

CREATING (IN) CAPACITY: TEACHERS IN GLOBALIZED EDUCATION POLICIES

Athena VONGALIS-MACROW

La Trobe University, AUSTRALIA

Abstract. The relationship between education and globalization stands largely unexamined from teachers' perspectives. By focusing on the teachers, as axiomatic to educational and pedagogical change, teachers feature in education policy and through their plight, the paper explores and challenges ideas that displacing teachers from input into educational reforms facilitates progressive implementation of new education. Demonstrating teachers' displacement from the policy making process becomes evident through the use of computer assisted qualitative research examining and drawing inference from textual evidence. Using text analysis focuses on teachers' work and how it is shaped and represented. On a policy continuum beginning from the policy makers and leading towards the policy takers, the way that teachers are represented in education policy demonstrates their limited capacity to influence policy making. By examining how teachers and their work are thus defined in macro policies, the intension is to raise concerns about the uncontested way that globalization driven educational reforms have entered the discourse of educational policy and the implications for educators. Educational policy advocates teachers' critical role yet blurs teachers' participative capacity and leads towards the conclusion that policy obscures teachers' agency in order to ensure that teachers are objects of policy rather than integral to policy making.

Keywords: policy analysis, globalization, education reform, internationalization

The mechanism of global policy

The early shaping of the global economic paradigm responded to a perceived global problematic centered on harnessing broadened economic possibilities and reconstituting economic spaces and territories. The phenomena of globalization took on a normative idea which, reconstructed globalization as free, robust flow of financial and economic growth, and such a normative came to inhabit education policy. Globalization prioritized questions about commodity prices, flows of capital, economic viability, competition and national survival in the global market, and such questions came to take precedence in educational policy. Nations across the world moved towards embracing the globalization juggernaut, lest they be left behind, and educational policy became peppered with globalization jargon such as interrelatedness, innovation, ongoing learning, network community, borderless world, mercerization to name but a few. Educational change became synonymous with progress and modernization responding to the pressure to “globalize or fossilize”¹⁾.

While educational change continues to focus on remaking the architecture of education systems, this paper focuses on axiomatic agents who operate within this policy space. Teachers are critical subjects and objects of educational policy. They are subject to reconstituted work spaces as part of the globalization agenda remaking their schools and organisations. They are also objects of educational policy, especially when considering the demands of the knowledge economy, which stress the ongoing deskilling of workers, and for teachers this plays out as continuous professional development. Being in such strategic position, it would be reasonable to conclude that such teachers would carry a measure of power. Materializing the potentialities of globalization, through educational policy, and thus contributing to national survival in a tough global market, implies power and influence.

Questions of power and influence in policy are political and teachers’ capacity to shape and make their work and conditions, can be used as criteria quantifying power and influence of the policy making process. By focusing on how teachers are reconstructed in this policy space, teachers are drawn into the globalization debate and their influence to have input in the restructuring of education systems becomes a political question.

Mapping out power and influence and its relationship to teachers’ work is pursued through a two step process. Firstly, how teachers are named in policy is revealed through textual analysis in order to understand how policy speaks about teachers and the manner of speaking. Sample policy analyses of international organizations, such as, OECD, UNESCO and World Bank

(Dale, 1999; Spring, 1998; Vongalis, 2003) have undergone analysis using CAQDAS (computer assisted qualitative data analysis software) to facilitate the filtering of policy. Educational policy from OECD, UNESCO and World Bank is influential in articulating and leading world-wide trends in education reforms (Ball, 1998; Dale, 1999; Henry et al., 1999; Jones, 1992; Marginson, 1999; Spring, 1998). Secondly, critical interpretive research, based on critical discourse analysis deconstructs how teachers are named and labeled in policy. Critical policy research has contributed to the demystification of globalization processes, focusing on unpacking the machinery of processes. Deacon (2005) notes a more recent shift in global policy that he partly attributes to the work of political analysts advising international agencies and scrutinizing their processes. The work of epistemic communities to identify interests and analyze the politics of change is critical to ensure more desirable and equitable systems. This paper seeks to continue that analytical work by assessing how teachers are represented and reconstituted in globalised education policies. The subsequent discussion draws together key findings to assess how globalization driven reforms affect teachers' capacity and the paper concludes by identifying issues that are relevant to educators as they are engaged yet disempowered by globalised education reforms.

