



**Consortium for Research on  
Educational Access,  
Transitions and Equity**

**A Review of Concepts from Policy Studies  
Relevant for the Analysis of EFA  
in Developing Countries**

**Marie Lall**

**CREATE PATHWAYS TO ACCESS  
Research Monograph No 11**

**March 2007**



**Leading education  
and social research**  
Institute of Education  
University of London

**Institute of Education  
University of London**



Consortium for Research on  
Educational Access, Transitions & Equity

Funded by DFID

The Consortium for Educational Access, Transitions and Equity (CREATE) is a Research Programme Consortium supported by the UK Department for International Development (DFID). Its purpose is to undertake research designed to improve access to basic education in developing countries. It seeks to achieve this through generating new knowledge and encouraging its application through effective communication and dissemination to national and international development agencies, national governments, education and development professionals, non-government organisations and other interested stakeholders.

Access to basic education lies at the heart of development. Lack of educational access, and securely acquired knowledge and skill, is both a part of the definition of poverty, and a means for its diminution. Sustained access to meaningful learning that has value is critical to long term improvements in productivity, the reduction of inter-generational cycles of poverty, demographic transition, preventive health care, the empowerment of women, and reductions in inequality.

**The CREATE partners**

CREATE is developing its research collaboratively with partners in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. The lead partner of CREATE is the Centre for International Education at the University of Sussex. The partners are:

The Centre for International Education, University of Sussex: Professor Keith M Lewin (Director)

The Institute of Education and Development, BRAC University, Dhaka, Bangladesh: Dr Manzoor Ahmed

The National University of Educational Planning and Administration, Delhi, India: Professor R Govinda

The Education Policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa: Dr Shireen Motala

The Universities of Education at Winneba and Cape Coast, Ghana: Professor Jerome Djangmah

The Institute of Education, University of London: Professor Angela W Little

Associate Partner: The Institute of Development Studies at Sussex

**Disclaimer**

The research on which this paper is based was commissioned by the Consortium for Research on Educational Access, Transitions and Equity (CREATE <http://www.create-rpc.org>). CREATE is funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) for the benefit of developing countries and is coordinated from the Centre for International Education, University of Sussex.. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of DFID, the Institute of Education, or the CREATE Team.

Copyright © CREATE [2007]

ISBN: 0-901881-04-X

Address for correspondence:

CREATE,

Centre for International Education, Sussex School of Education,

University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QQ,

United Kingdom

Tel: + 44 (0) 1273 678464

Fax: + 44 (0) 1273 877534

Author Email: [M.Lall@ioe.ac.uk](mailto:M.Lall@ioe.ac.uk)

Website: <http://www.create-rpc.org>

Email: [create@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:create@sussex.ac.uk)

Please contact CREATE using the details above if you require a hard copy of this publication.

**A Review of Concepts from Policy Studies  
Relevant for the Analysis of EFA  
in Developing Countries**

**Marie Lall**

**CREATE PATHWAYS TO ACCESS  
Research Monograph No 11**

**March 2007**



## Contents

Acknowledgements .....	iv
Preface .....	v
Summary .....	vi
1. The Background .....	1
1.1 Education Policy: Key Concepts and their Context of Evolution.....	1
2. Defining the Key Concepts and Debates and their Theoretical Underpinnings.....	3
2.1 What is Policy? How is It Made and Why is It Relevant?.....	3
2.1 What is the Structure-Agency Dichotomy? .....	3
2.3 The Role of the State.....	3
2.4 The Policy Cycle.....	4
2.5 Policy as Discourse .....	5
2.6 Critique and Debate .....	6
2.7 From Policy Making to the Central Concepts in Policy Studies .....	7
2.7.1 The state or the market? .....	7
2.7.2The functions of the state .....	8
2.8 Social Justice.....	9
2.8.1 The history of the concept in England.....	9
2.8.2 The distributive paradigm.....	10
2.8.3 Understanding social justice: the post-modern challenge .....	10
2.9.Globalisation .....	13
2.9.1 To what extent are current changes in education systems part of a global phenomenon?.....	13
2.9.2 The market and education .....	14
3. EFA Studies and Review of Research Methods.....	18
3.1 The Child and the State in India - Myron Weiner .....	18
3.1.1 Description .....	18
3.1.2 Analysis .....	18
3.2 Operation Blackboard: Policy Implementation in Indian Elementary Education - Caroline Dyer.....	19
3.2.1 Description .....	19
3.2.2 Analysis .....	20
3.3 Education, Economic change and Society in England 1780-1870 - Michael Sanderson .....	20
3.3.1 Description .....	20
3.3.2 Analysis .....	21
3.4 Social Origins of Educational Systems - Margaret Archer.....	21
3.5 Concepts and Methods to be used in future studies.....	22
4. Conclusion.....	23
References .....	24

## **List of Acronyms**

PSE	Policy Studies in Education
EFA	Education for All
LEA	Local Education Authority
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
UN	United Nations
WTO	World Trade Organization

## **Acknowledgements**

Many thanks go to Angela Little for her valuable guidance as well as Carol Vincent and David Gillborn for introducing me to the policy studies literature when I joined the Institute of Education. This paper is based around the doctoral lectures Carol gave and which I took over and developed over the last two years.

Thanks also to Fran Hunt and Joanna Harma for the editing of this paper, and to Sylvie Lomer and Elena Dennison for presentation.

## **Preface**

This research monograph is one of several in the CREATE Pathways to Access Series that address policy formulation and implementation. Over the last thirty years the international literature on education policy has developed along paths that sometimes meet and frequently diverge. Since the 1970s a body of literature has emerged on policy formulation and implementation in developing countries, much of it linked with political science and management theory. A rather separate, but equally powerful, body of literature on policy studies in education (PSE) has emerged since the 1980s in the UK. We invited Dr Marie Lall, the author of this monograph to focus on the latter and to identify key concepts from PSE for their potential relevance to EFA policy formulation, implementation, impact and institutionalisation and to outline, where relevant, the theoretical underpinnings of these concepts.

Marie Lall outlines how policy relates to the social construction of ‘problems’ and how policies which respond to these problems do not emerge in a vacuum. Rather, they reflect compromises between competing interests and privilege specific interests as they move into practice. Policies in the domestic sphere in the UK are increasingly subject to influence from the international sphere, a source of influence very familiar in developing country contexts. Everywhere the number of actors involved in policy making is increasing and creating a more complex playing field.

This is an important contribution to CREATE’S work on EFA policy analysis and dialogue. A parallel review of literature on education policy formulation in developing countries will be published in this series in due course.

Professor Angela W Little  
Institute of Education, London  
CREATE Partner Institute Convenor



## Summary

This paper aims to give an introduction to the central concepts and the literature of Policy Studies in education.

The first part of the paper addresses the questions of what policy is. How is it made and why is it relevant? It looks in particular at the role of the state and the Policy cycle framework which is an analytical tool that helps to analyse how policy is made and later implemented.

The second part then focuses on the central concepts. The two main paradigms of education policy studies relate directly to these central themes. On the one hand a series of policy concepts cluster around *social justice, inclusion* and the fight *against discrimination* on the basis of race, gender and disability. On the other lie the debates raging around *efficiency, effectiveness and quality* of education. These include the issues of accountability and measurement of pupil achievement. The role of the market is discussed and a short section on globalisation explains how the nature of education policy is changing in light of globalisation.

The last part of the paper four studies were chosen to look at how the concepts elaborated in the earlier part have been used in studies relating to EFA. The works chosen are: Myron Weiner's *The Child and the State in India* (1991), *Operation Blackboard, Policy Implementation in Indian Elementary Education* by Caroline Dyer (2000), Michael Sanderson's *Education, Economic change and Society in England 1780-1870* (1991) and *Social Origins of Educational Systems* by Margaret Archer (1984).

The paper concludes that the transferability of the concepts discussed above and their related debates to the context of EFA in developing countries require a re-contextualisation which takes into account the EFA priorities of equity and access. The basic question remains of how governments will manage to reconcile expanding the education system and creating a true EFA system, while maintaining high levels of quality. The role of education policy analysis is key in looking at this debate from a different vantage point.

