

Editorial

*Alison Taysum*¹

This special edition journal focuses on Globalization, Policy and Agency with twelve papers. Eight of the papers focus on education policy in eight nation states in alphabetical order; China, England, Israel, Italy, Nigeria, Northern Ireland, Republic of Ireland, and Russia. A further is based on the French report and the European comparative results of an international project about inclusive education supported by the European Commission and is written by Danielle Zay. It focuses on one of the main issues and the specific methodology of the French report. Globalisation has required engaging with the issue of making life together possible for native and immigrant populations on the same soil. Through research results, the paper compares the advantages and failures of the French republican secular school with others. It resumes the French conclusions to propose a cooperative school inspired by the spirit of the Council of Europe directives and developing social ties based on differences. A further paper is from The United States of America (US) that focuses on education policy development and research. The first paper introduces the methodology for the paper and the final paper attempts to bring coherence to the special edition journal by exploring three themes that weave in and out of the papers, whilst recognizing the value of each paper in its own right.

The authors of the papers engage with meaningful and worthwhile education policy analysis with qualitative analyses of the social historiographies of nation states' educational policies. In the introductory paper Taysum and Iqbal argue that such analyses are important because mapping the complex histories of each nation state addresses the questions

¹ School of Education, University of Leicester, Leicester, England. E-mail: ast11@le.ac.uk

of ‘how’ and ‘why’ these education policies developed as they did. This moves beyond the ‘what’ questions that quantitative analyses address. Using qualitative policy analyses the articles in this journal reveal the extent to which education policy as text and discourse engages with important issues. These include the facilitation of community engagement and participation, the management of economic transitions and economic growth within sustainable ethical frameworks, and tolerance for cultural diversity. Disseminating such policy learning is important so that nation states might learn from each other and develop global competences. Reading nation states’ education policy through Hodgson and Spours (2006) policy analysis framework may reveal particular eras in education systems and processes. Further, such researches may illuminate commonalities and differences in nation states’ education policy as text and discourse thus facilitating opportunities for critical analysis, reflection, and transformation. Such policy analyses are required to make a new contribution to knowledge with a sharp focus on policy learning to improve approaches to and engagement with globalization, policy and agency.

The project grew from Professor Muhammad Iqbal and I looking at the impact of educational policy in England and Pakistan whilst he was on a post-doctoral fellowship at the University of Leicester. We began to examine how educational policy positioned educational leaders’ agency and the impact of this on the interpretation of policy as text into discourse in educational contexts. In our analysis we began to see patterns in the shifts in educational policy. We were able to map educational policies in England and Pakistan from World War II to the present day drawing on policy documents and secondary data. We wanted to conceptualize these shifts and we turned to Hodgson and Spours (2006, p. 658) Analytical Framework for Policy Engagement, a policy analysis framework that the authors state has emerged from limited research. We wanted to further test out the framework, which was found useful and revealed two distinctive political eras in both England and Pakistan. The first political era was influenced by a welfare state and an agenda of personalized learning in the 1960’s. The balance of power lay with teachers who used their professional judgements in the provision of the curriculum. The second was established by 1988 and was categorized as a market state that shaped a single political era. There was a shift in the balance of power away from the teaching

profession when the government and quangos controlled the curriculum. Further, private enterprise was encouraged to invest in education and the management of local and particular budgets was devolved to schools through a strategy of local management of schools. It was interesting that there were similar shifts in political eras underpinned by two very different ideologies in both these nation states.

Prof Victoria Pogosian of Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia and I were working as part of a team on a British Council funded project: British Degrees in Russia. I invited Prof Pogosian to be part of the comparative analysis focusing on England and Pakistan and to map Russian educational policy since the second world war to date and I was pleased that Prof Pogosian agreed. The three of us bid for some money from the British Educational Leadership, Management and Administration Society (BELMAS), and from Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, which enabled us to put on a one day conference hosted at the University of Leicester: Innovative Educational Programmes to Build Capacity for Leading Teachers with three aims:

- To examine how leaders learn to put educational policy into practice in different international contexts
- To consider how this may inform the provision of innovative educational programmes to build capacity for leading teachers
- To begin to construct bids for research grants emerging from seminar discussions with a view to generating new analyses and understandings.

