

*Globalization and the Study of Education:
An Introduction*

THOMAS S. POPKEWITZ AND FAZAL RIZVI

Globalization has been in the forefront of public debates in recent decades. It was brought anew in the debates surrounding the current global financial crisis that have forced many to reconsider the idea of globalization and raise a number of new questions. To what extent has the current crisis been caused by the ways in which the possibilities of globalization have been interpreted and enacted? In what ways did the rhetorics of globalization unleash a range of practices that led many countries to abandon prudent regulatory systems of financial systems? Were global processes badly managed or was their very construction flawed? To what extent and how did the dominant construction of globalization re-shape not only economic activity but also other fields of human endeavor, such as education, and with what effects? How did the narratives of globalization become so ideologically dominant? Is it possible to imagine a different form of globalization that does not have such disastrous social consequences?

The essays in this volume are written against the backdrop of these urgent and profoundly consequential questions. If the global financial crisis makes us more aware that individual existence is not just bound by one's immediate environment and national contexts, how can the interconnectedness of ethics, politics and culture presupposed in the term globalization be interpreted, and its implications explored for educational policies and research, as well as for curriculum and teaching? What are different modes of interpreting and conceptualizing the study of education in these changing conditions? What "demands" on contemporary life are being produced by a focus on globalization and how are they different from those that have dominated twentieth century scholarship?

The chapters in this book consider some of the different paths taken in the study of globalization to de-parochialize our understanding of educational aims, processes and outcomes. They signal the need for a reflexivity that enables understanding the present and its particular conditions as they impact the school. Each chapter examines in its own

distinctive way the premise put forward in multiple ways (for example by Appadurai, 2001; Connell, 2007; Hacking, 2002; Popkewitz, 1998; Rizvi & Lingard, 2009; Wagner, 2001) that the traditional conceptions of social research and its territorial boundedness are challenged by the processes that are described by the term globalization.

Globalization as a Contested Notion

Globalization is a highly contested notion. It both describes a set of empirical changes and suggests a range of the conceptual “tools” required to interpret and respond to changes in contemporary events and schooling. It is used, in one important respect, to name shifts in patterns of transnational economic activities, with respect to the movement of capital and finance. It also refers to contemporary political and cultural configurations that are being fashioned and reshaped (Larner & Walters, 2004; Tomlinson, 1999). Its normative qualities are expressed as both salvation themes and fears through which governments, research communities, and civil society are to both interpret and imagine the possibilities of our lives.

In their highly influential analysis, Held and McGrew (2005) argue that while there are no definitive or fixed lines of contestation surrounding the globalization debate, at least three contrasting positions can nonetheless be identified. The *globalists*, they argue, view globalization as a real and significant historical development that has fundamentally altered all aspects of our lives. The *skeptics* deny this claim, and view globalization as a primarily ideological social construction that has limited explanatory value. Enthusiastic globalists such as Friedman (1999) argue that globalization involves a significant re-configuration of the organizing principles of economic activity and social life. In contrast, skeptics believe that the claims about globalization are based on various myths, and that the changes that are described are largely exaggerated, and indeed, there is nothing new about global changes, which have been occurring at least since the 1880s (Hirst & Thompson, 1997).

A third and different intellectual tradition undoes the opposition of realism or nominalism in philosophy and social theory. This position, found in different degrees among chapters in this volume, takes as its focus the need to make visible the particular cultural territories being generated under the banner of globalization. Studies of international relations and global politics, for example, can be traced as governed by changing rationalities about security, development, immigration and

poverty, and the ethical governance of corporate practices (see, e.g., Lerner & Walters, 2004). These rationalities are not merely discourses but generating principles that order what is seen, acted on, and thought about. They cross institutional practices as they are given expressions in concrete social programs, theories and systems of evaluation, such as in the new management techniques of benchmarks that circulate in governmental policies about social reform and school reforms.

It needs to be noted, however, that the lines of disagreement about the changes are not absolute. No one, for example, completely denies the significance of recent global changes caused by the revolutionary developments in information and communication technologies. Nor does anyone suggest that everything has changed, and that we live in a world that is unrecognizably different. Much of the debate centers instead on how to talk and think about the changes we are witnessing in the “transformation of dominant patterns of socio-economic organization, of territorial principles and of power” (Held & McGrew, 2007). Held and McGrew take a middle position between the globalists and the skeptics, whom they refer to as *transformationalists*, a perspective that suggests that globalization has an undeniably material form, for it describes social transformations resulting from growing flows of trade, capital and people, as well as ideas, images and ideologies. Globalization, they argue, describes new patterns of worldwide interconnectedness—the stretching of social relations and economic activities across national spaces and regions resulting in various complex networks of interaction.