# **A Review of Concepts from Policy Studies Relevant to the Analysis of EFA in Developing Countries**

## **1. The Background**

Education policy concepts need to be seen and explained within the broader context of government action alongside a range of economic and social policies that are both domestically and internationally determined. The analysis of policy is concerned with the theoretical and conceptual aspects of policy making and is related to the wider aspects of politics, power and influence. Policy Studies in Education (PSE) is an interdisciplinary area based on research in sociology, political science and economics, where the views taken in the literature depend on the disciplinary background of the writers. In general Policy Studies' central concepts have been developed largely based on research in the western world.

This paper is based on this literature. It does not address parallel literatures on education policy in developing countries, reviews of which will be undertaken in due course by other members of the CREATE consortium.

Education for All (EFA) was a policy statement signed up to by 181 countries in 1990 in Jomtien. The countries undertook to provide universal primary education for all children by 2010. Its focus was primarily to set targets in the developing world. The six Dakar goals which were signed up to in 2000 reaffirm EFA and aim to:

- Expand early childhood care and education;
- Ensure access to free and compulsory education of good quality by 2015;
- Promote the acquisition of life skills by adolescents and youth;
- Expand Adult literacy by 50% by 2015;
- Eliminate gender disparities and achieve gender equality by 2015;
- Enhance educational quality.

These goals, based on the premises of social justice and equity are reiterated in the more recent OECD literature on Education and Equity in Lifelong Learning (OECD, 2004) and reflect an increased concern by international organisations to look at education beyond its human capital development objective. Jomtien and Dakar could therefore have a direct effect on education policy making in developing countries.

### **1.1 Education Policy: Key Concepts and their Context of Evolution**

The EFA declaration, the Dakar goals and the OECD brief mentioned above link in with policy concepts which have traditionally been used in the western world. Education policy concepts relate to the social construction of 'problems'. Policies which respond to these problems don't emerge in a vacuum, but reflect compromises between competing interests: 'Policies embody claims to speak with authority, they legitimate and initiate practices in the world, and they privilege certain visions and interests' (Ball, 1990:22).

They are therefore linked to power and who at any given point in time is in power to take the decisions regarding the formulation of education policy. The context in which these policy studies concepts are evolving is the increasingly globalised world. As a result, the policy

decisions around education in the developed as well as in the developing world are being influenced by priorities emanating from the international as well as the domestic sphere. The international not only includes organisations such as the United Nations (UN) and the World Bank, but also other countries from which policies are being borrowed in order to help reform national education systems. In effect the developing world will increasingly approach education policy making from a 'western' point of view, as structural reforms imposed by international organisations and policies borrowed from a western country take hold locally.

'Globalisation at its most developed predicts three different phenomena: the destruction of the nation state's power, the movement of this power both upwards to supra-national bodies, and downwards to regional assemblies (glocalisation) and the demise of systems with a distinctive national stamp, such as education.' (Green, 1990: 55).

As Green defines globalisation as the increased importance of supra-national and local structures, the other context in which these concepts are emerging is the competition between the national and the local sphere. Centre-periphery relations are changing as there is increased devolution in certain matters pertaining to education in many countries. In England this devolution has been mainly that of financial responsibility, yet in India for example state governments and panchayats have growing influence on what is taught and how. Increasingly it is being recognised in England that area-based initiatives might have a greater impact on solving local education problems by creating programmes which meet local need. The recent British New Deal for Communities initiative which was the government's flagship programme for neighbourhood renewal and deployed at a cost of two billion pounds from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister reflects this. In India, the expansion of the Panchayati Raj system since 1993 has created the basis of a village democracy which allows for local concerns to be addressed.

In order for Policy Studies concepts to be transferable from 'North' to 'South' one should bear in mind that mass schooling in the north took place in the 19<sup>th</sup> century within a specific cultural and economic context (Muller et al. 1987 and Sanderson, 1991). As the aim for mass quality schooling is now the aim for the developing world the question is - are there lessons to be learnt despite the different historical contexts?

Policy concepts differ depending on the context they evolve in and the structures they evolve out of and the discourse which defines them. However certain policy concepts do travel across disciplinary boundaries and could help enrich the analysis in both fields. To be able to transfer policy studies concepts to the EFA debate there will be a need for some re-contextualisation. It is not the aim of this review to directly link the policy concepts which will be discussed below with the EFA debate. However in introducing these concepts and their theoretical background, their usefulness to studies in developing countries will be kept in mind.

## **2. Defining the Key Concepts and Debates and their Theoretical Underpinnings**

The first part of this review will discuss the key concepts described below as well as the main debates surrounding them and their theoretical underpinnings.

### **2.1 What is Policy? How is It Made and Why is It Relevant?**

Policy making has been analysed in depth through the 'policy cycle', a concept developed by Stephen Ball along with Richard Bowe and Anne Gold (Bowe, Ball and Gold, 1992). The key question at the heart of the debate is the extent to which the state determines the policy making process and as a consequence the room available for other actors, especially those involved in implementation to re-interpret the policy text in practice. In this analysis both the process and the extent to which the state determines policy content is key. This is particularly important in today's globalising world, as the number of active actors involved in policy making is increasing and creating a more complex environment. This discussion also reflects the social science binary of structure and agency that is central to a lot of Policy Studies questions.

### **2.1 What is the Structure-Agency Dichotomy?**

The structure-agency dichotomy focuses on the relationship between individualism and holism and is one of the main dialectics in Policy Studies. The central question focuses on whether individuals or social structure should be given primacy in explaining social ontology. Bourdieu however holds that structure and agency are implicit in each other rather than being two poles of a continuum. Ball 1998 explains that this is not a zero-sum game but that relations shift and change and that the world is effectively 'in flux'.

Ball 1998 relates this in particular to the debate of policy as text and policy as discourse. Discourse, the product of agency becomes a part of the structure and can consequently limit who speaks and who is heard. In this context structure is most often treated as constraint and not as an enabler of change for action.

The policy effects of the structure-agency debate are context dependent: specific effects of a specific policy may be limited but the general effect of an ensemble of policies of different kinds may be more wide reaching. In certain circumstances human agency opens up the possibility of the transformation of structures. There are periods when structures are changeable, and individuals, or individuals acting collectively, are able to reshape these structures.

### **2.3 The Role of the State**

There is some degree of difference between state controlled and state-centred explanations of the role of the state in policy formulation, however both see the state as the primary actor in making education policy and do not engage greatly with contributions to education policy made by actors outside the state.

State controlled models would see the state as determining in all policy making. These models come from the Marxist tradition - influenced by theorists like Habermas, Althusser, Gramsci and Offe. These authors stressed the structural constraints and the power of the state.

State-centred explanations of policy making however, see the state as dominating but also acknowledge other influences. Roger Dale's position is state-centred, as he highlights the political and ideological dimensions to the state's actions (Dale, 1989). He argues that the state has to fight to secure active consent, to secure hegemonic control and as a result there are inherent contradictions and conflicts with different levels of the state. Gerwitz and Ozga (1994) argue a similar line:

'As historians and as Marxists, we believed that insufficient attention was being paid to the deep structures of English education and to the sedimented patterns of differentiation which so characterise English provision. And we felt that insufficient attention was being paid to analysis of the role of the State in education, to the contradictory demands upon it and to the economic and political constraints which helped determine the pattern of provision. It seemed to us that there was overmuch attention being paid to (relatively superficial) change, to education politics and to politicians and to superficial noise and activity in the policy making arena' (Gerwitz and Ozga, 1994:126).

However this position still argues that a central position should be allocated to the state in policy analysis, because the state is more than just another actor as it is able to employ legitimate coercion, shape institutional features, define and enforce conditions of ownership and control, and secure active consent.

