

INTRODUCTION

Internationalism, Education and Governmentality: Critical Perspectives

Elizabeth M. Grierson and A.-Chr. (Tina) Engels-Schwarzpaul

Governance and Governmentality

The theme of this collection is *governance* and its dispersal across educational sites that are increasingly diverse and internationalised. The term, with its Latin source in *gubernare* 'to steer, rule', means 'the action or manner of governing'. One can govern oneself, and a governess (*gouvernante*) may be employed to help children learn how to wisely govern themselves, but we usually think of governance as a system of rules and practices that is designed to determine the conduct of a population, or, of meta-rules and institutions that provide procedures and roles to structure social action. The following essays are concerned with the manner of governing that underpins institutional policy and practice in education, particularly with regard to education as a globalised commodity of the knowledge economy. In examining specific situations of internationalism, export education, research performance, cultural equity and curriculum policy, the authors raise questions of modes of governance and how they affect educational operations and practices. The articles work through a range of critical perspectives on governance, often referring implicitly or explicitly to the Foucauldian notion of governmentality whereby relations of power produce particular effects on individuals through the institutional practices in question. This notion of governmentality follows the discussions on teacher education in the previous issue of *ACCESS* (2004) in which a normalised regime of truth underpinning the neoliberal agenda of educational policy and practice was seen as a 'will to certainty' (see Grierson and Mansfield, 2004: 1-9).

Unlike governance in many instances, governmentality does not appeal to juridical guarantees or sovereign power but is concerned with the relationship between the management of individuals and that of populations. Foucault (1980: 19) called governmentality the correlation, or contact, "between the technologies of domination of others and those of the self". It is not simply the quality of actions pertaining to government, as a grammatical reading of the noun may suggest. Lemke (2002: 2) points to the semantic link effected in the French term *gouvernementalité* between governing (*gouverner*) and modes of thought or mindsets (*mentalité*), which indicates an important connection between technologies of power and the modes of political rationality on which they rely. Rather than separating knowledge and power, the State and the individual, or politics and economy, governmentality links "forms of knowledge, strategies of power and technologies of self" and thereby "allows for a more comprehensive account of the current political and social transformations" (7). The concept affords to the analysis of neoliberal rationality an exposure of how it "functions as a 'politics of truth', producing new forms of knowledge, inventing new notions and concepts that contribute to the 'government' of new domains of regulation and intervention" (7).

In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1994), Foucault analysed regimes of power in the discursive regularities of practice. He explained: "the rules of formation operate not only in the mind or consciousness of individuals, but in discourse itself" (63). It is in discourses that regimes of truth are established in institutional practices via a set of rules or norms; and it is through such practices and their legitimisation that one is subjectified, becomes a 'subject' and thence 'governs' the self. This is particularly predominant in the disciplines of educational practice where discursive formations present the "articulation between a series of discursive events and other series of events, transformations, mutations, and processes" (74). And it is through these processes and their affects on the individual that governmentality operates.

Such processes and events characterise the 1980s and 1990s as decades of neoliberal educational ‘reform’ in Britain, Australia and New Zealand. In that period, political governance entrenched marketplace logic as the defining programme of institutional policy and practice. As scarce public resources were allocated according to economic rationality, education was inexorably drawn into a narrative about economic and social life in which benevolent market forces not only cultivate desirable individual attitudes and conduct but also provide a measure against excessive government controls. As the neoliberal agenda simultaneously resurrected modernity’s Enlightenment project of progress and individualised autonomy, it inscribed a ‘will to certainty’ as a Foucauldian regime of truth through state-controlled policies and practices. The reforms have left a lasting legacy on education as a public practice as they made appeal to the private choice of the individual consumer. Classical liberal education might have had at its philosophical base the ideals of the liberal state, where the individual is granted the conditions of democratic freedom and equality, but education under the aegis of the neoliberal state conflates the limits of ‘state reason’ with the limits of ‘marketplace reason’. Thus the exercise of self-limiting logic is handed over to the self-interested, autonomous individual of the marketplace who is then, it is presumed, granted the freedom to exercise his or her power of choice as a free-market subject.

