

Governance and governmentality: relation and relevance of two prominent social scientific concepts for comparative education

Karin Amos
University of Tuebingen

Abstract

Against the background of a changing relation between the state and "its" education system, the present contribution focuses on two concepts that can be used as analytical tools in order to analyze the current transformations.

"Governance" is more concerned with technical issues: with instruments and modes, procedures and actors, with their constellations and forms of cooperation. It focuses research on questions such as: who provides educational services, what is the relation between public and private education etc. It is also very useful in investigating the relation between the various levels of analysis and has proven particularly useful for an adequate theoretical understanding of the role of international organizations in shaping educational policies. Sociology and political science are the two disciplines most prominently associated with elaborating the concept under various perspectives. Governmentality, on the other hand, although sharing many characteristics with governance, is a Foucauldian term concerned with the generation of different subjectivities through techniques and modes of ruling and guiding in an encompassing sense. Governmentality thus includes investigations of the typical Foucauldian knowledge/power nexus. Both perspectives are brought together to discuss the implications for comparative education.

Keywords: Governance – Governmentality – Education policy – Foucault – Educational governance.

Contact

Prof. Dr. Karin Amos
Universität Tuebingen
Institut für Erziehungswissenschaft
Allgemeine Pädagogik
Münzgasse 22-30
72070 Tübingen - Germany
E-mail: karin.amos@uni-tuebingen.de

Governance and governmentality denote two concepts rooted in different disciplinary and intellectual traditions that converge around a common core question: the problematics of steering, regulating, governing, conducting etc. in modern society – with regards to individuals, organizations, systems, the state, and society at large.

The debate on governance emerged in the political and social sciences and focuses on changes linked to new constellations of the state's relations with social affairs in the broadest sense. In this respect, governance emerged as a new term to analyze these changes in a nation-state context as well as in international relations.

A succinct rendering of the origins and developments of the term in the respective academic disciplines, i.e., in sociology and political science, has been provided in a short paper by Renate Mayntz (2004; see also 2009). There she delineates the respective perspectives and characteristics of the different disciplinary contexts mirrored in the differences between actor-centered and institution-centered meanings; she also emphasizes that “governance” and “steering” are not identical concepts. She insists that governance is broader, encompassing not only narrow questions of steering, but also broader issues of regulation. The discussion of governance is also linked to the changing relations between the national and international levels, where the adoption of the term governance in international relations follows its own disciplinary traditions. A landmark of the use of governance in this context certainly is the 1992 publication by Rosenau and Czempiel, *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics*, which triggered a widespread concern with issues of global governance. In this context, International Regime Theory should be mentioned (Rittberger 1993; Hasenclever et al. 1997) as well as its appropriations in comparative education (Parreira do Amaral 2007; Radtke 2006).

As a general definition of governance, a distinction can be made between a broad and a narrow sense. In the broad sense, governance refers to different mechanisms employed to bring order to a population of actors, by adaptation, negotiation, order, and obedience; in a narrow sense, it refers to the different forms of purposeful acting of collective concerns (Mayntz 2009, p. 8). The network-like structures of governance, the shifting area of specific actor constellations in social and educational policy have raised many questions concerning, for example, issues of legitimacy and authority (see also Radtke in this volume).

The reason why governance has become an important term in educational policy and educational research is related to profound changes in the area of education. These changes concern specifically the instruments and ways of steering, new forms of providing and organizing educational services, and the emergence of new actors in educational policy.

In a very different context, located in the interstices of various disciplines typical of his work, “governmentality” was coined by Michel Foucault (1991) and then taken up in an interdisciplinary field to become known as governmentality studies, a rich and

ramified international intellectual endeavor of theorizing and researching (for a critical overview, see Lemke 2007, pp 47-64; for a descriptive one, see Fimyar 2008).

It denotes a concern with the general problematic of ruling, steering, and governing in modern societies in all major areas of the state, the economy, the *oikos*, i. e. the family and children – both with regards to others as well as in the sense of self-techniques. Its origin as a Foucauldian term already indicates that “governmentality” has very broad and rich philosophical and historical roots; it is a term of meta-analysis that may also be used to critically reflect on the findings of governance research.

Foucault gives us a succinct definition of governmentality:

1. The ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security. 2. The tendency which, over a long period and throughout the West, has steadily led towards the pre-eminence over all other forms (sovereignty, discipline, etc) of this type of power which may be termed government, resulting, on the one hand, in the formation of a whole series of specific governmental apparatuses, and, on the other, in the development of a whole complex of *savoirs*. 3. The process, or rather the result of the process, through which the state of justice of the Middle Ages, transformed into the administrative state during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, gradually becomes ‘governmentalized’. (Burchell/Gordon/Miller, 1991: 102-103)

The story of this Foucauldian concept is well known: The lectures held at the Collège de France in 1977 and 1978 were finally published in France in 2004, the German version appeared also in 2004 under the title *Governmentality I and II*; the English version appeared in 2007 retaining the elaborate but also more ambiguous: *Security, Territory, Population of the French title*. With the publication of these lectures, it became clear that Foucault had not just made a few and scattered references to elaborate on his neologism *gouvernementalité*, but systematically delineated a field of investigation. Characteristic of Foucault’s approach is a relational conception of society and its institutions connecting the political and the subjective realms. The term governmentality is the missing link between Foucault’s two main projects after *Discipline and Punish*, one the genealogy of the modern state, the other concerned

with ethical questions, a genealogy of the subject. With this project, he touches at the core of the relation between pedagogy and politics.

