ESRC Research Project on *Education and Youth Transitions in England, Wales and Scotland, 1984-2002*

PRESSURES FOR CONVERGENCE AND DIVERGENCE IN EDUCATION: DEVOLUTION IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALISATION

Jenny Ozga
Centre for Educational Sociology, University of Edinburgh

Paper prepared for the *Scottish Educational Research Association Annual Conference,*
Perth, 27-29 November 2003

INTRODUCTION: CONVERGENCE AND DIVERGENCE

This paper is a companion piece to David Raffe's '*How different is Scottish education? How do we measure convergence and divergence?*' and derives from the same ESRC research project on Education and Youth Transitions in England, Scotland and Wales for which Linda Croxford is Principal Investigator. The paper responds to one of the central puzzles of that project in seeking to explain change in education. The project takes the position that since the 1980s, 1990s and continuing today there have been changes in young people's experiences of schooling, their outcomes, levels of participation in the labour market, and in further and higher education. To some extent these changes reflect the transition from 'economic nationalism' to the 'new consensus' on education's centrality in post-industrial societies (Brown, Halsey, Lauder and Wells 1997) and consequent policy convergence that tightens the bond between education and the economy. That transition has been experienced throughout GB and mediated by the UK government. At the same time, it is necessary to take account of the fact that England, Wales and Scotland have different, though interdependent, education systems for which there has been progressive devolution of responsibility during the last two decades (Raffe *et al* 1999). Ideologies, priorities and policy implementation have differed and continue to differ and there are may be signs that the systems are tending towards increased divergence in some policy areas.

The overall context of the project is set by the economic, cultural and social transformation of post-industrial society (Brown *et al* 1997). In the period since 1984, which is the focus of the research, changes in societal context include changes in the global economy and related changes in the structure of the labour market, that in turn have influenced family structures and gender identities (Arnot *et al* 1999). These changes seem to be connected to considerable education policy convergence (Whitty *et al* 1998) as policy agendas are developed in pursuit of modernisation and to meet the challenge of globalisation. The UK government defines these agendas in relation to competitiveness and the discourse of the market (Flynn 2000,

Newman 2000), but they may be received and inflected rather differently in England, Scotland and Wales (Ozga and Lawn 1999b). Thus, as Castells (1998) suggests, the logic of global economic change may be questioned or modified by forces that call upon and reconstitute ethnic, national and local identities.

It will already be apparent that I am approaching both the general issue of convergence and divergence and the specific issue of Scottish 'difference' in a particular way. I have not reviewed objectively the different approaches to the analysis of education and training systems, as David has in his wide-ranging companion paper. Instead I am taking the opportunity to develop here some long-standing preoccupations with explanations of education policy with which I take policy sociology to be concerned (Ozga 1987, 1995). The main points of my argument are as follows: (1) the need to locate change in education within a broad framework of enquiry, that takes account of exogenous, macro-social change (2) the need to draw on resources from across the social sciences that enable understanding of that change (3) the need for reflexivity in research that enables identification of the assumptions about the source, scope and pattern of education policy that are implicit in research on education (Dale 1986, Ozga 1987, 2000).

In pursuing these preoccupations, I hope to make a contribution to the constructive conversations within the Education and Youth Transitions project team and its advisory group and in particular to exploit the opportunity that the 'case' of devolution offers as a vehicle for exploration of contrasting theoretical approaches to change. The internal UK comparisons in the project enable exploration of the capacity of 'local' systems to mediate global pressures, and thus enable development of the concepts of 'travelling' and 'embedded' policy (Alexiadou and Jones 2000). These terms express the idea that while global change promotes homogeneity of education policy, it simultaneously reconstitutes local, national and ethnic identities that resist convergence. It is these ideas, and the resources that they offer for understanding pressures for convergence and divergence, that I shall focus on in this paper.

GLOBALISATION

Before focusing down on changing governance within the UK, we need to very briefly establish the wider context of our discussion. Globalisation: defined briefly as: 'the increasing interconnection between economic and social life' resulting from the particular interaction between technological innovation and the development of capitalism (Grey 2000:32-3) frames this discussion. It is acknowledged as offering a significant challenge to the nation-state's capacity to design and support previously established patterns of welfare provision, including, for example, national education system's key roles of socialising people and allocating labour market positions. The nation state faces stresses that arise from the need to compete globally to ensure a share in the rapid accumulation and transfer of wealth; from the deepening of inequalities and from the growth of insecurity and uncertainty. There is, as Castells puts it, change in the macro-social and macro-political contexts that shape social action and human experience around the world (Castells 1998:2).

From this general statement I draw two conclusions about education policy:

1. that at international level there has emerged a coherent set of policy themes and processes through which policy makers (at national, international and trans-national levels) are reshaping education systems;
2. that these policy agendas and processes interact with traditions, ideologies, institutions and politics that have developed on national terrains

Furthermore, as Alexiadou and Jones (2001) argue, the relationship between points (1) and (2) indicates growing embeddedness of 'travelling policy' within national policy elites, and differing degrees of local 'policy inflection' in which various forces (local policy communities, trade unions, social movements) have forced adaptation of global agendas, or in which local policy elites have integrated travelling policy with national agendas.

