

GLOBALISATION AND GOVERNANCE: EDUCATIONAL POLICY INSTRUMENTS AND REGULATORY ARRANGEMENTS

KA-HO MOK

Abstract – For more than a decade, the economic, social, political and cultural effects of globalisation have been central topics of debate. Those who see globalisation as a combination of economic transactions and worldwide telecommunications tend to believe that its impact is profound, inasmuch as it is fundamentally altering the way in which we live and creating hybrid cultural styles. No country is immune from the effects of globalisation, and controversy continues to reign about its positive and negative consequences. The present study identifies and examines numerous challenges posed by globalisation and their implications for educational restructuring, with special attention being given to new forms of governance; the relation between the state, the market and civil society; and governmental policy instruments for education.

Zusammenfassung – GLOBALISIERUNG UND REGIERUNGSGEWALT: NEUE POLITIKINSTRUMENTE UND REGULIERENDE ARRANGEMENTS FÜR DIE BILDUNG – Seit mehr als einem Jahrzehnt werden die wirtschaftlichen, sozialen, politischen und kulturellen Auswirkungen der Globalisierung debattiert. Diejenigen, welche die Globalisierung als eine Verbindung von ökonomischen Transaktionen und weltweiter Telekommunikation ansehen, neigen zu der Auffassung, dass ihr Einfluss tiefgehend ist, insofern sie unsere Lebensweisen grundlegend verändert und hybride kulturelle Stile erschafft. Kein Land ist gegen die Auswirkungen der Globalisierung immun, und die Kontroverse über ihre positiven und negativen Konsequenzen besteht weiterhin. Die vorliegende Studie identifiziert und untersucht zahlreiche Herausforderungen der Globalisierung und ihre Auswirkungen auf die Restrukturierung der Bildung. Dabei wird neuen Formen der Regierungsgewalt, der Beziehung zwischen dem Staat, dem Markt und der Zivilgesellschaft sowie den Instrumenten der Regierungspolitik für Bildung besondere Aufmerksamkeit gewidmet.

Résumé – GLOBALISATION ET GOUVERNEMENT : NOUVEAUX INSTRUMENTS DE POLITIQUE ET DISPOSITIONS RÉGULATRICES POUR L'ÉDUCATION – Depuis plus d'une décennie, les effets économiques, sociaux, politiques et culturels de la globalisation ont été des sujets de débat centraux. Ceux qui voient la globalisation comme une combinaison de transactions économiques et de télécommunications à l'échelle mondiale tendent à croire que son impact est profond en ce sens où elle altère fondamentalement la manière dont nous vivons et où elle crée des styles culturels hybrides. Aucun pays n'est immunisé contre les effets de la globalisation et la controverse continue de régner à propos de ses conséquences positives et négatives. L'étude présente identifie et examine les défis nombreux posés par la globalisation et leurs implications pour une restructuration éducative, cela avec une attention spéciale accordée aux nouvelles formes de gouvernement ; la relation entre l'état, le marché et la société civile ; et les instruments de la politique gouvernementale de l'éducation.

Resumen – GLOBALIZACIÓN Y BUEN GOBIERNO: NUEVOS INSTRUMENTOS POLÍTICOS Y CONVENIOS REGULADORES DE LA EDUCACIÓN – Durante más de una década, los efectos económicos, sociales, políticos y culturales han sido temas centrales de los debates sobre la globalización. Quienes consideren que la globalización es una combinación de transacciones económicas y telecomunicaciones mundiales tenderán a sostener que su impacto es profundo, ya que altera fundamentalmente nuestro modo de vida y crea estilos culturales híbridos. Ningún país ha quedado inmune de los efectos de la globalización, y sigue reinando la controversia en cuanto a sus consecuencias positivas y negativas. El presente estudio identifica y examina numerosos retos planteados por la globalización y sus implicaciones para la reestructuración de la enseñanza, dedicando especial atención a nuevas formas de gobierno, a la relación entre el Estado, el mercado y la sociedad civil y a los instrumentos de política gubernamental relacionados con la educación.

Резюме – ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИЯ И РУКОВОДСТВО: НОВЫЕ ИНСТРУМЕНТЫ ПОЛИТИКИ И КОНТРОЛЬ В ОБРАЗОВАНИИ – Свыше одного десятилетия экономическое, социальное, политическое и культурное влияние глобализации являются центральными темами в дискуссии. Те, кто рассматривают глобализацию как сочетание экономических сделок и всемирное средство телекоммуникации, полагают, что ее влияние достаточно глубоко и серьезно ввиду того, что она существенно изменяет образ нашей жизни и создает смешанные культурные стили. Ни одна страна не может избежать влияния глобализации, и продолжается полемика о ее позитивных и негативных последствиях. В данном исследовании рассматриваются и изучаются многочисленные проблемы, вызванные глобализацией, и их значение для реструктурирования образования, где особое внимание уделяется новым формам руководства; отношению между государством, рынком и гражданским обществом; и правительственным инструментам политики в области образования.

It should be noted at the outset that ‘globalisation’ is a highly contested term. Globalisation has different meanings for different people. Some scholars believe that we can only understand contemporary society by analysing the impact of globalisation processes; others reject this thesis, criticising what they see as the overstatement of the impact of globalisation on social, economic, cultural and political developments (Sklair 1995; Sassen 1998; Hirst and Thompson 1999; Mittleman 2000). Despite the disagreements and diverse interpretations of globalisation’s impact on contemporary society, no-one can deny that the discourse on globalisation has been growing, notably the examination of how globalisation processes have affected public policy formulation and modern governance (Massey 1997; Pierre and Peters 2000; Yeates 2001).

On the issue of globalisation, sociologists can be roughly divided into three camps. These can be described as the strong globalists, the sceptics and the transformationalists. Each of these schools of opinion has a different interpretation of globalisation’s impacts on modern states (Held et al. 1999).

A crude representation of the ‘strong’ globalisation theory is that the global economy is dominated by worldwide forces; as a result, nation-states are structurally dependent on global capital primarily controlled by transnational corporations (Yeates 2001). The emergence of a complex global

economy has also inevitably led to changes in state structures. Those who adhere to the 'strong' globalisation theory maintain that globalisation creates great uncertainty in the world economy, which in turn requires nation-states to promote stability in the domestic economy. In addition, globalisation also constrains the capacity of nation-states to co-ordinate political bargaining and to compensate interest groups (Woods 2000; Jayasuriya 2001). To strong globalists, globalisation means a drastic shift in structural power and authority away from nation-states towards non-state agencies, and from national political systems to global economic systems. They also believe that the world is being pushed towards political and economic convergence in the context of globalisation (Strange 1996; Held 2000).

