8-9 October 2018. International Symposium. Maison Inter-Universitaire des Sciences de l'Homme d'Alsace. University of Strasbourg, France.

The research unit CNRS SAGE (Society, Actors and Government in Europe) and the Chinese-French Centre for Innovation in Education (Beijing Normal University) organise, in partnership with the Federal University of Minas Gerais (GESTRADO), the European Network of Sociologists in Education (EERA : European Educational Research Association), and the thematic network « Globalization and the restructuring of professions in education» WERA: World Educational Research Association) an international symposium on the following topic:

Governing by numbers at international scale. New relationships between the State and Professions in Education?

Internationally, a government by numbers is extended through new assessment tools whereas the PISA survey becomes a critical reference for leading education policies (Grek, 2009). International organizations, as the OECD of the European Commission are key-actors in these transformations because they produce reports and address recommendations to States to engage educational agents towards a new Knowledge Economy (Sellar, Lingard, 2013, 2014).

These discourses and watchwords, recommendations and prescriptions, assessment and government tools, quality frameworks and rankings circulate worldwide and lead to different forms of policy borrowing and transfer from one continent to another, from one country to another, with important variations in the place given to the market and privatization, devolution, quality assurance, evidence-based technologies, as well as to the relationships between the State and professions, expertise and research, knowledge assessment and teaching, school management and leadership (Steiner-Khamsi, Waldow, 2012).

This international symposium aims to draw a state of the art in this international circulation of a government by numbers, and to feature continuities and ruptures observed since the 1980s in reforms and their effects on educational professions (Seddon, Levin, 2013). From South America to Europe and China, there are many historical, cultural, and institutional configurations which demonstrate that the globalisation of education systems is not a

1

homogeneous process. Indeed, the international circulation takes shape through national and local contexts, specific institutional trajectories, different assimilating and disseminating processes, in reforms in which actors are involved according to different ways of mobilization or contestation (Lingard, Shaun, 2011).

The first objective of the symposium is to question the way different worldwide organizations and agencies, with the development of the PISA survey, have shaped tools for evaluating education systems and discourses focused on effectiveness and quality in education. This reformist political agenda, which circulates at international scale, challenges knowledge and expertise among professionals, as well as their autonomy, in promoting new standards, recommendations, and best practices (OCDE, 2005, Seddon, Ozga, Levin, 2013, Robertson, 2012). The good students of the PISA survey, particularly Asian ones, are often take as a reference by experts to emphasize quality modernisation and improvement of education systems and to increase performance and competitiveness (Schleicher, 2012, Lindblad & Popkewitz, 2004). Some specific tools are developed (quality standards, audits, benchmarks, evidence-based data) and translated in national and local contexts. In parallel to this international agenda, education public policies are using the government by numbers to develop different assessment tools (tests, indicators, etc.). those have an important impact on the work of professions whereas some principles of local autonomy, external evaluation, diversification of school provision, performance-related pay are asserted (Ozga & Lingard, 2007, Ball, 2016, Gewirtz & alii, 2009).

In analysing this international circulation, what is at stake is the recognition of the fluidity, multiplicity, and historical contingency of education policies (Popkewitz, 2000). This circulation does not correspond merely to transfer from International Organizations to national spaces but to cross-over dynamics combining processes of dissemination, selection and adaptation with interdependencies between national and local actors with diverse interests and resources (Dale, 2009). Several studies have characterized these processes in terms of "mediation", "recontextualization", "glocalisation", "bricolage", "hybridization" in showing the complexity of scales, national trajectories, transnational networks (Ball, Maroy, 2009; Dale, 1999; Ball, 1998, 2009; Maroy, 2009). So, the government by numbers is at the crossroads of multiple games of action and interaction within political spaces themselves extremely diversified. The objective of the symposium is to examine these political, cultural, institutional variations in different world regions and countries in showing how these reforms converge or diverge by their intensity, rhythm, and implementation at national or local levels.