However, freedom under a neoliberal regime of power can never be uncurbed, since it is exactly the free play of forces that continuously poses an internal threat to the functioning of liberal society. Freedom is therefore subjected to a calculus of security which, on the one hand, cultivates risk as an invigorating factor stimulating ‘healthy’ competition and, on the other, weighs up its benefits against its costs. Extended mechanisms of control and *dispositifs* of security are the flip-side of newly established liberties and an existential condition and central element of liberal politics, just as the permanent threat of social insecurity is a central element of individual experience (Lemke, 2004: 3; see also Olssen, Codd, and O’Neill, 2004: 30). Like governmentality, security was thus an important concept for Foucault. In his 1978 to 1979 lectures at the Collège de France about the history of governmentality, he identified the implementation of “security mechanisms” or “*dispositifs* of security” as typical of liberal forms of governments (see Lemke, 2004: 1). Foucault was interested in “how the state deals with unpredictable events, how it evaluates and calculates costs and consequences, and how it manages populations within constraints, rather than through the imposition of rule” (Olssen, Codd, and O’Neill, 2004: 25-6).

Dispositifs of security rely on a concept of norm that takes its beginning from social normalcy as defined by the statistics of frequencies or averages. This is different from that of the rule of law which relies on a pre-defined norm or an ideal model whose violation is set in binary opposition. The empirical norm, invoking statistics, is an average within a range of variations that is considered rational and economic (Lemke, 2004: 4). Management of populations then means not a separation between what is normal or abnormal, right or wrong, but a “multiplication and commodification of *dispositifs* of security” (8), which become increasingly independent of the monopoly of the State without, however, replacing centralised surveillance mechanisms. The concept of *dispositifs* of security criss-crosses differences between State and society, or politics and economy. Thus, privatisation in that context does not lead to a loss of regulatory or managerial competencies by the State. Rather, it represents a restructuring of governmental technologies (8).

When, as in Thatcher’s Britain, monetarist policies were introduced in New Zealand by the 1984 Labour Government, the market-driven agenda was discussed in terms of ‘structural adjustment’. It was soon led by the New Zealand Business Roundtable – revealing the fallacy of the liberal doctrine of the separation of politics and economy. Its members advocated that government proceed with free-market responsiveness, sales of State assets, and corporatisation of public services – all this leading, presumably, to greater energy and efficiency in the interests of the free-market subject. An imaginary autonomous chooser, the effective individual in control of his or her own life, was deemed to be responsive to the

country's economy and destiny. As in the liberalised British economy, where Thatcherism had for years advocated hard won self-sufficiency, the creation of new wealth was prized above any forms of social justice. Human subjects would, it was presumed, adopt and adapt to the new set of values in both their private and public lives. Education was singled out as one of the prime and most important sites for the promulgation of 'new' and 'reformative' values to effect political-economic-social change.

Michael Peters, Jim Marshall, John Codd, Mark Olssen, and Stephen Ball have all shown how the market works as a 'disciplinary system' and how it has served to restructure education from a 'public good' to a 'consumption good'. Thus education's meaning and purpose was reshaped when classical liberalism's 'individual autonomous chooser' was ideologically repositioned as the neoliberal 'market chooser' as part of a marketplace equilibrium. The aim of education was increasingly the production of knowledge, excellently managed and marketed within a newly created 'enterprise culture' to shape a better future for the market subject.

Global Economies and Governance

That pre-scripted 'better future' is wrought today by the politics of a global knowledge economy. It is also somewhat predetermined – through economic trade pacts and political alliances – by global governance. Jane Kelsey (1999) has investigated the impact of free trade policies and global agreements on the New Zealand economy and social terrain and provides ongoing critical commentary on trade negotiations in the South Pacific. For example, in a recent article in *The New Zealand Herald* she proposes that the power relations via trade imbalances operate as a form of neo-colonialism in the Pacific. Predicting "a huge loss of tariff revenues for the islands", Kelsey explains: "Bigger manufacturers are predicted to relocate to Australia and New Zealand and export tariff free to the islands" with the consequent effects of diminished markets for local farmers, the closure of small businesses, and increased unemployment. "Economic, social, and political instability is almost bound to intensify" she concludes (Kelsey, 2004: A11).

