

Globalization/Regionalization, Knowledge, and the Educational Practices

Some Notes on Comparative Strategies for Educational Research

THOMAS S. POPKEWITZ

The globalization of economies and cultures and the emergence of new nationalisms that are associated with schooling have sharpened the problem of the governing of education. Educational reform has become a central item on the agendas of national governments and international agencies (such as the OECD, UNICEF, and European Union's Task Force on Human Resources, Education, Training, and Youth) that are concerned with modernization as well as research projects such as the International Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). In most nations, educational "reform" is considered to be a strategic site for intervention that can promote the modernization of nations, enhance the viability of economic systems within world markets, and link macro issues of regulation with micro patterns of socialization and child rearing.

This chapter is concerned with comparative strategies that consider the relation of knowledge, power, and educational practices. This focus on knowledge underscores an important facet of contemporary life. Power is exercised less through brute force and more through the ways in which knowledge (the rules of reason) constructs the "objects" that comprise the issues, problems, and practices of daily life. The discussion is organized around three themes:

1. The relation of global and local, national practices in the construction of power in education, with attention to how the global and local forms overlap

2. The transformation of educational systems as problems of governing and governmentality
3. The relation of intellectuals and knowledge in the problem of educational change

Through these three themes, certain conceptual distinctions that have ordered comparative studies are critically analyzed. Among the concepts explored are those of power, the State versus civil society, globalization versus regionalization, and social inclusion versus exclusion.

Globalization/Regionalization and the Reconstituting of Education Practices

My discussion joins with a broader sociological and historical literature about the relation of local changes to global culture and world systems (e.g., Featherstone 1990, 1995; Robertson 1992; Wallerstein, 1991; Wagner, 1994). My discussion highlights the importance of knowledge in considering the social practices through which schooling is being revisioned in both global and national contexts. To underscore the issue of knowledge, I focus on the relation and overlay of global and local or national practices using the concept of globalization/regionalization as a single concept with multiple overlapping dimensions. I pursue this overlapping of relations through considering the *hybridization* or amalgamation of educational practice and the concept of the *indigenous foreigner*. The latter considers the relation of new international heroes and heroic discourses that function to produce national imaginaries about the citizen and participation.

Knowledge, Power, and Schooling: Some Shortcomings and Directions to Comparative Approaches in the Study of Globalization

The globalization literature has tended to point to the relation of cultural changes but has tended to gloss over the theoretical implications of relations among knowledge, power, and changing social patterns. At one level are correspondence theories that relate changes in world economies to the analysis of the relative autonomy of cultural and social movements in the processes of globalization. Balibar and Wallerstein (1991), as one example, consider current interests in multiculturalism and ethnicity as the product of changes in the world system of nationalism and capitalism in the late nineteenth century. But when such analyses are brought into current transformations, there is little differentiation of the distinctive differences in the world capitalist economies among, for example, East Asia, Eastern Europe, Scandinavia, and the United States (see, e.g., Boyer & Drache, 1996).

Nor is there an elaboration of how knowledge produced in education and cultural spheres is a constructive element in the "innovative, health, growth and productivity at a society-wide level" (Boyer, 1996, p. 104). Featherstone (1995), for example, asserts that the narratives produced by intellectuals are important elements in defining the boundaries and distinctions of the conditions of globalization, which he calls "post-modernity." But once this rudimentary yet provocative observation is made, there is no sustained analysis of the function of knowledge as an effect of power. (For a counterexample, see Shapiro, 1997.)

What is more central to this volume is that schooling as an institution has produced systems of governing that tie the local and national with the global through pedagogical practices and knowledge (see, Donald, 1992; Hunter, 1994; Meyer et al., 1992, 1997). Schooling not only constructs the national imaginaries that give cohesion to the idea of the national citizenry. It also constructs the images of cosmopolitan subjectivities that travel across multiple boundaries that form the worlds of business, politics, and culture (see, e.g., Bourdieu, 1996). In multiple countries, curriculum reforms are concerned less with the specific content of school subjects and more with *making* the child feel "at home" with a cosmopolitan identity that embodies a pragmatic flexibility and "problem-solving" ability. The omission of schooling from most cultural studies of globalization and regionalization is odd.

Hybridity and Globalization/Regionalization

While the nation-state is the most common subject of research, national reform practices are simultaneously an overlay of a complex web of global and local relations. The histories of colonialization have depicted this relation as one that is unidirectional or univocal, leading from the colonizer to the colonized. But recent scholarship has rethought this relation as one of hybridity; that is, as an overlay or scaffolding of different discourses that join the global and the local through complex patterns that are multiple and multidirectional (see, e.g., Gilroy, 1993; Young, 1995; Anderson, 1991; Spivak, 1992; Dhillon, 1999). The idea of hybridity is underscored in the formation of political agendas for the new South Africa. Its politics embody fluid and pragmatic relations within a field of multiple power relations. The results are practices that are "a residue of Marxism, a spoonful of Chicago economics, a dash of West European social democracy, and much local spice. Like post-communists everywhere else" (Ash, 1997, p. 33).