Scholars who oppose the convergence thesis criticise the strong globalists for overstating and over-generalising the convergence aspects of globalisation. They point to the continuing importance of nation-states and the heterogeneity of national, regional and local responses to global processes (Hirst and Thompson 1999; Held 2000; Waters 2001). The sceptics maintain that contemporary levels of economic interdependence are not historically unprecedented. They criticise the arguments of strong globalists as fundamentally flawed and politically naïve, arguing that such arguments underestimate the power of national governments to regulate international economic activity. The sceptics point to the important role that regional organisations perform in the world economy. They also assert that, compared with the age of world empires, the international economy has become considerably less global in its geographical embrace (Held et al. 1999; Smith et al. 1999).

The transformationists, like the strong globalists, perceive globalisation as an unprecedented force for rapid political, economic and social change in modern societies. However, they reject the thesis of global convergence. They believe that the mere existence of a single global system is not evidence of global convergence or of the arrival of a single world society. Instead, the transformationists believe that globalisation will lead to 'global-stratification', since some states, societies and communities benefit from the global order at the expense of others. Globalisation thus marginalises less competitive economies. The transformationists believe that the new emerging global patterns require a reformulation of the old vocabulary that is based on a juxtaposition of North versus South or First World versus Third World, acknowledging that new hierarchies cut across and penetrate all societies and regions of the world (Held et al. 1999; Waters 2001).

In my view, globalisation processes are complex and often contradictory, and we need to avoid an overly deterministic view of globalisation. On one hand, we cannot deny that globalisation is a real phenomenon whose effects are enhanced and even transformed by the revolution in communications and the continuing advance of technology-driven innovation. On the economic front, globalisation is a process that allows for the removal of restrictions, hence leading to increased trade and economic growth – the benefits of a more liberal trade environment. On the other hand, we should not

underestimate the social and political costs of globalisation. These include growing inequalities between countries, environmental degradation, the commoditisation of culture and education, rising unemployment, greater uncertainty and risk, and a reduction in the power of states (Hsieh and Tseng 2002; Stiglitz 2002).

Globalisation in its most extreme form accelerates economic integration, which in turn privileges market capitalism. Thus, economic power is placed in the hands of transnational corporations, most of which are based in the United States and Europe. Globalisation has also resulted in an international stratification of national powers, making developed economies far more powerful and dominant in international affairs, while marginalising developing economies and threatening their social, economic, political and cultural development. Therefore, we should be cautious in our assessment of the growing impact of globalisation and avoid overstating the benefits that globalisation has brought.

The challenges of globalisation for modern governance

The growing impact of globalisation has caused many modern states to rethink their governance strategies for coping with rapid social and economic changes. Regarding the impact of globalisation on the power of modern states, both the sceptics and transformationists believe that nation-states still retain the ultimate claim of legal jurisdiction within their territories, even though they have to respond to external pressures generated by international laws and authorities (Pempel 1998; Jayasuriya 2001). Contrary to the arguments of the strong globalists, they believe that institutionalised links between the state and civil society (i.e., the mobilisation of non-state sources and actors for social/public policy provision and financing) may not necessarily diminish the state's capacity. Instead, globalisation may actually help in reconfiguring modern states, as it forces them to restructure their governance models and reform the ways that they manage the public sector (Pierre 2000). These changes can also be seen as allowing modern states to shift from 'positive co-ordination' to 'negative co-ordination'. This means that the state performs the roles of regulator, enabler and facilitator instead of those of provider and funder (Scharpf 1994; Jayasuriya 2001). ('Positive co-ordination', according to Scharpf 1994, refers to an "attempt to maximise the overall effectiveness and efficiency of government policy by exploring and utilising the joint strategy of options of several ministerial portfolios", while 'negative co-ordination' aims to "ensure that any new policy initiative designed by a specialised sub-unit within the ministerial organisation will not interfere with the established policies and interests of other ministerial units".)

The debate outlined above clearly indicates that scholars of public policy and governance have begun to reflect upon the extent to which globalisation

pressures have weakened states' capacity to shape local public policies and manage the public sector.

A close scrutiny of globalisation's impact on public policy/public sector management has led some scholars to conclude that, even though there are common trends and patterns in public policy and public management, such as privatisation, marketisation, commoditisation and corporatisation, governments may adapt these trends to serve their own political purposes. Modern states can also make tactical use of the globalisation discourse to justify their own political agendas or even to legitimise inaction (Mok 2003). Other studies conclude that, in Asian societies, strategies for public sector reform or government re-engineering have been adopted by governments as 'tools' or 'instruments' to increase state capacity (Cheung and Scott 2003). Similarly, it has been found that revitalising the role of non-state sectors (including the market or private sectors) in public policy provision and social service delivery does not necessarily weaken the capacity of the state (Knill and Lehmkuhl 2002), but instead may motivate modern states to reconstitute and restructure their systems and become proactive in creating policy agendas and policy directions. In short, these restructuring processes associated with globalisation can strengthen rather than weaken the capacity of modern states (Salamon 2002; Yang 2003).

Seen in this light, the processes of globalisation have prompted individual states to change their roles and reform their institutions in order to accommodate, and not just adapt to, the demands and pressures generated from the external environment (Giddens 1999; Waters 2001; Mok and Currie 2002). Marginson and Rhodes (2002) describe the challenges of globalisation for modern states well, observing that the changed role and function of the state in the context of globalisation favours the competitive state (Cerny 1996), which gives priority to economic activities above all others. Therefore, maximising welfare to promote enterprise, innovation and profitability in the private and public spheres is becoming popular. In this context, Dale (2000: 95) argues that the world is in the process of becoming wholly commoditised, both through the re-commoditisation of those elements of public provision that the welfare state de-commoditised, and even more so by the extension of the commodity concept to all those areas of the world previously exempted from it.

New forms of governance

New forms of governance and new governance philosophies have emerged in recent years with the aim of maintaining the competitiveness of modern states. Fundamental transformations have taken place in public policy instruments and public management (Faulks 2000; Lane and Ersson 2002). Theories of 'new governance' propose that modern governments adapt to radical changes in their environments by turning to forms of governance that are

“more society-centred” and focus on “co-ordination and self-governance” (Pierre 2000: 2–6).

