

The Uses of Globalization in the (Shifting) Landscape of Educational Studies

Paul Tarc

University of Western Ontario

Abstract

The term 'globalization' does more than represent a set of material (and ideological) processes that have impacts on education and schooling. Additionally, 'globalization' operates as a conceptual lens or set of interventions, which is significantly impacting academic discourses in Education and in other disciplines. Not only has *Globalization and Education* (G&E) emerged as a new, trans-disciplinary field of Educational Studies, insights from this field and globalization studies more directly have impacted many other fields of Education. This paper summarizes major impacts of globalization on education and maps out a 'first-wave' G&E discourse by analyzing a small set of key texts published around the turn of the century. The paper distills key uses of globalization from this 'first-wave' G&E and more recent correctives to clarify the potential applications for—and implications of the 'lens' of—globalization for educational scholarship.

Keywords: Globalization and Education, globalization, Educational Studies, methodology, deparochializing education

Résumé

Le terme «mondialisation» ne représente pas seulement un ensemble matériel (et idéologique) de processus qui ont des impacts sur l'éducation et la scolarisation. En outre, la «mondialisation» opère comme un cadre conceptuel ou un ensemble d'interventions, ce qui influe de manière significative sur les discours académiques en éducation et dans d'autres disciplines. Non seulement la mondialisation et l'éducation (M & E) a émergé comme un nouveau champ transdisciplinaire des sciences de l'éducation, mais encore les idées dans ce domaine, et plus directement des études sur la mondialisation, ont eu un impact sur bien d'autres domaines de l'éducation. Cet article résume les principaux effets de la mondialisation sur l'éducation et met en perspective une «première vague» de discours sur la M & E en analysant un petit ensemble de textes fondamentaux publiés au tournant du siècle. L'article rend compte de certaines utilisations essentielles de la mondialisation provenant de cette «première vague» et de correctifs plus récents afin de clarifier les potentielles applications ainsi que les implications dans «l'optique» de la mondialisation pour des études en éducation.

Mots-clés: mondialisation et éducation, mondialisation, sciences de l'éducation, méthodologie, «déparochialisation » de l'éducation

The Uses of Globalization in the (Shifting) Landscape of Educational Studies

Introduction

This paper focuses on how representations and theories of globalization are being employed in educational research and thinking in Canada and other Anglo-Western countries in particular.¹ By drawing on an earlier thematic analysis of G&E (Tarc, 2003), I propose and discuss a ‘first-wave’ of theoretical and conceptual interventions as well as dominant themes and registers that an emergent G&E discourse produced around the turn of the 21st century. Then, I draw upon a set of more recent texts in G&E that have a lineage to the earlier texts (Dale, 2005; Dale, 2007; Dolby & Rahman, 2008; Kenway & Fahey, 2009; Lingard, 2006; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010) and globalization studies (Sassen, 2006) to illuminate the continuities and (productive) shifts in discourses of G&E and how the lens of globalization is impacting Educational Studies more broadly.

Just over a decade ago (2001), I began my first doctoral-level course entitled “Globalization and Education” (G&E). As with some of my classmates, I wasn’t sure how to make sense of globalization; I tentatively held onto ‘globalization’ as a way of emphasizing the (changed or changing) ‘wider’ political, economic, and social contexts. I struggled to connect its complex discursive-conceptual features to my interests in critical pedagogies and with my prior experiences living and teaching in international schools in the global South. Nevertheless, as it happened, the required and supplemental readings from this first course grounded my comprehensive paper and the coarse historical periodization I employed in my dissertation to understand the shifting uses of the ‘International’ of the International Baccalaureate (Tarc, 2009). Now, in my fourth year as assistant professor in a different Faculty of Education, I find myself pressing my own diverse sets of students to consider the implications of globalization for their own work. If G&E is becoming an emergent subfield in Educational Studies (Dolby & Rahman, 2008; Spring, 2008), then I suppose I would position my work within this field.

In my classes and in my writing, I conceptualize ‘globalization’ quite broadly as an imperfect, but still dominant, term to signify the contemporary moment or ‘historical present.’ As with other instructors, I draw on specific definitions offered by a set of social theorists as Held & McGrew (2000) to mark the *material processes* that the term ‘globalization’ often signifies, such as:

the expanding scale, growing magnitude, speeding up and deepening impact of interregional flows and patterns of social interaction. It refers to a shift or transformation in the scale of human social organization that links distant communities and expands the reach of power relations across the world’s major regions and continents. (p. 4)

And with Appadurai (1996, 2000) and others (Ray, 2007; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010), I appreciate that globalization is more than a set of material (macro) processes (and more than a top-down neoliberal ideology), having entered into the social imaginary of individuals across many

¹ Given that English-language sources are the only ones used in this paper, my conceptualization (on the uses of globalization for Educational Studies) is located in the (somewhat permeable) knowledge production sphere of the Anglo-West. However there are likely some elements of this conceptualization that are relevant to other locations. Additionally, processes of globalization are impacting upon countries within the Anglo-West in diverse ways. Although the texts examined here present analyses located in a wide array of geographic contexts, my focus is on the conceptual moves being made through the use of the term ‘globalization’ at the discursive level.

cultures and societies. Further, even beyond the many debates on what the phenomena of globalization ‘truly’ constitutes (and does not) and whether it represents a qualitative break from past globalizing phenomena (Held & McGrew, 2000; Rizvi & Lingard, 2002), there is the question of how the signifier ‘globalization’ operates/intervenes in one’s thinking and research (for a similar approach, see Gough, 2000, p. 77).

As scholars and teachers, we engage representations of ‘globalization’ in the domain of (inter-)texts, tied to the particulars of ongoing academic conversations with their attendant key objects and categories of inquiry. In other words, as educationalists we are unlikely examining the phenomenon of globalization in any ‘pure’ way, but finding its significance through the prism of our disciplinary-informed discursive practices. Scholars working from different disciplinary traditions will tend to emphasize and privilege different dimensions of globalization and thereby find different *uses* in/for (theorizing) globalization. Anthropologists, for example, may privilege the cultural dimensions of globalization, emphasizing its bottom-up or vernacular manifestations (Appadurai, 1996) in contrast to sociologists or comparativists who have mostly concentrated on economic globalization at the macro level (Stromquist, 2002).

Acknowledging that one has a relation to the concept of globalization, structured by one’s participation in academic discourse communities, is particularly important when supporting graduate students who may find (an untethered) ‘globalization’ to be a particularly unwieldy concept. In teaching students, I also accentuate the discursive basis of our classroom discussions. I attempt to make explicit that what is deemed relevant for discussion under the rubric of globalization is shaped by the ongoing conversations constitutive of particular (if overlapping) academic discourses.² Of course, there are dominant understandings of globalization that cross multiple disciplines, which constitutes the term’s theoretical flexibility and robustness (*and* potential loss of precision). The pre-occupation with the changing role of the nation-state under ‘global’ transformations is a prime example.

If in recent history the dominant narrative of geopolitical order was understood as Westphalian (an international society of bounded, independent nation-states) and if globalization signifies the conditions of the changing present, then globalization typically denotes processes, such as denationalization, which illustrate how the Westphalian order is, at least along certain registers, becoming undone, due to intensifying economic interdependencies under the increased presence of influential transnational actors (for example). But despite such common theoretical currents that cross the social sciences and humanities, the point here is that representations of globalization have particular inflections according to the characteristics of specific disciplines and subfields. Different subfields will emphasize different aspects of globalization that will, in turn, impact the kind of conceptual intervention that the signifier ‘globalization’ makes. I think, particularly for a special issue focused on the impacts of globalization on education, it is valuable to examine the uses of ‘globalization’ in the (shifting) landscape of Educational Studies. The paper is organized into two parts. The first, more substantive part, presents what I am calling ‘first-wave’ G&E. The second part discusses certain continuities and productive shifts in G&E in light of more recent shifts in material conditions and conceptual developments.