While twenty-first century proponents of globalisation herald promises of extending the benefits of marketplace logic from the centre to the periphery, to local spheres of production, communication, trade, tourism and other consumer pleasures and necessities, "[a] growing divide between the haves and the have-nots has left increasing numbers in the Third World in dire poverty, living on less than a dollar a day" (Stiglitz, 2002: 5). Globalisation and the supra-territorial exchange of capital has huge effects on the material conditions of local societies. Mark Olssen observes (2002: 75): "During the last several years neoliberalism has been adapted [...] under the mantle of the 'Third Way' which aims to retain the neoliberal concern in the economic sphere with efficiency while avoiding traditional policies of redistribution, and still defining freedom in terms of autonomy of action". Thus the liberal concepts of freedom and autonomy remain at the bedrock of Third Way politics and little has changed for new Labour politics in New Zealand since the 1984 deregulation of the marketplace.

Globalisation, with its worldwide flows of power, finance, trade, people, communication, education and ideas, has rendered terms such as *sovereignty* problematic by, for example, continually interrupting the state borders (see Aart Scholte: 2000: 132-158). In spite of the reduction of State sovereignty, and despite increased participation of nations in transnational and multinational arrangements of trade, the rhetoric of sovereignty remains as if it were still a watertight condition of regulatory practice. Notwithstanding any implications of supra-territorialism, sovereign statehood appears to be entrenched – albeit perhaps only in the regulatory practices of specific institutions of society, such as health and education providers, police, and social services. In education, for example, funding, curriculum and assessment, research performance and accountability systems, export education, bicultural policies and practices, equity agendas, and so on are at least indirectly still controlled by the State.

Internationalism and Educational Governance: NCEA and Tomlinson Report

The principles of globalisation have affected national sovereignty in that local, regional and supra-state governance all come into a play of power across thresholds of individual needs. The number of layers involved in any shift in public-sector governance is growing as new forms of authority exercise their regulatory powers in public and private spheres (Aart Scholte, 2000: 133).

Cultural and economic globalisation brings with it new market opportunities. Government policies in Britain, Australia and New Zealand have strategised the export of education to international markets, measuring success in terms of financial base-lines and gains to fiscal productivity of educational providers and, ultimately, the contribution to the GDP. These processes create very real challenges to adequately respond to a growing diversity within educational spheres of governance in curriculum, pedagogy and social provision. However, when 'knowledge' is framed in terms of a marketplace logic under the banner of the 'global knowledge economy', educational systems such as national curriculum will be implemented via a means-end approach to learning levels and outcomes, just as policies of export education follow the imperative of economic gain. Such highly instrumentalised and modernist programmes of thought and action are hardly likely to meet the different political and social needs of increasingly diverse student populations from a vast range of cultural backgrounds, belief systems, geographical and historical settings.

How instances of educational governance in New Zealand and Britain can have specific effects on knowledge practices may be observed in the way national assessments are determined and implemented. The assessment or examination is, in Foucault's words, "the educational ... code of conduct or performance ... [marking] a first stage in the 'formalization' of the individual within power relations" (in Rabinow, 1986: 201). In New Zealand, the 2000s saw the introduction of new standards of assessment arising from the policies of the 1990s. New Zealand's National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA), Taumata Mātauranga ā-Motu Kua Taea is a crucial aspect of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF), and now the main national qualification for secondary schools in their preparation of students for the workplace or further education. NCEA Level 1 was introduced in 2002 to replace the old School Certificate external examination; Level 2 replaced Sixth Form Certificate in 2003; and in 2004 Level 3 replaced University Bursaries. The provision of what is known as 'seamless education' from secondary through to tertiary is organised to operate as a credentialising system for the workplace, a system that best 'fits' the complex discourses of the global knowledge economy. As students engage in the "pathway" that NCEA provides "to tertiary education and workplace training" (NZQA, 2004a), they are assessed on their mastery of categorised skills and attributes, gaining credits at each of three levels, in years 11, 12 and 13.

At a global level, this form of assessment fits the escalating attention to thinking skills, new forms of communications technology, and transferability. However, although privileged in educational policy and marketing discourses, these assessment regimes remain contested. At a local level, the NCEA assessments were designed to better meet the needs of increasingly diverse, multicultural learners as school populations become more internationalised and diverse. However, their claim to success is assumed rather than tested. Heralded by some as "the most significant change in decades in the way the secondary education system works" (New Zealand Herald, 2004: G3), NCEA has been dogged by controversy since its inception. There have been accusations in the media of dubious methods to gain high pass rates and untrained teachers were reported to have supervised students in "achievement recovery" programmes with "soft subject options" which could have the effect of ensuring that the majority of students gain passes. The recent governmental review of the management and, more particularly, the Principal of New Zealand's Cambridge High School even suggested that there are less than transparent practices to ensure schools gain a high percentage of passes. NZQA (2004b) announced the instigation of "a visit [to Cambridge High School] in June following concerns of manipulation of NCEA assessment" and