The concept of *hybridization* makes it possible to think of educational reforms as plural assumptions, orientations, and procedures in which the practices of reform are effected. The hybridity of discourses is evident within the political imaginary of European Union "unity." Current reforms give reference to Europe as a continent of diversity, with those "inside" the Union

built by the Maastricht Treaty having different national traditions of 'reasoning' about social policy, and separated from those outside "the walls" (Silver, 1994). Educational reforms in Argentina can also be understood as embodying a complex scaffolding of techniques and knowledge that are not exerted through fixed strategies and hierarchical applications of power that move uncontested from the center nations of the world system to the peripheral and less powerful countries (Dussel et al., in this volume). Rather, Argentinian reforms embody processes of mediation and transformations of "the space of political rationalities to the modality of techniques and proposals that are used in particular locales." Further, the governing patterns embodied in the new constructions of EU's Europe entail new reconfigurations in the nexus of nationality-sovereignty-citizenship that cannot be taken for granted in studies of "European identity" but need to be explored through the new principles of governing produced.

The concept of hybridity, then, enables us to consider the relation of knowledge and power as not hierarchical, moving uncontested from the center nations of the world system to the peripheral and less powerful countries. Rather, the global and the local are intricately joined through complex patterns that are multiple and multidirectional. My chapter, for example, points to the differences in how seemingly universal discourses of centralized/decentralized systems of educational reforms are deployed variously as multiple global and local discourses intersect in South Africa, Russia, Sweden, and the United States (also see Kerr's chapter). Bloch and Blessing's chapter, as well, points to the complexity in which Eastern European centralized patterns of the state and foreign interventions through international grants interweave with local "cultures." While not using the word *hybrid*, Bloch and Blessing point to discourses that join what is analytically distinct: liberalism, neoliberalism, and collective, social ideologies of the welfare state. In these contexts, the overlapping discursive practices make it difficult to apply traditional ideological categories of conservative, liberal, or left. The chapter by Whitty et al., as well, gives a historical specificity to the British discourses of neoliberalism as entailing a cross-Atlantic movement that has no center but different sets of relations as policy is realized. The reform policy discourse continually moves between the United States and Britain with no apparent originary authorship.

Hybridization, then, provides a way to consider the interrelation of processes of globalization and regionalization as constituted through fluid, multiple, and historically contingent patterns. At the same time, we need to recognize that the playing field in which these processes of change occur is not level. In one context, Latin America and African national reforms may be positioned in relation to international funding agencies and other centers such as Europe/North America.

The ideas of hybridization pertain in different contexts. While the rhetorical constructions of today's reforms speak of giving marginal groups "voice" in schools, there is no natural voice. There are only mediated distinctions and divisions which are the historical effects of multiple discourses through which subjectivities are constructed. The construction of voice is an effect of power and never outside of the power relations in which it is positioned.

Hybridity also provides a way to consider globalization as not merely an issue of hegemony and the dominance of the powerful over the less powerful—a power that moves from the "core" nations to the periphery. There is not some non-European "voice" that exists in some pristine state to be deployed to counteract the colonialism of the European. As recent historical discussions of colonialization illustrate, there are slippages and processes of translations of ideas of the colonial metropolis as discourses are rearticulated in different contexts from which they were originally produced (see, e.g., Moore-Gilbert, 1997). At the same time, the metropole is itself reconstructed in a manner that is still relevant today. Europe, for example, was made by its imperial projects as much as the colonial encounters were shaped by conflicts within Europe itself (Cooper & Stoler, 1997). Nóvoa's chapter discusses the inclusions and exclusions through which the nineteenth-century European nations refashioned notions of citizenship, sovereignty, and participation cannot be adequately understood without exploring the relation of European practices to Asian and African political movements as well as self-doubts about the moral claims of liberalism in the face of the colonial enterprises.

Current Tanzanian reforms can illustrate the hybridity. Current Tanzanian educational reform about national unity and community overlap national purpose with the subjectivity of the individual (Vavrus, in this volume). The reform discourse appears indigenous as it refigures and reformulates the national imaginary through notions of "self-reliance" and African unity. But the Tanzanian reforms embody hybrid relations as colonial and "postcolonial" discourses collide. The discourses of African unity and nationalism inscribe the historical construction of European State (see, e.g., Badie & Birnbaum, 1983). Its notions of history and "public sphere" assume historicism, agency, and gendered quality that are themselves of European construction (Prakash, 1994; also see Pateman, 1988).¹ The double relations become important to the reading of contemporary literatures that focus on curriculum change.

The Production of Memory/Forgetting in National Imaginaries

In the previous section, I referred to the concept of hybridity in relation to national imaginaries. This section will explore this idea, with the following section pursuing the idea of the *indigenous foreigner* to explore how global discourses circulate without a history of time and place.

The idea of a nation and of a citizen is not one that is naturally produced through a common language, race, or geographical boundary. Nation-ness, as a community, is formed through discourses that project individuals into a collective narrative that enables people to know, understand, and experience themselves as members of a "community" (Balibar, 1991, p. 49). Discourses of public policy and theories of the social sciences, for example, generate images of the attitudes, dispositions, and capabilities of the "citizen" who contributes and participates in a nation. Anderson (1991) has called this institution of an imaginary unity an "imagined community," one in which cultural representations are historically fabricated to produce a "nation-ness."

The fabrication of the citizen and nation-ness is not only important for its construction of national imaginaries through which identities are constructed. The images and narratives of nation-ness produce new memories. These memories of the past, however, are not of the past that is more adequately represented in the present. The narratives of nation-ness recuperate national memories through the forms of representation constructed. "The past is not simply there in memory but it must be articulated to become memory. Memory is *recherché rather than recuperation*" (Huysen, 1995, p. 11).