(Alexiadou and Jones 2001:2)

There is, of course, a good deal of debate about how the conduits of travelling policy operate and a need for further enquiry into exactly how the design and delivery of national policy agendas responds to pressure from supra-national organisations and agencies (Lingard 2000). I want to stress that I am seeking to contribute discussion of these issues, and that I adopt a perspective on convergence/divergence that is located within that 'travelling/embedded' view of globalisation and education policy. Put simply, invocation of globalisation means for me that there is acknowledgment of rapid social, political and economic change while recognising the importance of context (Held et al 1997). As Giddens puts it in his well-known definition:

> *'Globalisation can thus be defined as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice-versa. This is a dialectical process because such local happenings may move in an obverse direction from the very distanciated relations that shape them.* Local transformation *is as much a part of gloablisation as the lateral extension of social connections across time and space.'*
>
> (Giddens 1990:64 emphasis in original)

From this perspective, as Appadurai argues, it is possible to identify 'vernacular globalisation' in which there is change and reconfiguration in global, national and local interrelationships but mediated by local and national history and politics (Appadurai 1996). Old notions of 'centre' and 'periphery' are collapsed in communities that are overlapping, complex and disjunctive. Disorganised capitalism creates fundamental disjunctures between the economy, culture and politics (Appadurai 1990). Globalisation produces rebalancing of national and global functions; in Sassen's words:

> *Globalisation is partly endogenous to the national and is in this regard produced through a dynamic of denationalising what has been constructed as the national. And it is partly embedded in the national … and in this regard requires that the state regulate specific aspects of its role in the national'*
>
> (Sassen 2002: 177)

Jones and Alexiadou's (2001) discussion of '*travelling'* and '*embedded*' policy takes travelling policy to refer to supra and trans-national agency activity, as well as to common agendas (for example for the reshaping of educational purposes to develop human capital for the information age). Embedded policy is to be found in 'local' spaces, (which may be

national, regional or local) where global policy agendas come up against existing priorities and practices. This perspective allows for recognition that, while policy choices may be narrowing, national and local assumptions and practices remain significant and mediate or translate global policy in distinctive ways. Within the framework of policy sociology, there is an emergent strand of theorising and investigation that seeks to respond to the problem of interpreting the translation of globalisation into policy. Such work includes Taylor et al (1997) who discuss global policy transfer; Ball's characterisation of a 'small' world with 'big' policies (1998), and Lewin's argument that globalisation has produced 'an epidemic' of education policy (1998). There is work to be done that pays attention to the mechanisms of policy, in particular to detecting and conceptualising their operations at national, transnational and institutional level (Dale 1998). I shall now discuss the EGSIE project, which included comparisons of policy in Scotland and England.

CONVERGENCE THROUGH CHANGING EDUCATION GOVERNANCE: SOME EVIDENCE FROM EUROPE

The EGSIE study investigated different national and local contexts in order to capture changes in education governance that were associated with neo-liberal design principles. We looked at structural and relational changes associated with deregulation, devolution and decentralisation, along with marketisation. The national and local contexts included Australia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the UK (England and Scotland). The project lasted from 1999 and 2002, and provides evidence of changes in the institutional steering or governing of school systems. There are significant patterns of change in the control and use of resources, in the use of legislation as a form of regulation and in the decentralisation and devolution of school organisation accompanied by new management practices of centralization. These changes in fiscal regulation, in legislation and in the loci of decision making within the school system are claimed by policy-makers to provide more democratic and accountable schools through improving the quality of education. In each of the countries in the EGSIE study, with some variations, fiscal management was transferred to local districts, with consequent changes in the school as a workplace, in curriculum content and in professional relations, contract management and teacher evaluation. Devolution is visible in the gradual transfer of resource allocation to the regional level and in the introduction of state steering mechanisms especially intensified student and teacher evaluation.

These changes support other studies that identify convergence through decentralisation, devolution and deregulation as key principles of restructuring of education. As Whitty, Halpin and Power (1998) observe, the process of restructuring has been marked by shared design principles of devolved systems that possess institutional autonomy and some form of school-based management. In some cases these changes are accompanied by enhanced parental choice of school, and by greater competition between schools. These changes reflect the dominance of neo-liberal design principles, so that decentralisation and devolution are pursued with the aim of enabling the market to operate more effectively. There are many issues that arise from this but here I want to focus on the significance of shifts in the work of the state and in the state-market-civil society relationship. It is possible to interpret these patterns of change as evidence that the mode of regulation has shifted from rule-governed

forms dependent on normative prescription through a centralised legal framework to output or goal governed steering through monitoring of targets. In other words, we see evidence of Neave's evaluative state, operating not through *a priori* evaluation, but through *a posteriori* evaluation (Neave 1988:9). By this means, argues Neave, the evaluative state achieves powerful steerage of individual institutions through:

> *'a rationalisation and wholesale redistribution of functions between centre and periphery such that the centre maintains overall strategic control through fewer, but more precise, policy levers'*
>
> (Neave 1988: 12)

In this redistribution much of what used to be the preserve of the state is distributed or decentralised to a range of actors and agencies, including, in some cases, private companies. Whatever the specific case, mapping the patterns of governance of education requires attention to a wide range of possible organisations and relationships, which may operate at national and international levels, and through state and non-state institutions and processes. However the state remains central, as Dale points out:

> *'It is crucial to note that the state does not 'go away' in this process…Its continuing role as overwhelmingly the major funder and regulator of education enables it to remain very much in the driving seat. True, the nature of the work it does has changed, very broadly speaking, from carrying out most of the work of the co-ordination of education itself to determining where the work will be done and by whom. This devolution and detachment demonstrate strength rather than weakness (albeit over a policy terrain considerably reduced by the state's changing relationships to the global economy).*
>
> (Dale 1997: 274)

In exploring the state-market-civil society nexus it is interesting to remember that one of the ostensible purposes of decentralization and devolution in education is to increase citizen involvement and sustain the development of civil society. Here an interpretation of participation is offered in which it operates as a governing strategy that seeks to produce personal feelings of efficacy and increasing loyalty in a period of change and difficulty. In making an assessment of the meaning and impact of devolution and deregulation, then, there is a combination of insights that derive from attention to new forms of regulation and from new governance practices. This requires attention to strategies of governance that involve reorganisation of the regulation systems of education through 'governing at a distance' (Kivinen and Rinne 1991); to the role of managerialism in governing through evaluation and to the new systems of governance that are being produced by new sets of social and economic relations and discursive formations in which governance practices are constructed (Popkewitz 1996). Some of these are the subject of the next section.