One of the major intellectual tensions has to do with globalization as a reality to deal with, a way of thinking about an ideological construction, and/or as something about the in-between “spaces” of institutional relations and knowledge systems. On one layer are the arguments that adopt a critical realism, such as that of Dale and Robertson, who speak, in this volume, of globalization as the ever-expanding, ever-improving, ever-progressing set of relationships between the historically intertwined but essentially distinct trajectories of capitalism and modernity. A different interpretation of globalization is presented by Lingard in this volume. Lingard highlights the importance of political agency in the constitution of global processes. He rejects the idea that texts are merely about interpretation, and argues against viewing policy discourse as a unidirectional command and instruction that constrains the possibilities for interpretation. In a third position, Buenfil-Burgos, drawing on post-foundational political theories, suggests that the real and “discursive” are in fact distinctions of philosophy that may

have little materiality or usefulness for the interpretation of issues of globalization. She offers a notion of territory to understand the relation of material and ideological dimensions in which globalization is studied to consider the interaction of universal values and temporal qualities as they enter into contact with each other.

In each instance, there is an attempt to think about how the knowledge systems (texts and discourses), institutional practices, and social structures are intertwined, through patterns that are not bound to particular nations and the politics of these relations that potentially span the globe.

Globalization in an Historical Perspective: So What's New?

Globalization is a name given to the phenomena of the present to consider the effects, consequences, and causes of the changes occurring. What if this newness of globalization is not so new? In view of such a challenge, the question arises as to how we might think about globalization as an event through which to understand how it is given such currency as a descriptor and explanation for contemporary conditions, the qualities of people's lives, and the paths that are offered for salvation and redemption.

The "newness" of globalization in today's public discussion is consistently linked to capitalism and technologies associated with modernity through European periodization of trade, rapid communication, and price convergence. Yet this "newness" may be challenged historically. One can argue that globalization as a process is evident at least since the late fifteenth century. This process includes: steady trans-Pacific connections; global awareness through mapping; global transformative effects of the exchange of New and Old World crops and germs after 1492; flows of exotic objects, medicines, experts, religion, and dynastic genealogies; and ideas associated with universal power, including centralized states to sponsor and protect long-distance trade.

An incipient globalization related to the development of capitalism was already evident in the second half of the nineteenth century, along with the emergence of more consistent and coordinated practices of colonialism (Scholte, 2005). Under colonial regimes, globally integrated markets and financial systems were forged as it became possible to transport goods across vast distances, and as people were able to remain in touch with each other using new communication technologies such as the telegraph (Ferguson, 2006).

When historically examining arguments about global integration after 1950, it becomes clear that the forms of interaction in trade, investment, and tourism—with the exception of migration growth—have remained steady. Only in the 1990s did flows reach the per capita rates of the 1910s and late 1920s. The distribution between different regions has remained almost steady since the 1870s, with even more regional concentration in the most recent decades with the rise of the European Union, although there are specific changes in the growing role of East Asia and declines in Africa, Latin America, and the former Soviet bloc.

Further, capitalism was not and is not a monolithic structure, but has different trajectories of development and institutionalization in North America, South America, Asia, and Eastern and Western Europe (Boyer, 1996). Its emergence is further nuanced through a range of literature that has focused on the increasing transformations and entanglements during the past 150 years to alter the social-cultural, economic, and political patterns even in allegedly secluded places (Sachsenmaier, 2009). The emergence of capitalism in Japan, for example, entails the overlapping of militaristic, political/bureaucratic, and commercial elites in a state corporatism through which modes of production were assembled and connected. Ohkura and Shibata (in this volume) argue, for example, that Japanese internationalization and interdependency from the nineteenth century to the present entails multi-polarization. This interdependency is evident in the Ministry of Education's textbook writing policy concerning "Neighboring Countries" in the Far East, which signals Japan's own international economic position and the emergence of China and South Korea as economic centers.

It is also possible to locate other forms of globalization in and outside of Europe through different kinds of worldwide¹ flows, networks and connections; some literary, some religious, some purely military, and others political as in the creation of a world system of nations. One can think of the military conquests of Rome, the literary movements that spread Sanskrit, the making of the universal church in medieval times, the spread of Islam and Buddhism, and the establishment of the modern nation in the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia as embodying particular events and institutions that create worldwide interactions that carry semblances to what might be labeled today as globalization.

The spread of ideas about civil society, liberalism, and notions of democracy is often cited as another manifestation of globalization. This

notion of the spread of ideas is intricately tied to the formation of capitalism and liberalism, and normatively inserts the West as its focal point in rating the degree of nations' progress in efforts to accommodate to "globalization." This view of globalization, however, functions as a mode of colonialization through its comparative formulations. Globalization becomes simply the spread of Western cultural and political traditions. A variety of case studies outside of the West, though, illustrates how indigenous traditions of social solidarity and tolerance have produced different possibilities and institutional forms, socio-political orders and value systems than those of Western models (Sachsenmaier, 2009).

We historically focus on the question of the newness of globalization for two reasons. What is important about the present is not the general proposition about globalization or the interconnections, spatial condensation, and differentiation through which the child and citizen are located. Rather, what is important are the particular differences and similarities with the past that require attention when we wish to consider the possibilities and limits of these changes in educational policy, research, and schooling. The changes cannot be taken for granted or assumed, but must be interrogated through rethinking the practices and study of schooling that are not bound by its territorial boundaries or instrumental tasks.