² The pedagogical import of this point becomes evident when graduate students are unfamiliar with these academic discourses. Incoming graduate students who are school teachers, for example, whose experiences are embedded in the more micro contexts of the classroom may have little understanding of the degree to which the ‘nation-state’ has been a foundational conceptual category in the social sciences, humanities, and in educational policy studies. Thus, the significance of arguments about the nature or effects of globalization and its relation to education may be difficult for these students to grasp.

Before concluding this introduction, it is important to make the methodological approaches that undergird the overall architecture/argument of this paper more transparent. In the next subsection, six representative texts in G&E are examined to conceptualize a first-wave of G&E around the turn of the century. For the second main section, where I discuss more recent ‘continuities and shifts,’ I have selected texts that not only share a lineage with the first set of texts but also offer what I believe (based on my wider readings and teaching in globalization and education) to be productive correctives to the wider (sometimes reductive) take-up of G&E in educational research. Although, my primary concern is to map the uses of globalization in educational discourse most focused on globalization, I recognize that I do have my own set of preferences in terms of how ‘globalization’ is or could be more useful in educational scholarship. At one level, my own understandings and uses of globalization have been shaped by the ‘first-wave’ G&E scholars cited here. My preferences become more transparent, however, in the second part of this paper, where I include the interventions of particular scholars that can help orient the uses of globalization for more theoretically robust and productive outcomes. If the lens of globalization ultimately draws attention to ‘relationality’ and ‘historicity’ so that our scholarship and teaching is grounded by and engaged in complex real-world phenomena, then it is fundamentally important that the scholarly uses of the construct ‘globalization’ avoid reducing the term to another reified or statically-conceived category that interferes in the difficult work of careful observation and nuanced thinking on the objects of our inquiry. This is particularly important (and challenging) for graduate students and new scholars who are compelled to use and evaluate research categories and constructs even while they are still working at comprehending them.³ On the one hand I want students to fully engage with these constructs and categories and to be adept at using them. But I also want them to know that these mastered categories can become crutches, that they most often represent the *means* to illumination and understanding, rather than the *ends*. In the latter part of this paper I discuss this aim of ‘deparochializing’ research that has emerged in more recent discourses of G&E in considering scholarship and teaching.

First-Wave Globalization and Education

In a previous analysis (Tarc, 2003) I attempted to characterize a discursive field of globalization and education by examining six texts: (1) *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation Across Cultures* (Stromquist & Monkman, 2000); (2) *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives* (Burbules & Torres, 2000); (3) *The OECD, Globalization and Education Policy* (Henry, Lingard, Rizvi, & Taylor, 2001); (4) *Education in a Globalized World: The Connectivity of Economic Power, Technology, and Knowledge* (Stromquist, 2002); (5) *Contested Classrooms: Education, Globalization, and Democracy in Alberta* (Harrison & Kachur, 1999); and (6) *Teaching in Global Times* (Smith, 2002). The first two edited texts are seminal in the G&E field with contributions by educationalists with backgrounds in sociology, educational policy analysis, development, comparative education, and critical education. In their recent mapping of international education, Dolby and Rahman (2008) particularly note the importance of these two texts in the area of G&E.

Stromquist and Monkman (2000) are affiliated with comparative education but view this field as becoming re-worked by the changing conditions of globalization.⁴ Most of the articles

³ Perhaps this remains a challenge for all ‘new’ scholarship and not just for new scholars.

⁴ Nations can no longer be studied as separate wholes—national policies and discourses are already contaminated from elsewhere. National governments are only one level of institution involved in the global flows of goods,

collected by these editors have empirical data or case studies to present and analyze, or at least, to concretize the presented conceptual framing. Burbules and Torres (2000) provide an explicitly “critical” perspective to the debates. The editors denounce the “inevitability” of globalization as unsound and politically motivated. Their critical approach aims to (1) differentiate globalization as a historical process from contemporary (neoliberal) ideology, and (2) consider the winners *and losers* of globalization processes. In contrast to the Stromquist and Monkman collection, only two of the contributions from Burbules and Torres include empirical studies as a part of their analysis.

The third text on the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) impact on Australian educational policy (Henry et al., 2001) is methodologically a ground-breaking work. It pays substantive attention to the “how?” of globalization processes and effects by researching one of the more influential transnational actors in the educational policy-making arena. One of the dominant critiques (see for example, Monkman & Baird, 2002) is of globalization as a “just is” set of conditions with little explanation of the processes, connections, and actions of individuals who play a part in how “globalization” (as governance, policy trends, imperatives) comes to be. Also less scrutinized are the processes by which the particular is ‘globalized.’ While many of the educationalists make reference to the new set of “global” educational policy-makers (such as the OECD), Henry, Lingard, Rizvi, and Taylor’s ethnographic case study (2001) deeply illuminates the dynamics by which supra-national institutional actors influence state educational policy decision-making.

The three remaining texts may be less representative of the G&E field, but nevertheless expand the breadth of my analysis. The fourth, single-authored text by Stromquist (2002) is grander in scope offering a more systematic and exhaustive literature review. The fifth text (Harrison & Kachur, 1999) is useful in providing a number of critical perspectives engaging (the politics of) recent neoliberal educational reforms in one particular educational jurisdiction—the province of Alberta. This text does not theorize globalization; rather its collection of essays convey the changing historical, ideological, and political contexts that Alberta has faced in the domain of public education in the past couple of decades, indicative of a particular form of neoliberal globalization. And the final text, *Teaching in Global Times*, is unique as a text because it attempts to relate the significance of globalization, beyond simply “neo-liberal reform” to the more micro contexts of teaching and learning. Smith’s (2002) text is unique (and more eclectic) in its attempt to “keep the two tropes of teaching and globalization circulating together” (p. 15). The analysis of this set of six texts informs the characterization of ‘first-wave’ G&E presented in the following sections.

Summarizing Dominant Representations of the Impacts of Globalization on Education

In this section, I draw on Martin Carnoy’s (2000) contribution, *Globalization and Educational Reform*, as an exemplar of many accounts discussing the key impacts of globalization on education around the turn of the century. Carnoy categorizes the impacts of globalization into financial, labor market, and specifically educational terms as follows: (1) pressures to reduce *public* spending on education; (2) pressures to expand higher education and correspondingly to increase the number of secondary school graduates (in developing countries, governments face pressure to increase access to elementary education for all members of society); and (3) pressures to participate in international comparisons of educational systems,

services, finances, ideas, peoples, and technologies. And some of these flows work quite independently of national policies. In addition, supranational institutions are new actors in the economic and political spheres.

which has “increased emphasis on math and science curricula, standards, testing, and on meeting standards by changing the way education is delivered” (p. 44). *Each of these impacts can be related back to the increasing ties between education and economic principles.* The first kind of impact relates directly to the pressures for countries to reduce all forms of public spending relative to the private sector. This is especially evident for developing countries shaped by IMF and World Bank policies (attached to Structural Adjustment Loans) for ‘sound’ economic growth. In the context of the richer Western nations, while financial austerity remains important for being competitive in the global economy, the reduction of spending in public education and privatization or corporate sponsorship of schooling fit well within neoliberal ideologies calling for the reduced role of the nation-state under market rationalization of schooling.

The second pressure relates to the understanding of the payoffs for higher levels of education within the emerging “knowledge economy.” To attract foreign capital investments in a knowledge-intensive economy, governments need a ready supply of highly-skilled labour and the conditions for the on-going production of such highly skilled labour power. There are contradictory tensions between the first two stated pressures—to reduce spending on education while improving the quality of education. The use or subtlety of language is significant here, as a number of theorists (Carnoy, 2000; Morrow & Torres, 2000) attempt to differentiate the changing economic conditions represented by globalization and the dominant ideology (especially as endorsed by Anglo-Western countries) of neoliberalism. For this reason, Carnoy uses the term “pressures to...” rather than to make globalization synonymous with *effects*—reducing public spending on education—since it is conceivable that in the context of globalization, some governments might increase funding to public education to improve educational access and quality. In some jurisdictions new regimes of educational governance, accountability, and standards have been implemented to improve the efficiency and quality of education at the very time that funding is decreased. Carnoy uses the term “finance-driven” reforms that are oriented primarily toward cost-saving, and has stressed that when finance-driven reforms dominate, reforms are unlikely to have positive educational benefit.