the release of a report on Cambridge High School. This was followed by a formal review of the school and its management system in October 2004, and the subsequent resignation of the Principal. This particular event was much debated in the news media with emotive talk extending from issues of assessment to students' rights, parents' roles and expectations, to community, board and management responsibilities. It highlights the legislated authority for the reviewing bodies (NZQA and ERO) to act as over-arching governors for a national system of educational standards and accountability. It also reveals the levels of controversy between detractors and supporters of the new assessment system. Newspapers opened the discussions to issues of educational practice and purpose, school zoning, the politics of decile rating and their relation to the capital values of properties.¹ NCEA began to stand for local concerns about the way knowledge was being controlled via centralised, regulatory powers of government, to suit political agendas rather than individual learners' needs.

Questions of assessments, national standards and control are at the heart of liberal values of education, its practices and purposes, rights and responsibilities. They bring into play matters of freedom of choice and the sovereignty of political governance in the lives of individual learning subjects. Foucault (in Rabinow, 1986: 197) wrote: "The Examination combines the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of normalising judgement. It is a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify, and to punish". Such processes and events are shot through with relations of political power but are not always recognised as such by a non-discerning (or well-disciplined) public.

Mirroring these changes in the New Zealand educational landscape, Britain has recently released its Tomlinson Report (launched October 18, 2004), which proposes a new four-level diploma as a replacement of the British examination system of GCSEs and A-Levels. Claiming that information and communication technology (ICT) should be moved to the centre of the curriculum and that "young people should develop essential technology skills" (Samuels, 2004), the Tomlinson Report positions mathematics, literacy and communication, and ICT as complementary *core learning modules*. As in the New Zealand system, the emphasis here is on the development of "essential knowledge, skills and attributes" to "meet the demands of end-users, particularly employers" (Samuels, 2004), with emphasis on improvement of "key skills". Again there is a predominance of a means-end approach to education aiming to make the local learning subjects fit the global knowledge economies. Under "The Use of ICT in Qualifications", Tomlinson (2002) advocates that public funds be dedicated to the implementation of new ICT systems in the qualifications framework. In Section 145 of *The Inquiry into A Level Standards, Final Report*, Tomlinson reports (2002: 48):

Consideration of how to improve the reliability, efficiency and quality of the qualifications system inevitably raised questions about the potential impact of ICT. I have looked at the potential for ICT in three aspects of the system:

- (a) administration and data processing;
- (b) to improve the quality and efficiency of the marking processes;
- (c) as a medium for examining – i.e. ICT based examinations and assessment tasks.

It is significant that the "three aspects of the system" bring administrative and pedagogical efficiencies into such close proximity that they seem to have coalesced. This move opens a raft of critical questions regarding the privileging of a managerial proficiency model for pedagogical practice. For example, if ICT is promoted as the preferred means to steer and measure student learning, then what sort of learning will be privileged; what is predetermined; what is permitted in the terms of such governance? These are very crucial questions for education which also concern the role of the *Technology in the New Zealand Curriculum* (1995), its central positioning, and its claims for neutrality and inevitability (see A-M. O'Neill, 2004: 19-34; and J. O'Neill, 2004: 43-50). The reformist zeal of the Tomlinson

Report rings with familiar tones across the New Zealand educational landscape. In this setting, teachers and students alike are already propelled into, and seduced by, technologically inscribed, means-end knowledge-practices, even extending to a technologically determined world-view of 'being human' in global consumer culture. The Working Group on 14-19 Reform (2004) asserts: "the pace of change in the knowledge economy is leading to new demands being placed upon today's learners, and to compete successfully, learners need to develop knowledge, understanding and transferable skills". Considering the current of the knowledge economy and its clarion calls for transferable knowledge and applied skills, it may well be that, through political governance, knowledge policies set in concrete a technologised resource by which to re-script human subjects fit for a new form of 'public good' in an instrumentalised, global, civil society.

