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The relationship of the social administration of the state and problems of social inclusion and exclusion has become an increasingly important cross-national welfare policy issue. This interest is not only one of the altruistic promises of modernity but historically bound to a variety of contemporary changes that relate processes of globalization to traditions of nationalism and liberal ideals about democratic participation. Concern with governing and social inclusion and exclusion is a focus of the European Union which relates to a number of factors. Long-term migration patterns associated with and following World War II changed the complexions of nationalities and citizenship in European nations. These changes overlap with changes in the work patterns and educational requirements in the post-Fordist economies of the European Union coupled with, for example, changes in the politics of cultural movements as there are new demands for representation of groups previously excluded, such as in contemporary feminism, green movements, and multiculturalism, in many European states. In conjunction with these changes are changes in the models of participation and the welfare safety nets as the welfare state is redesigned in current processes of globalization and economic restructuring. These collective patterns have made administration of cultural and social affairs a policy issue in the Europe Union.

More general concern with the relationship of state policy and issues of social inclusion and exclusion is explicit within the educational arena. Economic issues of equity and justice are prominent in the assessment of the role of school in producing the workforce deemed necessary in the new work world. The other side of this is international competition and conceived risks of economic degradation and exclusion on a national or regional level if education cannot produce the competencies needed. Economic concerns are themselves tightly interwoven with national and European Union cultural issues of representation of different social and ethnic groups within educational policy. At one end, education is to forge the new cosmopolitan image of the citizen, who is no longer defined in a singular image of the citizen. And with this new sense of citizenship are changing national imaginaries—what it means to be Swedish, British, Spanish, as well as...
what it means to be at home within the hybrid constructions that form the image of a European and national citizen. This review examines the cross-disciplinary literature that informs our understanding of the relationship of educational governance and social inclusion/exclusion in policy and research. It differs from previous policy analyses in significant ways. Policy research in education tends to accept the discourses of policy as the governing structures for research. Policy research becomes bound to the policy makers’ definition of the problem, taking the categories and problem definitions derived from governmental policies as the problems of research without any serious intellectual scrutiny. Current policy research assumes rather than interrogates the links between governance and inclusion and exclusion. The research situates itself within the same framework as its objects of study and its results become nothing more than recapitulation of given systems of reference in state policy rather than a knowledge produced through critical analysis.

In contrast, our purpose is to interrogate the relation of assumptions about governance and social inclusion/exclusion in educational policy research through examining two different problematics. We call the different approaches ‘problematics’ to emphasize how the methods of science and the concepts and theories of social affairs produce ways of thinking and ordering action and of understanding results. Our task is to explore the different sets of principles that organize the construction of educational problems and policy about governance and social inclusion/exclusion (see e.g. Popkewitz, 1997). The review weaves national discourses with international discourses in different disciplines, such as education, historical anthropology, political science, and sociology, as they have relevance to the conceptual problems of the study.

The two problematics we explore are as follows:

(1) The equity problematic examines questions of representation and access of individuals and groups to educational and social practices. The equity problematic makes as locus of change the actor who enacts cultural interests. Governance, within this perspective, is a concept for thinking about and judging what is appropriate for action. It is, to borrow from Hirst (1997), ‘the means by which an activity or ensemble of activities is controlled or directed, such that it delivers an acceptable range of outcomes according to some established social standard’. Questions of governance in research are related to the organization and procedures of the social administration of institutions and the representation of groups previously excluded. Governance is understood to be the mixture of policies that produces inclusion and eliminates (at least theoretically) the exclusion of targeted groups of social actors, such as those defined by class, gender, race or ethnicity. Thus, inclusion and exclusion are treated in research as separate entities. The equity problematic often draws on liberal and neo-Marxist theories of social differentiation and stratification, although with different ideological agendas.

(2) The problematic of knowledge focuses on the systems of reason that are embodied in educational policy and pedagogical reforms. This problematic draws on a broad band of literature that we call postmodern political theories (Rajchman, 1995; Connolly, 1987; Popkewitz, 1998a, b; Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998). One element of this problematic is that exclusion and inclusion are considered as one concept (inclusion/exclusion) unlike in previous theories that viewed exclusion as something to be eliminated through correct policies of inclusion. Exclusion, then, is considered continually against the background of something simultaneously included (Goodwin, 1996). The problem of governance is not, as in the equity problematic, to develop
appropriate organizational processes or institutional practices for access and participation. It is to study the distinctions, differentiations and divisions (the principles of ‘reason’) that discipline and produce the principles that qualify and disqualify individuals for action and participation.