For Carnoy, the “most direct impact on education” from globalization has been these finance-oriented reforms, with the main promoter of such reforms being the World Bank. A 1995 World Bank Educational Sector Paper (cited in Carnoy) recommends the following strategies:

- (1) the shift of public funding for education from higher to lower levels of education;
- (2) the expansion of secondary and higher education through increased privatization;
- (3) the reduction of public spending per pupil in countries with “high” teacher-pupil ratios in primary and secondary education (less than 1:40) through increasing class size; and
- (4) the increase of the quality of education through relatively costless “efficiency” reforms such as decentralization. (p. 47)

Decentralization, in education and generally, is to have the effect of lowering bureaucratic cost, while providing more autonomy for local actors to provide a better fit between methods used and clients served. Further, it also shifts a greater accountability for success down to the local authorities. Privatization—an increasingly common phenomena in the age of globalization—can also be seen as a way of making educational delivery more efficient and improving the quality of education. While empirically there is little evidence to support such claims (Carnoy & McEwan, 1997, cited in Carnoy, p. 48), the idea is that through competition (between schools, private and public) and school choice options (including vouchers), schools will become more accountable

to their “clientele” (families, but also business funders): schools either improve the quality of educational delivery or face losing students. Carnoy reiterates the problem of reform, such as decentralization, where structured as financially-driven reforms. He writes: “Decentralization can conceivably improve educational productivity. But in the present historical context, globalization is accompanied by an ideology that makes financial austerity a condition for economic progress” (p. 49). Without a coherent focus on school improvement, these reforms, especially in the under-resourced developing nations, have produced a series of negative effects that have reduced the quality of, and even access to, education.

Specifically, in the domain of educational curriculum and outcomes, the third pressure presented by Carnoy is significant, “[g]lobalization has ... produced an increased emphasis on teaching science and mathematics and on educational measurement” (p. 56). In general, particular subject areas most connected to the market or production (“commercial transfer”) are more highly valued and marketed (irrespective of any changes to local classroom practices). With the increased interconnectivity and emerging international testing bodies and organizations (World Bank, International Association for Evaluation of Educational Achievement, OECD) it has become easier to promote (largely quantitative) measurement and comparisons across countries towards increasing educational quality more recently framed as (student or institutional) ‘performance.’ While international comparisons add to the hype around global competitiveness in a knowledge-based economy, how the test results are used remains largely a matter of political climate and ideological preferences of educational authorities.

Another dynamic tension arises with *decentralization* to give more ‘autonomy’ to local actors, under increasing *centralization* of accounting mechanisms where state or national governments are increasingly controlling the setting of curricula, testing, and standards. Thus, present reforms represent a paradoxical decentralization, a form of “steering from a distance.” Local actors have the autonomy to teach for the learning outcomes that, through accountability mechanisms, are increasingly more scrutinizable and thus governable by central authorities. While decentralization is supposed to allow for local interpretation and thinking, the recent forms being taken seem to be producing opposite effects.

Carnoy’s (2000) account of the main impacts of globalization on education parallels that of many of the authors contributing to the selected texts. For example, it centers on economic globalization with its dominant neoliberal ideology that presses for particular forms of educational restructuring and reform, particularly at the levels of policy and governance. Indeed, since the early 1990s there has been a vast set of critiques on educational school reform framed as an outcome of globalization and reform’s negative effects on learning and equity (Apple, 2000; McNeil, 2000; Portelli & Solomon, 2001). Many critics tend to reduce the phenomena of globalization to neoliberal economic globalization and I will return to this tendency below. At this point, I expand beyond Carnoy’s chapter to consider common elements across the range of selected texts.

Dominant Themes and Registers

Drawing on my earlier analysis (Tarc, 2003), I now sketch out the common themes and registers surfacing across the texts. Generally, the common registers correspond to Stromquist’s (2002) broad survey, and to chapters like Carnoy’s (2000), which summarize the main impacts of globalization on education. Additionally, the ‘education’ of G&E typically connotes schooling, which makes certain themes or registers more common than others. As stated, (neoliberal) school reform and educational restructuring as it relates to formal educational policy and governance are common areas of focus. Within the writings on educational restructuring, higher education is a

dominant register for a number of reasons: universities and colleges have closer ties to the domain of professional jobs and careers; they are “knowledge producers” in a context of intellectual property (academic capitalism); they rely increasingly on private and corporate funding. While the privatization of elementary and secondary schooling through choice, vouchers, or charter-school movements has become more common,⁵ public funding of lower levels of education seems to remain the common practice for developed nations and part of the educational policy consensus for developing nations. Higher education is also the site most involved in distance education as supported by communications technologies, and in international education in general, as universities and colleges increasingly aim to attract high-paying foreign students. The influence of supranational actors, such as the OECD, in educational policy-making is mentioned in a number of articles. Also commonly cited is the influence of the World Bank and IMF in the importation of decentralization, managerialism, and entrepreneurialism from business culture to that of education.

Less common themes for analysis emerging from the conditions of globalization are the following: (1) internationalism, (2) internet technology and open learning, (3) citizenship, (4) identity formation, and (5) curriculum. Technology was substantively considered in only two chapters; it was theorized more as a catalyst or condition of globalization, rather than a dominant feature of the changing contexts of learning. Although gender was a key category for a small number of contributors (e.g., Kenway & Kelly, 2000; Stromquist, 2002), almost absent from the articles was the category of race, engaged explicitly only in the chapter by McCarthy and Dimitriadis (2000). Largely absent were the actual practices of teachers and students at the classroom level.⁶ While the ethno-cultural diversity of the student body of urban schooling can be seen as a manifestation of globalization, it has mostly been addressed in other fields, such as multicultural or anti-racist education. The production of subjectivities was also not taken up to a great extent; although the Burbules and Torres (2000) compilation does include contributions focused on the less common registers of identity and citizenship (McCarthy & Dimitriadis, 2000; Popkewitz, 2000; Rizvi, 2007). Relatedly, only Stromquist (2002) takes up the importance and power of media in shaping identities and promoting particular kinds of knowledge and values, both inside and outside formal institutions. *As a whole*, the contributions of the examined texts engage a large number of themes across multiple registers. See Appendix A for a more complete listing of the registers analyzed in each chapter and non-edited book. In the next section I attempt to synthesize a few primary currents of first-wave G&E represented by these texts.

Synthesizing Key ‘Stances’

The previous sections describe the major impacts of globalization on education and a set of common themes and registers surfacing in G&E discourse around the turn of the century. I include this thematic content to enable readers to engage the synthesis provided in this section and to the later discussion of more recent developments in G&E. The point of identifying a coarse first-wave G&E field is to provide a base-line for considering new uses of globalization discourse under a relatively brief historical arc. This approach is important given my attention to the discursive effects of ‘globalization’ in Educational Studies. So what key (if temporary) ‘stances’ are being made in the name of ‘globalization’ by educationalists substantively engaging the concept in this first-wave?

⁵ Admittedly with wide variations across states.

⁶ Carnoy (2000) and McGinn (1997, cited in Carnoy), claim that globalization has had little effect on classroom delivery.

I suggest that at least 5 points are noteworthy: (1) Each of the contributors are attempting to understand the new conditions and contexts whereby processes, ideologies, or imaginaries of globalization have *altered* the conception of the bounded nation-state that autonomously organizes its economic and social systems and, more specifically, its educational policies and programs for its nationally- [read: territorially-]constituted (multicultural) citizens; (2) Educationalists emphasize that the phenomena of globalization represents more than neoliberal economic globalization, albeit neoliberalism is a dominant and dominating feature (and sometimes tends toward reification despite cautionary notes); (3) Following globalization theorists, educationalists emphasize that globalization produces contradictory and differentiated effects as the ‘global’ is inflected through the ‘local’; (4) Invoking Held & McGrew’s (2000) tripartite depiction of globalists, skeptics, and transformationalists, many of the educationalists take a transformationalist view of globalization [the middle ground], albeit the debate over the ‘newness’ of the phenomena remains salient; (5) Corresponding to the disciplinary traditions of comparative education and sociology of education and to the externally-relevant disciplines of political science and economics, the economic and political dimensions of globalization and the macro-levels are privileged above the cultural dimension of globalization and the micro; in turn, educational *policy*, under a transnational policy convergence (Rizvi & Lingard, 2002) is taken up by G&E scholars much more often than curriculum or pedagogy.