The point about the complexity of globalization relates not only to theoretical issues but also matters relating to the politics of theorizing. Often globalization appears to be a term that emerges from the West and is articulated through its categories and geopolitical centers. Yet as several chapters in this volume argue, there are politics and the political in the deployment of globalization as foci of interpretation. Lingard, for example, calls for de-parochialization of research through an epistemological diffidence that does not reinscribe the Global North and its epistemologies in its constructions of what constitutes globalization. In another paper in this volume Buenfil-Burgos, from a different theoretical position, also argues for rethinking the categories and distinctions through which the study of education is engaged. She suggests the problematization of globalization through considering the *imbrication*, that is, the *overlapping of edges* through which a systematic order is given visibility as a positivity in contemporary affairs.

In each of these two papers, and in some others, globalization is shown to represent an ideological formation embedded within a social imaginary that is re-shaping most aspects of our sociality. This perspective is consistent with the argument of Larry Ray in *Globalization and*

Everyday Life (2007) that globalization may have reconstituted the concept of the *social* itself, implying a new way of interpreting modernity—the principles generated to order how thought and action are ordered and imagined as “our” futures.

Globalization: (Re)Visioning/(Re)Constituting Conditions of Modernities

The suggestion that globalization is not entirely a new phenomenon does not imply that the current patterns of global interconnectivity and interdependence are not in fact significantly different, shaped by the profound technological developments in transport, communication and data processing that have altered our concepts of time and space. In earlier eras space was understood largely in terms of concrete localities. Mobility was limited, and for most individuals it was safer to stay in the same place. This is not the case any more, as Rizvi points out in this volume. He argues that global mobilities of people are no longer linear but dynamic and networked, and that this has highlighted the need to pay attention to the “transnational.” Gulson has similarly suggested that the ways in which urban neighborhoods are not so much declining as becoming reconstituted through the processes of gentrification are linked to the global mobility of capital and people, within the framework of structures emerging out of a neoliberal imaginary.

It is however, not only people and capital that move but also ideas and ideologies. For most of human history it took time for ideas to travel from one place to another. Today, it is possible to send a message around the world instantaneously, giving rise to a globalized media, and making it possible to lift cultural meanings out of their original social context and transplant them in a radically different community. In her paper in this volume, Buenfil-Burgos explores the politics surrounding the movement of ideas. Arguing against the subsuming political traditions under the economic conditions related to contemporary neoliberal thought, Buenfil-Burgos considers globalization as having multi-directions of economic tendencies, cultural diversity and the intertwining and interdependence of political trends whose syncretic and hybrid conditions are given a commensurability between the heterogeneous.

In an important layer of contemporary literature, the transformations are associated with new patterns of interconnectivity and interdependence resulting in the inexorable integration of markets,

nation-states, and technologies to a degree never witnessed before. Globalization, it is argued, enables investors and corporations in disparate locations to move money at the speed of light. This instantaneity of capital flows creates conditions for a complex range of financial interactions that leads to the reshaping of boundaries within national, cultural, and political spaces. A globally integrated system has thus emerged, becoming so large and complex that it cannot be adequately controlled by the existing institutions created in an earlier era to regulate international trade and flows of capital. And hence the financial crisis.

Global enthusiasts assume this economic system to be natural. Indeed, such an account of global processes treats them as historically inevitable, as a kind of juggernaut, with which people and nations simply have to come to terms, or negotiate as best they can. It is based on a politics of meaning that appears to seek to accommodate people and nations to a certain taken-for-grantedness about the ways the global economy operates and the manner in which culture, crises, resources, and power formations must be filtered through their universal logic. They thus “ontologize” the global market logic, creating global subjects who are asked to consider policy options through its presupposed conceptual prism, which revolves around such market principles as free trade, the production of profits through greater productivity, a minimalist role for the state, a deregulated labor market, and flexible forms of governance.

But what the global financial crisis has made clear is that this account of the term “globalization” is deeply ideological, implying certain power relations, practices and technologies, playing a “hegemonic role in organizing and decoding the meaning of the world” (Scharito & Webb, 2003). It contains an unmistakable ideological dimension filled with a range of norms, values, claims, beliefs and narratives which, while they are not always grounded in truth and are often inconsistent, are nonetheless sufficiently plausible to suggest historical accuracy. The debate about whether globalization is good or bad arguably takes place within an arena of ideology that, as Steger (2003, p. 96) points out, is “notoriously difficult to resist and repel because it has on its side powerful social forces that have already pre-selected what counts as ‘real,’ and that it therefore shapes the world accordingly.” It is assumed that globalization of the economy in particular is inevitable and irreversible. It implies moreover that nobody is in charge of globalization and that it benefits everyone. Not surprisingly, therefore, the states that take this ideology of financial

deregulation for granted simply take their eyes off the ball. There is thus now a belated call for a new regulatory system.

According to Manuel Castells (2000a), the new economy is knowledge-based, postindustrial, and service-oriented. Castells (p. 82) speaks of this economy as “informational”: it is “organized around global networks of capital, management, and information, whose access to technological know-how is at the roots of productivity and competitiveness.” These networks constitute “the new social morphology of our societies,” which has substantially modified “the operation and outcomes in the processes of production, experience, power and culture.” This has the consequence of making capitalism more fragmentary, as time and space are rearranged by the flows of multinational capital. Acquiring a new form, capitalism has extended its reach, and now, Castells argues, potentially shapes all aspects of human life and relations.