## **2.4 The Policy Cycle**

On the other hand, Stephen Ball and colleagues (Bowe, Ball and Gold, 1992) argue that the state centred models are too simple and too linear and that they neglect the agency of anything other than the institutions of the state. They criticise the state control approach for the detachment of the policy generation from implementation, which reinforces tidy, managerial, linear models and its focus on macro-based theoretical analyses that 'silence' the voices of teachers, students and parents. When those voices are included, they argue they are as 'potentially free and autonomous resisters or subverters of the status quo' (Bowe, Ball and Gold, 1992: 6):

'Despite the very real sense in which teachers have been excluded from the 'production' of the Reform Act of 1988, we still want to argue that a state control model distorts the policy process. Indeed it seems to us that the image implicit in the conception of distinct and disconnected sets of policy-makers and policy implementers actually serves the powerful ideological purpose of reinforcing a linear conception of policy in which theory and practice are separate and the former is privileged. The language of 'implementation' strongly implies that there is within policy, an unequivocal governmental position that will filter down through quasi-state bodies and into the schools....[We argue] that it is not simply a matter of implementers following a fixed policy text and 'putting the Act into practice'' (Bowe, Ball and Gold, 1992: 10).

In theorising this space, Bowe, Ball and Gold (1992) used Barthes' distinction of readerly and writerly texts<sup>1</sup>. They argue that one needs to understand the histories and ideologies of the people who receive policy texts and what drives them to implement policy in the way that they do. Policy authors cannot control the meaning of their texts even if they do try.

They also stress that the policy process doesn't just begin when the policy is launched and received as a text by the people who have to implement it. The production of the text itself is not one static moment, but a process. Texts themselves are the products of compromises and power struggles. They have interpretational and representational history and a 'policy sediment' builds up around them, which in effect means that there are never really any completely 'new' policies'.

The notion of a policy cycle is therefore about where and how policy is made and remade in different contexts. Each of the three contexts described below have public and private arenas of action and each involves compromise and in some cases even the repression or ignoring of certain interest groups altogether:

- *Context of influence* is where interest groups struggle over the construction of policy discourses and where key policy concepts are established;
- *Context of policy text production* is where texts represent policies. Texts have to be read in relation to time and the site of production, and with other relevant texts;
- *Context of practice* is where policy is subject to interpretation and recreation.

In his 1994 book, Ball added two more contexts in apparent recognition of the need for a feedback loop from the context of practice at micro level back to the context of influence at macro level:

- *Context of outcomes* is where the impact of policies on existing social inequalities is seen;
- *Context of political strategy* is where one identifies political activities which might tackle such inequalities.

## **2.5 Policy as Discourse**

Does policy as text overemphasise the agency or the space for creativeness? Ozga (2000) discusses how this approach concentrates too much on what those who inhabit policy think about, and fails to attend to what they do not think about. In her view understanding policy as discourse rather than texts pays greater attention to constraint.

The concept of discourse draws heavily on Foucault. Discourse is language, values, beliefs, practices. There is a close nexus between power and knowledge and meaning is constructed historically in contested social arenas. Power is exercised through a production of truth.

'Discourses are about what can be said and thought, but also about who can speak, when, where and with what authority.... Certain possibilities for thought are

---

<sup>1</sup> *Readerly texts* leave reader as 'inert consumer', all that s/he can do is read the text, and accept or reject it, the text itself, its substance is non-negotiable. Completely readerly texts are hard to come by.

*Writerly texts* encourage the reader to join in, to contribute, to co-author, to feel a sense of ownership. A creative response may also be critical, so it is not a process of co-option.

constructed. Words are ordered and combined in particular ways, and other combinations are displaced or excluded' (Ball, 1994: 22).

Discourse analysis focuses above all on the productive nature of texts. Unlike text analysis which studies a text in terms of its inherent linguistic characteristics, discourse analysis focuses on the way in which these texts produce 'reality' by providing structures of meaning that make particular object and subject positions appear. Within discourse analysis, 'reality' is therefore a function of intersubjectively shared knowledge and the particular power that sustains it. Conversely, power itself draws on particular structures of knowledge. The emergence of particular discourses is therefore a historically contingent process that needs to be studied in terms of the power mechanisms that precludes one such structure of meaning rather than another.

Consequently discursive frameworks articulate and constrain the possibilities and probabilities of interpretation and enactment. Discourses construct us, making it hard to think otherwise or think of different possibilities. The state is the source of some of these forms of power, but others are rooted elsewhere such as racial and gender hierarchies.

## **2.6 Critique and Debate**

Beyond the debate of looking at policy as text or as discourse, criticisms have centred around the state, and whether Ball's emphasis on agency amounts to a 'washing away of the state' (Lingard, 2003). This links in with the suspicion of post-modern analyses which are perceived to be dismissive of state power, seeing diverse and fragmented sources of power, rather than a monolithic and possibly coercive state. The principal differences revolve around state and non-state and the relative weight to be given to each.

Fitz, Halpin and Power (1993) suggest some inherent limitations in the 'bottom -up' approach, such as overemphasising the ability of the periphery to frustrate the centre and not sufficiently analysing the structural constraints.

Evans, Davies and Penney (1994) viewed Ball's 'policy as discourse' (with its notion of constraint) as a check on the postmodernism inherent in his 'policy as text', which emphasises human agency as texts are invariably the product of those who write them.

Another criticism is that Ball's theory doesn't take into accounts changes as nation states adapt themselves to the process of globalisation (although he tries to do this to some extent in a paper in *Comparative Education* where the policy cycle gets a brief mention<sup>2</sup>).

What current theories leave out is acknowledgement of public policy (Ranson, 1995) and the idea that citizens should have a role in it.

'The debate has lacked an understanding of the functions of public policy in encapsulating ideal values and defining practices for the purpose and organisation of the public domain. The distinctiveness of public policy lies in the purposes and policies it clarifies for the members of a society as a whole, the values and interests which they may hold in common, and the activities they

---

<sup>2</sup> Ball, S. (1998) "Big Policies/Small World: an introduction to international perspectives in education policy" *Comparative Education*, 34 (2): 119-130. Introduction

undertake together, that is in their role as citizens.....The task of theory is to explain why public policy is as it is within the polity, but also to theorise the conditions for a different form of polity and public policy' (Ranson, 1995: 441).

## **2.7 From Policy Making to the Central Concepts in Policy Studies**

Aside from human capital creation, the goals of most states' education policies relate broadly to equity and expansion, with the ultimate objective being access for all to a high quality education system. Even if not in practice, this is at least generally the policy rhetoric.<sup>3</sup> The two main paradigms of education policy studies relate directly to these central themes. On the one hand a series of policy concepts cluster around *social justice, inclusion* and the fight *against discrimination* on the basis of race, gender and disability. On the other lie the debates raging around *efficiency, effectiveness and quality* of education. These include the issues of accountability and measurement of pupil achievement. In England the two clusters of concepts tend to be seen as opposing each other (Trowler, 1998), although the literature emanating from the international organisations do not see these concepts as necessarily on opposite sides of the conceptual scale. This binary also re-emphasises the question of how education should be provided and if it is the state's responsibility or the market's role. The issues debated around the binary of state and market are discussed below. In general it is seen that the state's priorities will be those of the social justice agenda while the market's priorities will focus around efficiency and quality.

### **2.7.1 The state or the market?**

By this western binary the query is how education (and other public services) should be delivered – through the state, through the market, or through a combination of public and private provision. The basic premise here is that the nature of state-provided education is tied up with the circumstances in which the nation-state finds itself; the different political, economic and social challenges and demands which it tries to meet. Therefore education policy and its central concepts need to be understood in relation to the changing nature of the state.

What is the state?

'The State then is not a monolith, or the same as government, or merely the government's executive committee...It is a set of publicly-financed institutions, neither separately nor collectively necessarily in harmony, confronted by certain basic problems deriving from its relationship with capitalism, with one branch the government, having responsibility for ensuring the continuing prominence of those problems on its agenda' (Dale, 1989: 57).

Sophie Watson (1999) develops these arguments about the state not being monolithic. She suggests that what we call the state is an erratic and disconnected group of publicly funded institutions. So instead of writing state with a capital S which suggests a certain unity, she puts inverted commas round it: 'the state'. She suggests that it is this erratic and disconnected nature which means that oppositional and marginalised groups and ideologies can make inroads into state institutions in certain localities depending on particular contextual factors.