Peters (1995) outlines four governance models as alternatives to the traditional system: the market model, the participatory state model, the flexible government model, and the deregulated government model. Central to these governance models is the involvement of sectors other than the state – such as the market, civil society and other non-state sectors – in governing the public domain. Instead of relying solely upon government bureaucracy to deliver goods or services, there has been a massive proliferation of tools and policy instruments, including loans, loan guarantees, grants, contracts, insurance, vouchers etc., to address public problems.

The proliferation of such policy tools and instruments may eventually render the conventional governance model obsolete. What makes this likely is the fact that many of these tools are indirect; they rely heavily on a wide assortment of ‘third parties’, such as commercial banks, private hospitals, industrial corporations, universities, social service agencies and other social organisations (Salamon 2002). Thus, networks and partnerships are likely to supplant hierarchical command and control (Rhodes 1997, 2000). In the delivery of services, public authority is shared between governments and non-government actors – what Salamon (2002: 2) calls “third party government”; services are decentralised and in some cases privatised; and the role of governments in managing the economy is more sharply delineated and circumscribed by new market-supporting instruments, which in some cases are self-regulating (Gamble 2000: 130–131; Jayasuriya 2001). Many possible causes of this paradigm shift have been proposed: changes of ideology, such as the discrediting of ‘statist’ models; growing problems of fiscal and bureaucratic ‘overload’; the growth of supra-national bodies that undermine a government’s control; and economic globalisation, which erodes the ‘steering capacity’ of states.

Central to changing governance are the emerging co-existing ‘processes’ that have transformed the way the public sector is managed and public policy is formulated. One of these processes is privatisation. Privatisation has been a common theme in relations between government and business in countries such as Malaysia and South Korea (Gouri et al. 1991; World Bank 1995). The pressure for broad governance changes was strong in these countries, and came to a head in the financial crisis of 1997. One source of this pressure has been influential international agencies such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Their preferred models of governance include many of the elements outlined above: a less interventionist and arbitrary state; a strengthening of ‘juridical’ forms of regulation (often associated with fundamental legal reform); more disaggregated and decentralised forms of government, including partnerships and a stronger ‘co-production’ role for civil society groups; and a preference for market mechanisms over bureaucratic methods of service delivery (World Bank 1995). Hence, it is not surprising that strategies, measures and policy instruments that support

perspectives of the market, corporations, and management are becoming popular practices in public policy and public management (Minogue 1998; Lane and Ersson 2002; Mok and Welch 2003).

Globalisation and educational restructuring

Earlier in this study it was suggested that globalisation is not the only driving force behind recent changes taking place in governance and public sector management. If we put the most recent reforms in public sector management and transformations in the public policy domain into historical perspective, we see that strategies such as marketisation, privatisation and decentralisation have long been adopted by modern states to resolve the problems generated by competing and growing social demands. The continual growth of social 'welfare' systems has already induced many states to transform the way social services and public policy are managed. This is particularly true when modern states undergo a fiscal crisis, such as in the late 1970s and the early 1980s when the British government under the leadership of Margaret Thatcher and the United States government under Ronald Reagan tried similar measures to improve public policy delivery and the efficiency of public administration.

Globalisation may be understood more as a force that *accelerates* change in public administration or public sector management than as one that *initiates* it. We must also pay particular attention to the unique social, political, economic and cultural contexts in which policy and governance changes are introduced, and try to understand how local forces interact with regional and global variables in the formation of public policy, in the implementation of governance change, and in initiating reform in the public sector (Cheung and Scott 2003).

Some policy analysts argue that education policy and development, just like other public policy domains, is not immune from the impact of these globalisation processes (Burbules and Torres 2000; Pierre and Peters 2000). Some scholars in the field of education even believe it is becoming increasingly difficult to understand education without reference to such processes (Currie and Newson 1998; Jones 1998; Crossley 2000; Welch 2000, 2001; Mok 2001; Currie 2002; Mok and Chan 2002; Mok and Lo 2002). A close scrutiny of comparative education literature reveals that there has been a convergence of curriculum on a global scale. International organisations such as UNESCO, the World Bank and the OECD, and research institutes such as IEA, have, by virtue of their high standing, funding power and cross-national competence, influenced both the curricula and the mindsets of education ministries in different parts of the world. It is remarkable how similar the rhetoric of reform has become across different education jurisdictions. For example, all education reform proposals talk about the importance of competition, global competence, diversity and choice (Mok and

Welch 2003; Gopinathan 2005). Even Andy Green, who insists that education systems are essentially national in character, also questions whether there is not an emerging “common world education culture” (Green 1997).

In order to make individual nation-states more competitive, schools and universities across the globe have been under tremendous pressure from governments and the general public to restructure/reinvent education systems. As Martin Carnoy (2000: 50) has pointed out: “Globalisation enters the education sector on an ideological horse, and its effects in education are largely a product of that financially driven, free-market ideology, not a clear conception for improving education.” According to Carnoy, education reforms within the context of globalisation can be characterised as finance-driven reform emphasising decentralisation, privatisation and better performance (2000).

Similarly, numerous major publications by the World Bank in the 1990s put forward a view of how education should be re-shaped, in particular so as to better serve the demands of national and international economic growth and competitiveness. This set of reforms was to be accomplished with increased financial inputs from families and individuals, and decreased inputs from the state (World Bank 1991, 1994, 1995), and was to be accompanied by increased privatisation and reform of the public sector. This would include substantial devolution to the local level and the reform of public authorities in education along business lines (Watson 1996; Welch 1998, 2000). This subjection of education to the language and logic of neo-liberal economics is arguably part of a larger process of commoditisation, which Dale (2000), citing Cox, terms an “ontological shift”.

With heavy weight being attached to the principles of ‘efficiency and quality’ in education, schools, universities and other learning institutions now encounter far more challenges, and are being subjected to an unprecedented level of external scrutiny. The growing concern for ‘value for money’ and ‘public accountability’ has also altered people’s value expectations. All providers of education today inhabit a more competitive world where resources are becoming scarcer. At the same time, however, providers have to accommodate increasing demands from the local community, as well as changing expectations of parents and employers. Governments in different parts of the globe are facing increasing financial constraints in their efforts to meet people’s pressing demands for higher education.