The rich discussions at this conference helped us to develop a paper for the European Conference for Educational Research (ECER) in Vienna: Comparing contemporary educational policies in England, The US, Russia and Pakistan (Taysum, Pogosian, and Iqbal, 2009). The US element was included because I had been doing some research into doctoral study in the US and had mapped educational policy in the US from the second world war to contextualize the research within educational policy (Taysum, 2010). At the ECER conference Prof Roberto Serpieri, Dr Emiliano Grimaldi, Prof Danielle Zay, and Prof Rui Yang agreed to write about educational policy in Italy, France, and China respectively and we agreed to develop papers for this special edition journal. In their paper in this journal Gramaldi and Serpieri interpret the recent trajectory of the Italian education system and like the Pakistani and English education policy, they

identify two different political eras; the welfarist education state and the (re)building of the nation and the era of the restructuring of education, between managerialism, decentralisation and a tentative neoliberalism. Grimaldi and Serpieri argue that the former era of 1944-1990 witnessed the building up of the welfarist and centralized education system. The second era is experiencing multiple trials to reform and modernize education matching temperate and radical interpretations of managerialist, neoliberal and Third Way recipes. Grimaldi and Serpieri introduce secular and non-secular approaches to the curriculum and identify how the Catholic church has had a powerful influence in the development of education policy. On the other hand, Zay in her article in this journal focuses on how globalisation has led to people facing the issue of making life together possible for native and immigrant populations on the same soil. Zay examines how a secular approach to education in French educational policy addresses the construction of a common citizenship, with the same rights and duties, for diverse populations separated by their birth community, religion, history, customs and traditions. Zay explores the kinds of education, and schools that may be able to elaborate a new common heritage for citizens-to-be. Through research results, the paper compares the advantages and failures of the French republican secular school with others. It resumes the French conclusions to propose a cooperative school inspired by the spirit of the Council of Europe directives and developing social ties based on differences. This paper is juxtaposed with the paper in this journal that focuses on Chinese educational policy where Yang explores a secular approach to education within a communist totalitarian ideology. Yang argues the fundamental values of education equity were based on the Chinese communist political ideology and education was treated as a public good. However, equal opportunities were not necessarily guaranteed. Since 1978, contribution to economic growth was prioritised on China's education policy agenda. The political function of education was downgraded to favour a strategy that would accelerate China's march toward economic modernisation. Priority has been shifted from equity to efficiency that is measured almost exclusively in financial terms. Within this process, new winners and losers have been created, with the former far outnumbered by the latter. Yang traces current practices to Chinese social and historical roots in order to grasp the essence of paradigm shifts in

China's higher education policy during the past six decades. Further he proposes that educational policy needs to be observed as social action within a certain social, and historical environment. Pogosian's paper in this special edition journal offers important insights regarding two main political eras of Russian policy in the sphere of education starting with post World War II: the Soviet and the post-Soviet periods. It is interesting to compare the Russian paper with the Chinese paper in this respect. Pogosian argues that in Russia, these eras are different not only in terms of educational policy: The Soviet system of education developed in isolation from the rest of the world, behind the Iron Curtain, under the total control of the state and Communist ideology, within a centralised planned economy. Pogosian's analysis reveals that post-Soviet Russia is economically, politically, and socially a different state. The post-Soviet Russian system of education is developing in a globalised world, within a market economy state. Thus the article reveals that there are similarities in terms of shifts in ideologies and political eras that have shaped education policy.

Dr David Eddie Spicer at a British Educational, Leadership, Management, and Administration Society Annual Conference in Berkshire, 2010 agreed to write a paper about the relationships between education policy, and educational leadership in the US based on a paper that he gave at the conference. The paper published in this special edition journal examines the problem of developing and supporting a strong system of schooling and system-wide leadership. Eddie Spicer presents case study evidence that reveals the role research has to play in developing the knowledge base for the development of education for all.

At a meeting at the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Annual Conference in Oxford in 2011 Dr Barney O'Reilly agreed to write an article for this journal about the Republic of Ireland's educational policy. O'Reilly reveals policy processes have swung from being determined by single 'heroic' government leaders to more participatory processes including the production of papers, acts and consultation. In this analysis the participation of key groups such as the Catholic Church, Committees, governing bodies, Unions, teachers and parents are identified. The paper also illuminates continuities and changes in a move for comprehensive education that meets the spiritual and cultural needs of

students and education to produce human capital and meet economic growth. The comparison between France, and the Republic of Ireland was of particular interest because the educational system in France is secular and in the Republic of Ireland the influence of the Catholic church has been significant.