Creating corporate models: globalizing education policy

Ohmae's (1999) influential description of the globalization of corporations provides an illustrative understanding of globalization processes. His succinct five stages of globalisation, begin with expansion across national boundaries, advocate steps towards the cloning of corporate structures and functions, and finally, lead towards naming and establishing a corporate family where allegiance is to the company rather than national boundaries. The globalized corporation is underpinned and facilitated by the development of communication technologies transforming the nature of financial and economic transactions so these could take place across cyber space enabling, unimpeded interaction, and the monitoring of different persons, spaces and institutions. Ohmae's normative for the restructuring of organisations and institutions to capture global space proves irresistible.

Unlike multinational corporations, seeking unfettered access to the global market, education, as a public good, struggles to fit neatly within the globalised landscapes. The corporate governance models, suggested by Ohmae, did not really suit public, educational goods. However, from 1990s onwards, the term

globalization appeared in policy advocating major institutional change in order to respond to globalizing of economies and markets. Globalization, in concept and practice, appears as a significant impetus for education systems change reconstituting educational boundaries, expectations and reconfiguring the relationship global authorities such as the state, and educators (Held et al., 1999). Reframing educational goods as tradable goods and services opened the way for new types of educational provision that commodity status. While the continuity of education change has been well documented (Archer, 1984; Dale, 1989; Giroux, 1983), globalization inspired educational changes were marked by uncertainty and ambiguity especially since globalization appeared as a powerful market driven, economic paradigm and how other social structures fit within this paradigm elicited contestation.

Educational governance

From the 60s onwards, the World Bank had an interest in improving education as part of its poverty reduction strategy. However, by the 90s, global organizations, such as the World Bank, materialized as key players filling in the spatial occlusion between global economic escalation, emergence of the knowledge economies and national education goals. The World Bank president, Wolfensohn, reiterated the important link between the World Bank, as a global agency and a facilitator of globalised change, and its influence on education to create the conditions for economic growth. Its framework for action includes the following statement that solidifies the World Bank in education governance. He states,

[A]s globalization draws us all into greater proximity, it is essential that we nurture, prize, and support the diverse cultures and historical experiences of the countries in which The World Bank Group operates. We simply cannot conceive of development without cultural continuity. It must be acknowledged and must form the basis for the future. Serious attention to culture is basic to improving development effectiveness – in education, health, the production of goods and services, the management of cities. It is at the very heart of poverty reduction as well as the quality of life.²⁾

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

of countries receiving and assistance from the World Bank. This means that the World Bank constructs macro policy with global scope that it is relevant to groups of countries. National governments of those countries are more likely to concede national concerns and interests to the governance capacity of global organisations, in this case, the World Bank in return for pioneering global policy, funding and support. Global organisations have capacity oversee the development of national institutions, in alignment with global change, and provide broad policy as a way to address the concerns of clusters of nations seeking strategic aid in the representation of national and regional interests within the global landscape. Global governance, drawn together by supra figures, such as the World Bank, lead global policy making, frame and manage national social and economic change, in a distinctly global way^{3,4} (cf. also Amen (1999), Dale (1999) and Sklair (1997)).

Whether the global capacity is indicative of the disappearance of the nation state in constructing social policy remains contentious⁵ (also Albrow (1996), Amen (1996), Appadurai (1990) and Deacon et al. (1997)) but the point to be made is that the globalization paradigm has given rise to a greater governance role played by global agencies to construct policy on behalf of like-minded national governments. However, macro educational governance is not without problems. That global education policy is transmitted across national boundaries creates complex tensions for how that policy is interpreted and put into practice at the local level.⁵ Macro education policy, underpinned by corporate reconstructions of the global economy presents complex and troublesome phenomena.

Theorizing globalization phenomena problematises globalization strategies and how these overlap with education. Wallerstein (1990) argues that globalization is a continuation of the political struggles inherent in the capitalist world economy as a world system. Wallerstein's premise that globalization is a continuation of political struggle, is based on the ideas that both nationalism and internationalism are historical developments of capitalism and bring with it all the asymmetrical and uneven outcomes of capitalist systems. In other words, globalization benefits some and disempowers others. In such a context, education becomes an institutional site which plays out the broader political struggles between those who can benefit and those who may lose out as a result of globalization. Wallerstein's view of globalization is pertinent because he problematises social change and predicates the contested nature of downwardly causal social policy transmitted from international agencies to local sites of policy implementation. We can infer that the continual struggle of poorer less developed and less powerful nations competing with more devel-

oped nations in the global market is a scaled up version of winners and losers at the local level. Such contestation about the powerful and the powerless are played out in education policy and can be demonstrated when examining the plight of teachers in globalised education policy.

