforms and changes in education governance

What are the common aspects in the national cases and what are the distinctions necessary to capture in order to understand transitions in education governance and the implications of such transitions? Each research team presented their case as a basis for joint reflections in our research. This was presented in Lindblad and Popkewitz (1999). Our studies showed, for instance, quite distinct changing contexts for educational reforms such as the rise and fall of dictatorships, as well as the restructuring of welfare states. This was combined with ambiguity and complexity in recent tendencies in educational change as well as in discourses concerning such tendencies and changes. From this point of view changes in education governance can be regarded as part and parcel of ongoing and ambiguous modernization in the current societies. We realized the impact of international organizations – such as the OECD – on the making of education policy agendas in national contexts.

Research review and equity and knowledge problematics

In the EGSIE project we decided to present as early as possible a critical literature review concerning different theoretical perspectives and conceived results from research dealing with education governance and social integration and exclusion. Our method used to carry out the task was as follows:

- To ask each participant in EGSIE to review national discourses on education governance and social integration and exclusion.
- To explore existing databases – in practice the Science Citation Index and the Arts and Humanities Citation Index as well as ERIC Education Resources – in order to gather information on research from a variety of approaches.
- To analyze concepts and relations between concepts on the basis of our outline of research as presented in the proposal, as well as in different texts from EGSIE partners.

The results of this work are presented by Popkewitz, Lindblad and Strandberg (1999), where work procedures, descriptors as well as results, are displayed. Using individual descriptors in the ERIC system produced thousands of references (e.g. governance produced 7,456 references at that time, and social integration 2,385 references, for instance, in the ERIC system). But combinations between these research fields were rare. Thus, in the ERIC we ended up with 41 references to research that dealt with education governance (and related terms) and social integration or exclusion (and related terms) on the other hand. With such work procedures relations between education governance on one side and social inclusion and exclusion on the other hand seemed to be “under-researched” considering current changes in education. However, since we used two different strategies we found several other texts dealing with our research field. In sum the research review based on the two strategies dealt with 203 articles and books.

Over to the findings: This review focused on research approaches and theoretical concepts and categories. Thus, it did not have the empiristic stance – focusing on methods and results – that is rather common in reviews of research in the social sciences.

Our review has two foci. The first focus is on education governance and related concepts and the other is on the social integra-

tion and exclusion of youth. Considering the first focus, there are a lots of texts dealing with this issue. A good example here is Gösta Esping-Andersen's (1996) work on recent policy changes in Europe and other countries that he calls, "welfare states in transition". Esping-Andersen presents different routes among welfare states to deal with internal as well as external factors that threaten welfare states -how to deal with increasing global competition leading to demands to devaluate the labour force in Scandinavia, for example. His emphasis is on education reforms as producing increased job qualifications and thus providing the greatest benefit to society in the long run.² Within the field of education research a number of studies have dealt with restructuring of education in terms of deregulation, decentralization, marketization and so forth.

The other focus deals with social integration and exclusion – especially on youth. Here we find studies dealing with e.g. exclusion in different ways; e.g. the merit value of education in relation to the labour market and the percentage of students that take a certain exam, e.g. from upper secondary education; or studies on gender, class and ethnicity as well as the consequences of being disabled.³

Connections between these two fields of research are relatively few in number.

In exploring these different problematics, this research project recognizes a need to join the equity and knowledge problematics. This joining of the two problematics, however, is not merely an additive problem of doing a little of one (equity) and a little of the other (discursive analyses). It is, we believe, rethinking the conceptual ways in which we have organized research on governance and inclusion/exclusion. We can think of our concern in this research as understanding the relations of the groups of actors influential in educational decision-making and the discursive rules about inclusion/exclusion deployed to construct the subjects

² Esping-Andersen (1996, p 255f)

³ See e.g. Lindblad, 1994

and subjectivities that differentiate the different groups. This is not an equity problem nor it is solely one of knowledge, per se, but a relational question of fields of interaction.

For our purposes, we thought of inclusion and exclusion as a single concept, mutually related. Further, we sought to consider two different types of relations between the concept of governance and inclusion/exclusion: that of the problematic of equity and of knowledge. We assume that as our work moves further into the case studies and their comparative implications, these conceptual relations of the two problematics will be revised and re-examined.

For analytically purposes, we focused first on the relation of governance and inclusion/exclusion as a problematic of equity. This dominant problematic has many variations and different ideological agendas but can be summarized as defining the issue of governance through examining the policies and practices through which individuals and groups are given access and opportunity to participate in social, economic, and cultural activities. Class concepts and access to labour markets are the most prominent in this approach although concepts related to ethnicity, race, and gender have assumed greater prevalence in recent years. The particular mix and emphasis depended on the national context.

In the equity approach, we argued that the problem is generally to find the most effective ways to promote inclusion. Inclusion is often treated as an absolute term where there is belief that, at least hypothetically, there exists a final point that is totally inclusive. Thus the concept of exclusion stands only for a different point that will eventually be eliminated through wise policy and governance practices.⁴ When the equity approach is viewed at a macro level, it assumes governance and inclusion/exclusion tied to structural concepts. One prominent structural category is the State as an actor whose legislation, admission policies and steer-

⁴ There are exceptions from this. Thus, e.g. reproduction theories deal with reasons for reproduction of social inequalities (see e.g. Bourdeiu & Passeron, 1977) or state that school cannot compensate for society.

ing efforts govern through fiscal policy, legislation, and bureaucratic practices. At a system level, conceptualization of neoliberalism and marketization of education provides one example of current policy research concerned with a problematic of equity, even when the literature is critical of the basic assumptions of the policy orientation. Discussions of decentralization are another category of governance that is linked to practices of inclusion and exclusion.

Our second conceptual discussion related to governance and inclusion/exclusion as related to a problematic of knowledge. This problematic focuses on the ways in which the rules and standards of reason organize principles that function to qualify and disqualify individuals at the level of being, that is, the dispositions, sensitivities and awarenesses that govern participation and action.