As a first step, it suffices to say that both governance and governmentality have a concern with the state and with “stateness” as their common denominator, albeit in very different traditions and focus areas. As one last but important preliminary observation, let me point out that governance, particularly in its international relations sense, considers the emergence and influence of the international or transnational level as indicative of major transformations in the embeddedness of states and the resultant implications of these new configurations on areas traditionally considered the prime tasks and assignments of the state. Wolfgang Mitter (2006) has coined the fitting term *Nationale Bildungssouveränität*, i.e., national educational sovereignty, to highlight this relation. Foucault passed away just as the impacts and effects of these changes first became evident and turned into objects of social scientific analyses. Therefore, although Foucault is concerned with the specific constitution of the modern state and of modern societies, he does not transcend the level of the nationally bounded and did not focus on the international level as worthy of consideration in its own right.

The following sections of this paper will focus on the traditional state – education relationships to then consider the current transformations. The main thesis is that governance and governmentality perspectives intersect where the correspondence between the steering and governing structures of the state and the individual conduct come into view. More specifically, as shall be argued, regulation mechanisms become tighter with regards to both: the systems and the individual levels.

Education and the state – a modern nexus

The relation between education and the state is crucial in our context. When it comes to modern educative relations, especially in the form of education systems, it is sociological neo-institutionalism that provides some of the profoundest insights into the understanding of the relation between the state and “its” education system. Put differently, one may not deny the merit of macro-sociological, phenomenological neo-institutionalism of working out important features of the relational structures between the political, i.e., the nation-state and the pedagogical. In as far as the nation-state

might be said to follow a model, in as far, that is, as it is characterized by certain universal traits, education systems, too, might be described as fairly standardized (see Meyer et al. 1997). Of the many elements that come to mind here, the following may be especially emphasized: universal access to schooling, grade differentiation and grade promotion, educational certificates, standardized learning and teaching material, standardized teacher training etc. all of which are state controlled and financed; professional educational personnel and a bureaucratic organization of public education – including social services (see Meyer/Rowan 1978) are further examples of the dissemination of a universalized model. In a neo-institutional perspective, the isomorphism of education systems, i.e., their tendencies to become increasingly similar in a number of ways, which is not to say they become alike or even identical, is linked to their sharing the same cognitive culture. Among the traits they have in common are membership models, principles of rationality, modern concepts of individuality, of individual perfectibility, and societal progress through education.

At this point it seems to be appropriate to bring Foucault back in, because neo-institutional theorists primarily focus on the fact that collectivities and individuals are produced through education and not so much on how this is done, what the techniques employed are like and how the tension between individualizing and collectivizing techniques is dealt with. Another difference between these perspectives is that although neo-institutionalists and Foucault recognize the centrality of the state in analyzing modern societal relations – of which education is a major part – they differ in that neo-institutionalism does not theorize the state but rather takes it for granted, whereas Foucault is very much concerned with the genealogy of the modern state. At this point one clearly discerns a commonality between governance and governmentality theories on the one hand, but also a difference on the other, a difference that primarily consists on whether an “institutional centrism” is maintained or rejected.

In the February first session of his governmentality lectures, published for the first time still in 1978 and then in volume 3 of *Dits et Ecrits*, Foucault takes as a starting point a simple observation, not dissimilar to what he had done in *Discipline and Punish* (1977). In this work his question was, how is it, that quite suddenly Western societies changed their forms of punishment? In the case of governance, he too

started out with an observation. He noticed that in the 16th century questions of governance appeared in several areas: how to govern oneself, how to govern the souls, how to govern children, and how the princes should govern the states. This sudden confluence of issues of governance is identified as related to the transformations resulting in the large territorial, colonial, and administrative states. As he had worked out in *Discipline and Punish*, there was an all pervasive presence of disciplinary techniques throughout the entire society in the schools, in the prison, in the factory, in the army, and so on producing specific subjectivities. To conceive of society as a governable, changeable, disciplined, and organizable body was the basis for conceiving of the state as a sort of administration union, or, as the German term has it, as a *Zweckgemeinschaft*¹. Two trajectories are additionally important in accounting for this transformation of the medieval feudal state: religious dispersion and a condensation and intensification of relations giving rise to the modern state. In particular three modes of governance related to three areas of knowledge became important: the art to govern oneself with morality, the art to govern the family with economy and the art to govern the state with politics. Foucault concludes this lecture with a typology of western societies of which the last is designated “governmental state”. He bases this last type on the concept of the population thereby extending and complementing his earlier focus on the effects of disciplinary techniques in the formation of subjectivities. The governmentality lectures therefore focus on the dynamics between individualizing and totalizing technologies, the former fundamental to the formation of subjectivities, the latter aimed at populations as large collectivities. Both areas are not unmediated, but closely interrelated; there is a correspondence between the shaping of subjectivities and the modern state.