Policy research has shown a growing array of social policy being deferred to global agencies, that are assuming greater responsibility for framing global social policy (Djelic, 2005; Good & Prakash, 2000; Green, 1997; Henry et al, 1999; Levin, 1998; Spring, 1998; Vongalis, 2004). Within the bounds of social policy, educational policy from the mid 1990s onwards, highlights the role of globally orientated organizations to increasingly incorporate education as part of the ongoing economic development agenda in the global era. Continuous innovation and change, responding to the pressure to globalize through globally instigated policy and actions brings to the fore political struggles that are played out in the language of policy. It could be said that global agencies popularize and globalize their agenda within the discourse of policy and help create the compensatory spaces necessary for their vision to manifest. The next sections detail policy analysis to show the flow of policy from macro agents to those receiving policy. From the data analysis of policy text, it is possible to highlight how the educational space is constituted through globalised policy, how this influences the plight of teachers, and the implications of teachers' policy positioning.

Policy analysis results: big picture understanding

In his extensive research into the World Bank, Jones (1992) confronted the complexity of trying to unpack policy from global organisations and suggested two ways to arrive at a generalized policy position. Policy analysis could be framed by tracking input and output by following the money and making assumptions based on the way policy supports specific actions. The other way is to construct analysis through the discourse of policy that explains and justifies educational change. More recently, Stiglitz (2002) refers to examining aggregate trends as a way to understand macro policy behaviours. The research uses macro policy research to generate data about trends in the way teachers are defined and delineated within globalised education policy. The author acknowledges the many variations in localized policy responses, and these are worthy of further analysis and discussion which falls out of the scope of this paper.

The research was framed by a critical discourse analysis of educational policy from the OECD, World Bank and UNESCO, as three key global organisations with interests in prioritizing education policies. In order to provide a generalized global policy position from OECD, World Bank and UNESCO, the research examined a range of policy texts from OECD, UNESCO and World Bank. The prime source of data and information came from documents (speeches, reports, and working papers) from 1996-2000. Policy texts were systematically coded for concepts about globalization, education and teachers in order to unpack the links between relationships and change. The following Tables 1, 2 and 3 summarize discourse evident in OECD, World Bank and UNESCO policy. The first column captures policy discourse relevant to the conceptualization of globalization. The second column gathered policy text pertaining to education and reform measures. The final column captures policy text that refers to teachers and their work. There is a causal link between the three columns because the globalised context provides a rationale for education reforms, consequently, as a component of educational reform policy, teachers are drawn into the policy making process.

Table 1. OECD globalised education policies

OECD context	Education	Teachers
Age of globalization: World economy based on knowledge, technology and flexibility; New pattern of demand for skilled labor; Sustainable capital development; Decline in stable social influences: social winners and losers; Globalization cannot materialize automatically; Human capital and life time learning skills.	Decentralisation: diffuse education system. Devolution to school level and head teacher. Life long learning; Utilization of Technology, knowledge & know-how; Meet the demands of the employer and individual; Improve currency value of life long learning.	Important for teachers to attend refresher courses, especially those teaching scientific or technical subjects; The ideal of life-long learning is as relevant to teachers as to other members of society teacher-as-learner; Teachers as ‘collaborators’ need to break with the past; Teacher reform part of wider enterprise to adapt education to society; Cost of teachers underscores reform

Table 2. UNESCO globalised education policies

UNESCO context	Education	Teaching
<p>Globalization intensifies awareness, new opportunities but paradoxical and incomplete; Mismatch between the supply and demand of labor market; Globalization dominated by economic, financial and market principles underpinned by technological and scientific revolutions; Internationalization of standards of educational performance.</p>	<p>Anti Neo-liberalism ideology; ‘Real’ Decentralization and autonomy of education not prompted by cost reduction.</p> <p>Resource and financing of education in hands of individual governments.</p> <p>Education enlarged/ customized; Learning to learn; A process giving all the possibility of learning throughout life; Prioritize social and cultural cohesion; Inclusive education system; Education heart and head; Need to update and innovate.</p>	<p>Teachers as custodians of education as a public good; A public resource; Technology and social change means the quality of teachers be more in demand; Status of teachers to reflect the important role; Teachers need to be more dynamic and responsive to changing world of work; Teacher development crucial and a determining factor in quality education.</p>

Discussion: what constitutes the globalised context?