PRESSURES FOR DIVERGENCE WITHIN THE UK: MODERNISATION AND MANAGERIALISM

I started from the premise that Devolution accentuates differentiation in education policy between Scotland and England and so creates problems of co-ordination between the two systems within the UK. Those problems, I suggest, may be exacerbated by the current UK

government's commitment to modernisation of education, and the managerialist modes through which that end is to be achieved. Modernisation in education policy has tied education very firmly to the economy (DfEE 1997) and may consequently underplay its role in social and cultural formation. Furthermore modernisation in governance involves a shift towards what Perri 6 (1998) has described as 'implied consent' by the public to government's problem-solving initiatives (see also Cabinet office 1999, DfEE 1999). This in turn removes 'old politics' from the framework of system design. The modernisation project is ambitious, it goes beyond system redesign to embrace a re-imagining of politics (Ozga 2003), linked to the decline of representational politics and their replacement by what Castells (1998) calls 'informational' politics. This re-imagining includes the development of forms of governance that encourage citizens' self-reliance and self-management, and that persuade people to change the way they behave:

> *'This means forging new systems of co-operation, innovation and learning in every sector. Democracy in practice must mean the chance to shape our own lives, through systems which allow us to meet collective goals in a more diverse, fluid and individualised society'*
>
> (Bentley 2001: 1)

The UK modernisation project has certain key elements: the mirroring of an idealised version of business; the creation of networks through which government and business may promote cultural change, and the fostering of responsible self-government. In all of these spheres education is important; and education policy is at the forefront in the encouragement of private sector involvement in what was public sector activity. Education is the favoured site for the development of self-regulation and responsibility. Modernisation requires the development of responsive, integrated management of policy (through strong inter-departmental, task-focussed work supported by new communications technologies) as well as active, engaged, responsible citizens. State redesign and modernisation at community level are promoted through multi-agency approaches, collaboration and co-operation.

Managerialism carries the modernisation agenda forward through its reinforcement of policy-making as technical and pragmatic, driven by a calculus of economy and efficiency (Clarke, Gewirtz and McLaughlin 2000). Thus modernisation and managerialism operate in a landscape that is, effectively, globalised (Fergusson, 2000). Policy networks feature in this landscape as preferred foci for policy steering (Kickert et al 1997). In education policy-making they promote integration ('joined up policy making') and seek to involve new partners (Jones 2000, DfEE 1998).

A question that relates to our concern with convergence, divergence and difference is this: how do new policy networks, with their orientation towards modernised, task oriented and problem-solving forms of policy making encounter and relate to existing policy formations?

Assumptive Worlds, Collective Narratives and Institutional Contexts

These new forms of governance must map against, overlap or conflict with what existing policy patterns and processes: the 'assumptive worlds' and institutional contexts of policy makers in education in England and Scotland. In England, educational administration post-1944 was sustained by deep assumptions about culture, ability and difference, and was practiced by an elite shaped by these assumptions (Ozga and Gewirtz 1990). More recent

work (Jones 1998, 2003) suggests that the current modernisation project in England is no less mythically informed. In Scotland, the assumptive worlds of policy makers, and the shaping myths on which they drew, pointed to a policy community (McPherson and Raab 1988) rather than a policy elite.

This theme was explored in the EGSIE project through analysis of the significance of what was called the *'collective narrative'* that relates policy to cultural identities in different national systems (Popkewitz, Lindblad and Strandberg 1999). That collective narrative, whatever its complex cultural and social origins, was most coherently articulated by national and local policy makers, who used it to moderate and mediate travelling policy. The EGSIE project research on Scotland and England produced some evidence of different 'collective narratives' from policy makers. This seemed to have effects in terms of the ways in which policy was made (for example it helped to explain differences in the role and influence of business interests, differences in the consultation process in relation to social inclusion/exclusion policy development) and hence for the policies themselves (Ozga, 1999, Alexiadou, Lawn and Ozga 2000). Most significantly in relation to differences between Scotland and England within the shared policy framework of the UK, there seemed to be differences in approaches to welfare redesign. This was perhaps most apparent in policy for social inclusion. In England government appeared to offer social inclusion to its citizens on the basis of **exchange** (ie evidence of good citizenship through responsible self-management and engagement in waged work), however in Scotland social inclusion was offered on the basis of **entitlement** (inclusion as a citizenship right) (Ozga 2003). At issue here, as I have argued above, is understanding the playing out of the encounter between the shared features of 'travelling' policy and the existing policy formations with their established relations and institutional contexts. In exploring these, shifts in the relationship of the state, the market and civil society provide a focus. It is possible, accordingly, to explore whether or not devolution has altered the relationship between these three elements, and in what ways.