The state and statehood were conceived by Foucault from the point of view of society, as the effect of social practices and of technologies of governing. Thus, he turned the issue around. Not the state as object was of interest to him, but the analysis of governance techniques the state is comprised of. With this perspective the state is turned into *explanandum*, not seen as *explanans*. Instead of taking the answers for granted, he asks: How does an ensemble of institutions and political

1. “*Zweckgemeinschaft*” literally translates into “community of purpose”, connoting a common direction and orientation.

processes become a state? What are the relations between the state and civil society, how does this juxtaposition come about in the first place?

Following Lemke (2007a) three aspects shall be highlighted to understand the Foucauldian perspective. First, he belongs to those theorists who de-ontologize the state. Sociological perspectives as different as neo-institutionalism and differentiation theory share this de-ontologizing view, looking at the state as a correlate of social practices being interested in what is nowadays discussed as knowledge regimes: How do the various kinds of knowledge form knowledge systems that then create a representation regime that open up spaces, make reality comprehensible and calculable, so that it becomes possible to structure and intervene, to steer and to regulate. This knowledge is a composite of different areas encompassing cognitive as well as affective, habitualized knowledge deeply inscribed into routines of action and normative orientation. This very broad view of the state includes the knowledge produced in the social sciences, such as the oppositions of structure and action, of individual and state. All of these are part of the constitution of statehood in that they create the symbolic infrastructure within which the state is located and the way subjects define their relation to the state. This view is both similar and dissimilar to neo-institutionalist anti-realism. In the final analysis, the strong and almost exclusive focus on symbols and myths characteristic of neo-institutionalism is not mirrored in Foucault's concept.

Foucault lays great stress on technology in relation to governance. Foucault's analysis of governance is concerned with how forms of subjectivity, life styles and gender regimes are practically produced. These practices would include physical discipline, but also political technologies and technologies of the self. The latter allow individuals themselves to influence their bodies, their souls, their thoughts, their behaviors. It is here, at the intersection of these different technologies, where the above stated link between the history of modern subjectivity and the history of the state becomes obvious.

Political technologies refer to a complex of practical procedures, instruments, programs, calculations, measures, and apparatuses to shape dispositions, preferences, and modes of acting with regards to certain goals. While rejecting a deterministic view of technology, Foucault undeniably strongly emphasizes the role of technologies in giving meaning and stability to institutions.

Finally, there is the dimension of the state as effect, instrument, and field of political strategies. State action is an effect of strategies, because it cannot be attributed to a single and coherent actor, but is the result of conflicting and competing governance practices. Bob Jessop concurs with this perspective by equally stressing the relational and therefore provisional character of “state projects” (Jessop 1990). Situating the state in a web of governance relations does not mean to see in the state nothing but a secondary category – to the contrary: The state takes a strategic position within societal relations. The state is also instrument of strategic acting in that it is implicated in creating a liminal territory where fundamental distinctions come into play: citizen and foreigner, private and public, where decisions are made over who is protected by the state and who is not, the conditions of access to public resources etc. The state is also a field privileging some actors while ignoring others, providing some with organizational infrastructures, but not others.

The general perspective of this is very close to the neo-institutional notion of the top-down constitution of modern actors: states, organizations, and individuals. The actors are constituted by their following universalized models, not by self-creation. The modern individual is a societal phenomenon, not a subjective one.

Education and the state – characteristics of a modern relation

What does the nexus outlined above mean more specifically?

In particular with regard to the modern state as a nation-state, there is a very important, not to say central relation between the pedagogical and the political, that is, assimilating individuals to the nation as an ethnic community. The pastoral form of governance that Foucault has clearly identified as providing the prototype of modern governance relations is very tightly linked to the pedagogical. Going back to antiquity it became the prime mode of governance in Christianity in that a special relation was formed between the pastor as shepherd and his flock, the minister and his community. This mode does not coerce, but is defined by an ethics of care under the motto: *omnes et singulatim* – each and all. The ancient image of guiding and saving souls is one of the archetypes of modern pedagogy and its main concern is not the disciplining of the body, but the steering of the soul, the influencing of attitudes and dispositions. It is hardly accidental that there is a strong historical link between

pedagogy and theology with repercussions throughout the entire 19th century. As much as one might be tempted to see here the German *Sonderweg* of the *Geisteswissenschaftliche Pädagogik*, the systematic relation can be identified in many different contexts, whatever the specific modifications might be. As corroboration to this claim I would like to quote David Lloyd's and Paul Thomas' *Culture and the State* (1998), a book that investigates the correlation between theories of culture and theories of the state in the late 18th century. In their rendition the pastoral figures prominently in the writings of Wordsworth and Coleridge. At issue here is not an inner differentiation of the young part of the population into various segments, but an assimilation of all of them as future citizens. This assimilation takes place through representativeness and exemplarity. Knowledge of the cultural traditions as well as unifying and homogenizing practices come into play on this non-differentiating level. The respective knowledge form would be that of the universal child or pupil without social origin, gender, and color. Its key concept is *Bildung*, or as Heinz-Dieter Meyer (2006) has convincingly argued, the American common school as its equivalent.