The globalised context refers to the construction of globalization as an umbrella term for the developing knowledge and technocratic world economy. Generally, it refers to development towards the ‘weightless’ economy and the emergence of knowledge capitalism or the trade in knowledge. The way each organization pursues its interests within the discourse of policy shows the differentiation of interests. For example, World Bank policy describes globalization as a flowering of development. The OECD is more technocratic, creating a highly knowledge based context as the foundation for further planning. UNESCO policy is more ambivalent about globalization. Policy text stresses the paradoxical nature of globalization, emphasizing progress and intercommunication possibilities, while also highlighting the potential clashes of cultures. The narrow, neoliberal definition of what is possible, in terms of reforms, remains

Table 3. World Bank globalized education policies

Bank Context	Education	Teachers World
Flowering of globalization; Capital market flows driven by knowledge in other words, capitalism; Workers meet changing labor market needs to compete in global market; Global capital seeking favorable opportunities; Educated and skilled citizens who can operate in a democratic society; Building up supportive domestic institutions and policies to reduce risks of financial crisis.	Education to meet changing market needs; A human capital investment; produces social cultural and economic improvements. Devolved financial control of decision making, fiscal discipline to deliver more quality and efficiency; Explore private funding options. Governmental centralized decision making on curriculum and assessment; Foundation skills (life skills), citizenry and proper ethical values; Tomorrow’s workers will need to be able to engage in lifelong education, learn new things quickly.	Teaching is a complex professional activity; Deploying a professional teaching force; Sustainability of teacher development; Effective teachers; Teacher development related to student achievement; Teachers as a component of quality provision of educational goods/products.

problematic. Another comparative aspect concerns the policy tone. The World Bank is expansive and upbeat about the promises of globalization, especially the free flow of capital. Capital is given agency status as it searches and seeks favorable conditions around the globe. In contrast, OECD policy suggests a much darker globalised landscape. Globalization, as processes, is depicted as difficult and challenging. Underpinning the difficulty to materialize those processes, are nefarious threats that labor needs to work harder, smarter, faster and that the threat of loss is a constant. These different shades of globalization are critical in further understanding the demarcation of teachers within the globalised landscape. The values that underpin the visual imagery of globalization, suggest ways that relationships between policy makers and policy takers are defined and constituted to form the basis for the relationship construction.

Referring to the tables, references to globalization also contain statements about the connectivity between education and globalization. International organisations propagate a view of globalization dependent on a redesign of education systems. Specific structural changes become integral strategic models so that common elements such as decentralization, devolution, continuous, life-long education, and monitored funding arrangements resonate throughout macro policy. OECD policy stressed that globalization cannot materialize automatically; that it needs human capital and life time learning skills. As a result OECD educational change aims towards this end. Policy emphasizes technical knowledge, employability, on going learning and a new responsive, diffuse system. Diffuse systems imply decentralization, devolution, core management and some sort of agency by in to update skills needed to negotiate around such models. UNESCO policy states that globalization intensifies awareness, creates new opportunities but can be paradoxical and incomplete, therefore educational responsiveness is laden with caution against extreme neo-liberalism in order to prevent the exacerbation of difference. Policy advocates change, devolution, continuous, adaptive learning but also advocates for more local control. Policy stresses customization and locality in the way education reforms. UNESCO relies on governments to keep state control over globalised systems unless there is a 'real' democratic need to decentralize control and power. For a global financial organization the World Bank globalization is a flowering of monetary opportunity. Education reforms reflect this monetary agenda therefore structural changes optimize education investment. Decentralization, restricted funding, restructuring institutions to reduce financial risks are keystones of policy.