At a British Educational, Leadership, Management and Administration Society Annual Conference in Cambridge in 2011 Prof Hauwa Imam agreed to write for the journal to map Nigerian educational policy from the Second World War to date. Imam's paper examines the colonial period from 1944 – 1960 and the post independence period from 1960 to current times with a sharp focus on Nigerian's educational policy. Imam considers the considerable education gap between those living in the North of Nigeria and those living in the South. An argument is made that in order to minimize conflict, it is important that people participate in the policy process and cognizance must be taken in education policy reviews of all the good parts of educational policies, whether they be from the former British colonial era or of the post-colonial era. Also, the values of traditional African education for self-reliance should be infused into the educational policy. Imam suggests this calls for a review of the National Policy on Education in the light of the new socio-economic demands. Correspondingly, the effect of political instability on the goals of education and mobilization of resources is all too evident. A stable democracy no doubt would provide the necessary conducive environment for the effective implementation of the National Educational Policy. This review of educational policy development in Nigeria provides a platform for comparative study of educational policies of countries with pluralistic societies and those that have undergone colonialism and which are still evolving. At the Cambridge BELMAS conference Dr Sam McGuinness agreed to map educational policy in Northern Ireland in this journal. McGuinness examines the impact of selection in education on identity, human capital, and performativity. Further McGuinness reveals that while Northern Ireland (NI) society continues on its journey away from conflict, schools and teacher training colleges remain largely segregated on a religious basis. Since the establishment of the first integrated school only twelve more have been established out of 215 post-primary schools. This paper is juxtaposed with Dr Khalid Arar's paper in this journal that focuses

on Arab Israeli education policy since the Second World War. Arar agreed to write the article at the Cambridge BELMAS conference and draws upon literature and policy documents on the colonial nation-state, and ethnic indigenous minorities to expose three educational policy shifts since 1948. The first is Arab education under military administration until 1966. The second is the policy of integration 1967-1991. The third is the peace process since 1992, the quest for autonomy and Arab education's present 'on hold' status. Using the analytical framework suggested by Hodgson and Spours (2006), Arar analyses political eras, the state of the education system and the policy-making process and its consequences for the educational space and system outcomes. These concepts and methods are used to narrate historical developments of the Palestinian Arab education system in Israel, to critique state policy-making and identify future challenges. The findings demonstrate contingent relations between ethnicity and the state. The paper concludes by discussing existing educational policies and suggesting recommendations for the future.

Readers of these this special edition journal are invited to critique their own systems by looking at other systems. It is possible to examine these national policies through a post-colonial lens to recognize the relationships between power, and multiple communities within a hegemony. Such analyses may enable readers to develop understandings of how people develop an identity located in other nation states and how this compares and contrasts to their own experiences. This has the potential to enable professional educationalists to gain new insights into relationship building in educational institutions (Bateson, 2002). Thus, the special edition journal presents systematic policy analyses of ten nation states, chosen for very strategic reasons combined with serendipity in terms of being in the right place at the right time to meet the authors of these important papers.

The final paper analyses the ten nation states' education policy presented in this special edition journal from 1944 to the present day. The evidence reveals that the nation states, other than France and the United States, identify particular eras that impact upon their education policies and education systems. This is not to say that France and the US do not have eras in their educational policy history, rather this has not been the focus of their papers.

Where the papers have revealed particular eras, they are shaped by

particular conditions that facilitate particular action(s). The first is a shift from a comprehensive education system underpinned by progressive, welfarist, and community ideologies to the marketization of education underpinned by the markets and capitalist ideologies. A second is the management of economic transitions, economic growth and human capital. A third is the commitment to tolerance for cultural diversity and the relationship this has with the transformation of identity. The analysis paper is limited in its scope and it is important to note that each paper in its own right, presents new and important contributions to knowledge and generate new understandings.