Recent developments in information and communication technology, especially satellite technologies, have revolutionized the circulation of ideas and information. There is an increasing global spatial proximity today that gives intimacy and connections in the immediacy of everyday life. It is now possible to transfer a large amount of money across national boundaries with the click of a computer key, and hold a meeting of the representatives of a transnational corporation from every continent without ever having them leave their offices. These developments have transformed the nature of economic activity, changing the modes of production and consumption. But they have also transformed personal relations through the internet, email, and “communities” of gamers that entail people around the world. As Harvey (1989, p. 7) points out, in the age of globalization time and space have become compressed in a number of ways, through faster communication, virtual contact, cheaper travel, and digitization. The capitalism of the present has clearly taken advantage of these possibilities, stretching the manner in which individuality is given expression across the whole globe.

Improved systems of communication and information flows, and rationalization in the techniques of distribution, have enabled capital and commodities to be moved through the global market with greater speed. The rigidities of Fordism, which emphasized standardization, mass production and predictable supply and demand chains, have been replaced by a new organizational ethos that celebrates flexibility as its foundational value, expressed most explicitly in ideas of subcontracting, outsourcing, vertically integrated forms of administration, just-in-time delivery systems and the like, producing niched products for a highly differentiated market.

This central idea about speed and flexibility of communication expressed in the literature on globalization is often expressed as the “liquidity of knowledge.” The focus is on changing patterns of communication, flows, flexibility, and flux (mobility) of knowledge that move around all currents of society, and the nonmaterial structures and organizational forms that enable and facilitate that mobility.

The issue of communication is given explicit attention through the discussion of visual media in the chapter by Dussel. She argues that visual culture is not simply a repertoire of images but a set of visual discourses that position people and others in an assembly of social practices that give us the “the rights to look.” Examining the visual discourse of “powerful images” by selected teachers in a Buenos Aires course, Dussel explores media as events in which there are networks in which teachers operate that shape and fashion the freedom of action; and the networks are historically related “in some yet to be determined way to the history of arts, technologies, media, and the social practices of display and spectatorship. . . deeply involved with human societies, with the ethics and politics, aesthetics, and epistemology of seeing and being seen.”

In his chapter, Peters examines the epistemic and pedagogic possibilities of new media and technologies, which are now converging around discourses of “open access” and “open education.” These discourses suggest not only new patterns of global interconnectivities and collaborations but also democratization of knowledge in the production and dissemination of new knowledge, implying new ways we might think about educational research and policies.

This focus again raises the question of locating the spatial and temporal qualities governing the present and the ways in which this has constituted the nature of the political in contemporary life. It also brings to the surface the importance of the historical. Ironically, Marx in the nineteenth century called the “annihilation of space by time as one of the conditions of modernity” (cited in Tomlinson, 1999). Sobe (in this volume) argues that the idea of knowledge as actively moving in all currents of society comes from a 1899 lecture by John Dewey in which he was comparing the turn of the twentieth century with previous times, drawing attention to the changing technologies of media, material structures, and forms by which ideas “move.” And in fact the idea of actively moving knowledge was found in the sixteenth century, with one of its authors being burned at the stake for a heretical cosmogony that threatened what Dewey later called “the high priesthoods of learning.”

Rethinking the Nation, Schooling, and the Governing of Political Spaces

One of the defining characteristics of schooling since the nineteenth century has been its focus on the nation-state. Whether emphasizing the internal institutional development of primary and secondary education or the relation of schooling to issues of democracy, equity and economic progress, the nation has been the center of attention. There is, however, a small sociological and historical literature that has run against this parochialism outside of the literature on globalism (see, e.g., Smeyers & DePaepe, 2008; Meyer, Kamens, Benavot, Cha, & Wong, 1992; Popkewitz, 2005; Steiner-Khamsi, 2004).

The rethinking of the nation and the global as it relates to schooling is evident when thinking about John Dewey and pragmatism. Often considered as an icon of present educational reforms of teaching, Dewey's writing can be read not only as about the turn of the twentieth century American progressivism and American progressive education. On one layer of analysis, Dewey's pragmatism was a historical project in reshaping the relation of the citizen and the nation, as expressed in the broader political and social movement of progressivism (Menand, 2001). But the changes in the U.S. embodied a worldwide circulation of ideas and programs bounded with political, economic, and social changes (Popkewitz, 2005). The New Educational Fellowship, for example, was a reform movement with representatives from 53 nations that embodied similar cosmopolitan dispositions in the construction of a modern schooling through inserting scientific principles in teaching, greater pedagogical relevance to children's lives, and the incorporation of psychology. The various cosmopolitan principles were, however, not the same, as they entailed different cultural theses about modes of life in different time/spaces. This can be understood through considering how Dewey's pragmatism traveled and was assembled, and then disconnected, in the salvation narratives of the Mexican Revolution, Chinese reforms to replace Confucian hierarchies, Turkish modernization of its peasantry, and Pan-Slavic education in Yugoslavia; as well as the placing of Dewey as antihero, an epistemological foreigner who violated the *geist* of the nation in Germany and the Catholic anti-enlightenment reforms in Brazil.