But the pedagogical is equally implicated in breaking up, as it were, the population as a collectivity into segments and then sorting the segments according to the pedagogical interventions they are potentially subject to. In this regard it is linked to Ian Hacking's analysis of moral statistics (1986). This reminder of the emergence of moral statistics is important because this area too, is closely related to governance relations. Pedagogical knowledge is produced about the relation between personal dispositions and abilities and their respective educational intervention is produced. With respect to this, pedagogical forms of knowledge and pedagogical practices are mutually constitutive. The technologies pertaining to the governance of children in whatever form of pedagogical intervention – instruction, aid, guidance, counseling – go hand in hand with the corresponding knowledge of the particular group that is the object of such interventions. Marianne Bloch, Thomas Popkewitz, and colleagues have shown in several studies how particular groups are pedagogically constructed to be then addressed with particular interventions, often with paradoxical results. Pedagogy not only constructs knowledge addressing individuals, the modern self, to quote Popkewitz (2008) on John Dewey, but also collectivities, poor children, normal children, deviant children, at risk children, gifted children etc. Frank-Olaf Radtke and

colleagues have shown how the ethnically and culturally different child, *das Migrantenkind*, is produced, which by definition is not only an individual but the single entity of a collective group (see Bommers/Radtke, 1993; Höhne/Kunz/Radtke, 1999; Gomolla/Radtke, 2009). Hence their criticism of intercultural education: it ascribes subject positions to which it tailors educational programs, but the subject position is not defined by individuality, but by collectivity. This is the dilemma of all special education which like other programs and procedures is devised to help the child. The pastoral ideal comes into play here as well; one only has to think of Thomas Popkewitz': *Struggling for the Soul: The Politics of Schooling and the Construction of the Teacher* (1998).

On an institutional level, the distinction between the unifying and differentiating levels could be said to correspond to elementary school on one hand, pertaining to the above mentioned homogenizing relation, and the distinction into various forms of secondary schooling pertain to the latter. In addition, the educational historian Bernd Zymek (2000) has rightly emphasized the historical division between a higher and a lower tier of the German secondary educational system, creating different types of subjectivity. The project of national education policy aimed at freeing individuals – mentally and socially - from their narrow, traditional, familial, religious and professional relations and to socialize them according to universal principles in a structured educational system, so that they would become *Landeskinder* and citizens (Zymek 2000, p. 93). Nevertheless, the traditions of the lower tier of the educational system – which has a much more regional not to say local nature, more geared towards inserting individuals into given social, economic, and religious structures than to cosmopolitize and universalize – them persisted until well into the 20th century. In particular, he says that only in higher institutions learning took its orientation from universalized principles corresponding to the humanistic ideal of *Bildung*, an adhering to scientific professional standards in order to create an elite of civil servants, lawyers, high ranking military officers and ministers, whereas the lower parts of the population literally received a popular education, in the sense of *volkstümlich*. Instruction was immediate and life world-oriented. Not universal relations were to be mediated, but the insertion into the existing ties of the local order. In a recent article Martin Baethge (2008) speaks of the persistence of the German Educational schism as he calls it – referring to the difference between

vocational and general upper level secondary education. Not dissimilar to Bernd Zymek, he identifies in the persistent division a pre-industrial phenomenon in a post industrial era. Relatively suddenly this long practice that has survived several educational reform eras finally seems to have become dysfunctional and obsolete.

The state, pedagogy, and the school

The public school as a key institution of the nation-state might not only be described as a bureaucratic model, it can also be analyzed as a people processing institution. Again, it is in the perspective of neo-institutionalism that the organizational specifics of schools have been focused on (H.-D. Meyer/Rowan 2006; Meyer/Rowan 1977).

When comparing schools to other organizations, the researchers found two “anomalies“: First, the lack of tight relations in the organization’s hierarchies, for which they found the term “loose coupling”, and second, the lack of a technological core (Meyer/Scott/Deal 1983). With regards to schools this implied that the technical core, i.e., the learning and teaching processes in the classroom do not strictly correspond to the external expectations addressed to the school. They found that the so called institutionalized organizations, such as schools, primarily relate to their environment and ceremonially refer to “environmental” ideas, imaginations, notions etc. It is the conformity with the institutional environment that renders legitimacy to the organization. Therefore the embeddedness in external expectations is to be identified as a crucial factor when it comes to explaining the durability of educational organizations and has to be taken much more seriously than their real efficiency (Meyer/Rowan 1977). The term legitimacy has to be taken in an encompassing sense as comprising not only beliefs, but also reasons of legitimacy.