(1) This first and most general stance is really the founding rationale for the whole set of contributions examined and for the G&E field as a whole; it overarches the four stances below. There are skeptics of globalization who have argued that shifts attributed to globalization are not as ‘new’ or ‘paradigmatically’ different than at earlier moments of history. Even where skeptics illustrate cogently earlier processes of globalization (Hirst & Thompson, 2003), the extent to which ‘globalization’ has entered into the social imaginary, and thereby has had material effects (including how ‘history’ is reinterpreted), is not lost on a number of these authors (Lingard, 2000; Rizvi, 2000).

(2) The tricky relationship between globalization as both a historical process and ideology is a major analytic thread as a great number of articles make reference to their close coupling and synergistic effects. While a number of educationalists stress the importance of differentiating the two, it seems much easier said than done. For example the basic assumption for Morrow and Torres (2000), in their contribution, is to “differentiate neoliberal globalization, as [the hegemonic] ideology, from the globalization of the economy, politics, and eventually culture as a historical and structural process” (p. 40). A number of scholars, both leftist (Burbules & Torres, 2000) and pro-capitalist (Stiglitz, 2002) point out that individuals and collectives at different levels can work against the narrowness of neoliberal ideology. But skeptics on the Left may be unwilling to accept the possibility of uncoupling globalization from the ideology that appears to function so seamlessly and synergistically.

If, as Warren Crichlow (personal communication, August, 2003) suggests, globalization is ultimately the changing conditions structuring and being structured by the “desires” of capitalism to reach out to new markets anywhere and everywhere to produce surplus value, then neoliberalism—given its alleged mandate to remove any obstacles from the “free” market, and to bring the free market logic into as many other areas of social life, including the constructing of citizens as human capital—seems the perfect ally. Stromquist (2002) alludes to neoliberalism’s operation as a kind of “iron-cage” in citing Bourdieu (1998):

Bourdieu defines neoliberalism (theories and practices) as a program capable of destroying any collective structure attempting to resist the logic of the “pure market.” He

explains that neoliberalism has acquired a powerful discourse, is extremely difficult to combat, and [it] presents a realism impossible to question because it represents the coordinated actions of all forces that hold prevailing positions. (p. 6)

The entangling of the material with the ideological is a dynamic that extends beyond globalization, but it clearly underlines the contentiousness of the globalization debates as a whole and under more critical perspectives in G&E (Burbules & Torres, 2000; Harrison & Kachur, 1999).

(3) Almost all of the contributors reject accounts depicting globalization processes as homogenizing the world towards one of sameness. These educationalists explicitly warn against a ‘homogenization’ thesis, stressing that the local mediates the global, often producing diverse outcomes across contexts. Consider two examples of how educationalists specifically articulate the relation between the ‘local’ and the ‘global’:

a. [Molly Lee, 2000 – Education in Malaysia]

In analyzing the impacts of globalization on education, one notices two concurrent but opposing streams: one is homogenization and the other is particularization. While we can identify certain global trends in educational reforms across nations, we should not assume that there is a total convergence of educational policies in all educational systems. In fact, the impact of globalization on policies as well as content and process of education should take into account the sociopolitical and economic context of each nation. What usually emerges is a hybrid of local variations in educational policy ideas that may have originated from various metropolitan centers. (p. 328)

b. [Rosa Nidia Buenfils, 2000 – Educational Policies in Mexico]

Global policies in education involving some uniformization of neoliberal criteria measures, values, and strategies are well known both in industrialized and poor countries. However, the way in which their implementation is produced in each particular site produces their resignification or reinterpretation. The encounter between the global policy and the specific conditions of each case brings to the fore the complex tension between universality and particularity when one conceptualizes globalization and produces an interpretation of its effects on education. (p. 289-290)

(4) Many educationalists were responsive to the critique made by the skeptics of globalization. Admittedly, globalization has historical antecedents. Nevertheless, most also recognize the expanding scope and intensity of global flows and connections beginning in the early 1970s and intensifying from the 1990s. Beyond Odora Hoppers (2000) who appears the most skeptical, many frame globalization as representing a new shift within larger historical trajectories. Relatedly, there was little ‘buy in’ to the hyper-globalist idea that globalization represented the imminent decline of the nation-state. A number of educationalists referred to the *changing role* of the nation-state given global transformations and increasing economic interdependency. Further, a number emphasized (Carnoy, 2000; Morrow & Torres, 2000; Odora Hoppers, 2000) that ‘developing’ countries, particularly those managing Structural Adjustment Programs, have much less autonomy to negotiate ‘global’ pressures than ‘developed’ countries.

(5) The dominant registers of G&E discourse have already been explicitly addressed. It may be trivial even to point out that *policy* seems more directly impacted by globalization than *curriculum*. Further, given that educationalists in policy are attuned to educational change and

the role of the state in setting policy, globalization will be understood as a very relevant phenomenon. For the single contribution in the Stromquist and Monkman (2000) book that did bring curriculum studies together with ‘globalization,’ it is worth noting how the connection was made. Noel Gough (2000) intersects a reconceptualist curriculum studies to the ‘transnational imaginary’ enlargening through globalization.⁷ He draws on Wilson and Dissanayake (1996) to describe the transnational imaginary as:

the *as-yet-unfigured* horizon of contemporary cultural production by which national spaces/identities of political allegiance and economic regulation are being undone and imagined communities of modernity are being reshaped at the macropolitical (global) and micropolitical (cultural) levels of everyday existence. (emphasis in original, cited in Gough, p. 78)

As curriculum and schooling are involved in processes of national subject-making and citizenship, clearly globalization, as propelling an expanded transnational imaginary, does have great implications at these levels. However there is much less writing on curriculum and pedagogy in G&E discourse in the first-wave.

A part of this disparity can be attributed to the first point above. Because globalization has often signified the economic dimension and neoliberal ideology, the effects of ‘globalization’ on curriculum and pedagogy, where made explicit, have been tied to negative impacts of neoliberal school reform as: the instrumentalization of learning, the erosion of equity advances, and the de-skilling of teachers (Harrison & Kachur, 1999; McNeil, 2000; Portelli & Solomon, 2001). In contrast, privileging the cultural dimensions of globalization, such as the expanding transnational imaginary gestured to above, would press educationalists (particularly curriculum theorists) to consider the registers of citizenship, (transnational) identity, and pedagogies of social difference.

Thus far I have given a snapshot of some of the background content and key stances taken by a first-wave of educationalists grappling with how the phenomena of globalization and its representation were impacting upon education and, to some extent, their educational fields. This snapshot is a significant portion of this paper, because the new developments fit upon a short time scale. Admittedly, a good number of the educationalists considered through the selection of my texts have a background in comparative education, policy studies, and critical education (Dolby & Rahman, 2008, p. 708). Nevertheless, my point was never to offer a comprehensive literature review. The point here is to draw upon a group of educationalists much involved in thinking (in) their educational fields through the prism of globalization. Having presented a ‘first-wave’ of G&E, this paper turns now to consider more recent developments in light of new writings and altered conditions.

Continuities and Shifts

[W]hether the notion of globalization ultimately helps or hinders our understanding of the contemporary human condition, and strategies to improve it, is now a matter of intense intellectual and public dispute. (Held & McGrew, 2000, p. 1)

⁷ This conceptualization resonates with the approaches of the internationalization of curriculum studies group (see Trueitt, 2000)

In light of a passing decade, how would we, as educationalists, assess this ‘dispute’ invoked by Held and McGrew? My sense is that globalization has taken an even greater hold in the academy and in wider publics. Indeed, in the third edition of their *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate* (2005), cited above, Held and McGrew continue to argue that globalization remains the dominant trope in the post-9/11 world. There seems no let-up to the intensification of cultural (digital and people), financial, and material (goods) flows and connections along particular legal and illegal routes.