Critical Perspectives

To produce "transferable skills", newly rationalised and legislated models of curriculum and assessment define, measure and legitimate the quality and quantity of student learning. Such functional and operational modes of prescribing knowledge as an economic commodity equate with the logic of capital exchange in the global world of finance and informational networks. As Lyotard predicted in his seminal 1979 work *The Postmodern Condition*, the "mercantilization of knowledge" now marks our global world. By that, Lyotard (1984: 5) refers to the emphasis on the development of a particular scientific and technological knowledge, which has been escalating under the influences of cybernetics, informational communication, information storage, data banks, and so on (3-4; See also Grierson, 2003: 7; Grierson and Mansfield, 2003: 30). Government rhetoric of political reform both constructs and follows this global mode of recasting knowledge as an "informational commodity indispensable to productive power" (Lyotard, 1984: 5). Through critically analysing the language of this rhetoric in policy and its attendant modes of educational governance, as well as its discursive practices in education, it is possible to trace the attachment of knowledge to political value in national and global exchange.

Knowledge might be the process of connecting mind and world but according to which principles or beliefs are such connections made sense of and organised? Who or what dictates mores and procedures and what interests or beliefs do they assert? Where are these assertions formed, who holds authority, and upon what substances or structures do these forces impinge? (see Cherryholmes, 1988: 32). These are the sorts of questions that are posed when a *critical perspective* is brought to the field of institutional governance.

With the current emphasis on applied skill and technologies – extending even to the skills of 'thinking' itself – the function of critique or critical thinking has become problematic: "Critical thinking now stands for generic thinking skills based on logic where the political content has dropped away. Is critique still possible in this situation, and if so, on what basis?" (Peters, 2003: 11). There appears to be a problem at a deep cultural level when the emphasis on transferability takes away the capacity or space for critical evaluation and divests it of local particularities. Transferable knowledge or information communication does not necessarily equip a new generation with the capacity to critique, analyse and critically reflect on political and ideological 'norms' and mores; nor does it instil the evaluative attitude needed for political action in the interests of values such as equity and social justice.

The authors in this collection try to resist their own and their students' subjectification under neoliberal forms of governance. Marshall (2000) notes that Foucault, in his account of governmentality, stresses the "subject's refusal to be subjected". It is precisely through such refusal that the exercise of power becomes visible. Resistance upsets the hegemony of political consensus which – however unstable – consolidates the interest of élites by normalising their interests into a common sense culture. When people identify their own good with what is presented to them as the common good, technologies of

domination and technologies of the self intersect and constitute “people in such ways that they can be governed”, they are “both individualized and normalized” (Marshall, 1995). Governmentality is thus not brought about by a “totalizing deterministic or oppressive form of power” from above but in the management of relations between individuals and populations, subjects and the State.

The analysis of governmentality affords a useful critical perspective to examine concrete, yet often less visible governmental practices. It centrally examines historical processes and configurations and how they function in multiple directions to constitute individual and institutional identities as, for example, self-disciplining, fit, mobile, effective, self-interested and autonomous. By highlighting the “integral link between micro- and macro-political levels” and the “intimate relationship between ‘ideological’ and ‘political-economic’ agencies”, the analysis of governmentality helps “shed sharper light on the effects neo-liberal governmentality has in terms of (self-)regulation and domination” (Lemke, 2002: 13). Moreover, by reflecting on theory production itself in relation to its socio-historical and local conditions, this approach is able to render truth-effects problematic. “It thus becomes possible to account for the performative character of theorizing, that could be comprehended as a form of ‘truth politics’.” (14)

The discussion opens with Mark Jackson’s “Pedagogy’s Topographies of Power”, in which he provides an attentive account of the notion of governmentality in Foucault’s writing and its relationship to educational practices. The article follows Foucault’s articulation of three independent but related “exercises of power”: strategies, programmes and technologies of power. Jackson demonstrates how central elements of what we today recognise as exercises of power, as well as the rationalities they appeal to, have their beginnings in the eighteenth century and a long line of developments throughout the nineteenth and twentieth. The well being of populations, the social mobility of individuals, and the concern with national efficiency and economic growth – all these are themes of our current concerns. While social relationships were in many respects fundamentally differently structured in the nineteenth century, common themes with those of the global twenty-first century become apparent. Within a globalised setting, the State is less than ever before the site and origin of government and, as a problem of governmentality, its regulatory and managerial capacities are constantly restructured. Education, as an ensemble of practices concerned with populations and individuated bodies, is both independent from the State and implicated in its technologies and programmes. Export education has accelerated the displacement of individuated bodies from one geographical and institutional site to another. It has activated the practical and theoretical potentials of globalisation, bringing together but also confronting diverse interests and knowledges.