Reframing education systems

Education is drawn into the globalised scenario as a causal element in both the construction and enhancement of the globalised future. Reforming education systems, as a result of globalization, is mostly linked with notions of capital development, harnessing the possibilities of the new economy, and growing knowledge and skills. Education is a strategic key in unlocking the potential economic growth from globalised economies. The impetus for globalised educational policy premises education as the backbone for growing the knowledge economy and preparing workers for the new age. Policy becomes a way of identifying what needs to be done to this end. UNESCO policy questions the purpose of education, used in such a blatantly pragmat-

ic way. The complexity of globalization processes played out in UNESCO policy shows that at the organizational level, UNESCO attempts to retain a humane, socio-cultural vision of education and teases out how such a vision may respond to neoliberal pragmatism. Policy advocates the prioritization of social and cultural cohesion, focuses on inclusive education systems, and stresses education for the heart and head. While policy identifies the need to update and innovate, policy challenges the uncontested nature of neoliberal globalization and raises concerns about new opportunities that are paradoxical in that they may intensify relations but also polarize outcomes. There is a policy message that cautions against hasty reforms.

When UNESCO policy specifically takes an anti-neo-liberal stance, implications are that other agencies are neo-liberal in their policy. Thus, UNESCO advocates 'real' democracy that accounts for social and cultural differences while World Bank discourse is grounded in the language of neo-liberal efficiency criteria. How the global agencies steer reforms suggests underlying tensions around responses to globalization, partly due to disagreement over how globalization is constructed. We can see that UNESCO policy continues to problematise educational reform stemming from the very proposition that globalization is *paradoxical*. At the very least, redesigning education is problematic in the way that some structural changes support a neo-liberal view of globalization.

The three agencies, UNESCO, OECD, and the World Bank differ in the way they conceptualize the globalize future and its connection to education. For instance, the prevalence of Lifelong learning, as an educational objective also highlights policy tensions. Life long learning can provide a basis for updating knowledge and skills across cultures and contexts, however, depending on the underlying agenda of implementation, lifelong learning is also a way in which employers can have a more direct input into the education system. Indeed this is a glaring policy desire embedded in OECD policy. Such reorganization of key stakeholders, in this case the promotion of employer demands above educators is a key shift in educational policy.

Despite the differences between the three agencies, there is a lot of common ground. Redesigning education suggests a prescription for globalised education. But who does all this? UNESCO advocates for local government to stay in control of their education systems. World Bank policy nominates governments as controllers of curriculum and assessment. OECD policy names employers as important stakeholders in a new technocratic education and apart from one very clear reference to the devolution of control of the school to the head teacher, other agents are conspicuously

absent. Yet, there is a lot of work to be done to redesign and make functional these restructured systems. In order for education systems to respond and be shaped by the global economy, change must occur. However, while change is articulated, the causality of agency, that is who does what, is blurred. Critical agents in the operational implementation of globalised policy are teachers, therefore the next section considers teachers' positioning in globalised policies and how involved they are in redefining their work, redesigning their work and organisations.

Creating (in) capacity in the teaching profession

It is argued in this paper that global organisations use education to promote a singular and mostly uncontested view of globalization and its consequences. Certainly policy from the OECD and World Bank is unrestrained by the paradox of globalization. The policy discourse shows that a mostly uncontested construction of globalization re-imagines education systems in like. However, reform measures such as decentralization, devolution, continuous, life-long education, innovation and change, and the customizing of education imply real changes to teachers' work and the scope of teachers' actions in response to policy. Considering teachers, in the context of globalised education systems, maps out the teaching future for the profession.

The tables show that teachers' work is embedded in the discourse of globalization and educational change policy. World Bank education reforms, reflecting a monetary agenda that conceptualizes globalization as a *flowering* of global capitalism which can be optimized through education investment, engages teachers as a component of the quality provision of educational goods/products. Teachers need to be effective and the outcomes of student achievement are key indicators of quality teaching. Teachers are *deployed* as a workforce to do *complex activity*. Enmeshed within the quality provision structures, there is no mention or hint of teacher influence or autonomy to make educational decisions about policy direction or implementation. Indeed, their *deployment* suggests strict governmental control over the profession, much like an army of soldiers. In OECD policy, materializing globalization means an emphasis on technical knowledge, employability, on going learning and a new responsive, *diffuse* system. Teachers model this scenario through their work. The *teacher-as-learner* acts as a conduit to model for student how they may also *adapt education to society*. Teachers must attend refresher courses and *collaborate* in