Given the vast number of accounts that focus on neoliberal ideology and educational restructuring, it would be remiss not to explicitly mention the 2008 economic crisis and the ensuing decline in the legitimacy of neoliberal economic principles as deregulation. Noteworthy are the Occupy Wall Street protests emerging in 2011, highlighting the growing discontent of the increasing wealth of the top 1%. Despite a huge crack in the legitimacy of neoliberal economic policy, the complement of accountability, transparency, market efficiency, and neomanagerialism and its intrusion in multiple domains of the social remains alive and well; indeed, this complement is even drawn upon to critique deregulation and corruption. Directly related to education, is the realization, even by former proponents of school reform policies, that neoliberal testing and ‘choice’ reforms have had grave effects. A case in point is the critique presented by former ‘school choice’ advocate Dianne Ravitch in her recent book, subtitled *How Testing and Choice are Undermining Education* (2010). Nevertheless it is difficult to know if such interventions will disrupt the intensifying market rationalization of schooling. What may be revealed here is that neoliberalism as an ideology is an oversaturated category in need of disaggregation. From my reading, ‘performativity’ (Lyotard, 1984) is a deeper and longer running current that tends to be read as or conflated with ‘neoliberalism.’⁸

Stances of First-wave G&E Reconsidered

There is much continuity into the present with a few notable shifts that are discussed in relation to the five stances:

(1) Understanding how globalization has altered the educational landscape continues to be a prime concern for many educationalists across fields. It is evident that a G&E field has become more pronounced and that the concept of globalization has penetrated further into other areas of education. The shifting role of the nation-state and the resultant educational impacts remains a dominant focus, albeit there has been increased attention to how globalization has also troubled conceptual categories as ‘nation,’ ‘state,’ and ‘education’ as historically or spatially stable (Dale, 2007), as I discuss in the concluding section of the paper. Here, I will discuss Dolby and Rahman’s (2008) recent mapping of the growing field of international education to support the idea of G&E as an emergent trans-disciplinary field.

Dolby and Rahman (2008) include *globalization of education* as one distinct approach to research, amongst five others: comparative and international education, internationalization of

⁸ My use of the term *performativity* as a dominant organizing logic draws on Lyotard (1984, 47–53), among others (Ball 2004; Henry, Lingard, Rizvi, & Taylor, 2001). Performativity represents the heightened demand for measurable quantities and processes in an era marked by the ‘incredulity of metanarratives’ (Lyotard, 1984). Where there is no longer a unifying story in which members of a pluralistic societies can believe, the loss of trust generated in authority (whether the church, state, or truth) presses for performativity, “where knowledge ceases to be an end in itself” (50) and the use value of knowledge dominates over the search for truth or normative ends. Lyotard’s account is quite prescient of the sweeping reforms witnessed in education in the past 25 years that have largely fallen under the label *neoliberal* ... Neoliberalism, or the penetration of the market logics, may have more to do with the conditions of postmodernity that have laid bare efficiency, productivity and transparency of the social system. (Tarc, 2011, p. 112)

higher education, international schools, international research on teaching and teacher education, and internationalization of K-12 education. They consider the ‘globalization of education’ approach as the most recent, gaining momentum ‘within the past two decades as societal forces world-wide focused attention on the emergent global processes that have shifted the economic, political, and cultural organization of the world’ (p. 704). According to these authors, educationalists working in the area of ‘globalization of education’ come from separate scholarly communities but “are united in their strong linkages to the social sciences and humanities” (p. 704). In contrast to the other approaches, scholars in this emergent field draw heavily on research/scholarship generated outside of education.

Dolby and Rahman discuss four “research trajectories” characterizing the area of ‘globalization of education,’ namely: Black education in global perspective, anthropology and education, world models in education, and critical globalization studies (p. 704). Each of these trajectories are informed by theoretical framings rooted in the social sciences and humanities and some of these, such as ‘Black education in a global perspective,’ have roots that date back long before the most recent phase of economic globalization emerging in the 1970s. The particulars of these distinct research trajectories will not be engaged in this paper; however, I will make explicit that my own characterization of ‘globalization and education’ is mainly represented by the ‘critical globalization studies’ trajectory and also by a subset of comparative educationalists whom are characterized within the ‘comparative and international education’ area in Dolby and Rahman’s typology.

In a later section, Dolby and Rahman concede this overlap stating:

[A] subset of the critical globalization studies trajectory is embedded within the comparative and international education community, represented by Nelly Stromquist and Karen Monkman’s (2000) edited collection, *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation Across Cultures* (see also Stromquist, 2002). (p. 708)

More importantly for the broader purposes of my paper is to shed light on the (potential) uses of ‘globalization’ for educational research more broadly. And this aspect is not lost on Dolby and Rahman. Discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the ‘globalization of education’ approach they argue:

Although there is little dialogue among researchers working within this research approach, one of the potential strengths of this approach is its inherent—if latent—*ability to transform all of the other research approaches discussed in this article*. Because of its strong theoretical orientation and roots in the humanities and social sciences, the globalization and education research approach is much more likely than other research approaches to have a transformative impact on all of education. Although not heavily engaged with actual practice, globalization and education questions the theoretical underpinnings of the entire international education endeavor—albeit from varying positions. Thus, one of clear strengths of this research approach is the inroads it is beginning to make into multiple aspects of the six research approaches discussed in this article. (p. 708, emphasis added)

I would supplement here by adding that G&E’s impact goes well beyond the six approaches circumscribed by Dolby and Rahman’s mapping. Beyond educationalists more directly studying the (emerging discourses on the) impacts of globalization on education, a much wider group of

educationalists employ globalization as a term that marks the historical present. In so doing, globalization becomes a lens or a contextual background to historicize a wide variety of research questions, objects, and/or categories.

(2) & (5) The dominant focus on neoliberal economic globalization, transnational educational policy convergence, and school reform in G&E discourse remains. There is no shortage of papers discussing (and critiquing) ‘global’ educational re-structuring trends under neoliberal ideology. At one level, the neoliberal imaginary is alive and well despite cracks in neoliberal political economy; at another level, there may be inertial effects propelling this orientation in so-called critical educational scholarship. Most scholars agree that globalization has multiple dimensions and is a very complex phenomenon. Beyond comparative education, which has been most active in acknowledging the (potential) impacts of globalization on the field (Carnoy & Rhoten, 2002; Dale 2005; Stromquist & Monkman, 2000), an expanding number of educational subfields have engaged the concept to maintain relevance in a dynamic world, see for example: policy studies (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010), multicultural education (Banks, 2007), higher education (Stromquist, 2007) and international education (Tarc, 2009; 2011). However, with the growing uses and popularity of the term comes also its vulnerability as being ‘oversaturated’ and/or lacking precision.

Attending to transnational processes has also given greater prominence to educational activities taking place beyond state borders. For example, an area that is now beginning to capture the attention of academic researchers is the area of ‘international schools.’ Still limited in numbers and traditionally viewed as highly peripheral to state schooling, certain trends emanating from globalization processes have increased the salience of the phenomena of international schools and the International Baccalaureate (IB) as research objects. International education is also making an emergence in higher education as Canadian universities are ‘internationalizing’ to compete in global markets. Knight (1997) considers the internationalization of higher education as a subset or response to globalization, where globalization is the larger set of processes that produces pressure on universities to find new forms of funding in a context of diminishing governmental support. Entrepreneurialism, attracting international students, branding one’s profile as a top-tier research-intensive university—processes considered part of a (top-down) globalization—create the context in which internationalizing higher education is a strategic institutional set of choices and indeed a growing movement.