In this situation, a free play of forces has threatened to endanger the very enterprise of export education and called onto the stage *dispositifs* of security through which the capacities of the State are restructured across its relationships with independent providers.

Andrew Butcher, in “Quality Care? Export Education Policies in New Zealand from 1999 to 2002”, shows how the concept of quality – while also concerned with pastoral care for international students – has been instrumentalised by the Government. Even as it lets the market control the industry, and while it wishes to stay aloof and delegates operational responsibility to education providers, the Government uses accreditation requirements, funding allocations and auditing procedures as control mechanisms in order to protect an image of New Zealand that would safeguard it as a national asset to “retain and attract the *business* of international students”.

Butcher examines official documents to unravel patterns of discourse, their underlying assumptions and inherent contradictions. When key policy documents for tertiary education bypass international students, this highlights the tenuous relationship between education as a public good, on the one hand,

and the export education industry, on the other. If international students are ignored in the context of broader educational policy reforms, it would seem that the interest in them is mainly motivated by the economic benefits they can yield. However, even that appreciation is questionable: Quality control in export education comes late and the concept itself is, on closer inspection, only casually defined. It remains unclear how quality is recognised or measured and how, in all this, international students are involved, except when making complaints. Even then, the assumption that they will be able to exercise their rights as rational and fully informed subjects is unwarranted. They may be reluctant or unable to articulate their grievances. As Marshall (1995) reminds us:

If there is no need to consider the other, to converse and to consult, and to enter into dialogue, then the independent autonomous chooser is further cut off from a shared community form of life and more liable to be 'picked off' by the information systems, consumer products and media, through which individual choices increasingly come to be policed.

Fazal Rizvi, in "Globalisation and the Dilemmas of Australian Higher Education", discusses the complex relationship between globalisation and the emerging discourses of internationalisation in higher education. While this relationship has mostly been viewed in the literature in functionalist market terms, Rizvi emphasises the importance of locating this new discourse within the broader history of internationalisation in Australian higher education. Viewed historically, the market perspective – with its narrow interpretation of the internationalisation of Australian education as a successful export industry – is a contingent phenomenon. Rizvi argues that its very success has created numerous problems that may well threaten its continuing growth.

As in New Zealand, neoliberal market logic has led in Australia to an evaluation of quality in commercial rather than educational terms. More actively than in New Zealand, the Australian government created favourable conditions for its universities to exploit their relative advantage. The divergent levels of opportunity are, of course, the result of an historical development from colonial, to aid, and then to trade relationships with countries in Asia and the Pacific. Where New Zealand has to struggle for an attractive image in educational provision, Australia can thus rely on existing links with powerful élites in Asia, created partly through its participation in the Colombo Plan. The ideological and practical commitment of successive governments since the 1980s to an increasingly market-oriented approach, however, has over the years diminished the capacity of Australian universities to serve the broader needs of their students. Only a re-haul of their core educational and cultural values would enable these institutions to realise internationalisation's potential for developing intercultural understanding and exchange, Rizvi maintains. New patterns created by globalisation – of cross-border mobility and consumption; global interconnectivity between economic power, technology and knowledge; and new markers of social status and objects of desire – now drive the processes of internationalisation in education. In order for Australian policy makers to come to grips with this confusing conceptual terrain and to resolve some of the resultant dilemmas, they need to recover their academic traditions and a sense of responsibility to students as well as to the global public good.

Craig Ashcroft and Karen Nairn describe and analyse New Zealand educational policy makers' quite different approach to responsibility and academic traditions. In "Critiquing the Tertiary Education Commission's Role in New Zealand's Tertiary Education System: Policy, practice and panopticism", they explore the implications of a 'managerial panopticism' that they see put in place as an instrument of surveillance by the 1999 Labour/Alliance Coalition Government's reforms and the 2003 investiture of the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC). The sheer multitude of evaluative and measuring events introduced by the reforms, often without directly attributable consequences, in which individual academics constantly participate as part of their day-to-day duties, effectively obscures the perception of who is doing the surveillance and when. These constantly operating technologies of monitoring and

review (of performance, outputs, and effectiveness) carried out by self, peers, students or departmental committees produce the illusion of an eternal, anonymous surveilling gaze that is characteristic of Bentham's design of the panopticon. Another illusion is simultaneously produced: Active participation in managerial panopticism, and the promise of rewards for compliance, create the illusion of individual freedom and a sense of opportunity. Ashcroft and Nairn argue that managerial panopticism is in fact coercive by producing docile minds and bodies. The endless inspection of their work and behaviour leads academics to pre-emptively monitor their own activities for compliance with the many and diverse performance criteria attached to their positions. If those criteria are increasingly related to the interests of external stakeholders like 'the business community' or government objectives, when investment flow is monitored and set off against expenditure, this will have an impact on what academics perceive to be quality education and research.