Further, our purpose is to think about the rationale of schooling as it interrelates with institutional and social practices without making a distinction between ideas, discourse, and nominalism in opposition to realism. Ideas are never merely ideas or discourses but cultural and

social practices that respond to and make up things of the world. The different assemblies, connections, and disconnections that can be traced through the traveling of pragmatism were made possible through changes that transcended the local and the national, yet at the same time brought into the different pedagogical contexts of schools to link collective belonging through universalizing narratives about who the child is and should be. These effects were material and not the same in Brazil, Japan, Mexico, and the United States.

If we move to the broader discussions of globalization, this parochialism of the nation is no longer sustainable. Nation-states have defined the social and economic conditions under which people work, but they are no longer the sole arbiter of governing. Increasingly, if we examine the increase in global capital, in the form of transnational corporations (TNCs), it has become equally if not more important. In an era of flexible accumulation, TNCs are able to exercise an enormous amount of power and influence, especially in the least developed countries. Controlling economic activity in two or more countries, TNCs benefit from globalization by maximizing the comparative advantage between countries, profiting from differences in wage rates, market conditions, and related political and fiscal regimes.

Accordingly, states are no longer the only or even the major drivers of the global economy. However, the new capitalism still requires the help of national governments to sustain its accumulation strategies; and it needs to create social subjects sufficiently invested in its operations, as well as cultural practices predisposed towards its products and services. Far from becoming redundant in a globalized economy, the state is now required to play a crucial role in developing public policies favorable to the processes of global capital accumulation. In this way, global economic shifts are dialectically related to contemporary political and cultural shifts. The changing architecture of the state may thus be viewed as both an expression of, and a response to, global economic processes, and the cultural changes we are now experiencing are partly a product of, and partly a contribution to, the consumerism promoted by the global economy.

Over most of the 1990s, many social theorists argued that the exclusive link between the state and political authority was broken. They spoke of the demise of the state and maintained that sovereign states could no longer claim exclusive authority over their citizens and their territory; and those recent changes in the structure of the global economy, as well as international law, regional political associations, and institutional formations had altered the fundamental constitution of the

state system. But such a view is fundamentally mistaken, for as Wood (2003, p. 140) has argued, while globalization has certainly been marked by a withdrawal of the state from its social welfare and ameliorative functions, it is impossible for global capitalism to dispense with many of the other functions performed by the state, such as security, social stability and infrastructural provisions that are essential for economic productivity. Global capitalism depends more than ever on “a system of multiple and more or less sovereign states.” Nation-states are still required “to perform the administrative and coercive functions that sustain the system of property and provide the kind of day-to-day regularity, predictability, and legal order that capitalism needs more than any other social form.”

This new set of relations of the state and international organizations is evident in the new management approaches. Several chapters in this volume refer, for example, to OECD’s PISA, an international assessment of students’ “practical” knowledge of science, mathematics, and literacy. These assessment tools are ways of creating new categories of equivalence across nations. In the European Union, for example, it can be argued that they provide a technology for creating a European identity in a scaled order that redefined the nation. If we look at the university, it is undergoing a transformation all over the world, within a context of both competition and collaboration (Rizvi, 2004). Lindblad and Lindblad (this volume) argue that new ranking systems perform as external assessments to order the quality of institutions into a hierarchy. The ordering system loops back into and enters the steering mechanism for the allocation of resources, and determinants of “quality” as a network of organizations supplement each other in different ways. Globalization is fostered through a soft governing in which external assessments and inputs create global positioning systems (Simons & Maschelein, 2008) that provide a constant location of institutions (and individuals) with global frameworks.

The above examples suggest that issues of the globalization of economic, political, and educational issues are inextricably linked. And so are issues of cultural formation and the role that education is expected to play in the new economy. Within the system of modern states, considerable cultural importance has been attached to education. Educational systems carry the narratives of the nation. In extensive studies of curriculum from the nineteenth century to the present, Meyer, Boli, Thomas, and Ramirez (1997) argue that there emerges a world systems (globalization) that in part can be studied through the formation of modern schooling and its relation to the nation. Gellner (1983) points

out, further, that it was the mass educational systems that provided the common framework of understanding which enhanced the processes of state-coordinated modernization. Through the diffusion of ideas, meanings, myths, and rituals, citizens “imagined” the nation and filtered conceptions of their “other.” Although education continues to serve this function, for many globalization theorists the nation-state can now be imagined in a number of different ways, and the lives of its citizens are now inextricably linked to cultural formations that are produced in faraway places.

However, these developments that accompanied modern schooling can be viewed in at least two ways. One is the world system argument of an increasing homogeneity in the internal workings of schooling; that is, there is an increasing consistency of what constitutes the curriculum and teaching of the school into the twentieth century. This global consistency, argued in multiple chapters in this book, requires theoretical perspectives and historical specifications to understand differences, divisions and heterogeneous modernities, rather than a single model of diffusion.² Again to return to the Japan study in this book, Ohkura and Shibata’s analysis of the multi-polarization of reforms includes Western human capital theories of development and international measurements of OECD’s PISA as “actors” transmogrified through connections with Japanese cultural and social practices.