The problematics of equity and knowledge can be understood as methods of problem solving and forming boundaries or ‘maps’ through which the objects of action are ordered, scrutinized and understood in policy and science. To be schematic at this point, the equity problematic emerges from particular philosophical and social ideas that emerged in the 19th century to emphasize rational action and a collective authority through the production of expectations and entitlements of individuals who act as agents of their own interests (see e.g. Giddens, 1990; Wagner, 1994). Problems of social administration of actors are central to its concept of governance, expressed through the conceptualization of inclusion through ideas of social mobility, access and social and cultural representation of groups. The knowledge problematic, in contrast, emerges from a different and related historical trajectory concerned with how the systems of reason (knowledge) organize (govern) the problem-solving approaches to policy and educational practice. Governance is inscribed in how the knowledge systems of policy embody a continuum of values that divide and include/exclude. Whereas the equity problematic locates the politics of governance in the processes that include or exclude certain groups from participation, the knowledge problematic focuses on the production of the images and narratives as generating principles of classification whose functions are to qualify and disqualify individuals for participation.

While we believe that research needs to consider both equity and knowledge problematics, most policy research does focus on conceptualizations related to the equity problematic and rarely on the systems of reason. The ‘cause’ is complex but, as this review illustrates, engaging the two problematics in a conversation with each other is important for an adequate understanding of contemporary politics, as well as for being reflexive about the politics of knowledge in science. Not to recognize the complex relations of knowledge to issues of governance and inclusion/exclusion is to lose sight of the politics of intellectual and social projects.

In choosing this strategy to explore the different problematics in research, we recognize that such an approach may ignore differences in which the boundaries among problematics are pushed and possible points of overlap occur. But with this risk comes, we believe, the possibility of making visible how epistemological assumptions are mobilized and circulate as principles for action and participation in the intersecting worlds of research, policy and the lived world of schooling. Thus a cautionary note in this division of problematics. We discuss the two problematics analytically, and recognize that there are slippage and overlap between the two in the writing of certain policy research (such as in, for example, Ball, 1994). Further and after discussion, we call for a joining of the equity and knowledge problematics through rethinking the conceptual ways that we organize research. This is not an additive problem of a little of one and a little of the other, but a problem of rethinking the relational fields of social practices.

The discussion involves, first, some general conceptual issues raised in the literature about relating governance practices to those of social inclusion/exclusion. It then proceeds to discuss the equity problematic. In the third section, we will move to a knowledge problematic as a governing principle in the production of inclusion/exclusion. In the concluding section of the essay, we briefly point to the need to consider both
problems in the study of inclusion/exclusion; such an approach is not merely additive but entails a rethinking of epistemologies of research.

Some Conceptual Difficulties of Reviewing the Concepts of Governance and Social Inclusion/Exclusion

When this literature review was begun, a number of difficulties arose relating to governance and inclusion/exclusion. Four are considered here. One is the unreflective incorporation of categories produced in the political arena into social research. Two, research tends to focus on the social relations effected by policy and obscures how the categories inscribed in those relations are the effects of power. Three, there is a continual dilemma of value and normativity in research through which the boundaries of inclusion/exclusion are drawn. And fourth, the production of systems of inclusion and exclusion is historically contingent rather than stable.

One of the major difficulties in studies of governance and inclusion/exclusion is the unreflective incorporation of categories produced in political arenas into social research. Within the conceptualization of research related to social inclusion, for example, the very definitions of the problem will vary as it relates to national welfare traditions of states. Silver (1994/1995), for example, argues that Anglo-American literature tends to focus on concepts related to individual access which embody particular liberal constructions of individualism by relating the problem of inclusion to access. French discussions, in contrast, have used the term ‘social integration’. The term is deployed in relation to a French image of the state as concerned with preserving and furthering the collective social goals of the nation. The differences in Anglo-American and French words express fundamentally different cosmologies about the relations of the state, the social and the individual.

This leads to a second problem that is produced when determining the categorizations of political policy for framing the problem to be investigated. When social policy and research coincides in classification of groups to be included, such research conserves the political systems of reference through accepting the practices of reform. The problem of research investigates only the effects of the given social relationships, not how those social relations may be themselves the effects of power. This conserving of the political systems of reference occurs without adequate sociological and historical reflection of the sets of relations embedded in the political changes, such as the long-term social and economic changes in which educational policy about social inclusion is situated. This appropriation of political systems of reference as the problem of study does not enable reflection on the relation of cognitive structures of science and social structures (this can be called a ‘spontaneous sociology’; see e.g. Bourdieu et al., 1991; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Popkewitz & Fendler, 1999).

A third limitation of existing policy research relates to the continual dilemmas of value and normativity that appear when relating governance to inclusion/exclusion. Four dilemmas are outlined and, as dilemmas, serve as a background to our efforts to sort out the problematic that link governance and inclusion/exclusion.