the change process. Once again, educational autonomy to make decisions about policy direction and to influence policy is minimal. Instead, teachers' actions model change as it is prescribed rather than have any deciding voice about change. UNESCO policy emphasizes paradoxical nature of globalization to raise concerns about the potential to exploit difference and lead to exclusion. Teachers occupy the ambiguous role in education policy. On the one hand they represent key social agents supporting elements of change that is customizing educational experiences, while acting as gatekeepers to more exploitative measures. They have *custodial* role in ensuring equality and tempering difference that may be exploited in more neo-liberal types of reforms. However, teachers are required to skill up and update as well. It appears that UNESCO policy prepares teachers for both eventualities. As up to date professionals, their status in globalised systems is assured and this axiomatic status reconstructs teachers as buffers from neoliberal excesses.

When answering the question about whose visions and interests drive globalised reforms, it can be seen that critical agents, such as teachers, are anything but core actors in the redesign process. In fact, teachers remain largely minor agents in policy making and deciding policy actions. When teachers are referenced directly in policy, it is mostly in terms of how they will receive policy directions and what policy actions are required. As mostly policy takers, teachers are more regimented in their work and expectations so their work practices ensure the global vision of education persists in local practices and that localized education systems are aligned with global policy making. Teachers' capacity to reproduce policy in their work reproduces global policy logic, locally.

If an outcome of globalised policy can lead to uneven benefits, as shown in the research and reiterated by theorists such as Wallerstein, teachers, as individuals and as professionals, have lessened capacity to influence and challenge the assumptions about globalization and education systems. By relegating the educators' role to largely passive, responsive role, it can be surmised that a problematic hurdle is overstepped. Educators, who may criticize the way education is drawn into globalization and thus challenge the politics of a particular type of redesign, have their role minimized and controlled. Teachers are controlled because their actions and interactions are employed solely to implement policy and procedure rather than critically evaluate or reflect on change. Having minimal representation in policy and minimal influences over structural changes means that the professional interests of teachers are obscured in

globalised policy⁶) (also Vongalis (2003)). When summarizing their actions and interactions, where teachers must account, collaborate, model and reproduce globalised education, what emerges is the unbalanced positioning in the policy making/policy taking continuum. Teachers' lack of control and decision making capacity in determining how the profession develops and responds to globalization reflects the educators' incapacity and reconstructs the profession as a tool of implementation.

Issues for teachers

When faced with momentous social and economic change, educational redesign occurs without significant input from the teaching profession. Good organizational change theory stipulates the full involvement and ownership of change by key agents. It also depends on a realistic appraisal of the complex social networks impacting on the organization. Globalization theorists stress the problematic nature of presenting globalization as uncontested phenomena so that the redesigning of education in the global era demands that the process is explored from a range of perspectives from the onset. However, what is happening is that global organisations configure globalization to reflect their own development agendas. From this loaded positioning, policy travels to reframe education systems reforms by pushing particular structural forms as more relevant to a particular perspective of globalization.

Globalised policy prepackages and redesigns education systems without seriously addressing the troublesome nature of globalization. Expecting large scale educational change without insisting on the considerable professional expertise of teachers, creates the potential to further disenfranchise local education systems as there is no way to influence distanced policy. Without teachers having the capacity to create checks and balances in policy directions, then we leave education systems to the vagaries of the market, the pragmatic policy making of globally orientated bureaucrats, economic modelers and compliant governments.

Teachers occupy a complex social, educative and professional role in education systems and reframing their work as class room practitioners, without capacity to critique policy changes, or contest the directions of globalization inspired reforms, creates incapacity. The policy objectives of global agencies which characterize the work of teachers illustrates how educators are limited in their capacity to critique the assumptions underlying globalised reforms, instead they are reframed as adaptive policy-takers.

With this context, where incapacity is instituted, the foundations are set for potential crisis when the full impact of teachers' displacement is an emerging consequence of policy. Creating incapacity further displaces teachers from deeper connections to education, pedagogy and professional autonomy. According to Au & Apple (2004) the restraining of teachers' representation acts to ensure that education is not hijacked by teachers' agendas. The policy research outlined in this paper suggests that teachers work and actions are controlled in educational policy which in turn enables the alignment of education with a normative model of globalization that maps out globalization as inevitable and competitive.