---

<sup>3</sup> See the discussion of Myron Weiner's work in the last section.



How do states exercise power and what affects the power relationship between state and society? Gramsci's concept of hegemony serves as a basis.

'Hegemony...is the power to establish the 'common sense' of a society, the fund of self-evident descriptions of social reality that normally go without saying. This includes the power to establish authoritative definitions of social situations and social needs, the power to define the universe of legitimate disagreement and the power to shape the political agenda' (Fraser, 1997: 53).

Dale (1989) emphasises that the state ensures the continuing prominence of problems on the public agenda. However, just as policy is not a straightforward process from decree to delivery, hegemony is not simply a process of ruling group ideology being transmitted to subordinate groups. It is important not to fall into a reductionist view of power as residing solely in the state and being centralised and oppressive. Watson argues that there is constant renegotiation of power between state and civil institutions, with the state granting additional power, or civil institutions extracting power, depending on the context.

### **2.7.2 The functions of the state**

In order to protect people's rights, states need to take on judicial and regulatory functions, and welfare functions such as education, as well as representing members collectively in relation to other states. None of this discussion about the function of the state suggests what is a necessary or desirable level of state welfare provision. Dale (1999) identifies three functions of states in relation to welfare policy: funding, regulation and provision.

He argues that in each of these there is a potential role for the state, but also a role for the market. Nevertheless, although there is some blurring of the edges, states, markets and civil institutions have different underpinning rationales. Dale sees the state's motive in provision as a protective one for all members, while the logic underpinning market provision is consumer choice, and the logic underpinning community provision is the needs of the members of that specific community.

Whitty (2002) in turn believes that the relationship between forms of the state and education is circular. The state sets up modes of education that serve its needs, but these in turn reinforce developments in the nature of the state. So education helps to legitimate modes of economic production and modes of state operation. Because of this circular and reciprocal relationship between education and the state educators argue that education has a vital role to play in shaping the evolution of post-modern society, not just in responding to it.

## **2.8 Social Justice**

Social justice is a commonly used phrase, especially in policy documents. It is often seen as the state's duty to provide a system which will ensure social justice.

David Miller's (2000) understanding of social justice is that of equal citizenship (equal set of basic rights and ability to exercise them effectively). He argues that there is a social minimum of resources needed to live a secure and dignified life. There needs to be equality of opportunity so that life chances depend only on motivation and aptitude, not class, gender, race etc.

Social justice is historically, socially and culturally constituted. What seems socially just varies from one historical context to another, from one culture to another, and even from one social group to another. Yet, there is an assumption, particularly in policy documents, that the idea of social justice is stable and universal. However despite the universality of the concept, there is no single common meaning for nor agreed way of understanding social justice. 'Popular attitudes to social justice are themselves complex and grounded in interlocking notions of equality, reciprocity, desert and reward' (Pearce and Paxton, 2000: xi).

Policies often do not define what they mean by social justice, or alternatively, the term is defined so widely and in such vague terms that everyone agrees to it, but no-one is quite sure exactly what is meant by it. Policies also use different terms: social justice, equality and equity can appear interchangeably (Taylor *et al.*, 1997). These terms are all used very generally, thus allowing the author/speaker 'to slide over difficult political practical issues' (Griffiths and Baillon, 2003).

### **2.8.1 The history of the concept in England**

When compulsory state schooling started in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century due to the fear of the middle classes of the ignorance of the poor and rising urban unrest, social justice then meant *equal*. If every pupil had a chance to access education, could get a place at a state funded primary and secondary school, then that was enough to ensure social justice. Education was seen as a long 'ladder of opportunity' (MacIntyre, 1985, cited in Taylor *et al.*, 1997: 130). Students would climb it at different rates and to different heights, but the social justice task for governments was ensuring that it was there to be climbed.

By the mid-late 1960s, researchers were compiling evidence to show that schools played a role in reproducing existing social inequality. That the way in which schools related to pupils, the way in which pupils were categorised as they went through the education system meant that not everyone had the same chance to climb that ladder. This led to an understanding of social justice as the need to compensate particular disadvantaged students, to realise *equality of opportunity* for all.

Compensatory policies did not critically look at schools – they looked at individual pupils, at families and at communities. The 1970s and 1980s therefore saw a rush of policies that did attempt to look at more systemic issues, to turn the focus of attention onto schools and the education system in general, e.g. anti-racist, anti-sexist policies focusing on *equality of outcome* through affirmative action and positive discrimination.

However equality of outcome is not what Kathleen Lynch, cited by Sharon Gewirtz (1998) calls *equality of condition*, which means developing an egalitarian society which would be committed to equality in the living conditions of all members of society, and a goal of the equalisation of hierarchies of wealth, power and privilege.

### **2.8.2 The distributive paradigm**

Many policies focus on distribution, more precisely on access and resources. The argument is that giving individuals particular rights of access to resourced services will be enough to guarantee social justice. However, there are limits to the distributive paradigm. It does not look at broader questions about social structure and institutional context which often help determine distributive patterns.

In relation to education, it can be argued that the distributive model draws undue attention to the allocation of education overlooking content. 'Education is a social process in which the 'how much' cannot be separated from the what. There is an inescapable link between distribution and content' (Connell, 1993: 18).

So distribution is only one aspect of social justice. A focus on distribution leaves out what Sharon Gewirtz has called relational dimensions of social justice.

'This refers to relationships which structure society. A focus on this dimension helps us to theorize about issues of power and how we treat each other, both in the sense of micro face to face interactions and in the sense of macro social and economic relations which are mediated by institutions such as the state and the market' (Gewirtz, 1998: 471).

This includes looking at distribution, but also at the system within which the distribution of social and economic goods, rights and responsibilities take place. The two dimensions are separate but strongly connected.

### **2.8.3 Understanding social justice: the post-modern challenge**

The Social Justice debates focus on difference: gender, ethnicity, sexuality, religion. Post-modern theory challenges the universalism of ideas. This approach stresses that insisting on universal truths obscures different and competing understandings of justice which derive from different people's subjectivities.

'The effect of the post-modern critique of universalism has been to render problematic any application of the concept of social justice. And there is an obvious sense in which this questioning of the concept is not only proper but imperative – too many colonial peoples have suffered at the hands of Western imperialism's particular justice, too many African- Americans have suffered at the hands of white men's justice, too many women from the justice imposed by a patriarchal order and too many capitalists to make the concept other than problematic (Harvey, 1993: 95).

The post modern critique brought with it 'a politics of recognition'. This in turn brought benefits, as different groups, such as women, minority ethnic groups, gay and lesbian groups have struggled for recognition in the political arena.

‘Many actors appear to be moving away from a socialist political imaginary in which the central problem of justice is redistribution to a ‘post socialist’ political imaginary in which the central problem of justice is recognition. With this shift, the most salient social movements are no longer economically defined ‘classes’ who are struggling to defend their interests, end exploitation and win redistribution, instead they are culturally defined ‘groups’ who are struggling to defend their identities, end cultural domination and win recognition. The result is a decoupling of cultural politics from social politics and the relative eclipse of the latter by the former’ (Fraser, 1997).

In the UK one ends up with a dilemma between strategies of redistribution which seek to eliminate the significance of race and gender on the one hand and strategies of recognition which insist on the importance of one’s race and gender on the other.

Iris Young’s (1990) conception of ‘The 5 faces of oppression’ argues that instead of a focus on distribution, a focus on oppression and domination allows us to understand social injustice.

Harvey (1993) summarises them:

Exploitation (the transfer of the fruits of labour from one group to another, as, for example, in the cases of workers giving up surplus value to capitalists or women in the domestic sphere transferring the fruits of their labour to men);

Marginalization (the expulsion of people from useful participation in social life so that they are ‘potentially subjected to severe material deprivation and even extermination’);

Powerlessness (the lack of that ‘authority, status and sense of self’ which would permit a person to be listened to with respect);

Cultural imperialism (stereotyping in behaviours as well as in various forms of cultural expression such that the oppressed group’s own experience and interpretation of social life finds little expression that touches the dominant culture, while that same culture imposes on the oppressed group its experience and interpretation of social life); and

Violence (the fear and actuality of random, unprovoked attacks which have ‘no motive except to damage, humiliate or destroy the person’)’ (Harvey, 1993: 106-7, citing Young, 1990).