Studies in policy discourses

In this study we focus on texts that in different ways deal with transitions in education governance- sometimes through legal-administrative and financial changes in the structuring of education (e.g., decentralization or deregulation), sometimes through creating quasi- markets; sometimes through a normative steering in the symbolic formulations of professionalization and pedagogical practices, and other times through a rhetoric (*topoi*) that inscribes certain universal truths in the process of education. Since each country has different legal-administrative and rhetorical structures, the selection of texts in the following analysis varies according to national context. The texts are chosen in light of their importance within the ongoing debates and historical configurations through which each country is re-constructing educational systems and its allocation of resources in education. The study of multiple texts is viewed as (a) “telling” about the means by which the activities of schools are controlled or directed in relation to some social standard; (b) generating principles through

which the “problem-solving” of action and participation are to occur.

Our analysis starts within the specific contexts of regions or states as a basis for a joint analysis of discourses and texts regulating education. The central discursive strategies are “units of ideas”. In the analysis, the interpretative strategies draw on multiple disciplines that include social and political theories of the state, current literary theories that consider the rhetoric the logic of the text, and the silences in the text, drawing on a post-colonial literature concerned with issues of exclusion.

Narratives

The current study contains different narratives on educational transitions related to restructuring and governance in different national cases. In several cases we find two parallel sets of stories, one on democratization and one on modernization.

There is a particular style of constructing narratives of educational transitions that tells stories of progress through the grammar and rhetorical styles of science. This use of science to tell of progress is not a new phenomenon as most nation-states in Europe sought to engage in modernization through the use of scientific expertise after World War Two. The mobilization of science to rationalize educational systems was a strategy of the state as it sought to provide educational systems that were both more efficient in training and more equitable in relation to State democratic concerns. Education is part of the stories of social progress and improved quality of life for the citizens. In these stories we can situate science in different ways.

At the same time, the narratives embodied new *topoi*, or slogans that are accepted as universal truths that need no explanation or questioning but which are to coalesce and mobilize public opinion in the process of reform. Different phrases are present as objects of community consensus, such as everyone “knows” what is meant by “quality of education”, “the knowledge society”, “lifelong learning”, “education and training”. Such phrases enable

a belief in a generalized agreement about directions of reform and social progress without any need for definition.

Finally, narratives presented in texts are often constructed with a theme of necessity in them – there was no choice or alternative to restructuring of education. It can be argued that this theme is a theme of tragedy – development or international economic competition demands changes in education – and there is no other way than the one taken. But in these narratives we find new heroes – e.g. the school leaders – who will make the future possible. Or is it the old story of Sisyphos once again?

Construction of subjects

In the texts we find new constructions of subjects – new students as well as new teachers and citizens. This is highly visible in the Finnish case, where the authors write about a tide break in this respect concerning students. In the Portuguese case we find a redefinition of the humanist project and in Iceland there are constructions of the child as a competitive, rational and independent consumer. Similar constructions of children or students are present in most cases.

Considering teachers we find new constructions as well (though not new if you are acquainted with the last decades of research on teachers and teachers' work). The new teacher in the reports can be understood as a "counsellor", a "reflective facilitator", who is directed by goals established in advance and whose procedures for assessment, evaluation and measurement of outcomes are used to control outcomes rather than processes.

Underlying the reports is a new individualization of the teacher and the child. The Finnish case, for example, discusses this as the movement from the citizen to the individual. Whereas previous reforms placed the individual in relation to concerns about the citizen who contributed to the collective, social development, today's reforms point not to citizens improving society but to ethical education and to the role of the pupil as an active learner and the development of talent. The student becomes an

active rational subject who uses services offered by the school. This new individualism relates to an active cooperation in an international world where human rights are not related to a generalized solidarity with the rest of the world but are embodied in the qualities of the individual who is in a constant state of flux.

To us, these changes indicate not only changes in education governance but also constructions of new education projects. We can speak of the changes through talking about a shift of focus from education of responsible citizens to motivated consumers. The teacher, the child, and the school administrator are constructed as not only with the right knowledge but also with the personal traits and dispositions, and social and cognitive competencies that are thought of as necessary for the future.

Governance and social inclusion/exclusion

We can read the current reform texts as often focusing on inclusion and exclusion through universalizing categories by categories of cause and victims of circumstances: unemployment, poor skills, low income, high crime environment or family breakdown.

We can also view these terms as functioning as *topoi* discussed earlier, such as new governance schemes: “risk zones”, “special needs” ethnic changes, increased differentiation of wealth and advantage. These words are deployed in texts to emphasize the inclusiveness and fairness of policy and governance strategies by targeting categories that point to differences from what are considered normal. But what becomes clear when looking at these categories of policy and governance strategies is that the *topoi* are assumed to point to real people without questioning the meaning or the norms that are inscribed about difference. What is not interrogated in the policy texts is how such distinctions of policy construct difference along a continuum of norms that define a standard of sameness.

Listening to education actors

Our studies are based on interviews with politicians and administrators – what we call “system actors” and teachers and head-teachers – what we call “school actors”.

Our studies are based on interviews with different kinds of actors at different levels in the education system. Constructions of questions were dependent on local circumstances. In sum we interviewed 156 system actors on central and local levels. Considering school actors, we have chosen to interview samples of head-teachers and teachers (in sum 380) at the same level as the local system actors. The interviewees are presented according to categories and cases in table 2.

Table 2: Categories of school actors over national cases. Numbers.

Case	System and		System actors		School actors	
	System actors	School actors	Head teachers	Teachers	Others	Total
Australia	29	17	8	4	0	12
Finland	69	26	17	18	8	43
Germany	38	4	17	17	0	34
Greece	44	11	17	14	2	33
Iceland	59	13	22	24	0	46
Portugal	41	10	6	25	0	31
Spain*	83	13	30	25	15	70
Sweden	54	12	8	26	8	42
UK E	76	39	36	21	0	57
UK S	23	11	0	8	4	12
Total	516	156	161	182	37	380

Narratives

We did not find as much difference among the different level of actors as we might have expected. In all of the school systems, system actors were experiencing a need for change and a fatalism about change. The feeling about change was expressed through

the Portuguese case study in which they discussed the fatalism toward and a consensus about the changes occurring.