Given these pressures, those academics who want to secure a well paid job and retain access to a rewarding career are less likely to oppose the principles or put up resistance to the processes of neoliberal reforms. Their lack of refusal to be subjectified would then, according to Foucault, contribute to the invisibility of the exercise of power. This process raises serious questions about academics' role as "critics and conscience of society" legislated by the Education Act (1989). With their voices depoliticised – by their own invisible identification with the reforms or by visible external pressure – academics are, so Ashcroft and Nairn argue, likely to demonstrate 'voluntary compliance' with the very system that keeps them under surveillance.

Jill Smith's contribution is another instance where the resistance to dominant policy framework renders specific aspects of the exercise of power visible. Smith, in "Cultural Equity in Policy and Pedagogy: An issue for visual arts education in Aotearoa New Zealand", looks at the visual arts in *The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2000) as she proposes that curriculum policy must do more than pay lip service to cultural equity if the conditions of democracy are to be met. She claims that curriculum practices in visual arts can too easily perpetuate a monocultural way of thinking which disempowers the minority cultures in New Zealand schools. Building on work done in New Zealand by Grierson and Mansfield (2003), Smith argues that if art educators are to enable students to understand and explore the way cultures operate, they must examine the values, beliefs and attitudes that they are advancing and reinforcing through the implementation of the curriculum.

Rather than addressing culturally relevant issues, diversity and difference, the 1993 *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* is oriented towards an enterprise model with economic efficiency as its prime goal. The fact that successful students under the national curriculum are primarily non-Māori and non-Pasifika highlights that previous policies purporting to further tolerance and understanding have failed to assuage inequities. Since 1992 this has been compounded by the Government's de-emphasising of equity issues through which education was to be freed from the burden of welfare and bureaucracy and rendered productive.

Smith argues that a culturally diverse country like New Zealand has no option but engage with multicultural perspectives if it is to sustain its pluralistic democratic values – diversity is a fact. Visual arts could contribute to multi-perspectival scenarios in which potentials for social practice can be symbolically anticipated and tested. Instead, the engagement with cultural diversity in the visual arts discipline in the curriculum is slight and appears at times tokenistic. What remains in place is a thoroughly modernist paradigm, with all its established Western fine arts canons, hierarchies, aesthetic practices and categories – an utterly limited frame of reference for understanding the art of diverse cultures. A voyeuristic confrontation with art works of other cultures, outside of their context of practice and theory, must be replaced by an approach in which cultural identity is critically assessed and in which

critical abilities that facilitate cultural agency are developed. This is only possible if art is reconnected with life and connections are made with its cultural setting. Smith exhorts academics and policy makers to leave the seemingly safe terrain of the current curriculum and to displace its prevailing monocultural view. An emphasis on democratic responsibility is apt to not only explore cultural difference, but to recognise and embrace it.

The discussions in this collection focus on a number of educational fields and events that promote the regulatory conditions of practice through which power-knowledge operates. It is the modern forms of governance, as understood through the writings of Foucault, that present their orders of governmentality through institutional policies and practices, and it is here that the writers in this collection have found their focus. Modern power as a form of political domination is seen to take many forms through educational policy and practice, and to underpin and shape internationalisation, export education, research, and curriculum. As the discursive events of each of these fields unfold they bring the power relations into play in many ways: by suggestion, consent, compliance, force, surveillance, appraisal, responsibility, advantage, punishment and reward.