In order to create more higher education opportunities, modern universities have started to change their model of governance by adopting the doctrine of monetarism – a core feature of free markets – to replace Keynesianism (Apple 2000). In order to generate additional revenue, an increasing number of universities have turned into “wealth creation” machines (Slaughter 1998); thereby the ‘third responsibility’ (other than teaching and research): revenue generation, has become an increasingly important mission of contemporary universities. Therefore, a process of ‘academic capitalisation’ is becoming increasingly common in shaping the higher

education sector across the globe (Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Mok 2001; Clark 2002).

Similar developments and experiences of marketisation can be found in the school sector. Based on the issue of 'choice' for students and parents, school governance and management has become increasingly important. According to Schneider et al. (2000: 21):

In the past, most educational reform movements focused on curriculum and teaching methods. Today's reform, however, centres more on issues of governance ... Education cannot be improved unless actors are brought into the decision arena, changing the way in which educational policy decisions are made, shifting power toward parents, and exposing overly bureaucratic school systems to some form of market discipline.

More and more school activities, including teaching and learning, have been oriented towards market-driven ideas and practices. The ranking of schools or the introduction of 'league tables', coupled with calls to strengthen the parent-school relationship by giving parents and communities a more prominent role in governance processes in schools, clearly indicate that modern schools are under intense, competitive market pressure (Bridges and McLaughlin 1994; Good and Barden 2000; Leung 2003). Schools and universities are now governed to a large extent by market ideologies and the corporate discourse of efficiency and effectiveness, as a result of which the lifestyle of teachers and academics has been affected as well (Mok 2001; Mok and Chan 2002).

The roles of the state, the market and civil society in changing education governance

With heightened expectations for better education, how do modern states/governments finance and provide education sufficient to meet the pressing demands of their citizens, particularly when an increasing number of modern states are confronted with economic downturn and financial constraints? A number of scholars in the field of education have emphasised the importance of changing governance in education, paying particular attention to changes taking place in educational financing, provision and regulation.

Exemplary is Dale's framework (1997). According to Dale, we should closely examine the roles that the three major co-ordination institutions: the state, the market and the community, play in the three main governance activities in education: funding, regulation and provision/delivery. His core research questions relate to how education is funded, how it is provided, and how it is regulated. Within a changing socio-economic and socio-political environment, especially in the context of globalisation, Dale (1997: 275) believes: "It is not necessary for the state to carry out all of these activities [i.e., the three main governance activities in education] while remaining in

overall control of education.” In view of the intensified financial constraints that modern states are facing, it is anticipated that non-state actors, including the market, local communities, the third sector and civil society, will assume increasingly important roles in education financing/funding and education provision/delivery, while the state will restructure its roles in education by becoming more actively involved in performing the roles of enabler, regulator, quality controller, facilitator and co-ordinator of services.

Such changes accelerate when governments make use of additional resources from civil society or the third sector. Meyer and Boyd’s seminal work (2001) showed that an increasing number of countries have started to revitalise the roles that non-state sectors, including the market, the community, the third sector and civil society, play in education. Scholars who support the diversification of education services point out the problems with state action in education. Reconsidering the society-based tradition of education as represented by writers such as Humboldt, Jefferson, de Tocqueville, or Mill seems timely and appropriate under conditions of cultural pluralism (Meyer 2001). The myriad social ties that connect actors within a community (in the case of education, students, parents, teachers and neighbours) could also generate rich ‘social capital’ for modern education systems to tap into (Coleman 1990). In short, the diversification of education service and funding providers, coupled with the revitalisation of third-sector and civil-society involvement in education, opens up new opportunities for modern states to reconsider the way education governance activities are managed.

With the involvement of an increasingly diverse range of actors in education provision and financing, there is a need to redefine the relations between the state and non-state education sectors (Rhodes 1997; Peters 2000; Pierre 2000; Salamon 2002). This is consistent with other public policy domains where concepts such as ‘co-production’, ‘bringing society back in’ and ‘co-ordinative relations’ between state, society and other non-state sectors are stressed. Not surprisingly, the non-state sector now has more power and influence in governing education policy and educational development. ‘Co-arrangement’, ‘co-production’ and ‘co-management’ relationships between the state and the non-state sectors (including the market, the community, the family, individuals and other social forces) are experiencing changes; hence, new co-ordination efforts and governance modes are urgently needed. As Salamon (2002: 2) has rightly suggested, the proliferation of policy tools and instruments requires the following:

An elaborate system of *third-party government* in which crucial elements of public authority are shared with a host of non-governmental or other-governmental actors, frequently in complex collaborative systems that sometimes defy comprehension.

Therefore, public–private partnerships to run the public sector or to deliver social services have started to take shape in different countries (Broadbent

et al. 2003; Klijn and Teisman 2003; Reeves 2003). During such a restructuring process, the role of the government has shown signs of fundamental change, from a “provider of welfare benefits” to a “builder of markets”, whereby the state actively builds, shapes and regulates markets (Sbragia 2000).

The changing mix of policy instruments

As already mentioned, globalisation processes have accelerated changes in the public sector, driving more modern governments to engage in public sector reforms in a quest for alternative ‘policy tools’ or ‘policy instruments’ to solve public problems. Hence, new governance models are evolving and different kinds of management reform measures are being developed. New theories of governance are, however, often contradictory (Peters 2000). They include a broad set of ‘mega-trends’ across a wide range of institutions and relationships that are not easily or precisely tested. To overcome this problem, the approach adopted here is to focus on one important dimension of new governance: changes in the mix of policy instruments. Instruments can be characterised in a number of ways. They include direct government provision, social and economic regulation, grants, and information collection and dissemination (Salamon 2002: 21). Table 1 below illustrates some major tools that modern states could adopt for education delivery and financing. These range from direct government delivery to loan guarantees delivered by commercial banks.

The proliferation of policy actors in general, and diversification of policy instruments in particular, suggests that the relationship between the state and non-state actors in education delivery and financing has changed from a ‘hierarchical’ to a ‘network’ relationship, whereby the conventional governance mode of ‘command and control’ has shifted to a ‘negotiation and persuasion’ model (see Table 2). Such fundamental changes have led us to call for new governance approaches and a new framework in education.