One dilemma is how to account for the pragmatic and historical qualities of the problem of inclusion and exclusion. The tendency of social theory is to assume that the categories of research embody universal categories from which to gauge the absolute movement from exclusion to inclusion. Policy studies, for example, tend to make one side (inclusion) the assumed normative good. But such a normative view elides certain historical complexities. At one level, Dryzek (1996) argues that formal governmental
policies about political equality can mask continued exclusions. Participation based on a universal concept of citizenship, for example, represents certain norms and patterns of behavior of those groups that have the authority to establish the social and cultural boundaries of membership. The norms of participation can produce exclusions through preferences, for example, for certain gendered or racial habits or dispositions (Dryzek, 1996; Pateman, 1988). Enfranchisement under the principle of ‘one person/one vote’, as a different example, can deny representation, as the history of gerrymandering of voting districts in United States city elections around 1900 illustrates. 

A different dilemma is related to universalizing the social goal of inclusion. Such universalizing of value may obscure contexts where groups do not want to be culturally included. Certain religious and social groups may not want to participate in a national school system, as was the case in the formation of the US Catholic schools at the early years of the 20th century. Issues of national language teaching and Moslem female dress in French schools are examples of conflicting interests when social policies concerned with a universal citizenry and cultural interests collide when one thinks about inclusion/exclusion. In this context, exclusion should not be confused with social differentiation, per se, as the existence of boundaries may not mean exclusion. One can also look at the goals of the contemporary women’s movement and of the contemporary African American movement in the US to get men and white people, respectively, to understand their distinctive social experience not as reflective of the human condition in general.

There is also the opposite dilemma in a universal social goal of inclusion. Some groups do not want to appear distinctive. Nicholson (1999) has observed that Karl Marx and Frederick Engels long ago pointed to the case of groups not wanting to have their characteristics viewed as distinctive. She continues that in discussing the rise of social classes, Marx and Engels claimed that such classes tended to portray their own interests and ideas as universals. When one examines the education of the poor and groups that have been socially and politically marginalized in the US there are also the inscriptions of universals that go unnamed but which signify the differences between those in need of help and remediation (urban education and education of inner-city children) and those who stand as unnamed but whose dispositions and capabilities embody the normativity to which the urban child stands in direct opposition (Popkewitz, 1998b). The qualities that order the pedagogical practices of urban education are discursively those of the child who lacked self-esteem, who needed remediation, who learned through ‘doing’ rather than through abstract knowledge and thus had different learning styles from ‘other’ children, and the child who required teachers with different teaching styles in order to address the differences in the capabilities of the child. Yet even with the absence of categories about which the normativity of the urban child is constructed, everyone knows ‘who’ is being talked about. What is named and what goes unnamed is an effect of power. Nicholson, in a different context, has argued that such discursive practices are the effects of power where those with power can depict others but not themselves as possessing ‘ethnicity’ and in which men more than women see themselves as without gender (Nicholson, 1999, p. 130).

A third dilemma is embodied in the contrasting purposes of modern schooling. Schooling in contemporary societies, for example, is globally marked by a dual role of providing social mobility and access while also performing social selection. Brown et al. (1997) discuss the school as a site of struggle between searching for symbolic codes that can develop a collective sense of a nation and of ‘self’ within that community, and, at the same time, credentialing educational attainment. These dual functions of the school can and do collide in how problems of inclusion and exclusion are explored.
A fourth dilemma relates to the politics of knowledge in social inquiry. The very inscriptions of the categories of governance or inclusion/exclusion create classificatory systems that produce systems of inclusion and exclusion that are different from the political frame of reference discussed above. The concept of social inclusion, Goodwin (1996) argues, may subsume and thus obscure a more focused discussion of social issues that were previously given attention through concepts of participation, citizenship, and racism. Goodwin (1996) argues, for example, that the policy emphasis on social inclusion ‘mis-diagnoses the problem and mis-prescribes the cure from most of the social ills to which it refers’ (p. 344). Thus, while the terms may have important political implications in highlighting the generalized nature of the problems of reform in European and US welfare policies, the exclusion discourse may ghettoize risk categories under a new label and publicize the more spectacular forms of cumulative disadvantage, and thus distract attention from the general rise in inequality, unemployment and family dissolution that is affecting all social classes (Silver, 1994/1995, p. 540). The way that categories of research order the problems of policy needs to be continually questioned.

If we move from these dilemmas back to the difficulties of the study of inclusion/exclusion and governance, a fourth difficulty is that inclusion and exclusion are not fixed concepts, but need to be conceptualized to consider how the boundaries move and are redesigned within particular contexts and among different contexts. Comparatively, there is a need for historical specificity in studying governance patterns related to inclusion/exclusion (Popkewitz & Pereyra, 1993). For example, research would need to consider different national phenomena when seeking to relate governing practices among different state traditions, such as those of Nordic and Anglo-American contexts.