(3) The complex interconnections between the global and local continue to be emphasized by scholars in G&E. Since the publishing of Burawoy, Blum, George, Gill, and Thayer’s (2000) influential *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World*, many more ‘global ethnographies’ have emerged that work to illuminate the complex relations between external flows and local conditions (and vice versa—how the particular becomes globalized). In some ways the privileging of globalization from above and the tendency to reify the global as an immutable external force is moderated by the attention to local contexts—and locating the ‘global in the local.’ Further, the field becomes a place to test out, demystify, or educate theory; as Burawoy et al. argue, “ethnography’s concern with concrete, lived experience can sharpen the abstractions of globalization theories into more precise and meaningful conceptual tools” (p. xiv).

(4) One noticeable shift from first-wave G&E is that the debate over the ‘newness’ of globalization has definitely lost steam. Although globalization continues to be contentious, particularly in the tension between top-down vs. bottom-up forms, there seems much less interest in debating whether or not significant transformations have taken place, and much more attention

placed on attempting to figure out the specifics and implications of such changes. In this sense, as stated above, globalization continues to be a key marker for the historical present across the humanities and social sciences. And, as also stated, its uses in the educational landscape have expanded. However, with the widening uses of the term have come critiques questioning its explanatory power. Another noticeable shift from first-wave G&E is the attention to better delineate how globalization can be used as a more productive conceptual category. The importance of ethnographic work mentioned above is one key approach; in the last section of the paper I consider a few others.

Deploying ‘Globalization’ with Greater Nuance

Of equal importance to identifying new registers or terrain in G&E discourses is the attempt to respond to the more superficial deployment of the lens of globalization under the rising popularity of the term. This desire was certainly expressed in the first-wave of G&E. However, there now seems to be more focus on how the concept of globalization can be employed with greater specificity and nuance. For example, Roger Dale and Susan Robertson, in their capacity as the editors of the relatively new (2003) *Globalization, Societies and Education* journal, advocate against the trend for globalization to act as ‘the [underthought] answer’ to a whole set of ‘why’ questions about educational change. Rather, they encourage authors employing ‘globalization’ on education to “really look at which actors? ... which projects? ... which horizons of action? ... the relationships to education ... how is education itself understood? ... what are the changing emerging relationships?...” (Robertson & Dale, 2011). Similarly, some scholars have begun to select specific components or dynamics of ‘globalization’ that they deem as more manageable to examine, such as ‘transnationalism,’ ‘denationalization,’ or performativity.

Saskia Sassen (2006, 2010), for example, is quite explicit about her approach to theorizing ‘globalization.’ She (2010) speaks of the blinding effect of meta-terms like the ‘global’ and the ‘national’ that interfere with the capacity to actually ‘see’ what’s going on, recommending that we look at objects that can be more easily grasped in the ‘penumbra’ (the partly-lit region outside of the bright circle). In her ‘global assemblages’ text (2006), Sassen avoids the meta-term ‘globalization’ to consider the three more analyzable registers of authority, territory, and rights. And she historicizes their shifting dynamics and relations from medieval times to the present to illuminate how emergent ‘global’ assemblages are produced *endogenously*; Sassen exposes thus how the nation-state itself is as much involved in processes of de-nationalization as the usual suspects (influential transnational actors as the OECD). She advocates that we must ‘dig deeper,’ to be vigilant about new taken-for-granted, sloganized in phrases as ‘heightened mobility’ and ‘intensifying interdependencies.’ She emphasizes, for example, that with hyper-*mobility* comes increased *fixidity* along certain nodes (2009, p. 116).

Given the increasing popularity and wide-spread uses of the term, it does seem that educationalists will need to better demarcate specific components of globalization, where analyzing the phenomenon or employing the concept. Further, as implicit in Sassen’s approach, it remains critical to illuminate the specific dynamics of globalization’s effects to minimize its operation as a tautology or reification, as if globalization remains independent of the state or of human action. Again, this demand surfaced in the first-wave discussed, but sometimes remained and continues to remain more an espoused intention rather than a scholarly practice. In addition to the oversaturation of the term and the tendency to gloss rather than dig deeper into the dynamics of multi-scalar phenomena, the lens of globalization has pressed some scholars to

acknowledge the problem of methodological nationalism and other 'isms' that tend to treat categories as historically and spatially stable.

This acknowledgement of methodological nationalism was not lost on Jones (first-wave). He concludes his chapter in the Stromquist and Monkman (2000) compilation with:

it will be important to assess the democratic prospects of a globalizing world and to think afresh about education and its interactions with nationalism, statism, governmentalism, and internationalism. (p. 39)

Although Jones leaves this last sentence to be unpacked by the reader, he is clearly acknowledging the necessity of re-thinking each of the terms (nationalism, statism, etc.) under the changed conditions of the globalizing present. In the final section of this paper, I will turn to consider some educationalists who respond to Jones' appeal to renew existing educational research in light of globalization.

Dale and Robertson's (2007), *Beyond Methodological 'Isms' in Comparative Education in an Era of Globalisation*, is particularly relevant amongst a growing number of scholars who are challenging methodological nationalisms and other (parochial)isms (Appadurai, 2000; Dale, 2005; Kenway and Fahey, 2009; Lingard, 2006; Sassen, 2006). In parallel to the argument set forth in this paper, they write:

It is our argument that it has taken the impact of globalisation to expose the problems of the 'isms' in comparative education (and indeed education studies more widely). It is fundamentally the changes of the scale and the means of governance at and through which 'education' is carried out that has exposed the shortcomings of previous theorising. What seeing the core elements of comparative education as methodological 'isms' reveals is that it has rarely ever been the case that 'the state did it all' in the case of education, that educational activities and governance have ever been confined to the national scale and that 'education' has ever been a single straightforward, unproblematic conception. (n.p.)

To put it briefly; one consequence of globalisation for comparative education, and for social science more generally, is to make it clear that the nation-state should be regarded as *explanandum*, in need of explanation, rather than as *explanans*, part of an explanation. Or, to put it another way, the component parts of what is connoted by the nation-state, need to be 'unbundled', and their status and relationships examined anew in a globalised world, by comparative educationists as by other social scientists. (n.p.)

First, these authors acknowledge that processes of globalization have not only altered the landscape upon which theorists can apply their conceptual categories, but they have compelled scholars to question the adequacy and stability of the categories themselves. As Dale and Robertson note, the nation-state (among other key conceptual categories) should not be deployed as a fixed category to be used to explain, in this case, 'globalization.' Rather, the category nation-state needs to be scrutinized and re-thought given the recognition of the transformed conditions of a globalized world. They further emphasize that even the more taken for granted meta-category, 'education,' of comparative education needs to be rethought under the changed conditions of the present.

To do this re-thinking, as with Sassen (2006), Dale and Robertson advocate for ‘unbundling’—in this case of the meta-terms ‘nation,’ ‘state,’ and ‘education.’ They write: “[T]he component parts of what is connoted by the nation-state need to be ‘unbundled’, and their status and relationships [to education] examined anew in a globalised world” (n.p.). For example, to move beyond the limits of “methodological nation-statism,” Dale and Robertson propose a “pluri-scalar” model of educational governance constituted by the axes of (1) “scale of governance” (supranational, national, subnational), (2) “institutions of coordination” (state, market, community, household) and (3) governance activities (funding, ownership, provision, coordination) (n.p.). I have glossed one productive approach here; but, again, the point is to find and deploy methods such that the phenomena of examination is not overshadowed by the effects of too-fixed categories produced in, and attuned to, a past historical conjuncture.