The fatalism was expressed as one of globalism of the changes which influence national school systems. In Iceland, this was expressed as the attempts “to tame the change” and change as “the wild thing”. In many instances, the respondents felt that the changes were authorless. Change appeared as the product of anonymous forces of society in which there seems to be no author – political, culture, economic – that is requesting change.

In some cases, the fatalism was given an “author” but with different faces of *topoi*, that is, banalities that are universally accepted to become truth and thus do not need to be questioned. One authorless *topoi* was the economic changes in a *global, knowledge society*. The Greek study suggests that concepts of egalitarianism/equity and democratization of education dominated the 1980s discussion but were revised in the 1990s through new discourses. These discourses linked education to modernization in a globalized society, and the needs of economy and society of knowledge through a holistic reform in education. The phrases were banalities that were assumed to be known by everyone but which have no points of reference or specificity other than as mobilizing a seeming consensus about change.

Another anonymous face was that of the European Union, which served as a generalized object to explain the purposes and directions of local actions. In the case of the Greek context, the European Union was symbolically positioned in relation to the political regime. System actors located the source of change symbolically as “the European Union” making demands for changes in the education system. These changes, it was believed, would provide a counterpoint to the political system where State Clientelism exists. The German case talks about intertwined or conflicting tendencies between internationalization and indigenous tendencies. Internationalization in Germany to make its schools comparability to others in the EU was reported as important.

While the European Union stood in the narratives as a convenient fiction by which system actors could justify local practices, there is also an author to these fictions. As Nóvoa has argued (2000), although there is an official principle of subsidiarity as it relates to education in the European Union and a language of harmonization of rules and regulation is not politically allowed, changes are in fact being harmonized through regulatory ideas that serve the same function, words that reorientate and edit past and future actions in the school such as the words “approximation”, knowledge-based policies, rolling agenda, development of quality education, promotion of mobility good practice that organizes sets of national policies.:

There is a sense of causality in questions of dislocation and schooling in the political and system actor interviews. The narratives are about the need for discipline and order in society. This lack of discipline is translated by the interviewees into questions of family problems, the decline of rural communities (and values assumed to be related to an ideal of the rural as a moral code for upbringing), and the corrosive effects of media on youth. The task of schooling becomes one of re-socializing the child and family and thus the remediating of the child who is deviant.

The focus on the family and the community are expressed through discussing images of the dysfunctional family. In the reports where the respondents focus on explanations of social exclusion and failure of school, family background is signalled out as reinforcing the moral values and judgements that are lacking for educational success. We can begin to see in the interviews how social and economic characteristics of school failure are transported into discussions of family attributes that are viewed as causes of exclusion as opposed to systemic factors. In the Spanish report, for example, respondents define the lack of school responsibility and see the failure of the child as residing in the family.

In the interviews, narratives of heroes, heroines and villains in the problem of social inclusion and exclusion are established. Finnish actors, for example, speak of the Head Teacher as a hero

and the dysfunctional family as villain, with terms as the degenerated families and disturbed pupils marking the division between the normal and abnormal home context for success in schooling.

Subjects and categories of exclusion

One series of changes and continuity in governing are the categories that classify inclusion and exclusion. The interviewees interrelate older and newer categories of groups that are to be considered as excluded. The categories related to state targeting of those who have been excluded internally through the school certifying processes, and externally through the social and economic conditions that are viewed as producing exclusion.

The major social categories given as externally influencing inclusion and social exclusion in schooling seem not to have changed. Central for system actors are socio-economic status and poverty. But these “older” categories of differentiation, exclusion, and social equity weave together with categories of ethnicity, gender and race. We say “weave together” with categories of poverty and socio-economic status because many, but not all of the newer categories, are in fact correlated in the interviews, but never made explicit except by discussion about an ethnic or minority group in contexts of social problems of “lack of discipline”, unemployment, and family. This is not, however, necessarily the case with gender issues, which we can surmise moves along structural lines of division in society.

The importance of the new categories that overlap with that of poverty and socio-economic status is that the excluded groups become defined through new social categories of deviance. The different sets of categories are placed in a proximity to each other to pose a practical causality, that is, the different categories are thought of as providing explanations about the cause and effects of social inclusion and exclusion.

Respondents’ talk appears to be about external factors of exclusion/inclusion in schools. Breakdown of discipline producing behavioural problems and lack of common values and integration

are seen as important elements in social exclusion. Icelandic actors express the belief that there is declining discipline and order in society that produces social and cultural disorganization and the loss of tradition. The declining discipline is seen as preventing integration, solidarity and cultural reproduction. In Spain, school failure is viewed as bound to children with special needs who do not have basic “human” and Christian values (190). The Swedish respondents define the problem of exclusion as related to societal changes that have produced dissimilar children, a sense of dislocation in changes and youth have a negative image of society: changes not only structural but dispositional. Thus there is a need to reassert discipline of the child and the home is viewed as important for preventing dissolution and chaos.

In the ways that different categories of social inclusion and exclusion are narrated in the interviews we can begin to explore whose distinctions of social, external criteria are transported into the school as distinctions of difference and division. The categories of immigrant status and categories of “minorities” are discussed as questions of social deviance through categories relating to family status (single parent, teenage pregnancy) and educational attainment.

We can also consider that the external categories are themselves transported into the school to form and interrelate with the internal categories of the divide students. The excluded students, for example, are “transient students” who enrol for short periods of time, children with behaviour problems, and students described as being “at risk”. In some instances, the internal categories of deviance exist as invisible in the actors who are not mentioned, but whom everyone knows are being talked about. This is evident in the silence about immigrants in Finland and Iceland when discussing the need for discipline, tradition, and social harmony.

There is also a suggestion that curriculum discourses have intensified discussions about the problem of inclusion and exclusion through categories of difference, flexibility in curriculum multiculturalism. However, the discourses of inclusion/exclusion are

viewed as being unchanged in relation to the substance of discourse (see, for example, the Australian case).