Under the conditions of globalization, then, the assumption of discrete national cultural formations can no longer be taken for granted because there is now an ever-increasing level of cultural interaction across national and ethnic communities. With the sheer scale, intensity, speed, and volume of global cultural communication, the traditional link between territory and social identity appears to have been broken, as people can more readily choose to detach their identities from particular times, places, and traditions. The media and the greater transnational mobility of people have had a “pluralizing” impact on identity formation, producing a variety of hyphenated identities that are less “fixed” or “unified.” This has led to the emergence of a “global consciousness,” which may represent the cultural basis of an “incipient civil society.”

What this discussion suggests is that global patterns entail complex dynamic processes that are constantly changing in light of new economic, political, and cultural as well as technological developments that embody hierarchies and divisions that are not equal. Some benefit more than others, but the relationship is not that of a flat world, as Friedman (2005) suggests.

Globalization: Knowledge, Cultural Flows and Assemblies

Earlier we explored the difficulty of periodizing globalization. We argued that the contemporary expressions of globalization embody a range of practices that include processes of colonialization (Rizvi, 2004). Indeed, colonialism sought to bring communities across vast distances into a singular political space, controlled and coordinated from a center. Patterns of global inequality date back to the sixteenth century and continue today through different forms than earlier, something we explore below.

The arguments over topological questions about colonialization and globalization explored previously have a different but complementary notion of power embodied in the systems of reason; that is, the historically generated principles about how judgments are made, conclusions drawn, rectifications proposed, and fields of existence made manageable and predictable. Colonialization, as postcolonial literature has continually demonstrated, is not merely about territory and local self-governance but also about the insertion of epistemological systems that order what is thought, done, and hoped for. These studies explore, for example, how the transportation of history into archives, the creation of museums, the use of statistical forms, and social science intersected in the administration and conduct of post-colonial nationalism in the second half of the twentieth century (see., e.g., Mehta, 1997).

To differentiate the issues of colonialization from earlier discussions, we now consider colonialization as embodied principles or systems of reason about what is “seen,” talked about, and acted upon. But to speak about “reason” is to locate its rules and standards historically and not in ideas in and of themselves. The relation of the rules and standards of “reason” as they intersect with and through economic, governmental, and social forms is seriously debated in social theory—from Harvey’s (1989) placing knowledge as an epiphenomenon to material conditions to Hacking’s (2002) “historical ontology” that speaks about the inadequacies of the dualism of knowledge (discourse and texts) and “realism.”³

This focus of reason as an “actor” is made more succinct in the topoi of current reforms about the lifelong learner, the knowledge society and the knowledge economy. These phrases give explicit attention to knowledge rather than brute force as central in the steering of conduct and the act of governing. The materiality of “reason” was embodied in the eighteenth century founders of the American and French Republics, who recognized that the citizen is not born but made. Central was

education in the making of society by making the child the future citizen required by the modern liberal state.

The “materiality” of knowledge—that how we “think” is not merely thought—can be illustrated through European enlightenment discussions about *civilize* and *civilizations*, and by contemporary international testing of science, mathematics, and literacy. The notions of “civilize” and “civilization” instantiate that present knowledge and wisdom superseded the past. “To civilize” in these debates was to extend what is common, or should be, to all human beings. “Civilized” encompassed a politeness, refinement, and new manners and decencies between people (Passavant, 2000). The travel literatures of the Scottish philosophers, influential in the formation of U.S. schools in the nineteenth century, accounted for societies in the New World and Africa through their approximations to “the superior” European models (Jack, 1989, p. 194). Today, European and North American narratives of globalization embody a different polarization that freezes authoritatively, for example, the meaning of Europe through expurgating its “Others.” Heins (2005), for example, examines leading German intellectual attempts to redefine the mission of Europe that criticize cultural essentialism and Eurocentricism; yet that criticism embodies a binary moral geography. The “orientalizing” is told through tropes of lawlessness and inhumanness. Europe is variously cosmopolitan, bearer of Enlightenment values, open to all. America is profane and Europe is sacred; America is selective, violent, and immature politically; Africa is suffering; the Middle East and the Balkans are powder kegs.

The very inscription of the notion of “new” in the context of globalization brings to the fore a way of thinking of colonization through the inscription of difference. The “new” embodied a particular continuum of the past/present/future that stabilized space to calculated change in the name of progress. The placing of human life and change in a regulated time freed people from theological restrictions through notions of actors, development and progress, and made possible the development of social sciences in the nineteenth century to plan society by planning people.

Raising the issue of the conceptualization of time and space is to point to the ways that something as seemingly simple as time moves as both a way of thinking and as the organizing of practices about what is known and acted on. If we examine the international ranking systems of nations that serve as global positioning devices (Simons & Maschelein, 2008), a particular continuum of time and stabilized spaces are produced. The models of modernity and its “advanced”

civilization is framed by the theories and programs about knowledge of science and mathematics found in the curriculum. The teaching of school subjects, however, is not merely teaching about disciplinary fields. School subjects are an alchemy that translates and transforms subject content into practices to govern dispositions and actions related to the obligations of the citizen (Popkewitz, 2008). Lindblad and Lindblad's discussion of international ranking of higher education provides a way to think about organized knowledge production and the circulation of "ideas" governing possibilities through the ordering of social facts and structures about what matters in higher education. The technologies of monitoring, standards, benchmarking, and ranking are produced in multiple sites and assembled by international, governmental, and local organizations. The divisions have a homology to the past differentiations of the civilized from those not as advanced.