Devolution

This section of the paper focuses on changes in education governance in England and Scotland, as evidenced by the EGSIE research. Devolution here means political devolution: that is the creation of a new set of policy relationships within the United Kingdom following the creation of separate assemblies with devolved powers in Wales and Northern Ireland, and a separate parliament in Scotland which was created by the UK government in 1998. The Scottish parliament has responsibility for all matters not 'reserved' by Westminster. Most of the 'reserved' matters relate to the common UK market, but they also include international relations, defence and provisions for dealing with terrorism, immigration and nationality, national security, employment and equality legislation, nuclear safety and (interestingly) research councils. Education and training are devolved matters, as are health, the environment, agriculture forestry and fisheries, sport and the arts, local government, social work, housing and planning, economic development, the law and home affairs including criminal justice.

Devolution in the UK, according to Keating, is not like the Spanish experience: it builds on existing administrative devolution in which each of the UK territories had distinctive ways of making policy and delivering services (Keating 2001:2). Paterson argues that Scotland's

social welfare policy had a Scottish character for a long period pre-devolution, that was, perhaps, intensified during the Conservative administrations led by Thatcher. Indeed he traces divergence between England and Scotland in welfare policy design from the early 20th century onwards. He explains the significance of this in the following terms:

> *'The welfare state in Scotland was Scottish in the implementation of large areas of policy. In certain crucial topics it was also Scottish in the devising of policy-for example, education, law, social work and the arts. These were crucial in the sense that they shaped the character of society more profoundly than many of the topics that were not administered in Scotland-matters such as macro-economic policy … Scottish institutions were held to constitute Scottish identity. They were taken to be the embodiment of a putative tradition of popular sovereignty which was believed to be older and more legitimate than the sovereignty of the parliament at Westminster'*
>
> (Paterson, 1998: 62-63)

During the years of Conservative government Scottish policy making in education resisted the UK government's pressure for local management of schools and for deregulation, and was largely hostile to demands to introduce competition as the guiding principle for improvement of performance. There was a considerable mismatch between Thatcher's drive for market oriented and culturally-conservative educational reform and the Scottish context. Reforms did not take or were substantially modified. In this period modification of UK initiatives protected key characteristics of Scottish provision, while at the same time the Conservative government's pressure on this key social institution (and others) produced popular support for devolution in order to protect Scottish welfare policies and practices from trends towards privatisation, competition and individualism. It is unclear if the New Labour UK government elected in 1997 government understood that background to devolution, or indeed, if it envisaged devolution as anything more than a managerial solution to party political problems. There seems to be a mismatch between the modernisation project as pursued by the UK government and the playing out of devolution as a form of representation of difference.

The interviews discussed below provide some evidence of difference. They were carried out with system actors in England and Scotland as part of the EGSIE project. Details of the interviews are given in Appendix 2.

England: the economising of education

England, perhaps more than any of the other systems studied by the EGSIE project, has justified its radical programme of policy change in education with reference to an economic imperative. It is therefore not surprising that our informants saw changes in governance under New Labour as underpinned primarily by an economic rationale that binds together the discourses of modernization, globalization, economic competitiveness and raising of standards of achievement across the education and training systems. The participants in our study share and strongly state the view that education must be modernized in order to contribute more effectively to economic recovery. That view is forcibly expressed by interviewees located in the government department responsible for education policy in England, that is the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE, now Department for Education and Skills [DfES]). The imperative of modernisation is also strongly supported by

representatives of business, who are increasingly involved in the processes of educational governance in England.

The system actors present two contrasting views of change, and the role of government in promoting it. The nature of the assessment is strongly influenced by the location of the respondent: the critical views come from local government informants, the more favourable assessment from those responsible for driving the change, and from a Conservative (opposition) politician who favours the direction of change. Local government informants are more likely to express concern about government's centralising tendencies, and the growing role of business. There is particular concern about the extent to which Central government's use of targeted funding inhibits local capacity to adapt change to its particular contexts. There is equal concern about the encouragement of business interests as powerful actors in national and local policy making. Both trends are understood to threaten democratically-based accountability. Since 1997 there has been little evidence of Labour support for the traditional local democratic institutions. Instead, new Agencies are encouraged. One Chief Education Officer describes this as *"the weakening of the intermediate institutions"* between central government and civil society. Central system actors defend central control as ensuring that central policies are implemented in the way that the centre intends. As Local government influence diminishes, local system actors see central government as determined to increase the influence and involvement of the business sector in education. This principle was exemplified in the Education Action Zones, which were set up as public-private partnerships in areas of economic deprivation and educational underachievement:

> *"The DfEE has powers to intervene in particular where LEAs are failing and hence it can take over services and contract them out".*
>
> (CO1, DfEE)

> *"The government does not trust LEAs to implement change and innovation, the DfEE wants business to take over and run the Zones. Zones are seen to have a 'dormant power' in them, they are a vehicle for government to use. I think the government wants to see what the market and business can come up with".*
>
> (BS)

> *'XXX [a large British business] is carving out a niche for itself in the changing face of education… It's almost a small-scale alternative to the LEA. We are involved in Careers provision… We are a leading provider of education services: we are an implementer rather than a partner. There's nothing the LEA can do that we can't. The LEA is a weak institution: we can identify their needs, and we can meet their needs'*
>
> (BS: EAZ Steering Group member: Director of XXX)

The system actors express concern about the tension between centralising and decentralising tendencies in government policy. These are associated with the New Labour government's continued promotion of marketisation in education while simultaneously adopting increasingly prescriptive policy design. As a DfEE official indicates: '*Ministers clearly want schools to run themselves*' (CO1), but at the same time the parameters within which schools

may operate are more tightly specified than ever. As CO1 in the DfEE comments '*this government is more prescriptive than any previous one'*.