The expansion of categories that differentiate the external social characteristics of the excluded student and the expansion of the categories of internal to the institutional ordering of the school have two implications. One is that they embody images and narratives of deviance. We will return to this in the discussion of the individualization of pedagogy. Second, the kinds of people who are targets as socially excluded are produced through new sets of distinctions and differentiations that overlap external and internal categories and are practically related as governing principles in the educational discussions.

Assessment and Management as Governing Inclusion and Exclusion

The intensified categories about social inclusion and exclusion are marked by and overlap with new discourses of governance through assessment and school management. In multiple countries, various system actors discuss the introduction of tighter assessment strategies in teaching, increased attention to measurement of children's and teachers' performance, and other accountability measures. The German and Spanish interview reports, for example, discuss the spread of assessments at both the system and teacher levels. The Swedish assessment systems is infused at all levels, from the development of school plans by the municipal council, to work plans in school based on the national curriculum and local priorities established as *benchmarks of necessary result*. National tests are given in years two, five and eight of schooling, with increased requirements including new criteria for grades. In the Finnish context there is increased talk about evaluation measures at the system level but this official narrative of assessment is virtual rather than real, as teachers report little actual use of accountability measures in daily practice. But this anomaly in the Finnish context may not be as much of an anomaly as it may appear on the surface if we think of examining the problem of as-

assessment and management as not only the concrete measures of performance in the classroom but of the circulation of particular rules to reason about problems of education, what we earlier discussed as “regulatory ideas” that reorientate and edit the past and the future actions. Discourses of quality control may function as such regulatory ideas in organizing teacher classroom practices. The new strategies of staff development programmes for teachers and school administrators are constructed through discourses of quality control through quality management. In Spain and Iceland, for example, the government offers new administrative courses, workshops, counselling and computer-based management for principals.

Quality control, as we have discussed in other documents, is a particular type of *governing-at-a-distance*. Individuals internalize the management rules of action and participation as though they are on their “own. The logic of action demands particular types of self-assessment that steer what is construed as responsible and motivated teaching. In Portugal, for example, respondents discussed the issue of the quality of teaching that inscribes an entrepreneurial logic. Quality is checked through identifying the material conditions of teachers and the pupils’ development of competencies. The changes in assessment and management procedures, however, have consequences other than increasing performance and outcome criteria. The Portuguese respondents suggest that the increased assessments are in conflict with those efforts for democratization. The new management procedures of assessment create more divisions of children’s achievement and development within the school organization. The criteria of quality, the Portuguese respondents suggest, also tend to depreciate the work of teachers. The conflict between participation and assessment can be thought of as a conflict between the logic of modernization and the logic of democratization, tendencies which are at odds with each other.

Governing & Inclusion/Exclusion

The problem of the relation of governance and exclusion/inclusion can now be explored more fully through the changes discussed by the system actors. There are two types of exclusion in perceptions: the internal distinctions of the school such as those classified as drop-outs and academic failures; and the external distinctions described as the new social phenomena that contaminates school realities. As we argued earlier, the internal and external distinctions overlap in ordering and dividing the characteristics of the child who is excluded.

This poses a difficult issue in the changes occurring. That issue is that the actual strategies to govern inclusion/exclusion embody divisions and theories of deviance. For example, a number of the case studies suggest that the processes of decentralization, devolution of decision-making, and resources allocation have had an impact on teaching and curriculum. This impact is viewed as a differentiation that enables teachers to meet the diverse needs of students.

Yet, at the same time, actors perceive that the changes in management and individualization are increasing and intensifying divisions and hierarchies in the educational system. New hierarchies have been produced through the classification and division of children who are included and excluded. This is evident in the Australian, Finnish, German, and Greek cases through the introduction of choice. Choice in schools has certain positive elements, such as in Finland as increasing autonomy of schools, cooperation among teachers, discussion of basic values and tasks of school, the need to focus on the individual pupil, and widening the possibilities of parent and pupils to choose.

When we examine further the new organizational and pedagogical practices related to flexibility and decentralization, many actors report contradictory elements. The changes towards flexibility and diversity, while addressing certain quality issues of schooling have also increased the divisions and distinctions through which schools order hierarchical pathways in multi-tiered

school systems. In Australia, actors at all levels view the external social-economic factors as most important in relation to social exclusion. But the practices of change in programmes and curriculum divides in the educational system through an academic and vocational split, intensified hierarchy among schools through creation of diversity of programmes, and the competition between schools between private and public for funding and students. Both Australian and Finnish actors suggest that the decentralization and individualization of pedagogical programmes reduces the reduce teachers' capacity to address student needs despite the stress on individualization.

Choice in schools has also been used by those most advantaged in society. Choice in Finland is accompanied with an individualization that has increased segregation. The choice of school is used by the upper social strata more than by the working class; also the upper levels are more critical and thus apt to choose schools outside the district.

Again, an ironic quality to the reforms that seek flexibility and individualization. A heterogeneity is imposed in replace of previous moves to homogenize the pedagogical system. Yet, heterogeneity is perceived as being the major obstacle to pedagogy work of teachers in Portugal, Spain, and Sweden.

Finally, the new categories of exclusion can expand the grouping of children defined as at-risk as part of a pragmatic response to the changes rather than as a substantive recognition of the social and political problems underlying social policy. One governing approach to issues of social exclusion is to provide special funding allocations for schools where there are children of "special needs". The new systems of financial redistribution thus provide extra resources for the excluded. But in at least one instance, respondents report how that category of "excluded" is expanded so that local schools can claim the extra financial resources. In Finland, financial control increases who is identified as excluded as the *rucksack money* is claimed for special education or students with learning disabilities so a school can get extra money.

Thus we can conclude that the system changes that are to provide governing solutions for problems of social exclusion produce and in some cases exacerbate trajectories related to social inclusion and exclusion.

Statistics and social inclusion/exclusion

Statistical reports and statistical data can be regarded as a way to perspectivize education – conditions and processes as well as outcomes. By means of categories and relations between categories we illuminate what we consider as important. We communicate to others what is of interest for us and tell them what to look for. For example, if we present shares of GNP for educational purposes in different countries we also say that it is important to consider this when we compare national educational systems.