Globalisation brings with it another range of dispositions that work across previously demarcated borders and categories, and in this context a whole series of educational changes are being implemented that impact upon the individual. Brought about in the name of the 'free' subject of a globalised world, their effects can be seen in academics' on-the-ground practices, raising questions of what to teach and how to teach it; how to assess and credentialise; how and what to research; and how to serve the needs of all cultures and conditions in a single set of policies and strategies whose primary focus is on economic rationality. The effects are also evident in the organisation and techniques of management where the figure of control exerts its full logic. From all of this, the academic is increasingly subjected to a range of disciplinary practices and systems of rationality that appeals to the needs of efficiency and enterprise while overshadowing pressing concerns of social justice and equity. When Stephen Ball wrote of the moral technology of management in education (1993: 153-166) he was both observing the present conditions of the 1990s and predicting the governmentality of the decade to come. Such a technology is still in place and is too often overlooked by academics as they get caught in, and framed by, the very conditions of practice that the technology aims to achieve.

References

- Aart Scholte, J. (2000). *Globalization: A critical introduction*. Hampshire: Macmillan Press.
- Ball, S. J. (1992). Management as moral technology. In S. J. Ball (Ed.), *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and knowledge* (pp. 153-166). London: Routledge.
- Education Act 1989. *Reprinted Statutes of New Zealand*. Vol. 34 (1996). Wellington: New Zealand Government.
- Foucault, M. (1994). *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (A. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). London: Tavistock Publications. [French 1963].
- Grierson, E. M. (2003). Globalisation, Cultural Nation & Truth Claims. Unpublished paper presented at *Between Empires: Communication, Globalisation & Identity*, the Centre for Communication Research Conference, Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand, 13-15 February, 2003.
- Grierson, E. M. & Mansfield, J. E. (2003). Editorial: Contextualising the Curriculum. In *The Arts in Education: Critical Perspectives from Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 27-46). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Kelsey, J. (1999). *Reclaiming the Future: New Zealand and the Global Economy*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Kelsey, J. (2004). Pacific economies suffer from too-hard bargains. *The New Zealand Herald*, Friday, December 31, A11.
- Lemke, T. (2002). *Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique*. Retrieved January 21, 2005, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.thomaslemkeweb.de/engl.%20texteFoucault,%20Governmentality,%20and%20Critique%20IV.pdf>
- Lemke, T. (2004). *Eine Kultur der Gefahr. Dispositive der Unsicherheit im Neoliberalismus (A Culture of Risk. Dispositifs of Insecurity in Neo-Liberalism)*. Retrieved January 21, 2005, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.thomaslemkeweb.de/publikationen/EineKulturderGefahr.pdf>

- Marshall, James D. (2000). "Thomas Hobbes. Education and Governmentality" Encyclopedia of Philosophy of Education, 01/02/2000. Retrieved January 21, 2005, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.vusst.hr/ENCYCLOPAEDIA/hobbes.htm>
- Marshall, James D. (1995). "Foucault and Neo-Liberalism: Biopower and Busno-Power", *Philosophy of Education*. Philosophy of Education Society. Retrieved September 21, 2001, from the World Wide Web: http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/95_docs/marshall.html
- New Zealand Herald* (September 22, 2004). In the Zone, Secondary Schools. Newspaper Supplement, G3.
- New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) (2004a). About NCEA: the National Qualifications Framework in Schools. Retrieved October 23, 2004, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/ncea/about/index.html>
- New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) (2004b). NZQA Releases Cambridge High School Report, 23 August 2004. Retrieved October 24, 2004, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/news/releases/cambridge-report.html>
- Olsen, M., Codd, J., & O'Neill, A.-M. (2004). *Education Policy. Globalization, Citizenship & Democracy*. London: Sage Publications.
- Rabinow, P. (Ed.) (1986). *The Foucault Reader*. London: Penguin Books.
- Stiglitz, J. (2002). *Globalization and its Discontents*. London: Penguin Books.
- Samuels, M. (2004). "ICT at the core of UK education" (18 Oct 2004). *Computing*. Retrieved January 21, 2005, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.vnunet.com/news/1158819>
- The Working Group on 14-19 Reform (2004). *Higher Education*. Retrieved October 23, 2004, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.14-19reform.gov.uk/education/index.cfm>
- Tomlinson, M. (2002). *Inquiry into A Level Standards. Final Report*, Department for Education and Skills. December 2002, released October 2004. Retrieved October 23, 2004, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/alevelsinquiry/docs/Tomlinson%20Final%20%20Report.doc>
- Tomlinson, M. (2004). ICT at the core of UK education. News report. Retrieved October 19, 2004, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.vnunet.com/news/1158819>

Note

- 1 See, for example, *New Zealand Herald*, 2004: G3.