The new images of the citizen, however, do not provide the missing conception of identity for groups that demand recognition. Rather, the new conceptions of identity are forged out of the relations constituted in the new cultural practices. Cultural anxieties are formed as old identities are estranged and one's "home" (identity) is no longer located where one thought it was (Wald, 1995). As older conceptions of one's "home" are juxtaposed with new images that are being imagined into existence, there are ambiguities and contentions assembled in the new cultural territories (see, e.g., Chatterjee, 1993; Wald, 1995). Adjustments to national imaginaries "conjur away" various aspects of disorder and disjuncture through the consolidating languages of solidarity and coherence (see, e.g., Shapiro, 1997). In Argentina, for example, public discourses have inserted a notion of *reconciliation* as a way to develop a consensus about the past in the present conjuncture (see Dussel et al., in this volume). The discourse of *reconciliation* is embedded in debates about where and how to build monuments and museums that are to produce new memories and new reading of the past through the articulation of new heroes to think about national identities.

The production of memory, then, "is not some natural generality of forgetting that could be contrasted with through some form of a more reliable representation itself. Memory is given in the structure of representation itself" (Huysen, 1995, p. 11).

The "making/remaking" of national imaginaries is also the producing of cultural anxieties. The constructions of memory entail a deconstitution of old images as people must be dissociated from the old collective identities and reimagined with another collective narrative (Balibar & Wallerstein, 1991).

The struggles over identity that exist over minority rights and gender, for example, have produced new exclusions and taboo zones, as monolithic notions of identity clash with the convictions of identities that are heterogenous. Current discussions in the United States about revising the school curriculum to include concepts of multiculturalism, for example, can be understood as transforming the geopolitical imaginaries and notions of community. Such discussions can also be examined as altering the forms of representation and images through which the culture constructs and lives in its temporality (Popkewitz, 1998).

In the construction of national distinctions and divisions is a forgetting practice as the new reorganizations of the notions of unity, community, and individuality "make" other histories disappear or appear as not relevant for action and participation. And as discussions about "the cultural wars" indicate, the forms of representations contest the home in which one is to locate identity. In part, the imagined unity is instituted against other possible unities, as well as interpretive contentions and analytic capacities of people (see, e.g., Shapiro, 1996).

The construction of "national imaginaries" is deeply embodied in the reflexivity inscribed in the social and educational sciences. The discourses of science have historically embodied the imagining (reimagining) of the conception of personhood and identity in the production of narratives of nationness (see, e.g., for general discussion Anderson, 1991; Hacking, 1995; in teacher education, see, Popkewitz, 1993a; Wagner, Wittrock, Weiss & Wollman, 1991; also see Herbst, 1965). The European and North American discourses of the social sciences linked the individual to political rationalities of a citizenry and collective social purpose in the nineteenth century.² Further, the disciplinary constructions of history, social and educational science, and anthropology centered a particular European historicism as their point of reference in the administrative reforms, although the discourses of "reason" are continually mediated and transformed in cultural contexts (see, e.g., Chakrabarty, 1992).³

The construction of national imaginaries provides a way to think about the discourses of educational reform and research. They should not be thought of as descriptive of change but as embodying a deep reshaping of the images of social action and consciousness through which individuals are to relate to the multiple global and local contexts in which they participate.

The Indigenous Foreigner

At this point, I would like to pursue the idea of national imaginaries further through the idea of the indigenous foreigner. I use this concept to direct attention to a particular type of hero and heroic discourses that bring global discourses of change into a relation with particular national discourses

through which national imaginaries are constructed. I view the indigenous foreigner as particularly important in contemporary understandings of the relation of knowledge and power.

It is common in national policy and research for the heroes of progress to be "foreigners" who are immortalized in the reform efforts. The names of the "foreign" authors, for example, appear as a sign of social, political and educational progress of the national debates. The turn-of-the-century American philosopher John Dewey and the Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky, for example, have become icons in the educational reforms that circulate among many countries. Dewey and Vygotsky appear as universal heroes to explain the "new" principles of pedagogy in South Africa, Spain, the Scandinavian countries, and the United States, among others. In critical social theory traditions, the names of the German Frankfurt School social theorist, Jürgen Habermas, the Brazilian Paulo Freire, and the French philosopher Michel Foucault, among others, are inserted into national debates to provide principles for social change, and, in some cases, educational planning. In most cases, these "foreign" traditions appear in discourse as if they were indigenous or universal.

While the heroes and heroines circulate as part of global discourses of reform, such heroes and heroines are promoted in national debates as indigenous or what appears as a seamless movement between the global and the local. The foreign names or concepts no longer exist as outsiders but with an indigenous quality that erases any alien qualities. The invocation of the indigenous foreigner functions to bless the social reform and nation with the images of the harbinger of progress. The discourses in which the foreigner appears are seen as opening up new intentions as new concepts are available for opportunities and interactions.

But when the narrative of the indigenous foreigner is examined closely, it is found to be a narrative without specific historical references and practices. It is a discourse that is *empty of history*. There appears an abstract, serial continuity rather than a series of specific historical contingencies in which the discourses of education are produced. The empty history of the educational reforms has no social mooring to the interpretations and possibilities of action. Dewey, Vygotsky, and Foucault are read not as writers whose ideas are produced in other, foreign fields of power relations but as local "saints" who forge an apparent continuity and evolution in the governing systems.