But statistics are more than ‘merely’ reports. Categories as tools can divide and label people and define what is normal and what is abnormal. There is a dynamic pattern here between people and their acting on one hand and the labelling of these people and their acting on the other hand. That is why, in a way, categories make up people. Numbers – such as in statistics – are technologies of government that make modern government possible and judgeable.

Therefore, there is a need to reflect on the uses of categories of social inclusion and exclusion as well as on the stories told by these uses. In this case we turn to national and international statistics. We use a pragmatic approach here – focusing on concepts and categories that are in use in education policy discourses.

Table 4: An overview of statistical indicators used in discourses on education and social inclusion/exclusion.

	Accessibility	Integration – separation	Participation	Economic distribution
Education	Share of population who go to education at different levels (including pre-school and adult education) Schools free of charge / school fees	Comprehensiveness/divisions in education at different levels Divisions of private/public schools, choice between schools	Share of population who successfully complete education at different levels Exclusion rates (drop-outs, school leavers without complete education Truancy rates	Principles of resource allocation (even/un-even, need-related etc) between municipalities, schools and students
Labour market	Employment and unemployment rates	Labour market divisions	Who are included and excluded in the labour market	
Society/ Citizenship	Who get access to society and who are considered as citizens	Ethnic divisions Religious divisions Regional divisions Housing segregation	Participation in general elections Organization rates Literacy rates	Income distribution Poverty Share of population on social welfare

In table 4 a matrix based on content aspects and context aspects is presented. Some implications of social inclusion/exclusion in the cross-sections between aspects are mentioned as well.

Statistics and equity problems

Educational statistics are a means to portray educational systems, their properties and inhabitants. From such information we not only learn about education properties such as costs, numbers of students per teacher or participation in education at different levels. We also learn about the people in education, how they are categorized as well as about the meaning of education in society.

Education is mostly constructed by means of costs and access to different levels of education in combination with some categories dealing with dropping out of the level or programme in focus.

Especially the OECD statistics but also in national statistics outcomes of education are presented and analyzed. An idea here is to present comparisons of educational system effectiveness – then in relation to costs.

We find in these statistics two different stories of progress. The one – an older story – is about increasing access to education in combination with decreased lack of education. Here problematic stories are defined in terms of social class, gender, ethnicity as well as age. The newer story is about success to reach certain results as measured by tests or perhaps by use of certain resources, such as computers or the Internet.

The subjects are constructed as individuals inside or outside an education system in progress. A way to construct individuals that deviate are those who fail to reach certain standards or who are low-achieving students. Sometimes this is made by distinctions of students' social and cultural characteristics.

Social exclusion is in general terms defined in terms of access, drop-out, or failure by the students. Distinctive for social exclusion in the education world is failure to complete compulsory education. The education system is a system that disqualifies as well as qualifies.

Statistics and the knowledge problematic

Statistics are a material practice in that they circulate in fields of cultural practices to generate principles of action and participation. Although with contestation along the way, statistical categories and magnitudes as they are woven with other discourses form a systems of reason that governs, as we will argue in this paper, how problems to be acted on are constituted, ordering the objects and characteristics of the people to be acted on, the relations through which causes are established and problems remedied, and the pathway for the possibilities of change itself. Statistics, then, in this discussion are not about numbers instituted in political projects and whose biases are to be corrected by better statistical formulas or more correct applications.

Our focus is on statistics as a system of reason poses the problem of the relation of governance and inclusion/exclusion differently from that of those who wish to deal with the technical issues of the adequacy of the use of statistics or their validity and reliability.

But the problem in our research is not only how numbers order and discipline what is seen, thought about, and acted on. The formulation of statistical reports does not exist on an equal playing field. Principles are generated that make up kinds of people, to borrow a phrase from Hacking (1995), as individuals are transformed into calculable and governable groups. The “kinds of people” targeted in the statistical formulates have typically been drawn from theories of deviancy, with the groups and individuals designated by social planning for rescue or redemption in the name of progress. The categories and divisions in national and international statistical comparisons of education that are constructed to seek a more inclusive society, we will argue, contain their own irony of modern social planning.

Statistics is, we argue, central in this modern problematic. They are deployed to administer populations in the name of freedom and liberty. This administration occurs through the reasoning of probability, as social planning is able to “tame chance” by making objects of the world intelligible and calculable for policy.

Our argument about education statistics, then, is not about their “goodness/badness”, usefulness, or biases; nor is it to censure or condemn numbers or statistics in education. Our task of inquiry is different: to inquire about the system of reason in which statistical discourses circulate and form a relation between governing and social inclusion/exclusion; it is to make apparent how the duality of the knowledge of education. The rules used to widen inclusion are, at the same time, rules of normalcy and divisions whose implications are to simultaneously construct systems that exclude as they include. To make the knowledge of policy and education as a problematic of study is to disturb “...that which forms that groundwork of the present, to make once more strange and to cause us to wonder how it came to appear so natu-

ral” (Rose, 1999, p. 58). To show the contingency of the arrangement that we live by is to show how thought has played a part in holding those arrangements together and to contest the strategies that govern human possibilities.

The importance of international comparisons through statistics is a post-World War Two phenomena. It is to construct a comparative source of data about the seemingly interaction of diversified societies; and a comparative statistics that has ‘translatability’ renders commensurable the diverse social arrangements and ways of living. The categories of international reports of educational performance are often mirrored in national examinations of educational progress and policies to modernize the educational system.⁵

Education at a glance, OECD Indicators (1998. 2000) is one such report that has importance to educational planners in Europe as they consider state policy related to education, and, although less obviously, in the U.SAs do other reports, Education at a glance, OECD Indicators (1998) describes a fairly standardized view through focusing on educational enrollment over different layers on the school system from primary to tertiary education. But when read closer, such reports of national and international statistics discursively link education to the economic welfare, social justice, democracy, and the well-being of the individual in a manner that is constitutive of educational progress at multiple layers. The statistics for a practical logic of causation through which the salient characteristics of the development and progressive nature of educational systems are constituted.⁶ At the same time, the

⁵ Such indicators appear often as in U.S. national reports of progress in science and mathematics achievement (such as the TIMSS studies) or as discussions of school subjects studies, rates of drop-outs, etc.