Gewirtz (1998) uses these as a basis for a suggested policy research agenda:

‘How, to what extent and why do education policies support, interrupt or subvert:

1. Exploitative relationships (capitalist, patriarchal, racist, heterosexist, disablist etc) within and beyond educational institutions?
2. Processes of marginalisation and inclusion within and beyond the education system?
3. The promotion of relationships based on recognition, respect, care and mutuality or produce powerlessness for education workers and students?
4. Practices of cultural imperialism? And which cultural differences should be affirmed, which should be universalised and which rejected?
5. Violent practices within and beyond the education system?’ (Gewirtz, 1998: 482).

One particular issue that arises out of the above is the question of participation and access to decision-making processes. Whose voice gets heard? Whose voice is silenced?

Another way forward suggested by Olssen, O'Neill and Codd (2004) is through the development of what they call 'thin communitarianism'. The problem they identify is how to achieve a balance between individual and group needs.

‘Thin’ communitarianism: stresses balancing the rights and freedoms of individuals to pursue their own interests with an equal interest in the rights and interests of the community. Such a conception is ‘thin’ in that the plurality of ends, goals and values are either institutionally permitted or if they conflict, democratically negotiated’ (Olssen, O'Neill and Codd, 2004: 235).

Still there is the irreducible notion of the common good, the protection and provision of resources necessary for the individual to develop capabilities. So in the field of education, this would require institutional support structures:

‘Policies for educational justice [must] embrace complex issues. These involve not only the political economy of schooling – of concerns of access and equity – but also issues of identity, difference, culture and schooling. That is, the way things are named and represented, the manner in which difference is treated and the way in which the values and norms which govern life in schools are negotiated and established. These are all matters central to the concerns both of social justice and education’ (Taylor *et al.*, 1997: 151).

Within the wider social justice discussion the main literature divides itself up around the various debates on race, gender and disability. Gillborn on race (2000), Youdell on gender (2005) and Armstrong and Barton on disability (1999) hold the central precept that discrimination in England is inbuilt in the social system.

## **2.9. Globalisation**

Globalisation is the new fashionable concept and policy effects of globalisation are associated with the increasing adoption of market forms for the delivery of services which were once organised by the state and financed through taxation (such as education or health). There is the increased 'commodification' of these services and their penetration by a private sector ethos, either in provision (e.g. contracted out cleaning and catering services) or in sponsorship, or through the organisation of services according to market principles by the introduction of consumer choice. Privatisation (discussed below) generally operates within a single country with no reference to anything beyond. However the increased globalisation of the world economy and the World Trade Organization (WTO) push for a shift from the public to the private sector in the name of efficiency and competition.

For education policy globalisation means that states are under increasing pressure to compete economically, hence a strengthened focus on human capital acquisition – skills, knowledge, standards and lifelong learning especially in the western world. States are taking a stronger controlling role on curriculum and pedagogy which results in increased regulation. It also means that policies are driven by a broad set of ideological preferences that have become orthodox solutions for rich countries responding to changing global economic circumstances (such as freer forms of economic competition and leaner government).

Dale (1999) asserts that the trend is towards what he calls a 'competitive-contractual state settlement'. The state itself sets up the conditions in which competition can take place and becomes itself an 'evaluative state' (Neave, 1988, cited in Whitty, Power and Halpin, 1998: 36-39).

The evaluative state focuses on outputs. The state withdraws to higher ground, and intermediate institutions emerge to fulfil planning and managing roles. These combine to form a new hegemony of public services administration called *new public management*, discussed below, which is underpinned by principles of cost-cutting and efficiency and not the traditional public sector professional ideal of service.

### **2.9.1 To what extent are current changes in education systems part of a global phenomenon?**

The World Trade Organisation (WTO) facilitates globalisation through opening up all spheres of social life – including the public services – to international capital. The WTO 'education agenda', therefore, is to facilitate the penetration of education services by corporate capital. The outlook underpinning the WTO is deregulation, with incremental 'freedom for transnational capital to do what it wants, where and when it wants' (Tabb, 2000:5). As William Tabb has noted, the 'WTO's fundamental postulate is that trade and investment liberalization lead to more competition, greater market efficiency and so, necessarily, to a higher standard of living' (*ibid.*). Education services will be progressively commercialised, privatised and capitalised.

The government in England has attempted to justify opening up education to corporate capital on the grounds that private sector management methods are best, and that business people are needed to 'modernise' education for a "knowledge economy" based on information

technologies. This results in the following outcomes:

- Social and moral concerns such as those of social justice and equality tend to be subordinate to the overriding priority of economic competitiveness, but may be used to generate social cohesion;
- The education sector, being a crucial area for the development of the economy is seen as needing to be increasingly directed from the centre;
- The blurring of the historically marked distinction between the public and the private sectors.

However increased globalisation has also meant increased market involvement in the public sector in general and the education sector in particular. This has been coated in discussions about *efficiency and quality* of education provision and the debates around parental choice with regard to the education provision for their children and in how far choice actually results in provider capture (Ball, 2003a; Power, 2003). An extension of this debate relates to accountability and the measuring of effectiveness and efficiency by focusing on pupil achievement. There seems to be a precept that the quality of education can be measured by test score results and that this in turn has a bearing on the value for money the particular institution provides.

### **2.9.2 The market and education**

The ‘market’ in education is actually a quasi-market where the state pays but the mode of provision is like a market. The increased role of the market has led to more private sector involvement and privatisation.

#### **Privatisation:**

Privatisation generally involves the transfer of public assets to private sector companies. Crouch (2003:4) suggests ‘commercialisation’ is the better general term, because the assumption is that the quality of public services will be improved through the introduction of practices and ethos typical of commercial practice.

There are concerns that even where not all services are commercialised, everyone within the education sector comes to be working in a commercialised sector with different values creeping in. There is the risk of a progressive demise of the public sector ethos, what Hanlon (1998) calls ‘social service’ professionalism (as oppose to ‘commercialised’ professionalism) which provides a service on the basis of need rather than the ability to pay.

‘The starting point has to be the recognition that there are two distinct logics at work. One is a logic of education, based on social and individual need, and notions of equity and democracy. The other is a logic of business, whose bottom line is profit. Not everything business wants to do is incompatible with education interests. But the logic of business is incompatible with the logic of education’ (Hatcher, 2001: 58).

Crouch argues that the superior efficiency argument depends heavily on the assumption that general management skills are more important than those specific to a particular service. He also says that many private sector techniques: effective niche marketing and ‘cherry picking’

can not work when applied to national education systems and that the ultimate consumer (parent/child) is not the party with whom the contract is made (government department) so efficiency for government department may not equal satisfaction for consumer. (Crouch 2003)

By breaking links with the electorate there is a loss of democracy and a loss of citizen capacity because firms are not directly accountable to customers, but rather to their shareholders.

‘When private firm invited to take over the functions of a ‘failed’ LEA, education services ceases to be a matter of local democracy, but contractual relationship between central government and provider’ (Crouch, 2003: 55).

As a result of privatisation there has been an increasing trend of using private sector management techniques in the public sector.

### **Managerialism:**

Over the last 20 years the way the public sector in England has been managed has changed markedly. There has been a shift away from old-style public sector bureaucratic administration. Managerialism has been the key mechanism in the cultural re-engineering of the public sector in northern countries over the past 20 years. The elevation of effectiveness and efficiency as the sole criterion of legitimacy reflects the increasing dominance of an ethic of managerialism and a concomitant emphasis upon measuring and improving performance. Managerialism and performativity are indicators of an underlying shift of the state from a role as provider to one as a regulator.

The introduction of managerial techniques from the private sector and the development of quasi market mechanisms within the public sector have resulted in the development of a new institutional culture which has been termed variously: ‘*new public management*’, ‘*new managerialism*’, or ‘*corporate managerialism*’. This has had an effect of changing relations between the centre and the periphery.