What this means against the background outlined above is that the tensions and contradictions of sorting individuals into groups while at the same time assimilating all have to be mastered by the school in such a way that the eventual outcome seems to be just and complying with a key idea of modern societies, i.e., meritocracy.

One early indication of a breakdown of this logic was the emergence of the school effectiveness and school improvement movement in the United States in the 1960s and 1970s. This is also the beginning of educational governance, often referred to as school governance. It takes as its starting point the bureaucratic organization of

schools and then asks under what conditions, actor constellations etc. school effectiveness can be increased, and, generally speaking, how schools can be improved. Anglo-American school effectiveness research, thus, debates the advantages and disadvantages of community control, mayoral control, or classical school boards, the effects of school leadership, and the involvement of parents, to name only a few examples. In the economics of education, the problem of school governance may be focused as a principal-agent issue (on economic principal-agent theory cf. Eisenhardt 1989; Grossmann/Hart 1983) – again related to the classical bureaucratic structure of the education system. “How can ‘principals’, educational ministries and offices of education impact the agents, i.e., the teachers responsible for putting curricula and other policy frameworks into practice?” would be one of the questions posed in this perspective.

In the different trajectories of criticism – be it in the form of evaluation research, such as in the United States, or in the notion that the traditional arrangement becomes dysfunctional, such as in Germany –, the diagnoses are quite similar, as the next section will show.

The current educational challenge and its relation to governance

This is where we stand today. Increasingly the old forms become dysfunctional because the types of subjectivities produced no longer correspond to the type of society we live in.

To further elucidate the implications of this observation, I would like to quote a metaphorical telling rendition by Thomas Rauschenbach (2005). He identifies the current educational challenge to consist not only in mastering an ever increasing amount of information, facts and knowledge, but in simultaneously learning to master the chances and risks of an individualized – let me use the German term – *Lebensführung* (conduct of life), hence close to our theme of self government:

Could people in former times climb on passing trains on prefabricated rails – however ordered by social class and social strata – they now have to conduct their lives themselves in a maze of streets with many junctions and turn offs with much other traffic. Insofar they do have much better options to determine direction and tempo themselves, but also the higher risk to miss the right junction, drive off the road or dead end. These

changes in the conduct of life are a new and independent challenge with regards to educational and learning processes of children. (p. 89)

The American president Barack Obama put it succinctly in his school speech from September 8, 2009:

And this isn't just important for your own life and your own future. What you make of your education will decide nothing less than the future of this country. What you're learning in school today will determine whether we as a nation can meet our greatest challenges in the future. (Obama, 2009)

As a result of changed societal practices and arrangements as well as of collective forms of sense-making of these transformations, be they encompassed in terms such as knowledge or information society, service or entrepreneurial society, or in other designations, educational aims and governance change.

The term educational governance might be taken to designate the ensemble of measures to ascertain educational quality in schools. A key orientation in this context is provided by the paradigm shift from input to output steering. A greater amount of school autonomy, the introduction of educational standards, and the inclusion of new actors, such as economic or civil society actors are further traits of the new trend. Educational governance is meant to bring the various actors, their activities and respective realm of influence into a coherent analytical framework: the school and its administration, the political actors, but also the “new” actors including the international ones.

Against this background, international comparison in education no longer focuses solely on the exchange relations between countries with a distinction between “donor” and “receiver” nations, between “lenders” and “borrowers”, between “importers” and “exporters”, between “educational policies” in one country and their “appropriations” and “adaptations” in another, but is multi-relational and multi-lateral in the sense introduced by Mundy as educational multilateralism (1998) and further expounded by Jones and Coleman (2005) indicating that education systems should no longer be studied in a nation-state context, but as part of wider web of global governance issues. The term “global governance” as used by Mundy and other comparativists who draw on the governance concept as it was developed by the international relations part of political science (Rosenau/Czempiel 1992) thus quite

easily relates to a world systems approach. Current world systems approaches applied to education, in turn, are characterized by attributing an important role to international organizations in the shaping of educational policies. Although organizations such as the EU, UNESCO, the OECD, the World Bank have been active in educational policy since the post World War II period, their role is much more prominent today than it was in previous decades (Reinalda/Verbeek 1998). Considering control media and intensity of influence and the tightness of interactions, comparativists increasingly come to the conclusion that international organizations are not merely executing national education policies on a higher level, but create their own agendas and start to constitute a transnational level in education. One of the central issues in this context is to study the transformations that distinguish the traditional forms of educational governance in a bureaucratic context to new forms of governance that are more market oriented or that make an effort to control educational outcomes through evaluation. In the European context, an empirical project Regulation and Education (Reguleduc) (Maroy 2004, 2009) has convincingly argued the implementation of these new forms of governance.

How the influence of international organizations plays out in national education systems depends on the specific constellations between the national and the international levels and the kind of leverage these supra-national actors can muster. In Brazil, for example, the World Bank plays a major role and has affected education in different ways than, for example, the European Union in Germany.