⁶ We use the notion of practical logic to examine how the textual relations of the categories through which data are collected in the reports form a way in which relations, outcomes, and cause/effect relations are to be understood. This practical causation has little to do with statistical theories but with the grammar of the text. The construction of a practical logic and causation is discussed further later in this paper.

categories and orders of ordered and made commensurate for social administration. A bond of uniformity about which objects are counted and ordered is created. The magnitude of the numbers establish the relation between categories of policy - between enrollments at different levels, school leavers (dropouts), and social economic group participation in different levels of school attainment. Its ambition to increase the efficiency of educational systems by means of comparisons focuses on a number of indicators. By means of numerical comparisons what is in flux becomes stabilized, and made to seem only as technical problem enclosed within a domain of objectivity.

What is perceived as a tool to capture educational realities and to make distinctions between individuals and groups for a more equitable and just society, is an inscription that brings into a seamless plane different discourses of education, economy, poverty, and cultural practices. The numbers are presented as a way to make the case for combating global inequalities through examining national trajectories in education, and to establish the role of education as an engine for the necessity to change. The use of seemingly an economic term as poverty is inscribes political and cultural representations as it is linked to other terms, such as sustainable development and peace in the text. The categories overlap with ideas of childhood (young people), and the administration of the future as the present in making the nation more democratic and inclusive. One is to read the statistical data as connecting education to democratization as a calculable, administrative practice.

Statistics is a key modality for the production of knowledge necessary to govern. Foucault (1988) argues that governing has involve, at least since the 18th century, a constant correlation between an increasing individualization and the construction of a totality that enables a recognising of ourselves as a society, as a part of a social entity, as part of a nation state. When people spoke about the police, Foucault (1979) argues, they spoke about the specific techniques by which a government in the framework of the state was able to govern so that individuals would be pro-

ductive ‘citizens’. By the 19th century, statistics conceptualized human needs in instrumental and empirical terms for the functioning of the state. Its system of social classification was not only to classify, but in an institutional form to establish grounds for authority and legitimacy through the categories they set down as those categories seemed both natural and socially real (Verdery, 1993, p.37).

Part of this social classification in governing is the assigning people to a population. Applying a calculus of probability, populational thought constructs a new form of individuality. The individual is normalized in relation to statistical aggregates from which specific characteristics can be ascribed to the individual and according to which a life trajectory can be plotted and development monitored and supervised. Measurement of school achievement related to social and psychological attributes of the child and family provide groupings of populations that relate through the statistic tables the “factors” of school success or failure. Through this thinking about populational reasoning we arrive further into the problem of numbers as more than just a way to classify. Numbers inscribe a system that not only calculates and rationally orders groups of people. The system of ordering and classifying also normalizes, individualizes, and divides. Reasoning about children, families and communities as populational groups makes possible of particular kind of governing that places the characteristics of individuals within populational norms and their divisions.

The practical causality is expressed textually through a certain commonality of categories that describe and interpret the performance of educational systems across national and international

reports of educational statistics.⁷ International reports of education statistics, for example, focus on the relation of input and output contexts of education. The input context assumes that resources to education will produce good things, such as combating illiteracy or social exclusion, or competent citizens.

In the national and international reports are changing categorization of the problem of inclusion and exclusion in the reporting of educational statistical reporting to changing governing practices of the organization of education. The shift is from a governance by rules that focused on an input approach (what social classes achieve and stay in the educational system or the money spent on national educational systems) to governance of education as an output approach by goals and evaluation, implicating that the results of education are emphasized. This shift can be related to other changes in the organizational relations of centralized and decentralized governing practices of education (see, e.g., Lindblad & Kallos, 1994; Popkewitz, 1996).

A major assumption of statistical reports is one of the equity problematic, that is, adequate data collection will enable policy to govern access and representation more efficiently. The quantities represented in the statistical categories are placed in relation to each other categories calculate as the governance of inclusion/exclusion and to produce legislative steering through fiscal policy, legislation, and bureaucratic practices. The rules of reason that travel across the surface of the reporting documents is that the proper social administration and coordination of quantities that express the categories will govern the relevant kinds of people and thus, inclusion can be obtained and exclusion eliminated.

⁷This commonality is a recent phenomenon, produced as international and interstate agencies work on common categories by which to compare nations. This commonality in statistical categories is not only one of globalization founded by, for example, efforts of the European Union to develop identity through educational projects (Nóvoa, 2000), but also of national political debates of which, in the case of this discussion, education has become a measure of modernization for domestic consumption.

Our approach to thinking of statistics has been to consider the calculations of the excluded as overlapping with other discourses of economic, social, cultural fields to form the biographies of kinds of people - the low achievement, poverty, ethnicity, and so on that make the categories and numbers significant as governing practices. A final note about policy, governance, inclusion and exclusion. When we talk current discussion about the so-called 'shrinkage of the state' that has been the hallmark of neo-liberalism and of The Third Way politics as to find a new relation between social welfare policy and economic restructuring of the state. Yet such a focus is on a sociology of institutions and organization. But when we examine the systems of reason that we have discussed in relation to statistical reporting, there is no such shrinkage of governing, just mutations. There are increased and finer national and international distinctions and elaboration of policy statistics. Thus, we can reach a counterintuitive conclusion to the problem of governance. If we think of statistics as embodying the idea of social administration, there has been a dramatic increase in the governance through the making of finer distinctions of the kinds of people governed.

Commenting conclusions: A report on knowledge

This study can be used to rethink the way in which we understand the politics of schooling and thus the problematic of research as it relates to policy. Our method of research has been not to measure educational systems in relation to a normative principle of 'the good' that dominates contemporary policy studies, such as whether the educational systems are more or less inclusive. We have not pursued this approach for a number of major intellectual and policy related assumptions that historically cannot be sustained in social science research.

One is that the full range of social, cultural, and political variables can be assessed, controlled, and measured in order to provide a rational plan for achieving the expressed goals of the

educational system. Yet while research continues with this tacit assumption, its ironies are to continually point to the complexities of social systems that limit if not prevents such a knowledge of the totality in which planning is to procedure.