The main features of the market system, that is the principles of 'choice' and 'selection', are understood by some system actors to have led to greater school differentiation, and increased disadvantage for those schools and students that do not perform well in the market-place. System actors acknowledge that choice-driven policies involve the risk of creating a hierarchy of provision. This differentiation is reinforced by the publication of League Tables to enable parental choice. The emerging system in one Local Education Authority is described despairingly by its Chief Education Officer, himself a supporter of comprehensive provision, as the most exclusive secondary education system in the whole of England:

> *"... It's a wicked system…We have complete freedom of choice, we have a complete pecking order, don't tell me I believe in comprehensives, I run a selective system here. And it is a nightmare, I don't know what we do about it without attacking the choice principle and selection ..."*
>
> (CEO)

The modernisers among our system actors are unwilling to consider that changes in governance may have the potential to increase inequalities. They acknowledge that the system of choice and competition may create 'perverse incentives' (CO) but see this as a technical problem that can be overcome with refinement of targets and indicators. Modernisers also argue that targeted policies that focus on underachievement are more likely to produce results than comprehensive policies. They defend a strong focus on numeracy and literacy and on promoting skills with reference to the potential of paid employment to improve quality of life and combat inequality and poverty, including poverty of aspiration. However local government actors tend to see these policies as unrealistic and as insufficient to address emerging hierarchies of privilege and opportunity-indeed they are concerned that highly centralised and targeted policies ignore structural inequalities and their consequences:

> *'It seems to me that the government will not examine the systemic issues…they don't seem to pick up the issue of parental choice and the operation of things like the Local Management of Schools formula and make it work so that is in the interest of schools to take kids who live in their immediate locality and not exclude kids. The net result is that the socially-excluded are even more excluded because they are out in an estate where there is no longer a school'*
>
> (CEO)

Scotland: The Changing Context of Governance

Among our respondents, whatever their location, there is a recognition of the changed landscape and of the primacy of the Scottish Parliament. A respondent from an interest group notes that consultation now takes place:

> *'with the Scottish parliament and with government in Westminster and fortunately we have now greater access to decision-makers than was perhaps the case in the past.'*
>
> (SIG1)

Another respondent points out that it is too early to judge how the relationship between the UK government and the Scottish Parliament will develop:

'The Scottish parliament has been up and running only for a very short period and they, while they have policy commitments in these areas which by and large we would share, actually converting these policy commitments in to reality is not an overnight process. The policy of new Labour on education and social inclusion, they are broadly similar north and south of the border. But I think there is scope yet when the Scottish Parliament really finds its feet and it is going to take a little bit of time to do things that bit differently. And I think there are some indications that they will not behave in quite the same way as parliament in Westminster.'

(SCO1)

A local authority informant supports this view of current uncertainty and possible future divergence:

'The Scottish parliament are still finding their feet and I think in fairness we all acknowledge that, still trying to work out their own relationship in terms of Westminster, in terms of devolution and are not too sure whether they should be totally going off in their own way or still paying something of recognition to a national strategy. I think that is becoming more and more clear. The Scottish parliament is beginning to exercise its own responsibilities.'

(SLG1)

The parliament is operating in a situation in which there may be rather contradictory pressures in relation to changing governance. On the one hand, there is the UK Government's modernising agenda that is attempting to change the nature of government and politics throughout the UK. On the other, as I have said, there are distinctive patterns of practice within the Scottish policy community that have existed for a considerable time. Some of the discussions with informants suggested that modernisation project in Scotland is not as advanced as in England. By this I mean that the discourse of governance in Scotland remains concerned to promote a revived partnership that does not include dominant business interests. There is still considerable reliance on a 'collective narrative' that gives status to the expert voice of teachers and local authority officers and not much indication of adapting governance to reflect private sector interests and behaviours. The capacity to get things done still seems to lie mainly with government (albeit in a new form and place), the civil service and the professional partners, operating as a policy community. Our informants raise some of these issues in response to questions about changes in governance, with particular reference to the balance of power between Whitehall and Edinburgh:

'Policy at the moment is still determined by Whitehall, I do not think the Scottish parliament has yet got to grips with this issue because I think one reason for that is that its independence of Whitehall is still in the process of being mapped out. The party links between the ruling group in Whitehall and the ruling group in Scotland are still strong enough to provide a uniform approach on these kind of issues. So although the Scottish Parliament has introduced policies of social inclusion, as indeed has Whitehall, they have not simultaneously dropped those aspects of the market which in effect have defeated their policies of social inclusion.'