In the new systems of reasoning, the "saints" appear to produce emancipatory projects. The constructive pedagogy of the "problem-solving" teacher and child employs the names of Dewey and Vygotsky, for example, in what appears to be a serial continuity of the past, present, and future (Popkewitz, 1997). From critical traditions, the German Frankfurt critical theories overlay with the Italian Gramscian's language of "hegemony" and the Brazilian Catholic worker heritage of Freire's "critical consciousness" and "dialogics" to become a discourse that promises universal liberation and empowerment.

The indigenous foreigner can be examined in Latin American discourses about "action research" in teacher education, and about decentralization and marketization of educational practices. The distinctions, which emerge in relation to different ideological positions, coexist in the reform literature as part of the local efforts to modernize schools (see, Dussel et al. and Torres, in this volume). Action research, decentralization, and marketization, sometimes separately and sometimes within the same policy discussions of educational change, construct the new manifest destiny of the country through claims of economic prosperity, personal liberation, and/or social reconstruction.

But these categories of reform and policy are not solely those of Latin America. The policy and research reports often deploy literature from Spain to justify the approaches taken. Here, though, the complexity of the discursive deployments of the foreigner as an indigenous practice does not end. The Spanish educational literature is itself one that is transmogrified, built on translations of British and American texts but this "origin" is not longer evident in the discussions of the reforms. Importation and translation no longer appear as either. The discourses become inscribed as the internal "logic" through which the ongoing national dialogue of educational change is discussed. The national narratives circulate as if they were local and with no history except in the logic of the principles that the categories are to represent: the *problem-solving* child, the *progressive* curriculum, the *professional* teacher, and the *decentralized* school.

The transmogrification of the indigenous foreigner is the effect of power. The indigenous foreigner appears in the form of universal categories that order the interpretations and possibilities of national practices—the paths that one must take toward salvation and emancipation. The universal principles, however, are not universal but embody specific social and cultural forms. The national imaginaries that speak of emancipation and empowerment tend to inscribe principles of a "liberal democracy." These universal, inalienable principles embody particular sets of European, bourgeois norms about human rights and political freedom. But the specific cultural and psychological conditions that are woven into the principles of "liberalism" are concealed, as they seem to exist as preconditions for the actualization of individual capacities (Metha, 1997). Thus, while it is important to recognize that the principles of liberalism have been important in producing major social and political changes around the world, it is also important to recognize that the narratives of rights and democracy are also woven into the production of violence both within European nations and in colonies.

My concern with the indigenous foreigner is to recognize how the local and the global become overlaid in the production of power. If the discourses of reform and science are thought of as a form of storytelling, then the indigenous foreigner inscribed in national debates is part of the power relations embodied in the stories of global/regional relations. The importance of

the indigenous foreigner, then, is not the individuality of the person who is made the heroine, per se, but in the deployments of the hybridity of discursive principles that order the memory about progress and that divide "reason" from nonreason. National discourses of policy and research embody multiple historical trajectories as principles for governing action and participation are produced. The indigenous foreigner is the effect of power.

Professionalization: An Example of Indigenous Foreigner in Global/Local Relations

The indigenous foreigner and the construction of memory/forgetting can be explored through the discourses of professions and professionalization that circulate internationally. The professional teacher seems to cross ideological positions. That image is found in liberal and neoliberal reforms to decentralized school decision making through teachers who have more autonomy and relation to local community "cultures." From the left, the professionalization of teachers is to promote the emancipatory, empowering potential of education for a democracy. The professional teacher participates with the community and the child in order to reconstruct the society (see, e.g., Popkewitz 1993b).

When examined comparatively, the discourses of professionalization are seen to produce an empty history that embodies the power relations of globalization and regionalization. The discourses of professions and professionalization are neither singular nor universal. The idea of professional occupations that is embodied in current reform literatures is particular to European and North American constructions. While there are distinctions between the European continental and Anglo-American traditions of professions, it is the Anglo-American one that is dominant in the reform literature (see, e.g., Popkewitz, 1992). Anglo-American traditions of professions emphasize an ideal type of the expert knowledge of the teacher and occupational control of members. This Anglo-American ideal of the professional is a historical construction of the relation of the state and civil society in these countries. The noncentralized legal/administrative traditions of the United States and Britain produced particular occupational groups with strong cultural and social authority that existed alongside the state legal-administrative apparatus. The social sciences and "helping" professions, including teaching, linked the governing patterns of cultural and social life with the governing patterns of the state.

In continental Europe, in contrast, the concept of "professional" is historically different from that of Britain and the United States (see, e.g., Jaraush, 1990). One can compare, for example, the German or Russian traditions where the word *profession* had multiple meanings, ranging from particular

occupations to any kind of employment. Discussions in France, as well as in Britain, have attempted to avoid the "expert knowledge" conceptions of professions through the introduction of the word *professionalism*. The "ity" of the word gives emphasis to a quality or a state unlike the "ism" that relates to a system or doctrine. This is a semantic move however, and does not differentiate historically about the nature of expert knowledge and experts.