Roger Dale and Joce Jesson (1992), writing about educational reforms in New Zealand, argue that the role of a central agency, the influential State Services Commission, has been to:

‘...mainstream the education service, that is to bring the education service into conformity with the broader reforms of the public administration and deny it any special treatment. The education reforms, that is, are much more part of and much more marked by the reform of public administration than they are to do with direct changes to education’ (Dale and Jesson, 1992: 29).

Dale and Jesson’s (1992) implicit question is: ‘should the means by which education is provided be different to the provision of other services?’ This raises an even wider question: is the public sector inherently different from the private?

Gewirtz et al (2001) and Gewirtz and Ball (2000) argue in their discussion on *welfareism vs. managerialism* that education has shifted from a ‘learner needs’ perspective to an ‘institutional needs’ perspective. The welfarist system is delivered via a rational rule bound bureaucracy, in which experts exercised their professional judgement. These professionals



were 'committed to a conception of the public interest which is not reducible to a sum of private preferences' (Yeatman, 1993).

New managerialism loosens the bureaucratic systems of control and stresses the importance of motivating people to produce 'quality' and strive for 'excellence'. It emphasises the instrumental purposes of schooling – raising standards and performance as measured by exam results.

'The market revolution is not just a change of structure and incentives. It is a transformational process that brings into play a new set of values and a new moral environment. In the process, it generates new subjectivities. The role and sense of identity and purpose of school managers are being reworked and redefined. In this way new managerialism functions as a 'relay' (du Gay 1996, p.66) for the implementation and dissemination of the post welfarist project' (Gewirtz and Ball 2000: 266).

Managerialism is a set of techniques which bring about a performative culture which theorists have analysed under the term *performativity*. Performativity is a mode of regulation that employs judgements, comparison and displays as a means of control, attrition, change based on rewards and sanctions. Performances (of individuals or organisations) serve as measures of productivity, displays of quality. They stand for and encapsulate an individual's or an organisation's worth.

The performances (of individual subjects or organisations) serve as measures of productivity or output of displays of 'quality' or 'moments' of promotion or inspection. As such they stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organisation within a field of judgement. The issue of who controls the field is crucial (Ball, 2003b).

Stephen Ball (2003b) argues that managerialism works on the individual from the inside-out overlaying traditional professional values and concerns with those of the entrepreneurial manager working within a competitive market-place. Performative regimes however drive individuals with the promise and 'terror' (Lyotard, 1984) of fulfilling (or not) targets and goals, and succeeding (or not) in rankings and comparisons with others.

As Anna Yeatman (1994) argues, performativity can supply a meta-discourse for public policy. It reifies values such as efficiency, silencing questions such as 'efficiency in relation to what ends, whose ends and what time scale (short, medium or long term?)' (Yeatman, 1994: 113).

Furthermore, Funnell and Stuart (1995) argue that the convergence of 'moral orders' from both private sector corporatism and public sector bureaucracy and the concomitant 'transformation from one order of codes and sets of values to the other' has profound implications for the 'formation of identity and self' for those professionals involved (Funnell and Stuart, 1995: 157).

Ball describes the effect on teachers as 'values schizophrenia' caught between what they want to be and what they feel is required, 'their own judgements and the rigours of performance'

(Ball, 2003b: 221). This has been further developed by Louise Morley (2003), who describes professionals as ‘ventriloquists’, who *enact*<sup>4</sup> the new language under the new regime.

Ball (2003b) suggests that our response to and accommodation to performativity results in fabrications which present versions of an organisation. Whether they are ‘true’ or not is beside the point, it is the work they do on the organisation, their transforming of the organisation and the individuals. Professionals are both resisting and submitting to the new modes of regulation.

---

<sup>4</sup> Judith Butler (1990) uses the term in the sense of enactment or performance.

### **3. EFA Studies and Review of Research Methods**

In this second part of the literature review I will review four selected EFA studies and review the research methods used. This section will also discuss concepts and methods to be used in future studies.

The four studies chosen are Myron Weiner's *The Child and the State in India* (1990) *Operation Blackboard, Policy Implementation in Indian Elementary Education* by Caroline Dyer (2000), Michael Sanderson's *Education, Economic change and Society in England 1780-1870* (1991) and *Social Origins of Educational Systems* by Margaret Archer (1984). It is hoped that by setting off two contemporary studies on India with two studies dealing with the historical expansion of the education system in England, the usefulness of the concepts of Policy Studies can be demonstrated for studies dealing with Education for All (EFA).

#### **3.1 The Child and the State in India - Myron Weiner**

Myron Weiner's disciplinary background comes from Political Science and his work is not generally associated with education and development studies. The aim of his book is to examine why the Indian state has so far not implemented a compulsory education for all programme, starting with compulsory elementary education. Weiner (1990) points out that states with lower per capita income than India have implemented such policies with great success and increased literacy rates at various points in time. He also shows that the lack of such a policy actually encourages high rates of child labour.

##### **3.1.1 Description**

The central part of his study does not examine a particular policy implemented by the Indian government, but rather questions the lack of a policy. As a result Indian government policy texts are not analysed in any detail. Rather the focus remains on exposing the current situation of large numbers of working children and the attitude which governs the lack of will at the official level.

Two texts (the Harbans Singh Report of Child Labour and the National Education Policy on Education, which was put in place by the Rajiv Gandhi government) are mentioned but are only discussed superficially through the interviews with officials in Chapters 3 and 4. The interviews do give a clear image of the attitude which prevails across the Indian government and at the official level, and in that way create the basis for an analysis of the context of influence which prevails and prevents a compulsory education policy from being formulated. The Prohibition and Regulation of Child Labour Act of 1987 is also used to give greater depth to the legislative understanding of the problem.

##### **3.1.2 Analysis**

The strength of Weiner's (1990) study is how through a combination of analysis of the historical background in India, the comparison both historically with western nations and other developing countries and the detailed relegation of interviews with policy makers and activists, he conveys the context of influence which has resulted in a lack of policy making and implementation. It is clearly mentioned that the comparative framework used in Chapters 6 and 7 is of limited value as each situation is different and India's case is unique. However

the comparative framework still proves a useful backdrop for those who do not know the situation in India.

Weiner's (1990) approach is one of policy analysis, however without using a particular Policy Studies theoretical framework. Neither does he engage with the theories of development studies which link mass education to economic growth, reduced fertility and better public health. His focus is on trying to explain why policy makers in India have chosen to take a different path – improving conditions for child labour as opposed to fighting for the implementation of compulsory education for all legislation. However an analysis of the basic education texts produced by the government of India and contrasting them with the reality on the ground would arguably have helped gain a greater understanding of how and EFA policy could or could not work in India.

### **3.2 Operation Blackboard: Policy Implementation in Indian Elementary Education - Caroline Dyer**

Caroline Dyer's (2000) book is a very useful Policy Studies analysis of education policy in India. The purpose of Dyer's study is to look at the gap between policy rhetoric as formulated by the government and practice on the ground. As is mentioned in Weiner's (1990) study above, policy rhetoric in India does favour a compulsory elementary education for all, yet this is not implemented in practice. The particular focus of this book is Operation Blackboard, which was one of the policies put forward under the 1986 New National Policy on Education. Dyer (2000) maps from the ground up the context of implementation of the policy, through the context of text production in India's bureaucratic administration, back to the context of influence at state level where the policy was first developed, almost in a reverse policy cycle approach.

#### **3.2.1 Description**

The background chapters give a detailed analysis of the development of India's education policy through the analysis of a number of policy texts. These include the various five year national development plans which lay out India's economic priorities, as well as a discussion of the various national policy statements on education which were produced in 1968 and 1986. The use of original text material is particularly useful and gives the reader a clear idea how the policy ideas came to be inscribed in official policy documents. Chapter 3 is a detailed analysis of the top-down process of education policy formulation showing how the above mentioned texts ignore 'end user perspectives' on the ground. The diagrams between pages 53 and 61 are a useful tool to understand how policy is formulated and implemented. This is embedded in a wider discussion of the policy literature showing clearly that India's education policy is not formulated in a vacuum.