Table 1. Illustrative tools of education

Illustrative tool	Vehicle	Delivery system
Direct government	Direct provision	Public agency
Grant	Grant award/cash payment	Lower levels of government, Non-profit organisations
Direct loan	Loan	Public agency
Loan guarantee	Loan	Commercial bank
Tax expenditure	Tax	Tax system
Fees, charges	Tax	Tax system
Government corporations	Direct provision/loan	Quasi-public agency
Vouchers	Consumer subsidy	Public agency/consumer

Table 2. Changing governance paradigm

Paradigm shift from	—————→
Traditional public administration	New governance
Programme/agency	Tool
Hierarchical relation	Network and synthesis
Public versus private	Public plus private
Command and control	Negotiation and persuasion
Management skills	Enabling skills

According to Salamon (2002), there are four principles by which policy instruments can be measured:

1. *Coerciveness*: the extent to which an instrument constrains behaviour rather than encourages or discourages it.
2. *Directness*: the extent to which the government body that authorises and finances a public policy is directly involved in implementing it.
3. *Visibility*: the extent to which the instrument's costs and impacts are conspicuous.
4. *Automaticity*: the extent to which the instrument makes use of existing social and economic mechanisms rather than having to use government authority to create alternative ones.

Many governance theorists claim that most of the changes involve a shift in a similar direction in each of these principles (i.e., from more to less coercive, etc.). Salamon (2002: 9) distinguishes between classical public administration and new governance as a field of study (the latter being concerned with the particular issues raised by an increasingly significant range of new governance 'tools' or 'instruments'). The 'instruments approach' not only seeks to make clear distinctions between types of instruments, it also seeks to explain their adoption.

In this regard, the search for a clear logic of design and adoption has had mixed results. In order to have a better and clearer understanding of the changing roles of the state in education and the roles that non-state actors perform in the education sector, we must closely examine the mix of policy instruments and assess how the four principles that Salamon outlined for measuring policy instruments have affected their adoption.

In addition, a few standard criteria – namely, effectiveness, efficiency, equity, manageability, legitimacy and political feasibility – are used to assess which policy instrument or policy tool should be chosen for education delivery. With regard to the diverse policy tools and instruments that are used in education, it is useful to examine the changing relationships between the state, the market and non-state actors, especially exploring the different roles that they are now playing in education. In addition, when planning and

designing how education services are financed and run, education researchers should pay particular attention to the way that different institutions (i.e., state or local governments, market, family, community, the third sector, and other social forces in civil society) differ in their application of the four principles of policy instruments, and to how individual tools of education might perform differently in terms of the five assessment criteria.

The choice of policy tool is a highly political process because decisions involve value judgements. Tool choices are related to the capacity of governance and manageability, as well as the legitimacy and political feasibility of the society introducing different policy options. Therefore, we should critically examine the impact of different interests and perspectives in tool choices (Peters 2002).

Changing the public–private mix and introducing new regulatory arrangements

So far this study has focused on one very important development: the revitalisation of the role of non-state actors and the proliferation of actors in education provision and financing. This development implies potential governance contributions from private or non-state sectors that might compensate for the decreasing capacity of nation-states to provide education services. While we do not expect a hollowing-out of the state, the increase in non-state and private contributions to education will certainly challenge the conventional regulatory arrangements in the education sector.

The major shift in national politics away from expanding the social welfare system to promoting entrepreneurial culture, innovation and profitability in both the private and public sectors has led modern states to adopt a technique of steering from a distance. New regulatory frameworks have evolved by which autonomous individuals as well as quasi-governmental and non-governmental institutions such as universities are ‘steered’ to behave in ways consistent with policy objectives by means of regulation, incentives and sanctions (Henry et al. 1999; Marginson 1999). This shift is characterised by public policy reoriented towards a smaller and more business-oriented state apparatus. This paradigm shift, manifested in a more individualistic, competitive and entrepreneurial approach, has become more common in public management (Robertson and Dale 2000).

Changes in governance, especially when newer tools of public action increasingly take precedence over the use of public authority, raise additional issues of regulation. Specifically, we need to consider how to understand the concept of ‘regulation’, and to what extent non-state-funded and non-state-run education institutions should have autonomy and flexibility in governing their education services. Moreover, we need to consider whether ‘self-regulatory’ frameworks could be developed to assure education quality and academic standards. Most important of all, the power-money dimension is likely to become a source of major tension between the state and non-state sectors, especially when funding sources and education services are diversified.

The growing interdependence between state (public) and non-state (private, community, family and individual) contributions, and the exchange relationships between these sectors, will render conventional regulatory arrangements obsolete. With more private contributions or resources generated from civil society to support educational development, we anticipate that there will be a decline in hierarchical forms of intervention from the state, but that other forms of regulatory arrangements will take their place. When education financing and provision is no longer monopolised by the state, the conventional 'interventionist regulation' framework (implying a hierarchical intervention by the state in imposing micro-control of every aspect of education delivery) is no longer applicable. The reduction of the state's role as a *regulator* is clearly shown in trends of decentralisation, deregulation, privatisation, marketisation and administrative reforms in education (Hood 1999; Robertson 1999).

Alongside diversification of actors and institutions in education financing and provision, coupled with patterns of 'co-production', 'co-arrangement' and 'co-management' in education services, we anticipate the development of a new regulatory model: *regulated self-regulation*. Through 'regulated self-regulation', "the state plays a central and active role in disposing of powers and resources that are not available to societal actors" (Knill and Lehmkuhl 2002: 50). Although the state is responsible for promoting quality education and meeting heightened expectations for education, it cannot adopt the same interventionist regulatory framework with regard to non-state actors, especially when education provision and financing is diversified.

Special arrangements need to be made to allow non-state actors to participate in policy-making and implementation. One of the ways of doing so is by delegating power to these non-state actors, particularly as they play increasingly important roles in education. A self-regulatory framework should be established to govern these newly emerging non-state education co-ordination institutions, providing that these participative institutions still follow the overarching framework or directions set out by the state.

A regulated self-regulatory framework could be further developed by re-conceptualising the relationship between the state and professional bodies. It is generally accepted that the overall quality assurance responsibility in education, unlike other goods or services, still lies with the state. But state intervention is also influenced by professional influences. With regard to professional qualifications, for instance, it is not the role of the state to set detailed requirements for approving professional credentials. Instead, professional bodies have a very important role to play in governing professional standards. In order to maintain high standards in education, the state must liaise with the relevant professional organisations, rather than simply making detailed requirements.

The proliferation of non-state actors in education will certainly pose challenges to the conventional regulatory framework, driving the state to move away from an 'interventionist regulation' to a framework of 'regulated

self-regulation' (with more emphasis given to 'negotiated' regulation). This is especially true where co-operative patterns of interaction between private and public actors in education delivery are becoming more common in education provision and financing (see Table 3).