Second, if we think of the hallmark of political decision-making is that it depends on assessments of multiple and contingent interests and decisions that prescriptive and instrumental research is unable to satisfy.

Third, such research fails because research is always of the past. Its understandings of the present are through what has been and not what is or will be. The philosophy of science has long made the distinction between social and natural phenomena. This discussion can be expressed as the difference between atoms that do not know they are being talked about when called atoms and thus unaffected by language and meanings, and people where the categories and distinctions of social science, once made, become part of and influence the world in which we live. In a difference sense, for ideas to be useful, they need to be adequately conceptualized in order to consider their implications and consequences to the practices of policy. But this is not one that provide schemes for direct intervention but schemas that enable a public dialogue in which to think about possibilities.

As a result, our approach to policy implications is one that diagnostic in order to consider the relations between governance and social inclusion and exclusion. Rather than seeking to be prescriptive or didactic, our approach is to focus on the assumptions, implications and consequences of those relations as they are expressed in the educational restructuring and reform constituted across the spaces of the European Union. In this sense, our research intervention in policy is to explore the rules that organize policy so that those rules can be open for discussion about their possibilities and other alternatives.

1. *Reason as a Cultural Practice of Policy*: Policy needs to consider the significance of systems of reason that orders and classifies who is included and the excluded as a

practice of governing. As we have argued, the principles that order the ‘problem-solving’ of policy and actors are not neutral but constructive and productive of educational practice. They should not be taken-for-granted.

2. *Two Different Politics in Policy*: Policy recommendations need to take into account two different elements of the politics of schooling. There is a politics related to who is represented and have access among different populational groups in a society and across the European Union space. But the politics of policy cannot only be concerned with whom benefits from organizational or pedagogical changes, but it needs to consider as well the principles generated to make the objects of schooling known, comprehensible and capable of action.
3. *Problematics of governing as both equity and of knowledge*: The ordering and dividing practices are not solely who is represented in school classrooms, such as who has higher achievement, or who goes on to college or who drops-out. While these are important indicators of equity, policy also needs to address the systems of reason in schooling as establishing a continuum of values that normalize certain types of dispositions and capacities that qualify and disqualify individuals for participation. In this sense, policy needs to consider the two problematics of governing: that of equity and of knowledge.
4. *Topoi in Policies*: Policies need to carefully examine the different *topoi*, that is, banalities that are universally accepted as truth about social policy and thus seem as unquestionable. While rhetoric strategies are important to any document, policy needs to consider where rhetoric becomes a *topoi* and obscures rather than clarifies the issues under consideration.

5. *Understanding the Complexity of Policy:* The new calculus of intervention and displacement are being placed in policy. The organizational changes that are to call forth a new democratization of the school are more than procedures and processes of some pure notion of democracy but are inscriptions that embody particular ways of classifying and dividing the world and its objects for action.
6. *The Policies Of Decentralization/Centralization:* The policies of decentralization need to be considered in relation to that of centralization in the configuring and re-designing of the relation of the State as the arena for securing the obligations to its citizens and decentralization that focuses on local involvement and *partnership* for participation through civil society. The governing patterns in these new relationships for increasing participation are not straightforward and needs careful scrutiny.
7. *Restructuring and its Downside:* While notions of market, individualization, and more efficient local management of educational systems seem to have a certain orthodoxy in reforms, policy makers should consider the downside of such reform, such as how new patterns of segregation and exclusion are produced.
8. *How Kinds of People Who are Vested as Objects of Policy:* It is through considering the knowledge systems of educational practices that policy makers can consider how particular kinds of people are vested with the capacities and capabilities for action and thus groups and individuals are qualified and disqualified for participation.
9. *Practical Causality in Policy and Creating Notions of Deviance:* It is important that policy makers consider the practical causality inscribed in current policy through its systems of reason. The categories deployed

in policy ‘say’ that certain phenomenon should be viewed as going together and how certain people are to be given attention in planning for a more equitable society. But the practical relations among the categories do establish a causality based on notions of deviancy and ironically, not making it possible for groups to be considered as normal and included.

10. *Universals About Learning, Curriculum, Students and Cultural Divisions*: Much of the data in the current study points to how the pedagogical content of teaching and curriculum is organized through policy that seems as universal set of rules - rules about the growth and development of childhood, rules about the cultural values and disciplines that children need to participate as a citizen in society, and the curriculum knowledge of school subjects that will produce the ‘knowledge society,’ among other universals. But policy makers should consider the rules of learning, pedagogy and curriculum are not universal rules about children and their development but particular historically mobilized divisions, norms, and displacements.

The results can be summarized in two distinct sets of outcomes. The first set deals with the problematics of equity. A basic notion is here that (a) patterns of social exclusion and segregation increases during the current period, and (b) educational systems are expanding and including more adolescents for longer periods of their life. This is combined with (c) organisational decentralization and an increased steering through management procedures, assessment, and resource regulations. The first two outcomes mean that increased access to education is combined with increased exclusion by means of education. Within this set we also note the lack of difference in perspectives among system actors and school actors.

The second set of outcomes deals with the knowledge problematics and the systems of reason, which enables a consideration

of (c), the new steering mechanism in relation to social exclusion. Our studies resulted in different, but similar categories, conceptions, and patterns of reasoning. These were presented in texts, and interviews as well as in statistics. Similar narratives on the necessity to transform education governance were presented. In sum these narratives reveal a fatalism among actors as there appears to be no alternative to current changes. Further, we raised questions about the ways in which external, social and cultural distinctions of deviance travel with institutional practices through which reforms are formulated at all levels of the system. The changes in narratives governing reforms are combined with new demands on teachers as well as students. There was a silence about those who did not fit in this new way of governance.

A major conclusion in terms of education policy making is the need to problematize current stories of educational progress. There is a need for more reflexive and intellectual understanding of changes in education governance and the systems of reason that are used for educational changes as well as for social inclusion and exclusion of youth. In a word: knowledge matters in the making of education policy.