One might say that the majority of the “governance” literature relates to an analysis of the technicalities of regulation: Against the background of the changes outlined above, three areas in particular affect the education sector: the modes of regulation, the forms of provision and distribution of educational services, and the emergence of new actors, such as international organizations, which are of special relevance with regard to issues of comparative education.

To sum up: Research on educational governance is concerned with actors, their constellations, and the modes of coordination between the various levels of analysis – local, national and international levels; with forms of educational provision and educational programs; and with modes of governance (Martens/Rusconi/Leuze 2007; Jakobi 2009; Chabbott 2003; Altrichter/Brüsemeister/Wissinger, 2007). And it is the modes of governance that have received heightened attention in education since

they were first introduced under the name “new public management” in the 1980s. The aim of new public management strategies was not only to optimize the performance quality, but also to positively influence the cost-benefit relations. Efficiency and efficacy of the performance based on evidence became the orienting key terms.

Transnational governance

The previous section has illustrated that the new forms of educational governance cannot be sufficiently analyzed within a nation-state context. Rather, the re-embedding of the state in the context of a national population and national boundaries needs to be considered so that the complexity of relations shaping education systems and education policy is not artificially reduced. The discussion I would like to present here is less concerned with questions of whether the state disintegrates, weakens or disappears, but rather aims at illustrating that the new forms of regulation only become fully evident when looking at the larger picture.

In their introduction to *Transnational Governance* (2006), the editors Marie-Laure Djelic and Kerstin Sahlin-Andersson concentrate on the political constitution of order and regulation. They stress that the current transformation in the embeddedness of education should not be mistaken for deregulation, weakening, loss of structure and order, but conversely, the rise of what they convincingly argue has to be designated transnational instead of global (Djelic/Sahlin-Andersson, 2006, p. 3-5) forms of regulation intensify instead of weaken and this intensification is directly linked to a diminishing of trust in the traditional sense.

With reference to relevant studies in the field of transnational governance, Djelic/Sahlin-Andersson argue, that it is suggested that:

expanded monitoring and auditing activities are associated with a decline in trust. Auditing and monitoring reveal and make apparent. Rather than building trust, though, transparency may in fact undermine it further, leading to still more requests for auditing and monitoring. This may particularly be true for processes of self-regulation that are prone to questioning. Thus self-regulation tends to be replaced or developed into regulated and framed if not controlled self-regulation. (p. 13)

Hence, there is what they call a distrust spiral propelled by transnational governance activities. Educational governance in the sense of school governance is a good case in point. As the argument in the previous section pointed out, the long standing distrust with schools to do the job of developing individual capacities and preparing the young generation for successful societal participation has in the 1960s given rise to evaluation research. This trend, an important source to evidence based expertise, has been reinforced by the transnational focus to bring education systems into alignment with the changing societal demands which are no longer perceived to be comparable to the situation in the sixties when societies based on the Fordist production regime and being sheltered by the division of influence spheres of two superpowers as well as dependency relations between “first” and “third” world were able to establish and expand their welfare systems. In contrast to these conditions the world has turned global bringing heightened competition and an intensification of interactions in its wake. Where research with a governance orientation can tell us much about the mechanisms and networks, the forms, means and media of influence, the actors and areas, it is not concerned with the question central to the work of Foucault: how can the trans-state, education, subjectivity nexus be described and analyzed. I will address this question in the final part of the contribution.

Education and Trans-state: a ~~modern~~ nexus

As is obvious from the phrasing of the heading, two terms are problematical. How to designate the reembedding of the state – which of course remains a powerful actor if not the only one – and how to adequately refer to our present societal context. The term trans-state has been chosen because it seems to be the best conveyor of the implications under consideration. It is more accurate than “global” and at the same time indicates that something is going on that is different from replicating state activities on a higher level. The crossing out of the term ~~modern~~ follows the deconstructive, semiotic practice associated with post-structuralism indicating that the term has become problematical. Zygmunt Bauman (2007) made the distinction between solid and liquid modernity which comes close to what is meant here. The term has been given preference, over alternative terms also designating current transformations that might come to mind. Postmodernism or postmodernity would

have been possible candidates as well as late modernity. These terminological variations and search movements are a strong indicator that we are in the middle of larger transformations, but it is too early to see the outcome and therefore to decide on specific names. The biggest question is whether the current changes still pertain to what we mean by modernity or are already part of another overarching concept of society. As long as these questions cannot be resolved, appropriations have to suffice.