Contextual analysis of the mix of 'policy instruments'

Counterbalancing broad generalisations such as the growing diversity of instruments and trends toward "third party government" (Salamon 2002: 1–3), a number of findings show the contingent nature of actual instrument choice. The mix of instruments used for delivering government policies varies widely for a number of reasons (Linder and Peters 1989; Howlett and Ramesh 1995: 157–163; Peters 2002).

Paradoxes are likely to be observed; for example, de-regulation in fact often entails tough new forms of 're-regulation' (Vogel 1996). Comparative research also suggests that national factors influence instrument choice (Vogel 1996; Ringeling 2002). The scope and impact of instrument change rests heavily on pre-existing patterns of administration and on the political context (for the case of privatisation see Ramamurti 1999; Cheung 2001).

Another complication is that instrument choice is not the end of the matter. The same instrument can be applied in very different ways – the distinctions made between types of instruments in the abstract can conceal important facts about their real character in practice. For example, in order to understand the case of privatisation in Malaysia, a detailed analysis of its implementation would be necessary, including the importance of privatisation for targeted support to particular entrepreneurs (Jomo et al. 1995). Therefore, researchers should pay additional attention to the particular context in which policy instruments are chosen and adopted.

When determining which policy instrument to adopt, one should pay heed to the likely consequences of the chosen policy instrument in terms of the four principles discussed earlier. What may be the best policy instruments or mix of different policy instruments is heavily dependent on the unique socio-

Table 3. Different modes of governance

Mode of governance	Bureaucratic governance	Deregulated governance	Societal-market governance
Policy trend and style	Centralisation and state dominance	Decentralisation, diversification and mobilisation	Marketisation, privatisation, various social sources
Form of Regulation	Interventionist regulation	Interfering regulation	Regulated self-regulation

economic, socio-political and historical backgrounds of individual societies. In addition, a country's own legal, administrative and political system affects the particular institutional arrangements; hence, we must pay attention to the institutional context in which policy instruments are chosen (Knill and Lehmkuhl 2002).

In addition, we must evaluate the mix of policy instruments according to the four principles outlined above. A comprehensive contextual analysis is needed when examining and comparing education governance in different societies. Therefore, careful empirical analysis is needed before reaching conclusions about broad trends. For instance, it is particularly important to be cautious when applying observations about what is 'new' in a European context to the conditions of East Asia. The history of East Asian state development may provide a somewhat different starting point to that which many new governance theorists are familiar with; 'old governance' in East Asia has its own features.

Research has identified networks and third-party co-operative implementation as distinctive features of East Asian governance. In industrial policy, some common instruments are information sharing, close informal consultation and strategic financial support for targeted, collaborative research and development. Heavy-handed regulation and high levels of public subsidy are less common (Evans 1999). At the same time, analysis of different states in East Asia makes it clear that there are many differences in both the content and style of government action. For example, different patterns of social welfare provision combining different instrument mixes – social insurance schemes, tax-based entitlements and directly produced services – have been observed (Holliday 2000).

Taking these points into account, the instruments approach opens the way to test the existence both of broad trends and local variations. Whether or not we can identify some common trends in outcomes, as Jayasuriya (2001) and other new governance theorists propose, is a key question for this article. This is largely a question of identification. But the task of explanation involves far more than merely identifying whether or not there are common trends in instrument adoption. The process by which new instruments are adopted needs investigating in detail in order to understand the causes of any observed trends.

If there is an observable trend (whether this may be labelled 'new governance' or not) there are three possible types of explanation: First, such outcomes may be the result of concurrent choices in the face of similar constraints; second, they may be formed as a result of international processes, such as imitation and emulation of ideas and practices; and third, they may be "transnationally formed" (Sahlin-Andersson 2001: 45) – in other words, the result of the influence of 'transnational mediators', such as international consultants, or of organisations such as the World Bank, IMF and OECD.

Discussion and conclusion

This study has demonstrated how globalisation processes have affected governance and management in education policy. One crucial point when discussing the impact of globalisation on education is to avoid either overstating or underestimating the impact of globalisation. This study has taken a more critical stand in reflecting upon the impact of globalisation on education policy and educational developments. No matter how we assess the impact of globalisation on education, we must admit that the principles of structural adjustment, coupled with the ideologies of managerialism and economic rationalism, have become increasingly popular not only as a governance philosophy but also as an effective method of public administration (Hood 1991; Flynn 1997; Marginson 2000; Deem 2001). It is not surprising that corporatisation, marketisation and privatisation have become the most popular policy strategies for reforming public services, including educational institutions (Mok and Currie 2002).

This article has attempted to explain recent changes and reforms in education by analysing how educational governance is affected by the challenges of globalisation, with particular reference to educational policy development using the 'policy instruments' approach. This approach can serve as a useful public policy framework, allowing education researchers to engage in systematic and critical research of major educational governance activities and the changing roles of the state and non-state actors in education within the wider context of globalisation and changing societies. Therefore, education researchers may investigate the changing mix of policy instruments in the context of globalisation and changing societies.

More specifically, attention should be given to changing relations among the state, society, and the market in educational financing, provision, and regulation. When actors in education financing and provision are diversified, the traditional private–public distinction is rendered obsolete. Therefore, education analysts can explore new research frontiers by investigating the changing mix of policy instruments and the way that various educational governance activities are transformed, with particular reference to creating new regulatory frameworks to govern 'co-production' and 'co-arrangement' in education.

It is equally important when talking about the changing mix of policy instruments in governing and managing education that we be aware of the negative consequences associated with marketisation, privatisation and commoditisation of education. Since a growing number of modern states have followed the recommendations of UNESCO, the World Bank, OECD and IMF to run modern schools and universities like private business entities, the adoption of such ideas and practices has had negative consequences. Modern states want to be economically competitive but are not prepared to sacrifice their national autonomy by accepting measures imposed by the supra-national bodies mentioned above. Despite the fact that there is a

tendency for modern states to reduce their role in the economy, to move away from their present regulatory stance to a more facilitative one, allowing businesses more space and creating greater diversity and choice in the market, are they prepared to undertake such measures if it means becoming less powerful or less capable nation-states?

The emphasis on competition, diversity, choice, efficiency and economy in education governance raises issues related to education disparities and inequality. The growing tendency to privatise and marketise education has caused increased social concerns about social re-stratification and marginalisation of groups from lower socio-economic strata (Brown et al. 2001). When framing debates about choices and diversity in education as part of the globalisation discourse, we often find that people with better financial means enjoy far greater choice and diversity, while those from poorer families have difficulties paying for their education. Thus, we must carefully examine both the positive and negative consequences when education providers proliferate and policy instruments in education are diversified. We must guard against change processes that may lead to social inequalities and greater disparities in education by privileging only a few but disadvantaging a larger proportion of the population.