Latin America involves different state traditions through which discussions of the teacher-as-professional occur as a particular, historical hybrid of the global/local (see Dussel et al. and Torres, in this volume). The Latin American state was built on a Borbonic tradition. This involved strong state-centered policies that defined the progress of society as a movement from top to bottom. In this state tradition, citizenship was an achievement that was to be reached through state mass education. With this background, the welfare state that emerged by the second half of the twentieth century did not construct citizenship in the liberal terms of the European welfare state, but in a Catholic antienlightenment tradition that left little room for the formation of the modern individual; rather, it was distrustful/disregarding of civic participation, contemporary culture, and the construction of the teacher as found in Britain and the United States. Thus, the idea of professionalization in Latin America has a different trajectory from that found in Europe and English-speaking North America.

Discourses of professionalization, then, provide an exemplar of the global/regional relations that seem to go unnoticed in research. The discourses of the professions travel across national boundaries in the form of universal principles that govern particular aspects of social and cultural life. The discourses appear to have no apparent "origin," but are not global or universal. They emerge from particular national or local interests but become part of the authorized discourses of world systems of reason about social and educational reform. But the movement is one that embodies the local in the global and back to local or national arenas. What seems global in policy and research discourses is brought back into different local contexts and deployed within fields of power.

It is here that there is a need to return to the circulation of ideas and power as embodying a *hybridity* rather than the hierarchical application of power. Hybridity draws attention to how the different sets of distinctions and conditions of the professional, for example, are those of power with a specific historicity in relating state traditions and expert systems of knowledge in the governing of populations. In one sense, the circulation of ideas requires attention to issues of power, as certain discourses do become authorized as the "reason" of reform, such as those related to professionalism discussed above. But to complicate matters further, the inscription of discourses of professions in current educational reform, then, is regionalized within different social fields, cultural traditions, and social relations. The discourses of reform, then,

are not one of an ideal to pursue but of changing power relations concerned with governing patterns that link political rationalities with identities. These changes in power relations cannot be assumed but must be interrogated for their implications, assumptions, and consequences.

The complex field that relates knowledge and social relations compels us to rethink the legacies of the nineteenth century that embodied binaries such as that of global and regional. This rethinking of binaries in social theory, however, is not only of geographical distinctions but of the dichotomies of political philosophy and social science such as the state/civil society and inclusion/exclusion, ideas taken up later in this chapter.

Methodologically, the relation of knowledge, institutions, and power in the comparative understanding of educational systems is elegantly drawn in Schriewer's chapter. He explores the challenges of a comparative social research program that is premised upon a theoretical understanding of historical changes in knowledge and structures that cannot be reduced to ideas of the state and the boundaries of the nation, but which require historical specificity. Schriewer helps us recognize that movements of ideas and practices that cross national boundaries cannot be explained through examinations that are limited within national contexts.

Transformation of Educational Systems as Problems of Governing and Governmentality

The previous discussions focused on the relation of knowledge and power through issues of memory/forgetting and hybridity. Two different notions of power were used that I want to explore more explicitly here. One focus is on the knowledge of policy and pedagogy as benefitting or excluding different social actors. I will call that a *sovereignty concept of power*. The second concept of power relates knowledge to the rules generated for action and participation. This notion of power can be viewed as the effects of power in that it examines the outcome of the relations of knowledge in governing the problematic or rules through which choices and possibilities are generated—what Foucault (1979) called *governmentality*. Where the sovereignty notion of knowledge identifies how knowledge represents and represses social interests, power as governmentality focuses on ways in which the individual is disciplined to act through discursive practices. The two different concepts of power and knowledge involve different strategies for understanding the governing practices of the state as well as for thinking about the politics of social change.

Knowledge, Policy, and the State: Sovereign Power

In contemporary social and educational analysis is found a view of power as something owned or possessed to dominate, repress, and oppress. Implicitly

or explicitly, the idea is that power is something possessed by "the rulers," which enables their rule and, in principle has to be undone so as to provide a more equitable context in which people can equally "negotiate" how resources are allocated. When notions of "resistance" are inserted into discussions of power, it usually focuses on those groups who are dominated and oppressed and how they resist the demands and expectations of those who rule.

This concept of power can be viewed as one of sovereignty in that there is assumed a source or origin to the control mechanism of society. One side of the sovereignty concept of power is pluralist and elitist traditions that emphasize "power over" groups and individuals. The idea of "power over" tends to focus on structural forces and groups that have the power to exert their values as those of the society as a whole, such as capitalism, the State, and racism. Studies of schooling, within this tradition of power, look for how the daily practices and policies correspond to preserving or resisting the structural agents who have power over the decision making and value allocations in society. A different side of sovereignty power is "power to," which stresses the collective capacity of groups to negotiate power relations and thus privilege dimensions of consensus. Much of the progressive pedagogies of group processes embody the "power to" concept. In both "power over" and "power to" conceptions, the idea of sovereignty assumes that there is an actor where power originates that needs to be addressed to change in the distribution of production and consumption among groups.

If the State is taken as a key concept in contemporary social and educational analysis, it is assumed that the State acts as a sovereign power in the restructuring of education (Green, 1990; Torres, in this volume). Analyses examine, for example, how the State's monopoly (sovereignty) weakened hold over the economy has produced new cultural forms as pragmatic responses to the reduction of public funding and local specific pressures created by economic, demographic, and social needs (Bakker & Miller, 1996). In current educational and social theory, the new State is described as "neoliberal" to focus on the mixture of centralized and decentralized practices that benefit or repress structural agents (actors).