(SIG2)

The introduction of market principles into services like education seems to be an area of some tension in Scotland, perhaps particularly in education policy:

> *'I think there are signs that there is a divergence within Scotland in some policy areas and I think this is one which is perhaps open to some degree of pressure. I think that the government in Scotland has been more nervous about being openly market orientated, for example when they published the examination results of schools in Scotland, they bend over backwards at government level to say these are not league tables. So there is a distinction in tone between what happens in Scotland in this what I would term 'market driven issue' from what happens in England, and I think the difference in tone might become greater as the Scottish Parliament establishes itself more.*
>
> (SIG 2)

Another possible source of tension reflects the discussion above about pressure on local autonomy and responsiveness by steering mechanisms that allow little local latitude. Target setting and specific funding are significant here. There is disagreement with the tight steering of policy: and our respondents emphasise differences in practices and relationships, even if a similar policy goal is being pursued. The following quotation highlights differences in which performance measurement and target-setting are implemented in the two systems:

> *'…we have got an agenda about the raising of attainment and the tools in the setting of targets which is significantly different in the way it is frequently portrayed, particularly in the South [ie England] as the league tables illustrate. The targets which schools are asked to set are not targets against some arbitrary fixed point in the examination structure. They are targets set against the contexts of that particular school's environment and the needs of the children within the school. There is no question about arbitrary targets being set across these schools being measured simply one against another without regard to background.'*
>
> (SCO 1)

An interesting contrast appears between England's EAZ initiative and the Scottish New Community Schools (NCS) development. The NCS were devised as a model for system-wide development, rather than a targeted and competitive initiative. There was much less emphasis on competition for resources or improved league table position as a stimulus to improvement. Instead, NCS were seen to embody and revive generally-accepted principles of community-based provision, enshrined in national policy priorities, supported by a major public consultation exercise, and with the promise of benefiting all pupils:

> *'It is very clear, in the same way as early pioneers, I think it was in 1696 said: we will have a school in every parish and every community-the statement for the year 2000 should be –we will have new community school authorities. All authorities will be run on a new community school basis. That should be our vision for the next hundred years'*
>
> (SLG)

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As stated above, devolution needs to be seen not as creating an entirely new situation but as building on existing administrative devolution where policies could be adapted for 'local' contexts. In addition, among the powerful pressures for policy convergence is the current reasonably close party political alliance between the UK Labour government and the Labour-Liberal coalition governments of the Scottish parliament to date (although Scottish policy has diverged in relation to higher education support and long-term care for the elderly). The significance of this divergence is not yet clear. It may signal the emergence of substantial differences about the nature of the welfare state informed by different 'collective narratives' about the nature of a social contract based on exchange in England and entitlement in Scotland. Some of the evidence above on education policy supports that interpretation. On the other hand, the modernisation project has strong UK wide effects. Keating argues that the modern, integrated welfare state provides the context for UK devolution, and adds that 'there are questions about how much divergence is possible in these conditions' (Keating 2001:13). However this reading, while drawing attention to very powerful forces for convergence such as the Barnett formula,[1] may underplay the influence of 'collective narratives' and neglect the part played by embedded policy in vernacular globalisation.

The modernisation of governance is, as we have noted, a key policy project for the UK government. Education is a priority area of policy and a central element in the drive to make Britain an effective competitor in a globalised economy. However education, as we have suggested, is also strongly embedded in national cultures, including those of the constituent nations of the UK. This means that it is not always amenable to modernisation, and there may be considerable tensions between practices and forms of governance understood as 'national' and the agenda of modernisation, which is refracted through these forms and practices. This tension between education's centrality as a policy site for the Westminster (UK) government, and its simultaneous status as a location of cultural and political identity and practice in the devolved polities (but perhaps especially Scotland) is evident in the interviews discussed here. Changing governance in the UK takes place against a background both of long-established patterns of internal variation and of new institutional arrangements and actors who are not uniformly compliant with the direction of change. The modernisation process may, indeed, produce self-conscious revisiting of models and myths of governance that appear threatened by the market-focused radicalism of the UK centre. Modernisation of governance may therefore appear, in some of the particular ways in which it is being designed, as an intrusively English project.

It could be argued that it is in the definition of civil society that a new post-devolution, post-welfarist 'collective narrative' may be constructed. The account given here is intended, at least partly, to reiterate the importance of the local in responding to, and mediating. globalising pressures and travelling policies. I have attempted to argue that policies get recontextualised and remodelled according to local and national histories, traditions and

[1] The Barnett formula* is the shorthand term for the system of Block grants to the devolved bodies, calculated on a share of increases or decreases in corresponding English programmes. As Keating points out, finance raised on a common (ie UK) tax base used to fund different entitlements (student support, long term care) in different parts of the UK will cause political tension. He argues that *'if a future government were to extensively privatise the welfare state, promoting private schools and medicine and charging for services, the devolved administrations would automatically lose their corresponding public funding and have to respond'* (Keating 2001:14)

social relations. One of the fundamental characteristics of globalisation (though often neglected in summary accounts) is that it can revitalise local institutions and formations. Faced with homogenising travelling policy; particular groups or societies can be encouraged to revisit and reconstruct the value basis of their organisation; and generate new energy in its production within social and cultural institutions. In doing this work of defining and developing civil society in Scotland there is perhaps the possibility of greater divergence from England because of emergent definitions there of 'the public', which seems to be a space that has been sucked into the market. Resisting that definition may be enabled by judicious use of existing 'collective narratives' that re-engage with some of the older Scottish traditions of civil society. Scottish Enlightenment traditions envisaged civil society as a foundation for reciprocity, mutuality and co-operation beyond the calculus of pure exchange (Seligman 1992). This 'shaping myth' could provide resources for a construction of civil society that redefines the public as not distinct from the state or the market but playing out the tensions between them. But this moves the discussion well beyond the immediate concerns of exploring convergence and divergence.

APPENDIX 1: THE EGSIE PROJECT

Selected EGSIE Project Publications (in English)

Lindblad, S, Ozga, J. and Zambeta, E (2003) 'Changing Forms of Education Governance in Europe' European Educational Research Journal 1(4) 615-624

Lindblad, S and Popkewitz, T (eds) (1999) Education Governance and Social Integration and Exclusion : national cases of education systems and recent reforms, Uppsala Reports on Education No. 34, Uppsala: Universitetstryckeriet.