Notes

¹ Johnston, D.J. A New Global Age. *OECD Observer* 207, Aug/Sept 1997 http://www.oecdobserver.org/news/printpage.php/aid/2733/A_New_Global_Age.html

² Wolfensohn, J.D. Culture and Sustainable Development: A Framework for Action. Paper presented at the Culture Counts: A Conference on Financing, Resources and Economics of Culture in Sustainable Development, October, 4–7, 1999, Florence, Italy.

³ Globalization: What Challenges and Opportunities for Governments? OECD Report, 1997.

⁴ Tiruneh, A. Globalization of Capitalism, Global Policy Forum, 2000 <http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/define/kism.htm>

⁵ Jones, K. & Alexiadou, N. The Global and the National: Reflections on the Experience of Three European States. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, September, 5–8, 2001, Lille, France.

⁶ Vongalis, A, & Seddon, T. Futures for Teachers? Unravelling Global Agencies Development Agendas in Education and Training and Lifelong Learning. Paper presented at the Travelling Policy/Local Spaces: Globalization, Identities and Education Policy in Europe, June, 27–29, 2001, Keele University <http://www.keele.ac.uk/depts/ed/events/conf-pdf/cPaperSeddon.pdf>

References

- Albrow, M. (1996). *The global age: state and society beyond modernity*. Cambridge (OK): Polity Press.
- Amen, M. M. (1999). Borrowing authorities: eclipsing government. In: Hewson, M. & Sinclair, T. J. (Eds.), *Approaches to global governance theory*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global economy. *Public Culture*, 2(2), 1–24.
- Archer, M. S. (1984). *Social origins of educational systems*. London: Sage.
- Au, W. & Apple, M.W. (2004). Interrupting globalization as an educational practice. *Educational Policy*, 18, 784–793.
- Ball, S.J. (1998). Big policies/small world: an introduction to international perspectives in education policy. *Comparative Education*, 34, 119–130.
- Dale, R. (1989). *The state and education policy*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Dale, R. (1999). Specifying globalization effects on national policy: a focus on the mechanisms. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14, 1–17.
- Deacon, B. (2005). From ‘safety nets’ back to ‘universal social provision’. *Global Social Policy*, 5, 19–29.
- Deacon, B., Hulse, M. & Stubbs, P. (1997). *Global social policy international organizations and the future of welfare*. London: Sage.
- Djelic, M.-L. (2005). From local legislation to global structuring frame. *Global Social Policy*, 5, 55–76.
- Giroux, H.A. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education: a pedagogy for the opposition*. Amherst: Bergin & Garvey.
- Good, R. & Prakash, M.S. (2000). Global Education. In: Gabbard, D. A. (Ed.), *Knowledge and power in the global economy: politics and rhetoric of school reform*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Green, A. (1997). *Education, globalization and nation state*. London: MacMillan.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: politics, economics and culture*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Henry, M., Lingard, B., Rizvi, F. & Taylor, S. (1999). Working with/against globalization in education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14, 85–97.
- Jones, P. M. (1992). *World Bank financing of education*. London: Routledge.
- Levin, B. (1998). An epidemic of education policy: (what) can we learn from each other? *Comparative Education*, 34, 131–141.
- Marginson, S. (1999). After globalization: emerging politics of education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14, 19–31.
- Ohmae, K. (1999). *The borderless world: power and strategy in the interlinked economy*. New York: McKingsley.
- Rinne, R. (2000). The globalization of education: Finish education on the doorstep

- of the new EU millennium. *Educational Review*, 50, 131–142.
- Sklair, L. (1997). Social movements for global capitalism: the transnational capitalist class in action. *Review International Political Economy*, 4, 514–538.
- Spring, J. (1998). *Education and the rise of the global economy*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Stiglitz, J.E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontent*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Vongalis, A. (2003). *Deployed to deliver: the displaced agency of teachers in globalized education systems*. Melbourne: Monash University.
- Vongalis, A. (2004). Global education policy directives: impact on teachers from the North and South. *International Education Journal*, 5, 488–501.
- Wallerstein, I. (1990). Culture and the ideological battleground of the modern world-system. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 7(2), 31–55.

✉ Dr. Athena Vongalis-Macrow,
Faculty of Education,
La Trobe University,
Bundoora Campus, Melbourne, 3086,
AUSTRALIA
E-Mail: a.vongalis@latrobe.edu.au