The second objective of this international symposium is to question the relationships between educational professions and the State (Hood, 1991). Indeed, the State, everywhere in the world, is relatively active in the restructuring of educational professions and their adaptation to accountability and New Public Management (Pollitt, 1990; Pollitt, Bouckaert, 2004). Educators' professionalism is challenged by these critical changes in school organizations, conceptions of autonomy, rules of selection and recruitment, professional careers, balance between the public and the private (Evans, 2008). The government by numbers has placed effectiveness, quality and equity at the core of education systems and their regulation in making professionals more accountable for student outcomes. They must include assessment tools in their daily practices but also to be involved in collaborative practices within school organisations (Biesta, 2015; Robertson, 2013). This organizational professionalism, in replacing occupational professionalism, has important consequences on statuses and ethics

among professional groups as well as on conceptions of public interest and common goods in education (Evetts, 2008). These changes concern teachers, principals, as well as other members of the education community.

So, the symposium aims to stimulate a reflection on changes and continuities in the relationship between educational professions and the State (Clarke, Newman, 1997). The new professionalism, in attempting to break with bureaucracy, maintains however hierarchy and control over professionals, but also a relative standardization of practices through normalization devices and techniques (Mahony, Hextall, 2000; Evetts, 2009). But educational professions are also increasingly constrained by new requirements from audit and self-evaluation, quality management, while traditional forms of collegiality and solidarity between peers are replace by rationales focused on performance, flexibility, individualisation of remunerations and careers (Gunter & alii, 2007, Gunter & Fitzgerald, 2013, Gunter & alii, 2016; Ozga & alii, 2011, Green, Lingrend, 2014).However, these new organizations give place to collaborative practices and networking providing new opportunities in terms of training, innovation and partnerships.

The analysis of a government by numbers cannot be separate from a reflection on the impact of digital technologies on teaching and coordination of educative activities (Williamson, 2016; Fenwick, Landri, 2012). However, beyond instrumentalization and technologizing practices, the symposium focuses on how new working relationships are implemented through digital technologies supported by new principles and vision in education. Coupled with temporal and spatial arrangements, they contribute to redefine professional identities according to sometimes paradoxical injunctions in terms of responsibilities and commitments for student success. Professional cultures tend to be redefined in adopting compromises between traditional values and technocratic vision, competition and inclusion, performance and support, and they confront professionals to uncertainty, moral dilemmas, fragmentation of their identities and subjectivities. The symposium gives the opportunity to question this new making of the self and professional experiences within very diversified national and local contexts.

The stake of the symposium is to answer to these following thematic questions:

- What are the effects of an international circulation of a government by numbers on national and/or local education policies in terms of institutional dynamics and trajectories?
- How the development of the PISA survey entails the international circulation of a reformist agenda, in terms of knowledge, meetings between national policy-makers, mobilisation of expert groups, development of national and international reports?
- How ideas, models, instruments, techniques which circulate at international scale are adopted and reintroduced in national and local contexts? Under what forms in terms of evaluation, organization, training of educators? What is the impact on professions?
- How some mobilisations emerge among policy-makers, experts, associations, trade-unions, media around the presentation and diffusion of PISA outcomes?
- In which ways the international circulation of a reformist agenda after the PISA survey leads to a restructuring of the relationships between the State and professions? What are the exogeneous and endogenous mechanisms explaining these transformations? What are the consequences on professional cultures and identities?

- What are the convergence in the restructuring of school organizations and professions at international scale. What are the historical, cultural, institutional factors which explain different trajectories, compromises, translations and hybridization in national and local contexts?
- What are the features of this new professionalism which emerge at international scale? Which conceptions of profession are underlined? What is the influence of New Public Management? What can be said about the new relationships between educators, their professional knowledge and school organizations?