The Operation Blackboard case study and the effects it has had on teachers is discussed in Chapters 4 and 5. Again Dyer (2000) goes back to the original policy documents for her analysis. In Chapter 6 she then discusses the problem of policy formulation and implementation concluding that:

'In illustrating the process of policy implementation it has shown that actors' frames of reference and rationales vary widely across the system and are shaped by the politico-social contexts in which they operate' (Dyer, 2000:147).

The book's detailed analysis of the structural impediments which hamper policy implementation is a useful example of analysis which can help understand why India's education policy implementation has to date lagged so far behind government rhetoric. Dyer's (2000) conclusions point to the classical policy studies binary of the structure-agency debate as Operation Blackboard was administered solely within the government infrastructure, leaving no space for people's involvement.

### **3.2.2 Analysis**

It is clear from both the above studies that there is a gap between policy rhetoric and implementation in India. Both Dyer (2000) and Weiner (1990) use some of the policy studies concepts described above to illustrate their case and help with the analysis of education policy formulation and implementation in India. Both show how despite policy discourse favouring an education for all approach, policy implementation has moved away from this priority. Dyer's (2000) work proves more useful in Policy Studies terms because of the use of original texts. However Weiner's (1990) extensive use of interview material also delivers a clear insight into the policy formulation mechanisms which prevail in India.

### **3.3 Education, Economic change and Society in England 1780-1870 - Michael Sanderson**

Sanderson's (1991) study differs from a policy analysis piece as it is written by a historian and from a historical vantage point. The aim here is not the analysis of public policy but to determine if the English industrial revolution was successful because of strong educational support or despite educational defects in Britain at the time. In this way education is seen as a part of human capital development during the time of the industrial revolution as opposed to a policy goal.

#### **3.3.1 Description**

Sanderson (1991) distinguishes between societies that focus on mass literacy and those which focus on creating technologists by educating the top end of society. Though not mentioned here – this is a useful distinction when looking at developing countries such as India that have, unlike some of their counterparts that focus on mass elementary education, had a clear policy of science and technology education at the secondary and higher level.

The historical account describes how in England early literacy development was pushed by the churches. Especially in the Victorian era after 1830 the expansion of education for the poor was actually not about liberation, but about societal control and power. The role of the government is hardly mentioned, giving the impression that the state is barely involved in the expansion of mass education. There seems to be no 'education policy' as such. The role of the state only increases in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century with the appointment of Her Majesty's Inspectors who have to ensure that grants are spent on school buildings.

Sanderson (1991) also shows that a lot of education is pushed by the emerging middle classes who can afford private day schools. Interestingly enough a similar development of parallel private education outside the state system is taking place across India's urban centres – even amongst the poorer sections of society (see Srivastava, 2006).

Finally Sanderson (1991) analyses the schools of thought behind the expansion of education in England by focusing amongst others on Jeremy Bentham and Robert Owen. Both believed in rational choice with minimal state interference, the state's role being limited to the provision of facilities and penalties (Sanderson, 1991: 57).

### **3.3.2 Analysis**

It is concluded that education policy as such was only developed after 1870 when a secular state supported elementary school system, administered by around 2000 school boards was created.

‘From the 1830s to 1870 the main thrust of public policy had been the response to a social problem created by successful industrialisation, namely the mass education of the working classes’ (Sanderson, 1991: 69).

The main weakness of this study is the lack of analysis of the role the state played and if it was absent, the reasons why.

### **3.4 Social Origins of Educational Systems - Margaret Archer**

Archer's (1984) book takes a highly theoretical and sociological approach and sets out to answer two questions: How do state educational systems develop and how do they change? She analyses why education systems have a particular structure, particular relations to society and internal properties at any given point in time and concludes that this is determined by those who control it. Margaret Archer consequently links the development of the education system firmly to the politics and the political priorities of the day as it deals with the struggle for control, who gains control and how.

‘The point is that no group, even for that matter the whole of society acting in accord, has a blank sheet of paper on which to design national education. (...) Concepts of education are of necessity limited by the contemporary state of knowledge and their implementation by the existing availability of skills and resources.’ (Archer, 1984).

A large part of the analysis uses the structure-agency framework as a basis for analysis of how the education systems in France and England developed and later how they influenced subsequent educational systems. Archer describes the historical cycles which engender various systems, differentiating between the centralised and the decentralised ones.

The study is about locating the time at which a country acquires an education system and how this system develops. It is not about analysing the policies these systems later formulate or how education expands into a universal system. Education policy relates to the goals of those who have won the power struggles and which they try to implement – yet this book is not a discussion about the goals but about the structure. Archer (1984) provides us with a different theoretical framework from which to analyse national education systems, however with limited use for policy analysis.

Even in the section on how change is brought about within the state education system, policy is not discussed. This part only theorises the mechanisms of how the system has moved from power struggles to negotiations between various factions.

Archer (1984) concludes with a section on how different systems do in the end have a limited convergence.

### **3.5 Concepts and Methods to be used in future studies**

The above summary of some of the most commonly used concepts in policy studies in education hopes to help link in with the analysis of policy texts in development studies. Developing countries produce policies with regard to education, however they tend not to be analysed from a policy studies vantage point. A policy studies framework might however be useful in disentangling how some of these policies have been developed and how and why they are being implemented. Bowe, Ball and Gold's (1992) policy cycle is of particular use here as the various contexts require the analysis of both the structure and agency which led to policy formulation and implementation. In analysing any policy document relating to EFA it is important to remember the diverse contexts of the international non-governmental agencies as well as the role domestic ministries play in formulating policy texts. EFA for instance, although relating to domestic strategies today, was an international strategy to provide universal primary education. A comparative policy cycle analysis on a number of countries could yield interesting results.

When analysing policy texts it is useful to draw on Foucault's discourse analysis strategy described above, trying to remember how the discourses used shape the way we think and ask questions. It is important to step out of this artificially produced reality to be able to interpret text and discourse despite the context they are presented in. A good introduction to text and discourse analysis can be found in Denzin and Lincoln (2003), in particular Part V of their book on the art and practice of interpretation, evaluation and representation is very useful. Ozga's (2000) *Policy Research in Educational settings* is also a useful and practical introduction to the methods described above.

The spectrum and depth of analysis and evaluation in development studies could be enriched by adding to its analytical framework Ball's policy cycle and Foucault's discourse analysis strategies and by using some of the policy studies concepts described in this brief.

#### **4. Conclusion**

The review of concepts from Policy Studies relevant for the analysis of EFA has brought to light how concepts, used previously in the developed world could now become relevant for education policy analysis globally, including the developing world.

However, the transferability of the concepts discussed above and their related debates to the context of EFA in developing countries require a re-contextualisation which takes into account the EFA priorities of equity and access. Jomtien and Dakar have focused governments around the world to expand their education system in order to widen access to society as a whole. The wider notions of democratisation however go hand in hand with education reforms that link into the efficiency/quality and accountability versus social justice debate mentioned above. The basic question remains of how governments will manage to reconcile expanding the education system and creating a true EFA system, while maintaining high levels of quality. The role of education policy analysis and the use of policy studies concepts are key in looking at this debate within a different framework and from a different vantage point.