There were some problems that were encountered in the development of this project. Prof Iqbal and I submitted our joint paper that compared England and Pakistan education policies for peer review and it was rejected. The reviewers stated that there was not scope in one paper to provide the detailed description of the educational policies needed for a thorough and systematic analysis focusing on how and why these educational policies had been developed. Therefore we needed to develop two separate papers to provide the required level of detail and analyses. In the time allowed, the English (Taysum) paper was developed that mapped the English educational policy context and examined how and why these policies were developed and/or implemented. However, it was not possible to complete the research for the Pakistani paper in the short time allowed. This is very unfortunate particularly since Prof Iqbal was key to the development of this project. However, Prof Iqbal is recognized in this special edition journal as co-authoring a paper with me that was peer reviewed and accepted that examines: 'What counts as meaningful and worthwhile policy analysis'? This is the introductory paper and is important because it sheds light on the value of qualitative analyses of the social historiographies of nation states' educational policies. We argue that mapping the complex histories of each nation state addresses the questions of 'how' and 'why' these education policies developed as they did. This moves beyond the 'what' questions that quantitative analyses address. We suggest that using qualitative policy analyses reveals the extent to which education policy as text and discourse facilitates community engagement and participation, the management of economic transitions and economic growth within sustainable ethical frameworks, and tolerance for cultural

diversity. Disseminating such policy learning is important so that nation states might learn from each other and develop global competences.

It is important to compare educational policies as a source of mutual exchange of information between regions. Such an engagement with the evidence is what Olssen et al (2004) call policy-oriented learning. Here, policy learning means the ability of governments, or governance systems to draw lessons from the available evidence to shape policy formation, communication and implementation in the future. Taysum (2010) calls such policy learning evidence informed and includes experiential learning from history (Taysum, 2003). Alexander *et al.* (2000) note the importance of such policy learning within an international context where learning from other countries is valued along with learning from local innovations and experiments. Effective policy learning has the potential to increase the effectiveness of the resulting policies (Stasz and Wright, 2007). Disseminating such policy learning is important so that others might critique their own education systems by comparing them with other systems and learn from decision making and consequences for particular nation states' education. This is particularly significant if the potential for evidence informed policy is to play a greater role in policy formation (Pring and Thomas, 2008). Further such policy analyses help people connect with, and understand different values in terms of how identities are formed in other nation states particularly in different multi-community contexts. It is important to note that learning from other communities needs to be done with humility.

Further it has been agreed with the Italian Journal of the Sociology of Education that a proposal for a second special edition will be submitted. This proposal will focus on another collection of nation states' educational policies from Second World War to date. Thus far I have invited papers to be submitted for international peer review from Pakistan, Japan, India, and Israel. I am in the process of inviting more nation states that have the potential to reveal some very interesting comparative analyses. I would therefore like to invite proposals for papers that map nation states' educational policy for a possible subsequent special edition of the Italian Journal of the Sociology of Education. For more details regarding this call feel free to email me.

Finally I would like to thank the reviewers for giving up their time so

generously to provide high quality feedback on the papers. I would also like to thank the editorial board for allowing me to be guest editor for this special edition of the journal. This journal is particularly important because of its commitment to open access. The journal has all the benefits of being international peer reviewed, but anyone in the world can access it free of charge if they have internet access. Whilst I value the role of societies and associations and the journals they publish, the role of open access publications make a very important commitment to the democratization of knowledge (Delanty, 2001). This is because they facilitate countries that are culturally rich, but not cash rich, with opportunities to participate in the co-creation of knowledge as knowledge workers, knowledge brokers and knowledge consumers. Such an approach to knowledge potentially enhances the chances for human beings to gain new glimpses into the full potential of human beings.

References

- Bateson, G. (2002). *Mind and Nature A Necessary Unity*. New Jersey: Hampton Press Inc.
- Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging Knowledge The University in the Knowledge Society*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Hodgson, A., & Spours, K. (2006). An analytical framework for policy engagement: the contested case of 14-19 reforms in England. *Journal of Education Policy*, 21(6), 679-696.
- Olssen, M. Codd, J.O., & Neill, A.M. (2004). *Education Policy: Globalization. Citizenship and Democracy*. London: Sage Publications.
- Pring, R., & Thomas, G. (2008). *Evidence based Practice in Education*. London: Continuum.
- Stasz, C., & Wright, S. (2007). A framework for understanding and comparing 14-19 education policies. In D. Raffe, and K. Spours (Eds), *Policy-making and Policy Learning in 14-19* (pp. 157-185). London: Institute of Education University of London.
- Taysum, A. (2010). *Evidence Informed Leadership in Education*. London: Continuum.
- Taysum, A., Pogolian, V., & Iqbal, M. (2009). Comparing contemporary educational policies in England, The US, Russia and Pakistan; multi-cultural perspectives within the global village. *European Conference for Educational Research*. Vienna, September. Lead author.
- Taysum, A. (2003). In search of the holistic leader. *Management in Education*, 17(5), 9-12.