The sovereignty notion of power produces particular strategies toward policies about social *inclusion*. Equity is a practice to share ownership of the power that has an identifiable essence. Since power is considered to have a source or origin, the problem of inclusion is one of equity; that is, how schools provide for greater social access and representation of those groups and individuals who previously lay outside the ruling practices.

The idea of inclusion is analytically separated from exclusion in the sovereignty concept of power. Studies of inclusion are to identify access to social practices and values, to include others within the power arrangements. Exclusion is something separate from inclusion, something that is corrected through, for example, better policies that give representation (or "voice") to

the varied social interests. Research on policies related to school choice in Britain and the United States, for example, points to uneven effects of efforts to increase parent options and involvement in the schools, as well as in State policies to decentralize school decision making (Whitty, 1997).

Power as sovereignty provides a form of problem solving that searches for the origin of control and seeks to eliminate repressive forces and mechanisms that limit equal representation in social practices. Equity assumes the redistribution of ownership among groups. When questions of knowledge are introduced into research, they are investigated as an epi-phenomenon to understand how the groups who have power (its origins) affect their will or are resisted by others.

Knowledge and Power: Governmentality

A different concept of power is one that considers the knowledge or rules of "reason" as generating the principles by which individuals act and participate in the world as a "knowing" being. The notion of power looks to the effects of knowledge in governing social practices, subjectivities, and possibilities. The relation of knowledge to power is in its disciplining and producing of the "self," who operates in the world as a "reasoned" person. This disciplining element of knowledge is what Foucault (1979) called *governmentality*. Governmentality calls attention to the tactics of regulating society through the disciplining of the dispositions, sensitivities, and "problem solving" through which individuals judge their competence and achievements. Knowledge, in this sense, is productive and an active, material practice in constructing the world, rather than negative, repressive, or as an epi-phenomenon of the world.

Power-as-effects, or as governmentality, can be thought of as it relates to the categories and distinctions of the order and divides social and personal life. The categories of "the terrible twos," or the health choices made through the tables of ingredients on the back of a package embody systems of reason, and these categories are important in that they give order to "our" perceptions of "reasonable" actions in dealing with children or buying foods. The systems of classification embodied in these practices are not of our making but historically constructed and expressed through our actions. To put this somewhat differently, the knowledge that orders and gives meaning to experiences is formed through power relations and is the effect of those relations. Joan Scott (1991), in her essay on the politics of experiences, persuasively argues that what are taken as "natural" experiences are socially constructed identities tied to power.

How "reason" and "the reasonable person" are constructed are the effects of power. Power in modern political regimes is exercised less and less by brute force, and more and more through the circulation of knowledge that ties political rationalities to the governing principles of our individuality. The "educated subject" in the contemporary world is also one that relates political

rationalities to the governing of the "self." One just needs to look at the debates about the national curriculum standards in social studies to understand this relation of knowledge, power, and the idea of the educated subject. Rarely, however, are the rules through which we "know" about the world questioned or thought of as the effects of power.

The idea that knowledge is an effect of power can be explored if I return to the discussion of the State that I began in the previous section. The state in nineteenth-century intellectual and social thought extends its role of protecting territories and ensuring physical borders. The care of the state's territory shifted to include care for its population. The nineteenth-century state linked the development of social institutions to the development of the person. Power in this new constellation is reversed from its traditional moorings of sovereignty. Power no longer operates from the top or apex of society through the sovereign rulers. Rather, knowledge is linked to power by the microprocesses through which individuals construct their sense of self and their relations to others. Power functions through an individualization that disciplines and produces action rather than merely repressing action.

The problematic of governmentality provides a way to focus on the relation of the global and the local in social and educational studies. Like the new institutions of health and employment, the school tied the new social welfare goals of the state to a particular form of scientific expertise that organized the "knowing" capacities of the productive citizen (Wagner, 1994; Rueschemeyer and Skocpol 1996; also, see, e.g., Popkewitz, 1992, 1993a). Pedagogy would transform children into modern citizens who were self-motivated and self-responsible.

The idea of governmentality enables a rethinking of the binary of State/civil society that was embodied in the previous discussion of the State as distinct from that of economy or culture. Rather than focus on the State as a sovereign entity separate from other social actors (such as economy and culture of the civil society), the state can be thought of as the historical relations through which principles of governing are produced. This notion of the state provides a way to consider how multiple institutions overlap as the discourses of, for example, state-governmental agencies, philanthropic organizations, and international lending agencies, as well as professions, provide the technologies and discourses to fashion subjectivities. This multiple set of relations can be understood in recent transformation of Eastern European policy related to women, child care, children, and education. The hybrid discourses relate national and global discourses in the construction of the subjectivities of teachers, children, and parents, as Bloch and Blessing analyze. The state, in this context, is treated as an epistemological category to study the relations in which discursive practices construct governing principles (see, e.g., Popkewitz, 1996).

At this point, I can return to the distinction between the sovereignty concept of power discussed earlier and the current discussion of governmentality.

Whereas the sovereignty concept focuses on the negative, repressive side of power, the idea of governmentality considers knowledge as disciplining and productive through the rules that are generated for actions (see, Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998). While I make the analytical distinction between two different orientations to the concept of power, the two concepts sometimes collide in the concrete case studies. The work of Spivak (1992) in postcolonial studies, Fraser (1989) in feminist philosophy, Hall (1986), and the critical pedagogy tradition in the United States that draws on the Frankfurt School (Lather, 1991), are examples of discussions that maintain a certain Marxist structuralism while adopting a view of power as governmentality in exploring the concrete social relations.