Lindblad, S and Popkewitz, T. (2000) 'Educational Governance and Social Integration and Exclusion: some conceptual difficulties and problematics in policy and research' *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education, 21(1),* pp.5-45.

Lindblad, S and Popkewitz, T (eds) (2000) Public Discourses on Education Governance and Social integration and exclusion, Uppsala Reports on Education 36, Uppsala: Universitetstryckeriet.

Lindblad, S and Popkewitz, S (eds) (2001) Statistical Information and Systems of reason on education and Social integration and exclusion in national and international contexts, Uppsala Reports on Education No 38, Uppsala: Universitetstryckeriet.

Lindblad, S and Popkewitz, S (eds) (2002) Education Governance and Social integration and exclusion: studies in the power of reason and the reasons of power, Uppsala Reports on Education No 39, Uppsala: Universitetstryckeriet.

Popkewitz, T Lindberg, S and Strandberg, J (1999) Review of Research on Education Governance and Social Integration and exclusion, Uppsala Reports on Education No. 35, Uppsala: Universitrtstryckeriet.

Ozga, J and Alexiadou, N. (2003) 'Modernidsing Education Governance in England and Scotland' *European Education Research Journal* 1(4) 676-691

Ozga, J (2002) 'Education Governance in the UK: the modernisation project' *European Education Research Journal* 1(2) 331-341

Main Project Partners

EGSIE (Education Governance and Social Integration and Exclusion in Europe) was carried out with financial support from the European Commission, Directorate–General Research, as part of the Targeted Socio-Economic Research programme (TSER). It was also supported by the participating universities and by national research councils. The principal members of the national research teams are listed here. Several other researchers contributed to the different studies at different times, but we have not listed all of them, for reasons of space. All project participants are listed in the appendix to Uppsala Report No 39.

Partner 1 (co-ordinator) Uppsala University, Sweden: Sverker Lindblad (Uppsala) Tom Popkewitz (Madison) Lisbeth Lundahl (Umea) Gunilla Zackari (Ministry of Education)

Partner 2	Helsinki University, Finland: Hannu Simola (Helsinki) Risto Rinne (Turku) Joel Kiviruama (Turku)
Partner 3	The Icelandic University College of Education (Iceland) Ingolfur Johannesson, (Akureyri) Gudrun Geirsdottir (Iceland) Gunnar Finnbogason (Iceland) Siguron Myrdal (Iceland)
Partner 4	Keele University UK: Jenny Ozga (Keele) Nafsika Alexiadou (Keele)
Partner 5	Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universitat Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Edwin Keiner, (JWG)
Partner 6	University of Granada, Spain: Miguel Perayra (Granada) Pablo Castillo (Granada) Monica Torres (Granada)
Partner 7	University of Lisbon, Portugal: Antonio Novoa, Rui Canario, Natalia Alves
Partner 8	University of Athens, Greece: Andreas Kazamias (Athens/Madison) Evie Zambeta (Athens), Eleni Karadjia (National Ministry)
Partner 9	University of Birmingham, UK: Martin Lawn (Birmingham), Joan Stead (Edinburgh)
Partner10	University of Newcastle, Australia: James Ladwig (Newcastle) Bob Lingard (Queensland)

APPENDIX 2: THE EGSIE INTERVIEWS: SCOTLAND AND ENGLAND

The data drawn on in this article in relation to England comes from two main sources: thirteen interviews that were carried out with system actors at key central and local government locations, and twenty-six interviews with system actors involved in the Education Action Zone initiative. The first tranche of interviews took place in the following locations: the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (4 actors), Regional Government (2 actors), Local Government (6 actors). In addition, and to ensure a different perspective, a senior Conservative Opposition spokesperson on Education was interviewed (1 actor). The interviews with actors at the levels of Regional and Local Government took place in a major conurbation. The second tranche of 26 interviews was conducted with system actors who were engaged in a major initiative designed to promote change in educational governance: the Education Action Zones (EAZs). EAZs were planned as new forms of education governance in England, they involved partnerships between central and local government and business in order to improve performance in groups of mostly inner-city schools. The EAZs, which were intended at one time to cover most areas of England, were, accordingly, an important focus for the EGSIE project. These interviews were carried out in two large inner-city Zones. Most of the informants were actively involved in the EAZ initiative and represented one of the main interests in their operation, for example: a Local Education Authority (LEA); the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE); the Training and Enterprise Council (TEC); charities; business; and schools (three head teachers). The interviews were carried out by Nafsika Alexiadou, Jenny Ozga and Martin Lawn. In order to protect the anonymity of the participants, the following codes are used in presenting these data: CO: Central Officials (Civil Servants), RG: Regional Government, CP: Central Politicians, LG: Local Government, BS: Business representatives, CN: Conservative Opposition, CEO: Chief Education Officer. Eleven interviews were carried out in Scotland (by Jenny Ozga and Joan Stead, with assistance from Pamela Munn), with national politicians (SCP) and civil servants (SCO) and with local government officers (SLG) as well as with educational organisations/interest groups (SIG) and representatives of business (SBS).