References

- Apple, Michael W. 2000. Between Neoliberalism and Neoconservatism: Education and Conservatism in a Global Context. In: *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*, ed. by Nicholas C. Burbules and Carlos A. Torres, 57–78. New York: Routledge.
- Bridges, David, and Terence H. McLaughlin (eds.). 1994. *Education and the Market Place*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Broadbent, Jane, Andrew Gray, and Peter M. Jackson. 2003. Public-private Partnerships: Editorial. *Public Money and Management* 23(3): 135–136.
- Brown, Philip, Andy Green, and Hugh Lauder. 2001. *High Skills: Globalization, Competitiveness and Skills Formation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burbules, Nicholas C., and Carlos A. Torres (eds.) 2000. *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Carnoy, Martin. 2000. *Sustaining the New Economy in the Information Age: Reflections on Our Changing World*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Cerny, Philip G. 1996. Paradoxes of the Competition State: The Dynamics of Political Globalization. *Government and Opposition* 32(2): 251–271.
- Cheung, Bing-Leung. 2001. Public Enterprises and Privatization in East Asia: Paths, Policies and Prospects. *Public Finance and Management* 2(1): 67–96.
- Cheung, Anthony B. L. and Ian Scott (eds.). 2003. *Governance and Public Sector Reform in Asia*. London, New York: Routledge Curzon.

- Clark, Burton R. 2002. *Entrepreneurial Universities*. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong.
- Coleman, James S. 1990. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Crossley, Michael. 2000. Bridging Cultures and Traditions in the Reconceptualisation of Comparative and International Education. *Comparative Education* 36(3): 319–332.
- Currie, Janice, and Janice Newson (eds.). 1998. *Globalization and the Universities*. London: Sage.
- Dale, Roger. 1997. The State and the Governance of Education: An Analysis of the Restructuring of the State–Education Relationship. In: *Education: Culture, Economy and Society*, ed. by Albert H. Halsey, Hugh Lauder, Phillip Brown and Amy Stuart Well, 273–282. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2000. Globalisation: A New World for Comparative Education? In: *Discourse Formation in Comparative Education*, ed. by Jürgen Schriewer, 87–110. New York, Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Deem, Rosemary. 2001. Globalization, New Managerialism, Academic Capitalism in Universities: Is the Local Dimension still Important? *Comparative Education* 37(1): 7–20.
- Evans, Peter. 1999. Transferable Lessons? Re-examining the Institutional Prerequisites of East Asian Economic Policies. In: *East Asian Development: New Perspectives*, ed. by Yilmaz Akyuz, 66–86. London: Frank Cass.
- Faulks, Keith. 2000. *Political Sociology: A Critical Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Flynn, Norman. 1997. *Public Sector Management*. Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Gamble, Andrew. 2000. Economic Governance. In: *Debating Governance*, ed. by Pierre Jon, 110–137. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- . 1999. *Runaway World*. London: Profile Books Ltd.
- Good, Thomas L., and Jennifer S. Barden 2000. *The Great School Debate: Choice, Vouchers and Charters*. Manwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gopinathan, Saravanan. 2005. Globalization, The Singapore Developmental State and Education Policy: A Thesis Revisited. Working paper, National Institute of Education, Singapore.
- Green, Andy. 1997. *Education, Globalization and the Nation State*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Gouri, Geeta, et al. 1991. Imperatives and Perspectives. In: *Privatisation and Public Enterprise. The Asia-Pacific Experience*, ed. by Geeta Gouri. New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing.
- Held, David, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt, and Jonathan Perraton. 1999. *Global Transformations, Politics, Economics and Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Held, David (ed.). 2000. *A Globalizing World? Culture, Economics, Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Henry, Miriam, Bob Lingard, Fazal Rizvi, and Sandra Taylor. 1999. Working with/against Globalization in Education. *Journal of Education Policy* 14(1): 85–97.

- Hirst, Paul, and Grahame Thompson. 1999. *Globalization in Question*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Holliday, Ian. 2000. Productivist Welfare Capitalism: Social Policy in East Asia. *Political Studies* 48(4): 706–723.
- Hood, Christopher. 1991. A Public Management for All Seasons. *Public Administration* 69: 3–19.
- . 1999. *Regulation inside Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Howlett, Michael, and M. Ramesh. 1995. *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Hsieh, Yu-Li, and Shu-Fen Tseng. 2002. Welfare in the Information Age: Hollowing Out or Restructuring in the Changing Labour Market in Singapore? *International Journal of Human Resources Management* 13(3): 501–521.
- Jayasuriya, Kanishka. 2001. Globalization and the Changing Architecture of the State: The Regulatory State and the Politics of Negative Coordination. *Journal of European Public Policy* 8(1): 101–123.
- Jomo, Kwane S., Boo Teik T. Khoo, and Yii Tan Chang. 1995. *Vision, Policy and Governance in Malaysia*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Jones, Philip W. 1998. Globalisation and Internationalism: Democratic Prospects for World Education. *Comparative Education* 34(2): 143–155.
- Klijn, Erik H., and Greet R. Teisman. 2003. Institutional and Strategic Barriers to Public–Private Partnership: An Analysis of Dutch Cases. *Public Money and Management* 23(3): 137–146.
- Knill, Christopher, and Dirk Lehmkuhl. 2002. Private Actors and the State: Internationalization and Changing Patterns of Governance. *Governance* 15(1): 41–63.
- Lane, Jan-Erik, and Svante Ersson. 2002. *Government and the Economy: A Global Perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Leung, Yin-Hung. 2003. The Politics of Decentralization: A Case Study of the School Management Reform in Hong Kong. In: *Centralization and Decentralization: Educational Reforms and Changing Governance in Chinese Societies*, ed. by Ka-Ho Mok, 21–38. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong.
- Linder, Stephen, and Guy Peters. 1989. Instruments of Government: Perceptions and Contexts. *Journal of Public Policy* 9: 35–58.
- Marginson, Simon. 1999. After Globalization: Emerging Politics of Education. *Journal of Education Policy* 14(1): 19–31.
- . 2000. *The Enterprise University*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education [AARE], 29 November–2 December. Melbourne: AARE.
- Marginson, Simon, and Gary Rhodes. 2002. Beyond National States, Markets and Systems of Higher Education. *Higher Education* 43(3): 281–309.
- Massy, Andrew (ed.) 1997. *Globalization and Marketization of Government Services*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