With somewhat wider normative aspirations, Lingard (2006) draws on Appadurai’s conception of ‘epistemological diffidence’ to advocate for the ‘deparochialization’ of, or ‘strong internationalisation’ for, educational research. He writes:

Appadurai. . . writes about the needs for research to examine its own ‘taken for granted’, which include ‘systematicity, prior citational contexts, and specialised modes of inquiry’, replicability, along with ‘an imagined world of specialised professional readers and researchers’, and which taken together work to inhibit the deparochialisation of research, its theories and methodologies. The argument here is that a particular postcolonial politics is a useful starting point for a re-reading, re-examination, re-imagining, indeed deparochialising of re-search in the globalised context of American and western neo-colonialism, a reality often glossed over in talk about globalization. (p. 290)

Here, as Lingard notes, Appadurai is moving beyond the problem of static categories to consider the larger academic research enterprise and indeed how globalization, as top-down hegemonic discourse, presses for a Western-centered parochialism. However, as Lingard himself performs in his paper, ‘globalization’ also creates the conditions by which parochialisms come to light and can be challenged; with a ‘postcolonial politics’ and aspiration, researchers can contest and, at least rhetorically, move beyond the dominant and parochializing (and colonizing) uses of globalization.⁹ While realities are ‘often glossed . . . in talk over globalization,’ there is a growing understanding that the conceptual (and ethical) challenges that globalization invokes may also be framed as opportunities to make one’s work more connected and relevant, if less sutured to certain disciplinary expectations; with ‘epistemological diffidence’ we might risk more fully engaging the dynamic and complex conditions of the world as lived.

The purpose of this paper was to map out the expanding uses of ‘globalization’ on the (shifting) landscape of Educational Studies. By marking out and summarizing a ‘first-wave’ G&E and discussing more recent developments, I attempt to illustrate how the lens of ‘globalization’ has been deployed in educational scholarship. Ultimately, I have argued that ‘globalization’ has not only reconfigured the landscape of education and educational research, but has, at least for some scholars, laid bare the need to (1) ‘deparochialize’ research categories that have become too fixed under a nation-state-centered (or even the abstracted ‘global’)

⁹ Fazal Rizvi (2007) explicitly discusses the lack of cross-fertilization between globalization and postcolonialism in educational scholarship. He also argues, in alignment with Lingard (2007), that the postcolonial lens with its attention to historically-informed, situated analyses of “place, identity, difference, the nation, and modes of resistance” (p. 256) can ground ahistorical, abstracted, and reifying forms of globalization theory.

research imagination and (2) perform a certain ‘epistemological diffidence’ to prevent one’s ‘tried and true’ (disciplinary) methods and heuristic devices from interfering with the capacity to actually engage the phenomena of interest. Acting on these two insights is particularly challenging in working with graduate students who no doubt need somewhat stable narratives and constructs to hold onto as they enter into academic discourse communities. Nevertheless, I believe that the aim of making G&E and Educational Studies more authentically trans-disciplinary, epistemologically-open and relevant to the dynamic and complex conditions of the (post)modern moment is one worth striving for.

References

- Altbach, P. & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 290-305.
- Appadurai, A. (2000). Grassroots globalization and the research imagination. *Public Culture*, 12, 1-19.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Apple, M. W. (2000). Between neoliberalism and neoconservatism: Education and conservatism in a global context. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 57-77). New York: Routledge.
- Banks, J. (Ed.). (2007). *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*. Indianapolis: Jossey Bass.
- Blackmore, J. (2000). Globalization: A useful concept for feminists rethinking theory and strategies in education? In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 133-156). New York: Routledge.
- Buenfil, R. N. (2000). Globalization and educational policies in Mexico, 1988-1994: A meeting of the universal and the particular. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 275-298). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Burawoy, M., Blum, J., George, S., Gill, Z., & Thayer, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Global ethnography: Forces, connections, and imaginations in a postmodern world*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burbules, N. C., & Torres, C. A. (2000). Globalization and education: An introduction. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 1-26). New York: Routledge.
- Cammack, P. (2002). Neoliberalism, the World Bank, and the new politics of development. In U. Kothari & M. Minogue (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 157-178). New York: Palgrave.
- Carnoy, M. (2000). Globalization and educational reform. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 43-62). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Carnoy, M. (2002). Preface. In H. Daun (Ed.), *Educational restructuring in the context of globalization and national policy* (pp. i-xxiv). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Currie, J., & Subotzky, G. (2000). Alternative responses to globalization from European and South African. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 123-148). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Dale, R., & Robertson, S. (2007). *Beyond methodological 'isms' in Comparative Education in an era of globalisation*. Retrieved from <http://www.bris.ac.uk/education/people/academicStaff/edslr/publications/14ird/>

- Dale, R. (2005). Globalisation, knowledge economy and comparative education. *Comparative Education*, 41(2), 117–149.
- Dolby, N. & Rahman, A. (2008). Research in international education. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(3), 676-726.
- Gough, N. (2000). Globalization and curriculum inquiry: Locating, representing, and performing a transnational imaginary. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 77-98). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Harrison, T., & Kachur, J. L. (Eds.). (1999). *Contested classrooms: Education, globalization and democracy in Alberta*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta Press.
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. G. (Eds.). (2000). *The global transformations reader: An introduction to the globalization debate*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. G. (Eds.). (2005). *The global transformations reader: An introduction to the globalization debate* (3rd ed.). Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Henry, M., Lingard, B., Rizvi, F., & Taylor, S. (2001). *The OECD, globalisation, and education policy*. Amsterdam: Published for IAU Press Pergamon.
- Hickling-Hudson, A. (2000). Globalization and universities in the Commonwealth Caribbean. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 219-236). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (2003). The limits to economic globalization. In D. Held, D., & A. G. McGrew (Eds.). (2003). *The global transformations reader: An introduction to the globalization debate* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jones, P. (2000). Globalization and internationalism: Democratic prospects for world education. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 27-42). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kellner, D. (2000). Globalization and new social movements: Lessons for critical theory and pedagogy. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 299-322). New York: Routledge.
- Kenway, J. & Fahey, J. (Eds.) (2009). *Globalizing the research imagination*. New York: Routledge.
- Lee, M. (2000). The impacts of globalization on education in Malaysia. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 315-332). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lingard, B. (2000). It is and it isn't: Vernacular globalization, educational policy, and restructuring. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 79-108). New York: Routledge.
- Lingard, B. (2006). Globalisation, the research imagination and deparochialising the study of education. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, 4(2), 287-302.
- Lingard, B. & Rawolle, S. (2011). New scalar politics: Implications for education policy. *Comparative Education*, 47(7), 489-502.

- Luke, A., & Luke, C. (2000). A situated perspective on cultural globalization. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 275-298). New York: Routledge.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- McCarthy, C., & Dimitriadis, G. (2000). Globalizing pedagogies: Power, resentment, and the re-narration of difference. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 187-204). New York: Routledge.
- McNeil, L. M. (2000). *Contradictions of school reform: Educational costs of standardized testing*. New York: Routledge.
- Monkman, K., & Baird, M. (2002). Educational change in the context of globalization. *Comparative Education Review*, 46(4), 497-509.
- Morrow, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (2000). The state, globalization, and educational policy. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 27-56). New York: Routledge.
- Odora Hoppers, C. (2000). Globalization and the social construction of reality: Affirming or unmasking the "inevitable?" In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 99-119). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Parmenter, L. (2000). Internationalization in Japanese education: Current issues and future prospects. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 237-254). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (2000). Reform as the social administration of the child: Globalization of knowledge and power. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 157-186). New York: Routledge.
- Portelli, J. P., & Solomon, R. P. (Eds.). (2001). *The erosion of democracy in education: Critique to possibilities*. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises.
- Ravitch, D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rizvi, F. (2007). Postcolonialism and globalization in education. *Cultural Studies-Critical Methodologies*, 7(3), 256-263.
- Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B. (2002). Globalization and education: Complexities and contingencies. *Educational Theory*, 50(4), 419-426.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing Education Policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Robertson, S., & Dale, R. (2011). Interview [Recording]. Education Arena, Taylor and Francis Group. Retrieved from <http://www.educationarena.com/audio/interview23/Q2.mp3>
- Sassen, S. (2006). *Territory, authority, rights: From medieval to global assemblages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Sassen, S. (2009). Saskia Sassen: Digging in the shadows. In J. Kenway & J. Fahey (Eds.), *Globalizing the research imagination* (pp. 115-133). New York: Routledge.
- Soudien, C., & Corneilse, C. (2000). South African higher education in transition: Global discourses and national priorities. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 299-314). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Spring, J. (2008). Research on globalization and education. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(2), 330-363.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in universities environments. *Higher Education*, 53(1), 81-105.
- Stromquist, N. P. (2002). *Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Stromquist, N. P., & Monkman, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Tarc, P. (2011). How does 'global citizenship education' construct its present? The crisis of international education. In V. Andreotti & L. M. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education* (pp. 105-123). London: Routledge.
- Tarc, P. (2009). *Global dreams, enduring tensions: International Baccalaureate in a changing world*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Tarc, P. (2003). Working themes emerging in the field of 'globalization and education.' Unpublished manuscript.
- Trueit, D., Doll, W., Wang, H. & Pinar, W. F. (Eds.). (2003) *The internationalization of curriculum studies*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Walters, S. (2000). Globalization, adult education, and development. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 197-215). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Appendix A: Mapping the Selected Contributions

This list follows the description in the main body, with the Stromquist & Monkman edited volume considered most representative to the more eclectic single-authored Smith text. After the editors' introduction, authors are listed by the order of chapters in the edited books.