## **References**

- Archer, M. (1984) *Social origins of educational systems*. London, Sage.
- Armstrong, F. and Barton, L. (eds.) (1999) *Disability, Human Rights and Education: Cross-cultural Perspectives*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Ball, S. (1990) *Politics and Policy-making in Education*. London, Routledge.
- Ball, S. (1994) *Education Reform*. Buckingham, OUP.
- Ball, S. (1994) Some Reflections on Policy Theory: A brief Response to Hatcher and Troyna. *Journal of Education Policy*, 9(2): 171-182.
- Ball, S. (1998) Big Policies/Small World: an introduction to international perspectives in education policy. *Comparative Education*, 34(2): 119-130.
- Ball, S. (2003a) *Class strategies and the education market: the middle classes and social advantage*. London, Routledge/Falmer.
- Ball, S. (2003b) The teachers' soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2): 215-228.
- Bowe, R., Ball, S. with Gold, A. (1992) *Reforming Education and Changing Schools: Case Studies in Policy Sociology*. London, Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1990) *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*. London, Routledge.
- Connell, R. W. (1993) *Schools and Social Justice*. London, Pluto Press.
- Crouch, C. (2003) *Commercialisation or Citizenship*. London, The Fabian Society.
- Dale, R. (1989) *The state and education policy*. Milton Keynes, OUP.
- Dale, R. (1999) Specifying Globalisation Effects on National Policy: A Focus on Mechanisms. *Journal of Education Policy* 14(1): 1-18.
- Dale, R. and Jesson, J. (1992) Mainstreaming education: The role of the State Services Commission. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 2: 7-34
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y., (eds). (2003) *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. London, Sage.
- Dyer, C. (2000) *Operation Blackboard: Policy Implementation in Indian Elementary Education*. Oxford, Symposium Books.
- Evans, J., Davies, B. and Penney, D. (1994) Whatever Happened to the Subject and the State in Policy Research in Education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 14(2): 57-64.

- Fitz, J., Halpin, D. and Power, S. (1993) *Grant maintained schools: education in the market place*. London, Kogan Press.
- Fraser, N. (1997) *Justice interruptus: critical reflections on the 'post-socialist' condition*. London, Routledge.
- Funnell, E. and Stuart, M. (eds.) (1995) *Learning to read: psychology in the classroom*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Gewirtz, S. (1998) Conceptualising social justice in Education. *Journal of Education Policy* 13(4): 469-484.
- Gewirtz, S. and Ball, S. (2000) "From 'Welfarism' to 'New Managerialism': shifting discourses of school headship in the education marketplace." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 21(3): 253 - 268.
- Gerwitz, S., Bowe, R. and Ball, S. (2001) Social Class and Choice of Secondary Schooling. In *The Contemporary British Society Reader*, Abercrombie and Ward (eds). Cambridge: Polity Press
- Gewirtz, S. (2002) *The Managerial School*. Buckingham, OUP.
- Gewirtz, S. and Ozga, J. (1994) Sex, Lies and Audiotape: Interviewing the education policy elite. In *Researching Education Policy: Ethical and Methodological Issues*. D.Halpin, and B. Troyna (eds.) London, Falmer.
- Gillborn, D. and Youdell, D. (2000) *Rationing Education*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Gillborn, D. (2000) *Educational inequality: mapping race, class and gender : a synthesis of research evidence*. London, Office for Standards in Education
- Green, A. (1990) *Education and State Formation, The Rise of Educational System in England, France and USA*. London, Macmillan.
- Griffiths, M. and Baillon, S. (2003) *Action for Social Justice in Education: Fairly different*. Maidenhead, Open University Press.
- Gunew, S. and Yeatman, A. (1993) *Feminism and the politics of difference*. Boulder Colorado, Westview Press.
- Halpin, D. and Troyna, B. (eds.) (1994) *Researching Education Policy: Ethical and Methodological Issues*. Social Research and Educational Studies Series, 14. London, Falmer Press.
- Hanlon, G. (1998) Professionalism as enterprise: service class politics and the redefinition of professionalism. *Sociology*, 32(1): 43-63.

*Review of Concepts from Policy Studies*

- Harvey, D. (1993) Class relations, social justice and the politics of difference. In *Principled positions : postmodernism and the rediscovery of value (1993)* J. Squires (ed). London, Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hatcher, R. (2001) Getting Down to Business: Schooling in the Globalised Economy. *Education and Social Justice* 3(2): 45-59.
- Held, D. and McGrew, A. (eds.) (2003) *The global transformations reader: an introduction to the globalization debate*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Henry, M., Lingard, B., Rizzvi, F. and Taylor, S. (2001) *The OECD, Globalisation and Education Policy*. London, Pergamon.
- Lingard, B. (2003) *Leading learning: making hope practical in schools*. Maidenhead, OUP.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984) *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- Marshall, C. (2000) Policy discourse analysis: negotiating gender equity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 15(2): 125-156.
- Marshall, J. D. (1999) *Education Policy*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.
- Mehrotra, S. (1998) Education For All: Policy Lessons from High Achieving Countries. *International Revue of Education*, 44(5/6): 416-484.
- Miller, D. (2000) *Citizenship and national identity*. Cambridge, Polity.
- Morley, L. (2003) *Quality and power in higher education*. Maidenhead, Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Muller, D. K., Ringer, F. and Simon B. (1987) *The Rise of the Modern Educational System: Structural Change and Social Reproduction 1870-1920*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- OECD (2004) *Education at a glance*. Education Indicators.
- Olssen, M. (ed.) (2004) *Culture and learning: access and opportunity in the classroom*. Greenwich, Information Age Publisher.
- Olssen, M., O' Neill, A., and Codd, J. (2004) *Education Policy, Globalization, Citizenship and Democracy*. London, Sage.
- Ozga, J. (2000) *Policy Research in Educational Settings*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Ozga, J., Seddon, T. and Popkewitz, T. (2006) *Education Research and Policy, Steering the knowledge economy*. London, Routledge.

- Pearce, N. and Paxton, W. (2005) *Social justice: building a fairer Britain*. London, Politico's.
- Power, S. (2003) *Education and the middle class*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Ranson, S. (1995) Theorising Education Policy. *Journal of Education Policy*, 10(4): 427-448.
- Sanderson, M. (1991) *Education, Economic Changes and Society in England (1780-1870)*. London, Macmillan.
- Srivastava, P. (2006) Private schooling and mental models about girls' schooling in India. *Compare*, 36(4): 497-514.
- Tabb, W. (2000) The World Trade Organisation? Stop World Takeover. *Monthly Review*, 51(10): 1-18.
- Taylor, S., Rizvi F., Lingard, B. and Henry, M. (1997) *Educational Policy and the Politics of Change*. London, Routledge.
- Trowler, P. (1998) *Academics Responding to Change: New Higher Education Frameworks and Academic Cultures*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Watson, S. (1999) *Engendering Social Policy*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Weiner, M. (1990) *The Child and the State in India: Child Labor and Education Policy in Comparative Perspective*. New Jersey, Princeton University Press.
- Whitty, G., Power, S., and Halpin, D. (1998) *Devolution and Choice in Education: The School, the State and the Market*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Whitty, G. (2002) *Making sense of education policy: studies in the sociology and politics of education*. London, Paul Chapman Publishing
- Yeatman, A. (1993) Corporate managerialism and the shift from the welfare to the competition state. *Discourse*, 13(2): 3-19.
- Yeatman, A. (1994) *Postmodern Revisionings of the Political*. London, Routledge.
- Youdell, D. (2005) Sex–gender–sexuality: how sex, gender and sexuality constellations are constituted in secondary schools. *Gender and Education*, 17(3): 249-270.



Consortium for Research on  
Educational Access, Transitions & Equity  
Funded by DFID

### Report summary:

This paper gives an introduction to the central concepts and the literature of Policy Studies in education. It looks at what policy is, how it is made and why it is relevant. In particular it examines the role of the state in the policy cycle framework. The paper looks at the central concepts of policy studies and how they are used in studies relating to Education for All (EFA). The paper concludes that the transferability of the concepts and their related debates to the context of EFA in developing countries require a re-contextualisation which takes into account the EFA priorities of equity and access.

### Author notes:

Dr Marie Lall is South Asia specialist and a Lecturer in Education Policy at the Institute of Education, University of London. She is also an associate fellow at Chatham House. Marie's research interests include: education policy with regard to gender, race and social exclusion issues in developed and developing countries, specifically Indian and Pakistani education policy; the formation of National Identity in South Asia; politics of South Asia as well as Diaspora and migration politics. She is the author of India's Missed Opportunity (Ashgate 2001) and of numerous articles on education and South Asian politics.

Address for Correspondence:

CREATE, Centre for International Education  
Sussex School of Education, University of Sussex  
Brighton BN1 9QQ, UK.

Website: <http://www.create-rpc.org>

Email: [create@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:create@sussex.ac.uk)