- Meyer, Heinz-Dieter. 2001. Civil Society and Education – the Return of an Idea. In: *Education between States, Markets and Civil Society: Comparative Perspectives*, ed. by Heinz-Dieter Meyer and William L. Boyd, 13–34. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Meyer, Heinz-Dieter, and William L. Boyd (eds.). 2001. *Education between States, Markets and Civil Society: Comparative Perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Minogue, Martin. 1998. Changing the State: Concepts and Practice in the Reform of the Public Sector. In: *Beyond the New Public Management*, ed. by Martin Minogue, Charles Polidana and David Hulme, 35–58. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Mittelman, James H. 2000. *The Globalization Syndrome: Transformation and Resistance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mok, Ka-Ho. 2001. *Globalization, Marketization and Higher Education: Trends and Developments in East Asia*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Marketization and Higher Education in East Asia, 7–8 April. Shanghai: CEPRU.
- . 2003. Similar Trends, Diverse Agendas: Higher Education Reforms in East Asia. *Globalization, Societies and Education* 1(2): 201–221.
- Mok, Ka-Ho, and David Chan (eds.). 2002. *Globalization and Education: The Quest for Quality Education in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Mok, Ka-Ho, and Janice Currie. 2002. Reflections on the Impact of Globalization on Educational Restructuring in Hong Kong. In: *Globalization and Education: The Quest for Quality Education in Hong Kong*, ed. by Ka-Ho Mok and David Chan, 259–278. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Mok, Ka-Ho, and Ho Chun Lo. 2002. Marketization and the Changing Governance in Higher Education: A Comparative Study. *Higher Education Management and Policy* 14(1): 51–82.
- Mok, Ka-Ho, and Anthony Welch (eds.). 2003. *Globalization and Educational Restructuring in the Asia Pacific Region*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pempel, T. J. 1998. *Regime Shift: Comparative Dynamics of the Japanese Political Economy*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.
- Peters, Guy. 1995. *The Future of Governing*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- . 2000. Governance and Comparative Politics. In: *Debating Governance*, ed. by Jon Pierre, 36–53. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2002. The Politics of Tool Choice. In: *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*, ed. by Lester M. Salamon, 552–564. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pierre, Jon (ed.). 2000. *Debating Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pierre, Jon, and Guy Peters 2000. *Governance, Politics and State*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Ramamurti, Ravi. 1999. Why Haven't Developing Countries Privatized Deeper and Faster? *World Development* 27(1): 137–155.
- Reeves, Eoin. 2003. Public–Private Partnership in Ireland: Policy and Practice. *Public Money and Management* 23(3): 163–170.
- Rhodes, Rod A. W. 1997. *Understanding Governance*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- . 2000. Governance and Public Administration. In: *Debating Governance*, ed. by Jon Pierre, 55–90. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ringeling, Arthur B. 2002. European Experience with Tools of Government. In: *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*, ed. by Lester M. Salamon, 585–599. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robertson, Susan. 1999. Strip Away the Bark, Expose the Heartwood, Get to the Heart of the Matter: Re/regulation of Teachers' Labour in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 34(1): 121–132.
- Robertson, Susan, and R. Dale. 2000. Competitive Contractualism: A New Social Settlement in New Zealand Education. In: *World Yearbook of Education 2000: Education in Times of Transition*, ed. by D. Coulby, R. Cowen and C. Jones, 113–131. London: Kogan Page.
- Sahlin-Andersson, Kerstin. 2001. National, International and Transnational Constructions of New Public Management. In: *New Public Management: The Transformation of Ideas and Practice*, ed. by Tom Christensen and Per Laegreid, 43–72. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Salamon, Lester M. (ed.). 2002. *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1998. *Globalization and its Discourse*. New York: The New Press.
- Sbragia, Alberta M. 2000. Governance, the State and the Market: What is Going on? *Governance* 13(2): 243–250.
- Scharpf, Fritz W. 1994. Games Real Actors Could Play: Positive and Negative Coordination in Embedded Negotiations. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 6(1): 27–53.
- Schneider, Mark, Paul Teske, and Melissa Marschall. 2000. *Choosing Schools: Consumer Choice and the Quality of American Schools*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sklair, Leslie. 1995. *Sociology of the Global System*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, Sheila, and Larry L. Leslie 1997. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, Sheila. 1998. National Higher Education Policies in a Global Economy. In: *Universities and Globalization*, ed. by Jan Currie and Janice Newson, 45–70. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Smith, David A., Dorothy J. Solinger, and Steven C. Topik (eds.). 1999. *States and Sovereignty in the Global Economy*. London: Routledge.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. 2002. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. London: Allen Lane.
- Strange, Susan. 1996. *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vogel, Steven K. 1996. *Freer Markets, More Rules*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Waters, Malcolm. 2001. *Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Watson, Keith. 1996. Banking on Key Reforms for Educational Development: A Critique of the World Bank Review. *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies* 1(1): 43–61.
- Welch, Anthony. 1998. Education and the *Cult of Efficiency: Comparative Reflections on the Reality and the Rhetoric*. *Comparative Education* 34(2): 157–175.

- . 2000. Quality and Equality in Third World Education. In: *Third World Education: Quality and Equality* ed. by Anthony Welch, 1–10. New York: Garland.
- Woods, Ngaire. 2000. *The Political Economy of Globalization*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- World Bank. 1991. *Skills for Productivity: Policies for Vocational and Technical Education in Developing Countries*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 1994. *Priorities and Strategies for Education*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 1995. *Higher Education: The Lessons of Experience*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Yang, Rui. 2003. Globalization and Higher Education Development: A Critical Analysis. *International Review of Education* 49(3): 269–291.
- Yeates, Nicola. 2001. *Globalization and Social Policy*. London: Sage Publications.

The author

Ka-Ho Mok is Professor of East Asian Studies and Director of the Centre for East Asian Studies at the University of Bristol. He was previously Associate Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences as well as Convenor of the Comparative Education Policy Research Unit at the City University of Hong Kong. His main area of research is comparative education policy, with particular reference to development and educational change in East Asia.

Contact address: Centre for East Asian Studies, University of Bristol, 8 Woodland Road, Bristol BS8 1TN, United Kingdom. E-mail: KH.Mok@bristol.ac.uk.