Organisation committee: Luis Miguel Carvalho, Lisbon University, Portugal; Magdalena Hadjiisky, Strasbourg University, France; Louis Levasseur, Laval University, Québec, Canada; LIU Min, Beijing Normal University, China; Romuald Normand, Strasbourg University, France; Dalila Andrade Oliveira, Minas Gerais Federal University, Brazil

Scientific Committee: Jenny Assael, Chile University, Chile; Luis Miguel Carvalho, Lisbon University, Portugal; Rodrigo Cornejo, Chile University, Chile; Xavier Dumay, Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium; Vincent Dupriez, Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium; Myriam Feldfeber, Buenos Aires University, Argentina, Radhika Gorur, Deakin University, Australia; Emiliano Grimaldi, University Frederico II; Naples, Galina Gurova, Tampere University, Finland; Magdalena Hadjiisky, Strasbourg University, France; Jaakko Kauko, Tampere University, Finland, Paolo Landri, Research Institute on Population and Social Policy, Italy; Martin Lawn, Oxford University, UK; Louis Levasseur, Laval University, Québec, Canada, Romuald Normand, Strasbourg University, France; LIU Min, Beijing Normal University, China; Régis Malet, Bordeaux University, France; Helena E. Mincu, Turino University, Italy; Rick Mintrop, Berkeley University, USA; Christina E. Moldstad, INN University, Norway; Romuald Normand, Strasbourg, University, France; Dalila Andrade Oliveira, Minas Gerais Federal University, Brazil; Olivier Perrenoud, Lausanne University, Switzerland; Daniel Petterson, Gävle University, Sweden; Nelli Piatteova, Tampere University, Xavier Pons, East-Paris University, France; Tom Popkewitz, Wisconsin-Madison University, USA; Laetitia Progin, Lausanne University, Switzerland; Tine S. Prøitz, University College of Southeast Norway ; Palle Rasmussen, Aalborg University, Denmark ; Risto Rinne, Turku University, Finland; Roberto Serpieri, University Frederic II, Naples; Hannu Simola, Turku University, Finland; Noah Sobe, Loyola University, Chicago, USA; Pierre Tulowitzki, Ludwisburg University, Germany; Toni Verger, Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain: ZHANG Dan, East China Normal University, Shanghai.

References

Ball, Stephen J. "Big policies/small world: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy." *Comparative education* 34.2 (1998): 119-130.

Ball, Stephen J. "Privatising education, privatising education policy, privatising educational research: Network governance and the 'competition state'." *Journal of education policy* 24.1 (2009): 83-99.

Ball, S.J. (2016) Following policy: networks, network ethnography and education policy mobilities, *Journal of Education Policy*, 31:5, 549-566.

Ball, Stephen J., and Christian Maroy. "School's logics of action as mediation and compromise between internal dynamics and external constraints and pressures." *Compare* 39.1 (2009): 99-112.

Biesta, Gert. "What is education for? On good education, teacher judgement, and educational professionalism." *European Journal of Education* 50.1 (2015): 75-87.

Clarke, J. & Newman, J. (1997), *The managerial state: power, politics and ideology in the remaking of social welfare*. Londres, Sage.

Dale, R. (1999). Specifying globalisation effects on national policy: a focus on the mechanisms". *Journal of Education Policy,* 14 (1): 1-17.

Evans, Linda. "Professionalism, professionality and the development of education professionals." *British journal of educational studies* 56.1 (2008): 20-38.

Evetts, J. (Ed.). (2008). Professional work in Europe: Concepts, theories and methodologies. *Special Issue of European Societies*, 10 (4), 525–544.

Evetts, J. (2009). The management of professionalism: A contemporary paradox. In S. Gewirtz, P. Mahony, I. Hextall, & A. Cribb (Eds.), *Changing teacher professionalism: International trends, challenges and ways forward* (pp. 19–30). London: Routledge.

Fenwick, T., & Landri, P. (2012). Materialities, textures and pedagogies: socio-material assemblages in education. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, *20*(1), 1-7.

Gewirtz, S., Mahony, P., Hextall, I., y Cribb, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Changing teacher professionalism: International trends, challenges and ways forward*. Londres, Routledge.