Stromquist Monkman (editors)	Broad survey defining globalization and assessing its implications on knowledge and education	<i>School reform</i> (privatization, decentralization) <i>Higher Education</i> <i>Gender</i> <i>Adult Learning</i>
Jones	Differentiating globalization and internationalism	<i>World Education</i> (for democracy and peace)
Carnoy	Impacts of globalization on educational (finance-driven) reform	<i>School reform</i> (funding, privatization, decentralization, science culture, educational measurement) Higher education (competitiveness in knowledge economy)
Rust	Delineating the radical (Right, market-driven) vs. defensive (Left, state reliance) in present reform	School Reform (private vs. public) <i>Comprehensive Schooling</i>
Gough	Globalization as a “transnational imaginary” destabilizing curriculum theory	<i>Curriculum</i> (global perspectives, internationalization of, global/local knowledge)
Hoppers	Uncovering the ideological effects of the discourse of globalization as it attempts to hide an-ongoing Imperialism by the West	<i>Colonial education</i> <i>Transnational Actors</i> Development paradigms Imposing educational policy on <i>African</i> countries (SAP)
Currie Subotzky	Alternative responses to educational trends in higher education in <i>Norway, France</i> and <i>South Africa</i>	<i>Higher education</i> (managerialism, entrepreneurialism, privatization, democratic governance, equity, community service partnerships, public good)
Raby	Globalization of the community college model—local/global tensions	<i>Community College Models</i> (U.S. dominance, flexibility, access to)
Kenway Kelly	Macro and micro look at globalization (post-traditional)—restructuring of labor market, family, schooling, and community and its effects on gender in <i>Australia</i>	<i>Vocational Education and Training</i> <i>Gender</i> Schooling Youth

Walters	Explores the shifting discursive terms framing adult education in the increasing dominance of competitive globalization (human capital theory) in <i>South Africa</i>	<i>Adult Education</i> <i>Development</i> <i>Lifelong Learning</i> <i>Education for Citizenship</i>
Hickling-Hudson	Current reforms and continuing problems in universities in the <i>Caribbean</i> and IT visions for future	<i>Universities</i> <i>Internationalization of Higher Education</i> <i>Distance Education</i> <i>Open Learning, Internet</i>
Parmenter	Differentiates between global(ization) and international(ization) of <i>Japanese</i> educational policy and curriculum	<i>Internationalization of Education</i>
Rideout, Jr.	Compares the de jure (policy) and de facto (practice) components of decentralization in four <i>Sub-Saharan African</i> countries.	<i>Educational Decentralization</i>
Buenfil	How global educational policy trends as advocated by the World Bank and adopted as Mexican policy become resignified by different constituencies in the educational	<i>Educational Policy</i> <i>Transnational Actors</i> <i>School Reform</i>
Soudien Corneilse	Illustrates how managerialist reforms were contested at the micro-level—University of Cape Town, <i>South Africa</i>	<i>Higher Education (accountability)</i>
Lee	Explores the impacts of global trends on national educational policy	National Educational Policy Religious/Moral Education
Burbules Torres (editors)	Presents broad survey of globalization (Economic restructuring, changing role of nation-state) and education—alongside critical issues, and dilemmas.	<i>Neoliberalism</i> <i>Third World (Fourth World)</i> <i>Critical Issues</i>
Apple	Analyzes the neoliberal and neoconservative dimensions of the Right turn and their educational implications in the <i>United States</i>	<i>School Reform</i> (marketization, choice, vouchers, “corporatization,” “back to the basics,” “standards”

Lingard	Educational restructuring (<i>Australia</i>) “is and it isn’t” a result of globalization because along with educational policy consensus is the “vernacular” globalization.	<i>Educational Restructuring</i> <i>Educational Policy</i> Supranational Actors (OECD)
Peters Marshall Fitzsimons	Draws upon the work of Foucault to suggest that new managerialism in education produces specific forms of governmentality	<i>Socialization</i> (“busnopower”)New Managerialism Governmentality
Blackmore	Explores how new formations and relationships (state, movements, markets, education) attributed to globalization are gendered.	<i>Feminism, Gender</i> <i>Educational Restructuring</i> (<i>Governance</i>) Education Markets Citizenship
Popkewitz	Popkewitz uses an historical approach to place reform within the problematic of (self-)governmentality	<i>Educational Reform</i> <i>Governmentality</i> Social Administration Citizenship
McCarthy Dimitriades	Globalizing pedagogies: power, resentment and the re-narration of difference.	<i>Multiculturalism</i> <i>Identity formation</i> <i>Race</i>
Rizvi	Explores cultural globalization with an ethnography of <i>Malaysian</i> international students in Australia	<i>International Education</i> <i>Identity formation</i> <i>Globalism</i>
Capella	Political power is modified by the supstate and the opening of the nation-state. Explores implications such as the weakening of the culture of citizenship.	<i>Citizenship</i>
Stoer Cortesao	Explores the European stage of multiculturalism in education, but what constitutes European?	<i>Multiculturalism</i> <i>Educational Policy</i>
Luke Luke	Takes a situated perspective in attempting to provide a non-Western orientation to “globalization” and their cross-cultural educational research project.	<i>Development</i> <i>Educational Policy</i>

<p>Kellner</p>	<p>Proposes a critical theory of globalization, to think how globalization from below can be used for democratization and highlights potentials of technology.</p>	<p><i>Critical Pedagogy</i> Technologies (for resistance)</p>
<p>Burbules</p>	<p>Theorizes “community” and then considers the internet as a meta-community and theorizes the kinds of communities possible.</p>	<p><i>Educational Community</i> <i>Internet</i> <i>Technology</i></p>
<p>Stromquist</p>	<p>Encompassing and well-researched text of the economic-technological-knowledge nexus</p>	<p><i>Educational Reform</i> (Marketization, Instrumental Education, choice, vouchers, privatization) <i>Communication Technologies</i> (Media) <i>Higher Education</i> <i>Gender</i></p>
<p>Henry Lingard Rizvi Taylor</p>	<p>Looks at the functioning of the OECD in its increasing role as a global actor in national educational policy setting <i>(Australia)</i></p>	<p><i>Educational Policy</i> <i>Supranational Actors (OECD)</i> <i>Educational Indicators</i> <i>Vocational Education and Training</i> <i>Higher Education</i></p>
<p>Harrison Kachur (Editors) Individual authors not included only the registers are listed.</p>	<p>Provides an overview of educational change, politics of restructuring in educational policy and practice in <i>Alberta</i> with a good number of contributors.</p>	<p><i>Public Education</i> <i>Political Rhetoric</i> <i>Higher Education</i> <i>Ideology</i> <i>School Reform</i> <i>Privatization</i> <i>Charter Schools</i> <i>Teacher Unions</i> <i>Part-time Work (flexibility)</i> <i>Leadership</i></p>
<p>Smith</p>	<p>Collection of essays that attempt to integrate emerging understanding of the conditions and effects of globalization, critique of modernism and economism and teaching and global responsibilities of all.</p>	<p>Commodification of Education Teaching Curriculum Postcolonial pedagogy Graduate studies</p>