Rethinking the Concept of Inclusion/Exclusion

In the previous discussions of equity, one side of the binary of inclusion/exclusion is taken as a moral principle to judge the effectiveness of policy. If I return to the production of memory and forgetting in pedagogical practices, I find that the "memories" deployed to reason about the child embody normalizations about "being." That is, the discourses of pedagogy sanction the norms of health, attitudes, dispositions, and problem-solving abilities of the inner self of the individual. The categories and distinctions of pedagogy stand to "tell" what is to be valued and sought as successful, inner characteristics of the child.

But this memorialization of the child simultaneously forms a system that excludes as it includes. This can be illustrated in the U.S. idea of "urban education" that circulates within reforms (Popkewitz, 1998b). Contemporary U.S. reforms in teaching and teacher education "draw" distinctions and divisions to differentiate the *urban* children from those children who are *not* urban. The "urbanism" in educational discourses constructs a particular normalized space or "map." Urbanness outside of education is tied to ideas of cosmopolitan and modern, while urban education is historically mobilized to give attention to those who are to be socially administered because of their subjectivities. Practices were designed to help and save the *urban* child. However, *urban* signified something that was absent in the *urban* child, and, at the same time, these absent qualities were presumed necessary for success. The distinctions and divisions about what is present yet absent in the being of the *urban* child made it not possible for that child to ever be normal and "of the average."

The normalization of the urban child is at the level of the inner qualities, dispositions, and sensitivities that enable and disable action. The ability of the child and parents to act properly (of the home to provide books and reading time), to have positive self-esteem, and to participate in appropriate and successful ways in school activities appear as the product of a natural and

universal reason about learning (Popkewitz, 1993a). The distinctions of children's problem-solving capabilities are not universal but particular distinctions, tastes, and problem-solving strategies that are historically bounded. The particular distinctions of pedagogy are produced by particular social actors within a social field whose dispositions and sensitivities authorized as the reason of schooling (see, e.g., Bourdieu, 1984, 1996). What is taken as the universal capabilities of problem solving in pedagogy inscribe the divisions in a manner that makes the normalcies seem natural and unproblematic. It is at this level of inscription of dispositions and sensitivities that the inclusions/exclusions occur; that is at the level of "being."

It is in light of contemporary discourses of urban education in the United States that we can locate the significance of Hennon's chapter. While she focuses on the changing relation of power and knowledge in the construction of "urban" in the United States, she signals a way to comparatively understand how systems of inclusion/exclusion are produced. While there are different discursive forms through which normality and abnormality are established among the countries represented in this book (see Dussel et al. discussion of the "needy" in Argentina), Hennon's innovative approach enables us to begin to understand how certain historical rules and standards of reason about pedagogy are mobilized and overlay with those of social, psychological, and political discourses. The effect is to place the inner characteristics of certain children as inhabiting spaces that are outside of normality and in which the children can never be "of the average," no matter how much rhetorical energy is spent in talking about "saving" children.

This function of knowledge as producing systems of inclusion/exclusion is also important when examining the circulation of global discourses of reform. The policies of The World Bank, USAID, The European Union's Tacis, Swedish SIDA, and semiprivate international foundations, for example, can be thought of as constructing not only social and economic programs but as governing discourses that relate to the capabilities and being of the modern citizen, the teacher, and the worker in the "assisted" countries. The discourses of reform function in a manner similar to urban education in the United States. The World Bank and International Monetary Fund policies use a similar rhetoric as found in European and North American reform about modernization and saving the nation through saving the child. But the reforms do not take into account the particular social fields in which the dispositions and sensitivities of the teacher and child are constructed. The practical work of the apprenticeship models in teacher education found in the recipient countries of international funding agencies has different distinctions for the teacher than those found in the university educational systems of the donor countries. One can conjecture that the effects of these different sets of distinctions in the current World Bank restructuring policies may disqualify certain segments of the "assisted" country's population through the divisions produced in the

“being” of the teacher and child. (The qualifying/ disqualifying functions of such policies can be intuited in Torres’ chapter.)

To summarize, my concern with issues of inclusion and exclusion is to place them within a single continuum through which knowledge differentiates and divides. It is this continuum that structural analyses of inclusion and the sovereignty concept of power overlook in their focus on the origins of power. Power, in the sense of the production of principles that exclude as they include, is located in the classifying and dividing practices at the level of the being of the child and teacher. My concern, then, with the problem of inclusion/exclusion is to provide a comparative strategy by which to understand global and national relations as hybrid systems of reasoning constituted in an unequal playing field, in the sense of the principles generated about the being of the child and teacher.

Intellectuals, Governing, and Transformations in the Registers of Social Administration and the Freedom of the Citizen

This discussion of globalization and regionalization of knowledge has been infused with questions of power and the practices of educational research. Yet studies by academics tend to restrict their focus to the production of ideas within national boundaries. The history of the social sciences, for example, attends to how ideas are produced in response to national policy and a particular cultural milieu. The discussion of the European intellectual migrations prior to World War II focuses on the immigrants’ contributions to the local economy of ideas (see, e.g., Coser, 1984). The myopia is also exhibited in current social and cultural studies discussions of the relation of postmodern theories to French intellectuals. Anglo-American critics identify this phenomenon as “the faddism” of French thought without questioning how the *indigenous foreigner* has settled into national discourses as processes of both globalization and regionalization.