Further explored in the Popkewitz chapter are principles that exclusion and abjection are no longer talked about as "advanced" and "less advanced civilizations" in contexts of colonialization. The construction of distinctions and divisions is embodied in policies and research related to equality that recognizes particular marginalized populations for inclusion yet inscribes the child as different. The connections among inclusion, exclusion, and abjection are embodied, Popkewitz argues, in the system of reason that historically makes possible a comparative style of thought through which globalization is "seen" and acted on. He pursues these issues of inclusion and exclusion by first focusing on European and North American enlightenments notions of cosmopolitanism that link and differentiate individuality and societies. This historical analysis orients the discussion of contemporary European and U.S. policy and research. It embodies the globalized school, the child, the lifelong learner who lives in the knowledge society/knowledge economy, and the "other"—the child left behind, who does not "fit" into the envisioned future.

The questions of the "reason" embodied in today's conditions and the relations of time and space that it presupposes require a rethinking of the very problematics through which globalization and education is studied. Sobe, in this volume, for example, distinguishes between the possibilities and limits of different theories of globalization to suggest scopie systems that interrelate epistemological movements and the mechanism through which they become established and recontextualized. Buenfil-Burgos in another chapter also pursues the question of how to think about current conditions and their multi-directional

economic tendencies: cultural diversity, intertwining traditions, and interdependence of political trends that produce syncretic and hybrid conditions and prospects.

Globalization and the Study of Education

The questions about globalization raised in this volume are not merely about policy, research, or knowledge. They are also about the practice of schooling that reaches into the everyday life of schools. In proposals for reforms in education. In the United States and elsewhere, globalization has become part of the “planetspeak” of school reform and the university’s statement of mission. Globalization discourses speak of educational institutions preparing the individual for what is new, and of the future that will renew humanity. That preparation is for the knowledge society and the knowledge economy that knows no boundaries, expresses the citizen reborn through the imperative of general and universal commitments to humanity where allegiances are global—with hospitality to the other who is multicultural and multi-ethnic; with commitments to human rights that transcend the territorial boundaries of the nation. The salvation themes embedded in the narratives of globalization carry a double irony, embodying principles for governing the future in the present and to prepare for the global world through prescriptions designed to make the nation competitive and progressive in the new world system.

Collectively, the chapters make apparent the need to rethink the problems and problematics in the study of schooling. Analyzing the processes of education and thinking about the practices of schooling require examining the broader transnational and historical frameworks in which policies are formulated and programs realized. We have argued that the consideration of the particular implications and consequences of globalization are connected to economic factors and about *homo economicus*; yet at the same time, so as not to be reductive, we must consider the interactions in which transnational relations are performed and realized as specific historical events.⁴ The categorical imperatives that separate and segregate the arenas of the social, the political, the economic, and the cultural, in order to locate descriptions and explanations, are effects of power. If we take the formation of the discipline of economics through the work of Adam Smith in the late eighteenth century, it was concerned with moral philosophy and the good of society, linked to individual self interest. The institutionalization of the American Economic Association at the turn of the twentieth century

was initially designed to bring Christian values into social policy. The moral purposes of the discipline, however, were instrumentalized and its normative ordering subsequently subsumed in utilitarian theories and methods. The very separation of the category of economics from the moral, social, and cultural instantiated political processes differentiated colonial populations in forming their administration (see Mitchell, 1988).

An exploration of these issues should not be construed as an argument against social science but as an indication of the need to rethink the classifications and ordering procedures that engage the study of schooling and its limits. If the discussion of colonialization is of any relevance, the separation of knowledge from the materiality of the world is tenuous, if not eliding of the political. The same applies to globalization.

The volume speaks to issues of globalization and the ways in which it demands a rethinking of educational knowledge, and also, by implication, educational practice. It asks how, and the extent to which, global mobilities of ideas, capital, and people are re-shaping the terrain of educational work; and how global networks are utilized in promoting a particular set of prescriptions for educational reform, and how these prescriptions are shaped through the global processes of knowledge circulation, transfer, and convergence. The chapters in this volume suggest that teaching these prescriptions is based on a particular historical assemblage of values, which while they benefit some communities more than others, are perhaps masked behind a legitimizing discourse of globalization. While the perspectives on globalization presented in this volume vary, what is common to them all is the conviction that globalization is a name given to the present that needs to be historicized, and the very naming of that present is not neutral but part of the problem of political and governing practices.