For the same reason it is not yet possible to simply impose Foucault's analysis on new circumstances. Much must be left unanswered and can only be preliminarily explored. For example the position of education: in classical modernity, education in the form of state organized, run, and financed education systems clearly served to mediate between state, individual, society at large, and society divided into areas of social positions. It had assimilative as well as dividing and sorting functions. In the present context, these relations are much harder to describe. It seems as if the unconditional assimilative function addressing all citizens of an "ethnic" nation which used to take precedence over all other societal relations is less strongly emphasized than in high modernity. Instead, the "qualities" of each and every individual are focused on to be measured, documented with the aim to develop them intentionally and fully from the beginning on. Indications of this trend would be attempts to bring the various levels of the education system into alignment as well as to take non-formal and informal learning settings into account as well. The most obvious indicator of all is the trend for observation and documentation that sets in at the preschool age and continues over the life course well into adult life. Observation from outside is to quickly turn into self-observation to monitor and strengthen the self-capacities. At any rate, the documentation of competences, the need to account for what one is doing and why, how investments into self-development are calculated, are indicative that in addition to Foucault's focus on disciplining the body, making the body more docile and useful as well as internalizing surveillance techniques through confession practices, the cognitive level of consciously developing one's reasoning and cognitively instrumental capacities needs to be taken into consideration. It is too early to tell what kinds of subjectivities are constituted by these new means and pedagogical technologies. Much of the literature following Foucault's approach is by necessity preliminary and speculative. However, I am convinced that this question –

what kinds of correspondence-relations between complex transnational educational governance relations, between new forms of polities, policies, and politics and subject formations are emerging? – is one of the most interesting and challenging for future investigations and it is here that governance theories and governmentality might prove to be more complementary than one would think at a first glance. But, as the present article intended to demonstrate, their major differences and divergences cannot be denied.

References

- ALTRICHTER, E.; BRÜSEMEISTER, T.; WISSINGER, J. (Eds.). Educational governance. Handlungskoordination und Steuerung im Bildungssystem. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 2007.
- BAETHGE, M. Das berufliche Bildungswesen in Deutschland am Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts. In: CORTINA, K. S.; Baumert, J.; Leschinsky, A.; Mayer, K. U.; Trommer, L. (Eds.): Das Bildungswesen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Strukturen und Entwicklungen im Überblick. 3rd ed. Reinbek: Rowohlt, p. 541-598.
- BAUMAN, Z. Liquid modernity. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.
- BOMMES, M.; RADKTE, F.-O. Institutionalisierte Diskriminierung von Migrantenkindern. Die Herstellung ethnischer Differenz in der Schule. In: Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, Jg. 39, H. 3, 1993, p. 483-497.
- BURCHELL, G.; GORDON, C.; MILLER, P. (Eds.). The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- CHABBOTT, C. Constructing education for development: international organizations and education for all. London: Routledge Falmer, 2003.
- DJELIC, M. L.; SAHLIN-ANDERSSON, K. (Eds.). Transnational governance: Institutional dynamics of regulation. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- EISENHARDT, K. M. Agency theory. An assessment and review. In: Academy of Management Review, v. 14, 1989, n. 1, p. 57–74.
- FIMYAR, O. Using governmentality as a conceptual tool in education policy research. In: Educate – Special issue, March 2008, p. 3-18.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison. London: Ilen Lane, 1977.
- _____. 'Governmentality'. In: BURCHELL, G.; GORDON, C.; MILLER, P. (Eds.). The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1991, p. 87-104.
- _____. Geschichte der Gouvernementalität 1/2: Sicherheit, Territorium, Bevölkerung/Die Geburt der Biopolitik. 2 Vols. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2004.
- _____. Security, territory, population. Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-1978. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

- GOMOLLA, M.; RADTKE, F.-O. Institutionelle Diskriminierung: die Herstellung ethnischer Differenz in der Schule. 3. ed. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 2009.
- GROSSMAN, S. J.; HART, O. An analysis of the principal agent problem. In: *Econometrica*, v. 51, n. 1, January 1983, p. 7–46.
- HACKING, I. Making up people. In: HELLER, Thomas C.; SOSNA, Morton; WELLBERY, David E. (Eds.). *Reconstructing individuality: Autonomy, individuality and the self in Western thought*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986, p. 222-236.
- HASENCLEVER, A.; MAYER, P.; RITTBERGER, V. *Theories of international regimes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- HÖHNE, T.; KUNZ, T.; RADTKE, F.-O. Bilder von Fremden. Formen der Migrantendarstellung als der „anderen Kultur“ in deutschen Schulbüchern von 1981-1997. Frankfurt am Main. *Frankfurter Beiträge zur Erziehungswissenschaft. Reihe Forschungsberichte*, 1997.
- JAKOBI, Anja P. *International organizations and lifelong learning: From global agendas to policy diffusion*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009 (in press).
- JESSOP, Bob. *State theory. Putting capitalists states in their place*. Cambridge, Mass.: Polity Press, 2009.
- JONES, P. W.; COLEMAN, D. *The United Nations and education: Multilateralism, development and globalisation*. London: Routledge Falmer, 2005.
- LEMKE, T. An indigestible meal? Foucault, governmentality and state theory. *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory*, n. 15, 2007, disponível em: <<http://www.thomaslemkeweb.de/publikationen/IndigestibleMealfinal5.pdf>>, acesso em: 12 dez. 2009.
- LLOYD, D.; THOMAS, P. *Culture and the state*. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- MARTENS, K.; RUSCONI, A.; LEUZE, K. (Eds.). *New arenas of education governance - The impact of International organizations and markets on educational policymaking*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007.
- MAROY, C. *Regulation and inequalities in European education systems. Final report*. Disponível em: <http://www.girsef.ucl.ac.be/reguleducnetwork_VF_10dec041.pdf>, acesso em: 12 dez. 2009.
- MAROY, C. Convergences and hybridization of educational policies around "post-bureaucratic" models of regulation. In: *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, v. 39, n. 1, 2009, p. 71-84.
- MAYNTZ, R. *Governance im Modernen Staat*. In: Benz, A. (Ed.). *Governance – Regieren in komplexen Regelsystemen. Eine Einführung*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 2004, p. 65-76.
- MAYNTZ, R. *Über Governance. Institutionen und Prozesse politischer Regelung*. Frankfurt: Campus, 2009.
- MEYER, H.-D. The rise and decline of the common school as an institution: Taking “myth and ceremony” seriously. In: MEYER, H.-D./ROWAN, B. (Eds.). *The new institutionalism in education*. New York: SUNY Press, 2006, p. 51-66.