References

- Bourdieu, P. (1979/1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P & Passeron, J-C (1977). *Reproduction in Society, Education and Culture*. London: Sage.
- Chubb, J. & Moe, T. 1990. *Politics, Markets and America's Schools*. Washington, DC: Brookings
- Dale, R. (1997). *The state and the governance of education: An analysis of the restructuring of the state-education relation*. *Education: Culture, economy, and society*. H. L. A. H. Halsey, Phillip Brown, & Amy Stuart Wells. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 273-299.
- Durkheim, E. (1978). *De la division du travail social*. Paris, Presses universitaires de France.
- Education at a glance. OECD indicators 1998. Paris: OECD/CERI
- Education at a glance. OECD indicators 2000. Paris: OECD/CERI
- Education Policy Analysis 1998. Paris: OECD/CERI
- Esping-Anderson, G. (1996). *Welfare states in transition: National adaptations in global economies*. London, Sage.
- Foucault, M. (1988). *The political technologies of the individual*. *Technologies of the self*. L. Martin, H. Gutman, and P. Hutton, eds. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.pp. 145-162.

-
- Goodwin, R. (1996) Inclusion and exclusion, *Archives Europeennes de Sociologie*, 37(2), pp. 343-371.
- Hirst, P. & Thompson, G. (1999). *Globalization in Question*. Cambridge: Polity Press. (2nd edition. 1st edition published 1996.)
- Inglehart, R. 1997. Modernization and Postmodernization. Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Johannesson, I. A., Lindblad, S., Simola, H. (2002). An Inevitable Progress? Educational restructuring in Finland, Iceland and Sweden at the turn of the millennium, Scandinavian
- Lindblad, S (1994): Lärarna - samhället och skolans utveckling. Utforskningar och analyser av lärarledd försöksverksamhet. Stockholm: HLS Förlag
- Lindblad, S (1999): Changes in European Education from a Scandinavian Perspective. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, Vol 17, no2 págs 247-275.
- Lindblad, S. and D. Kallos, Eds. (1994). New policy contexts for education: Sweden and United Kingdom. Umea, Sweden, Pedagogiska institutionen, Umea universitet.
- Lindblad, S., Ozga, J. & Zambeta, E. (Guest Editors): Changing Forms of Educational Governance in Europe. *European Educational Research Journal*, Volume 1 Number 4 2002.
- Lindblad, S., Johannesson, I. A. & Simola, H. (2002). Education Governance in Transition: an introduction, *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, vol 46 nr 3, s. 237-245

- Lindblad, S., Lundahl, L., Lindgren, J. & Zackari, G. (2002). Educating for the New Sweden?, *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, vol 46 nr 3, s.283-303
- Lindblad, S & Popkewitz, T (Eds) 1999: Education governance and social integration and exclusion: National cases of educational systems and recent reforms. Uppsala reports on education no 34.
- Lindblad, S and T. S. Popkewitz (2000b): Public discourses on education governance and social integration and exclusion. Analyses of policy texts in European contexts. Uppsala Reports on Education, nr 36.
- Lindblad, S. & Popkewitz, T. (2001). Listening to education actors on governance and social integration and exclusion. Uppsala Reports on Education no. 37. Uppsala Universitet: Pedagogiska Institutionen.
- Popkewitz, T. & Lindblad, S. (2001). Statistical information and systems of reason on education and social inclusion and exclusion in international and national contexts. Uppsala Reports on Education no. 38. Uppsala Universitet: Pedagogiska Institutionen.
- Popkewitz, T. & Lindblad, S. (2001). Education governance and social integration and exclusion: Studies in the powers of reason and the reason of power. Uppsala Reports on Education no. 39. Uppsala universitet: Pedagogiska Institutionen.
- Lindblad, S. & Popkewitz, T. (2003). Comparative Ethnography: Fabricating the new millenium and its exclusions. A contribution to Beach, Gordon & Lahelma: *Democratic Education Ethnographic Challenges*. Ondon: Tufnel

-
- Lindblad, S. & Popkewitz, T. (2004) (Eds): *Educational Restructuring: International perspectives on travelling policies*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publ.
- Novoa, A. (2000). The restructuring of the European space: Changing relationships between states, citizens, and educational communities. Educational knowledge: Changing relationships between the state, civil society and the educational community. T. Popkewitz. Albany, N.Y., The State of New York Press.
- Popkewitz, T, Lindblad, S (2000): Educational Governance and Social Inclusion and Exclusion: A Conceptual Review of Equity and Post-Modern Traditions. *Discourse*, vol 21, no 1, p 1-44
- Popkewitz, T. (1996). "Rethinking decentralization and the state/civil society distinctions: The state as a problematic of governing." *Journal of Educational Policy* 11/1: 27-51.
- Popkewitz, T. (1998b) *Struggling for the Soul: the politics of education and the construction of the teacher* (New York, Teachers College Press). (It is being translated by the Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, Pomores Press, Barcelona).
- Popkewitz, T. S. and S. Lindblad (2000). "Educational governance and social inclusion and exclusion: Some conceptual difficulties and problematics in policy and research." *Discourse* 21/1: 5-54.
- Popkewitz, T. S., Lindblad, S. & Strandberg, J. 1999. Review of Research on Education Governance and Social Integration and Exclusion. Uppsala Reports on Education 35. Uppsala University.

- Popkewitz, T & Lindblad, S (2001): Estatísticas educacionais como um sistema de razão: relações entre governo da educação e inclusão e exclusão sociais. *Educação & Sociedade*, vol.22 no.75
- Popkewitz, T.& Lindblad, S. (2004): Historizing the future: Educational reform, systems of reason, and the making of children who are the future citizens. *Journal of Education Change* 5: 229-247
- Rose, N (1999): Powers of Freedom. Reframing Political Thought. Cambridge University press.
- Silver, H. (1994). "Social exclusion and social solidarity: Three paradigms." *International Labour Review* 133(5-6): 531-77.
- UNESCO 1998 statistical yearbook. Paris: UNESCO and Berman press.
- Verdery, K. (1993). "Whiter "nation" and "nationalism"?" *Daedalus* 122/3: 37-46.