Grek, S. (2009). Governing by numbers: The PISA 'effect'in Europe. *Journal of education policy*, *24*(1), 23-37.

Grek, S., & Lindgren, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Governing by inspection*. Routledge.

Gunter, H., Rayner, S., Butt, G., Fielding, A., Lance, A., & Thomas, H. (2007). Transforming the school workforce: perspectives on school reform in England. *Journal of Educational Change*, *8*(1), 25-39.

Gunter, H. & Fitzgerald, T. (2013). New Public Management and the modernisation of education systems. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 45 (3): 213-219.

Gunter, H. M., Grimaldi, E., Hall, D., & Serpieri, R. (Eds.). (2016). *New public management and the reform of education: European lessons for policy and practice*. Routledge.

Hood, C. (1991), "A public management for all seasons?" *Public administration*, 69 (1), pág. 3–19.

Lindblad, S., & Popkewitz, T.S. (2004). Educational restructuring: (re) thinking the problematic of reform. In. S. Lindblad & T.S. Popkewitz (eds.), *Educational Restructuring: Perspectives on Traveling Policies*. Greenwich, US: Information Age Publishing.

Lingard, Bob, and Shaun Rawolle. "New scalar politics: Implications for education policy." *Comparative Education* 47.4 (2011): 489-502.

Mahony, P. y Hextall, I. (2000), *Reconstructing teaching: standards, performance and accountability*. London, Routledge.

OECD (2005). *Teachers Matter: Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers.* OECD Publishing.

Ozga, J. & Lingard, B. (2007). Globalisation, education policy, and politics. In B. Lingard & J. Ozga (eds.) *The Routlege/Falmer in Education Policy and Politics*. New York: Routledge.

Ozga, J., Dahler-Larsen, P., Segerholm, C., & Simola, H. (Eds.). (2011) *Fabricating quality in education: Data and governance in Europe*. Routledge.

Pollitt, C. (1990), *Managerialism and the Public Services: The Anglo-American Experience*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Pollitt, C. y Bouckaert, G. (2004), *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis* [2a Edición]. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Popkewitz, T. (2000). Globalization/Regionalization, knowledge, and the educational practices. In T.S. Popkewitz (Ed.) *Educational Knowledge: changing relationships between the state, civil society, and the educational community*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Robertson, S. L. (2012). 'Placing' teachers in global governance agendas. *Comparative Education Review*, 56 (3): 584-607.

Robertson, S. L. (2013) Teachers' work, denationalisation, and transformations in the field of symbolic control: a comparative account. In T. Seddon & J.S. Levin (eds.), *Education, Professionalism, and Politics: Global transitions, national spaces, and professional projects* [World-yearbook of Education 2013]. London: Routledge.

Schleicher, A. (ed.) (2012) *Preparing Teachers and Developing School Leaders for the 21st Century: Lessons from around the World*. OECD Publishing.

Seddon, T., & Levin, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Educators, professionalism and politics: Global transitions, national spaces and professional projects*. Routledge.

Seddon, T., Ozga, J. & Levin, J.S. (2013). Global transitions and teacher professionalism. In T. Seddon & J.S. Levin (eds.), *Education, Professionalism, and Politics: Global transitions, national spaces, and professional projects* [World-yearbook of Education 2013]. London: Routledge.

Sellar, S., & Lingard, B. (2013). The OECD and global governance in education. *Journal of Education Policy*, *28*(5), 710-725.

Sellar, S., & Lingard, B. (2014). The OECD and the expansion of PISA: New global modes of governance in education. *British Educational Research Journal*, *40*(6), 917-936.

Steiner-Khamsi, G., & Waldow, F. (Eds.). (2012). *World yearbook of education 2012: Policy borrowing and lending in education*. Routledge.

Williamson, B. (2016). Digital education governance: data visualization, predictive analytics, and 'real-time'policy instruments. *Journal of Education Policy*, *31*(2), 123-141.