Historically, the social sciences and social scientists have linked political rationalities about progress with a particular redemptive culture about social reform and individual salvation and liberation (Popkewitz, 1998a). The linking of social sciences with a redemptive culture entails a complex set of relations between the global and the local. This was expressed earlier in the European Union efforts to fund research related to “European Identity.”

The idea of governmentality introduced earlier provides a different set of strategies for considering the politics of knowledge and social change. In one sense, knowledge produces distinctions, differentiations, and divisions that function to normalize and discipline action. With this in mind, to paraphrase Foucault, all discourses are dangerous, including intellectual production, but all discourses are not necessarily bad. I have argued elsewhere that one reflexive

strategy to this recognition that the political is knowledge is to focus on the concrete historical forms of reason through which the acting, sovereign subject is constituted as an effect of power (see, e.g., Popkewitz, 1996; also Fendler, 1998). Bauman (1987) called the stance as moving from the intellectual as a legislator who establishes the rules of social and the personal action to one of thinking of the role of knowledge and the researcher as a problem of an interpreter.

This position is different from seeing research as eliminating bias, stereotypes, or ideologies, at least the bad ones. Each of these strategies assumes that there is some final essence or universal principle of truth that can be obtained through either the proper methodology or theory. Science, it is assumed, is to improve the school or to emancipate! An irony in these ways of reasoning about social and educational research is their constructions of memory and forgetting. These constructions of purpose and fulfillment forget the relation of nineteenth-century social scientific knowledge to the formation of the modern welfare state in the social administration of freedom (Wagner, 1994). Also forgotten is the historical relation between policy and policing that emerged in the nineteenth century. It also forgets that statistics (state arithmetic) and the deployment of populational reasoning in thinking about children was produced to provide administration of the state in its disciplining of individuals. (Early statistics involved both qualitative and quantitative approaches to data collection.)

This selective forgetting has enabled researchers to view themselves as producing both the critique and planning of a progressive society through the policy sciences. In the global/regional contexts where knowledge circulates as part of the governing process itself, this joining of the interpretive, critical discourses with strategic tasks has to be questioned as itself as an effect of power (see Müller, in this volume). But as Callewaert (1999) suggests, the view of research as "action" for policy and planning is a political strategy of intellectuals that needs to be questioned epistemologically and ideologically. This questioning of the function of intellectuals in defining the political, however, is not to forego the use of reason or action for social change but to make the doxa that inscribes the academic's vision of progress onto "others" as the problematic of research (see, e.g., Buenfil-Burgos, 1997; Popkewitz, 1998a).

The issue of globalization/regionalization of intellectual work is taken up in multiple chapters, from Schriewer's discussion of comparative social research to the final section of this book. Drewek's historical analysis of the German academic debates about pedagogy in the 1930s and again in the 1960s, for example, enables us to consider pedagogical theory in relation to historical cultural changes as well as a reaction to the new position of Germany within an emerging world system. Rather than deploying a notion of the teacher as a professional, the German debates were structured around the concept of *Bildung*, a particular German concept related to "self-cultivation"

of the person. Drewek explores how *Bildung* is reinterpreted as the institutional demands of the German educational system change. In the post-world war changes that include educational expansion as well as the internationalization of pedagogical discourses, the older discourses of pedagogy are no longer appropriate, although residues of the older forms of representation remain.

Drewek's chapter compels us to rethink the epistemological principles of academics as related to social, political, and economic arenas. We can think of the paradigmatic debates that are expressed in the chapters of this book as not only descriptive and interpretive of the changes occurring. The discussions of power-as-sovereignty and power-as-effects are also linked to changes in social movements and political projects that have emerged after World War II (Popkewitz, 1996).

Further, one can read current discussions in this book as exemplars of not only the comparative questioning of policy but also as questions about the ideas of the rational administration of progress and the redemptive role of research (Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998). The previous discussions of the changes in the welfare state, economy, and culture are homologous to the epistemological challenges that are circulating in the humanities, social sciences, and educational research. The important article by Stuart Hall (1986), about Marxism without guarantees, epitomizes a rethinking about the role of knowledge and the researcher as a problem of an interpreter or a legislator. The postmodern social and political theories in which the discussion of governmentality is situated also refocuses the knowledge of intellectual as an interpreter rather than as a legislator.

It is with this last thought that I conclude this chapter. My focus has been on a strategy for thinking about comparative studies. In that process, I have focused on knowledge as a central problematic to understanding issues of power as the global and the local relate. My discussion explored how certain binaries of social thought (State/civil society; inclusion/exclusion, memory/forgetting) are, in fact, mutually related and thus require different conceptual strategies for understanding the function of knowledge as a material practice. The idea of the indigenous foreigner, for example, was deployed to direct attention to how power circulates through the methods of problem solving. I have not emphasized terms such as *postmodern* or *modern* to classify the debates and paradigmatic distinctions about power, although one might find much of my analysis on "governmentality" as drawing upon the former to develop the argument about historicizing "reason" in educational studies. Yet, in making this analytical move, I do recognize that the debates are not only about labels and slogans but about the conditions in which power and change are located.