MEYER, H.-D.; ROWAN, B. (Eds.). The new institutionalism in education. New York: SUNY Press, 2006.

MEYER, J. W.; ROWAN, B. The structure of educational organizations. In: MEYER, M. W. et al. Environments and organizations. San Francisco u. a.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978, p. 78-109.

MEYER, J. W.; SCOTT, W. R.; DEAL, T. D. Institutional and technical sources of organizational structures: Explaining the structure of educational organizations. In: MEYER, J. W.; SCOTT, W. R. Organizational environments. Ritual and rationality. Beverly Hills u. a.: Sage, 1983, p. 45-67.

MEYER, J. W.; BOLI, J.; THOMAS, G. M.; RAMIREZ, F. O. World society and the nation-state. In: American Journal of Sociology, v. 103, n. 1, 1997, p. 144-181.

MEYER, J. W.; ROWAN, B. Institutional organization as myth and ceremony. In: American Journal of Sociology, v. 83 (n. 2), 1977, p. 340-363.

MITTER, W. Bildungssouveränität und Schulträgerschaft in Europa in historisch-vergleichender Sicht. In: ANWEILER, O.; MITTER, W. (Eds.). Bildungssouveränität im Wandel, Bielefeld: Universität Bielefeld, 2006, p. 5-20.

MUNDY, K. Educational multilateralism and world (dis)order. In: Comparative Education Review, v. 42, n. 4, 1998, p. 448-478.

OBAMA, B. Prepared remarks of president Barack Obama: Back to school event. Arlington, Virginia, September 8, 2009, disponível em: <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/mediareources/PreparedSchoolRemarks/>>, acesso em: 12 dez. 2009.

PARREIRA DO AMARAL, M. Regimeansatz – Annäherung an ein weltweites Bildungsregime. In: Tertium Comparationis, v. 13, n. 2, 2007, p. 157-182.

POPKEWITZ, T. S. Struggling for the soul: The politics of schooling and the construction of the teacher. New York: Teachers College Press, 1998.

POPKEWITZ, T. S. (Ed.). Inventing the modern self and John Dewey: Modernities and the traveling of pragmatism in education. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

RADTKE, F.-O. Das neue Erziehungsregime. In: Ursula Frost (Hg.): Unternehmen Bildung. Die Frankfurter Einsprüche und kontroverse Positionen zur aktuellen Bildungsreform. Sonderheft der Vierteljahrsschrift für Wissenschaftliche Pädagogik, 2006, p. 45-49.

RAUSCHENBACH, T. Konturen einer neuen sozialen Bildungspraxis? Bildung, Erziehung und Betreuung in der offenen Ganztagschule. In: Opielka, M. (Ed.). Bildungsreform als Sozialreform. Zum Zusammenhang von Bildungs- und Sozialpolitik, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 2005, p. 89-111.

REINALDA, B.; VERBEEK, B. (Eds.). Autonomous policy making by international organizations. London u. a.: Routledge, 1998.

RITTBERGER, V. (Ed.). Regime theory and international relations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

ROSENAU, J.; CZEMPIEL, E.-O. (Eds.). Governance without government: Order and change in world politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

ZYMEK, Bernd. Regionalität und Internationalität, Mobilisierung und Internationalisierung. 42. Beiheft ZfPäd. Bildungsprozesse und Erziehungsverhältnisse im 20. Jahrhundert, Praktische Entwicklungen und Formen der Reflexion im historischen Kontext, 2000, p. 92-115.

Received on 28.09.09

Approved on 03.02.10

Karin Amos is professor of Education at the University of Tuebingen, Germany. She holds a doctoral degree in American Studies (University of Eichstätt, 1992) and has conducted a post-doctoral study (Habilitation) on the relation of education and the constitution of membership in the national community (University of Frankfurt, 2002). Dr. Amos has published widely on educational topics such as: comparative and intercultural education, on the role of international organizations on education policy, and on the school careers of migrant students. Karin Amos is co-editor of the Journal European Education (MESharpe); Erziehungswissenschaftliche Revue (Klinkhardt)