REFERENCES

Alexiadou, N. and Jones, K.(2001) 'Travelling Policy/Local Spaces' paper to the Congres Marx International 111 paris, September 2001

Alexiadou, N, Lawn, M and Ozga, J (2000) 'Interviews with System Actors: England and Scotland' in S.Lindblad and T.Popkewitz (eds) (2000) **Public Discourses on Education Governance and Social integration and exclusion**, Uppsala Reports on Education 36, Uppsala: Universitetstryckeriet.

Appadurai, A (1996) **Modernity at large: cultural dimensions of globalisation Minneapolis**, Minnesota: University of Minnesota press.

Appadurai, A (1990) 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy' *Public Culture* 12 (2) Spring

Bentley, T (2001) **Its Democracy, Stupid: an agenda for self-government,** London: Demos.

Castells, M (1998) End of Millenium: the Information Age, *Economy, Society, Culture vol. 3* Oxford: Blackwell.

Clarke, J. Gewirtz, S and McLaughlin, E (eds) (2000) **New Managerialism, New Welfare?** London: Sage.

Dale, R. (1997) 'The state and the governance of education: an analysis of the restructuring of the state-education relation', in A.H.Halsey, P.Brown, & A.Stuart Wells (eds) **Education: Culture, Economy, and Society**, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dale, R (1998) Specifying Globalisation Effects on national policy: a focus on mechanisms, *Journal of Education Policy, 14(1),* pp.1-17.

Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1997) **Excellence in Schools**, London: Stationery office Cm 3681 (July).

Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1998) **National Literacy Strategy,** London: DfEE.

Fergusson, R (2000) 'Modernising managerialism in Education' in J.Clarke et al *op cit*

Grey, J (2000) **False Dawn: the Delusions of Global Capitalism,** London: Granta Books.

Giddens, A (1990) **The Consequences of Modernity** Oxford, Polity Press

Held, D McGrew, A Goldblatt, D and Perraton, J (1999) **Global transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture Cambridge**, Polity press.

Humes, W and Bryce, T (2003) 'The Future of Scottish education' in T.Bryce and W.Humes (eds) **Scottish Education: second edition, post-devolution,** Edinburgh: Edinburgh University press.

Jones, K (1999) Education en Grande-Bretagne de 1979 a 1998: la revolution des conservateurs et ses prolongements, *Syndicalisme et Societe, 2(1),* pp.59-84.

Jones, K and Alexiadou, N (2001) 'Travelling Policy: Local Spaces' paper to '*The Global and the national: reflections on the Experience of three European states'* symposium ECER, Lille September.

Keating, M (2001) 'Devolution and Public Policy in the UK: Divergence or Convergence?' http://www.devolution.ac.uk/Keating_paper2.htm

Lingard, B (2000) 'It Is and It Isn't: vernacular globalisation, education policy and restructuring', in N.Burbules and C.Torres (eds) **Globalisation and Education: critical perspectives**.

Lindblad, S and T. S. Popkewitz (2000): Educational Governance and Social Inclusion and Exclusion: some conceptual difficulties and problematics in policy and research, *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education, 21(1),* pp.5-45.

Neave, G (1988) 'On the cultivation of quality, efficiency and enterprise' *European Journal of Education, 23(1/2),* pp.7-23.

McPherson, A and Raab, C (1988) **Governing Education: a sociology of policy since 1945,** Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Ozga, J (1987) `Studying education policy through the lives of the policy–makers: an attempt to bridge the macro–micro gap' in Barton, L. and Walker, S. (eds) Policy, Teachers and Education, Open University Press

Ozga, J. (1995) 'Frameworks for Theorising Education Policy' In Lindblad, S and Kallos, D. (Eds) Understanding Education Policy; comparative perspectives from Sweden and the UK Umea, Umea University Press.

Ozga, J (1999) 'Two Nations? Education Policy and Social Inclusion and Exclusion in England and Scotland, *Education and Social Justice, 2(1),* pp.44-51.

Ozga, J (2000) 'Education: New Labour, New Teachers?' in J.Clarke, S.Gewirtz and E.McLaughlin (eds) **New Managerialism, New Welfare**, London: Sage.

Ozga, J (2003) 'Two nations? Education Policy and Social Inclusion/Exclusion in the UK', paper to symposium on *Education Policy in the UK,* British Educational Research Association Annual Conference Edinburgh, September.

Ozga, J and Gewirtz, S (1994) Sex, Lies and Audiotape: interviewing the education policy elite, in D.Halpin and B.Troyna (eds) **Researching Education Policy: ethical and methodological issues',** Lewes: Falmer Press.

Paterson, L (1998) 'Scottish Civil Society and the Scottish parliament' *Etudes Ecossaises* No. 5 Grenoble, Universite Stendhal

Popkewitz, T, Lindblad, S and Strandberg, J (1999) **Review of Research on Education Governance and Social Integration and Exclusion**, Uppsala Reports on Education 35, Uppsala: Universitetstryckeriet.

Popkewitz T (1996) Rethinking decentralisation and state-civil society distinctions: the state as a problematic of governing, *Journal of Education Policy, 11(1),* pp.27-51.

Simola, H Rinne, R and Kivirauma J (2002) Shifting Responsibilties, Insolvent Clients and Double-bound teachers: the appearance of a new system of reason in constructing educational governance and social exclusion/inclusion in Finland?, in S.Lindblad and T.Popkewitz (eds) **Education Governance and Social Integration and Exclusion: studies in the powers of reason and the reasons of power,** Uppsala Reports on Education No. 39, Uppsala: Universitetstryckeriet.

Whitty, G Power, S and Halpin, (1998) **Devolution and Choice in Education: the school, the state and the market,** Buckingham: Open University Press.