The volume is organized in three sections. The first is entitled *Globalization and Education: Different Outlooks and Problematics*. Its major concern is with exploring existing approaches and alternatives for theorizing and conceptualizing the study of globalization. Themes of interconnectedness and difference give substantive discussions of the worldwide changes occurring and the issues posed for the study of education. The second section, *Globalization: Effects and Possibilities*, provides analyses of specific contexts and characteristics of globalization and education. This section, like the previous one, illustrates how different conceptualizations cast different ways to “see” and think

about the phenomena and the expression of the issues generated through the study of globalization. The final section *Globalization and Challenges for Educational Research*, grapples with issues of rethinking the legacies of late-nineteenth-century educational theories, research, and practices through the subject of the nation as well as the social, cultural, and epistemological assumptions for ordering the changes occurring. Along with the previous sections, these chapters provide ways of (re)visioning the commonsense about globalization, social changes, and education. While there are families of resemblance in the chapters of each section, there are also overlaps in the themes and arguments across the different sections. These overlaps also, we believe, reveal the strength of the contributing authors, who bring to bear a wide range of scholarship to the discussion of globalization and education.

NOTES

1. We use the term “worldwide” rather than “international” as many forms of globalization preceded the notion of nation.
2. For discussion of multiple modernities see Eisenstadt (2000) and Sachsenmaier (2009).
3. We have argued earlier and below that part of the inadequacy and thus the rethinking of the social and education sciences is the categorical separation of these different spheres of human life that are residues of nineteenth-century social theories.
4. The early use of the word was *oeconomy*, that in the seventeenth century referred to the prudent managing of the household that was not merely about its resources but also its moral qualities of conduct. We suggest this earlier usage to suggest that the reference to economic categories in school policy and research related to pedagogy, for example, quickly overlaps with cultural theses about who the child and family are and should be. This relation of the moral, the political, and the cultural to schooling is one of the elements of rethinking the social sciences that is becoming necessary in the current discussion about globalization.

REFERENCES

- Appadurai, A. (2001). *Globalization: A public culture book*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Boyer, R. (1996). State and market: A new engagement for the twenty-first century? In R. Boyer & D. Drache (Eds.), *States against markets: The limits of globalization* (pp. 84–116). New York: Routledge.
- Castells, M. (2000a). *The information age: Economy, society, and culture, volume 1: The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in the social sciences*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Eisenstadt, S.N. (2000). Multiple modernities. *Daedalus*, 129(1), 1–29.
- Ferguson, J. (2006). *Global shadows: Africa in the neoliberal world order*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Friedman, T.L. (1999). *The Lexus and the olive tree: Understanding globalization*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

- Friedman, T.L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hacking, I. (2002). *Historical ontology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Heins, V. (2005). Orientalising America? Continental intellectuals and the search for Europe's identity. *Journal of International Studies*, 34(2), 433–448.
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. (Eds.) (2005). *The global transformation reader: An introduction to the globalization debate* (3rd Ed.) Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. (2007). *Globalization theory: Approaches and controversies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (1997). *Globalization in question*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jack, M. (1989). *Corruption and progress: The eighteenth-century debate*. New York: AMS Press.
- Larner, W., & Walters, W. (Eds.) (2004). *Global governmentality: Governing international spaces*. London: Routledge.
- Mehta, U.S. (1997). Liberal strategies of exclusion. In F. Cooper & A. Stoler (Eds.), *Tensions of empire: Colonial cultures in a bourgeois world* (pp. 59–86). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Menand, L. (2001). *The metaphysical club*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Meyer, J., Boli, J., Thomas, G., & Ramirez, F. (1997). World society and the nation-state. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(1), 144–181.
- Meyer, J.W., Kamens, D.H., Benavot, A., Cha, Y.-K., & Wong, S.-Y. (1992). *School knowledge for the masses and national primary curriculum categories in the twentieth century*. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Mitchell, T. (1988). *Colonizing Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Passavant, P. (2000). The governmentality of discussion. In J. Dean (Ed.), *Cultural studies and political theory* (pp. 115–131). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Popkewitz, T.S. (1998). *Struggling for the soul: The politics of education and the construction of the teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Popkewitz, T.S. (Ed.) (2005). *Inventing the modern self and John Dewey: Modernities and the traveling of pragmatism in education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Popkewitz, T.S. (2008). *Cosmopolitanism and the age of school reform: Science, education, and making society by making the child*. New York: Routledge.
- Ray, L. (2007). *Globalization and everyday life*. New York: Routledge.
- Rizvi, F. (2004). Theorizing the global convergence of restructuring policies in education. In S. Lindblad and T. Popkewitz (Eds.), *Educational restructuring: International perspectives on traveling policies* (pp. 21–42). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2009). *Globalizing educational policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Sachsenmaier, D. (2009) The concept of multiple modernities and its neighboring fields. In J. Schriewer & H. Kaelble (Eds.), *La comparación en las ciencias sociales y históricas: Un debate interdisciplinar*. Barcelona: Editorial Octaedro.
- Scharito, T., & Webb, J. (2003). *Understanding globalization*. London: Sage.
- Scholte, J.A. (2005). *Globalization: A critical view* (2nd Ed.). New York: St Martin's Press.
- Simons, M., & Maschelein, J. (2008). From schools to learning environments: The dark side of being exceptional. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 42(3–4), 687–704.
- Smeyers, P., & DePaep (Eds.) (2008). *The educationalization of schooling*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Steger, M. (2003). *Globalization: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (Ed.) (2004). *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Tomlinson, J. (1999). *Globalization and culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wagner, P. (2001). *Theorising modernity: Inescapability and attainability in social theory*. London: Sage.
- Wood, E.M. (2003). *Empire of Capital*. London: Verso.