But even within historically related contexts, conceptualizations need to provide a flexibility to explore how boundaries among different classes of groups change (see e.g. Boltanski, 1988; Laclau, 1995). For example, discussions about including the excluded may mean just pushing over the boundaries or the lines of the marginal, thus in fact readjusting the boundaries and reinstituting marginality but with new lines of differences (Goodwin, 1996). A different example is that, while policies have pushed to increase the rates of school completion, such changes also produce structural changes in the educational credentials necessary for different jobs and for social mobility in industrialized countries. Thus the changing completion rates do not mean necessarily greater economic inclusion, since they are accompanied by a changing of the zero line that differentiates access for people within the economic system (Collins, 1979; Brown & Lauder, 1996; Meyer et al., 1997).

Taking these complexities into account, as well as the issues of classification embodied in the study of social phenomena, it is no wonder that the particular concepts of governance and inclusion/exclusion are defined in relation to more than one term (onomasiological terms). If we use governance as an example, Rhodes (1996) found at least six separate uses of governance in the literature which related to certain a priori conceptions of social administration of actors. Governance was used in (1) arguments for the minimal state as evident in neoliberal ideologies and its critiques; (2) corporate governance; (3) discussions about the new public management; (4) ‘good governance’; (5) socio-cybernetic systems; and, finally, (6) self-organizing networks (p. 653). In each instance, ‘use’ assumed that governance was either a process or procedure that organized the interactions of people toward a prescribed goal.

Similar issues are raised by the concept of inclusion/exclusion. An examination of its variations reveals it is a contested concept that inevitably involves endless disputes. The term ‘exclusion’, according to Silver (1994/1995), is expressed not only in relation to
national and ideological contexts, but also in relation to discussions about the new poverty and inequality (e.g., single-parent families), discrimination, marginality, foreignness, alterity, closure, disaffiliation, deprivation, destitution.

From the above, it should be obvious that the strategy of this review cannot be an empiricist stance—focusing on methods and results—which is rather common in reviews of research in the social sciences and education. To try to make shortcuts, presenting research results as such would lead to assuming distinctions for empirical elaboration without adequate theoretical and conceptual analysis in the construction of the subject. This is emphasized in Hannan and Werquin’s (1998) review of research on transitions from education to work. On one hand, they criticize current research for lack of theoretical elaboration and on the other hand they stress the need to reflect on categories used to define, for example, young people ‘at risk’, since this is part of the making of this problematic. As will become clearer in this discussion and as histories of social science methods have illustrated (Danziger, 1990; Hacking, 1990), an empiricist approach to policy analysis poses a danger of tautologies that normalize the objects of investigation through the distinctions and divisions constructed in methods of data collection and analysis.

Our approach in examining the problematics or ways of ordering and relating governance and inclusion/exclusion is for analytic purposes called the problematic of equity and the problematic of knowledge. Our interest in the problematics of research, to restate an earlier comment, is to emphasize how the ordering and dividing practices of the methods, concepts and theories of educational research ‘construct’ ways of conceiving of results and action rather than to provide an exhaustive review of any specific range of literatures (such as the relation of economics and school credentialing, for example).

The Equity Problematic

The equity problematic schematically treats inclusion and exclusion as analytically and empirically distinct. At least in theory, inclusion is made the normative standard to examine its opposition, practices that prevent inclusion—thus, the meaning of ‘exclusion’. The problem of governance is the administrative practices that promote or limit social, cultural and economic integration or access of social groups and individuals. Governance is typically related to a concept of the state that gives attention to the formal administrative governing practices of organizing institutional practices and social actors.

The central question of inclusion and exclusion is related to representation, that is, how can the participation/non-participation of social groups and individuals be understood and explained? Research is to understand the activity or ensemble of activities that control or direct the inclusion or exclusion of specific populations in society, such as women, social classes and ethnic and racial groups. This entails identifying the origin (the agents) and mechanism through which inclusion is prevented by, for example, differential integration into labour markets, non-inclusive cultural representation in the curriculum, failures of decentralization (or market) practices on school access and achievement, and ‘hidden curriculum’ factors in school access and performance.

In this sense, we use the notion of ‘equity’ to distinguish a problematic that is broader than that posed in an individualistic philosophy. One of the major characteristics of the equity problematic relates to the structural position of social actors in a field of unequal resources. One might at this point consider reproduction theories and cultural Marxist approaches as having different purposes and visions of society than what is traditionally
thought of within equity policy discussions. Some of this research does go so far as to argue that ‘schooling cannot compensate for society’, that is, schooling and education systems reproduce inequalities rather than eliminate them. Thus, schools are not considered as very efficient means to increase equity or to fight exclusion in society. While one could argue that reproduction theories have a different intellectual and social intent than liberal approaches to access and equity though focusing on how the relations of social class or gender are reproduced within social relations, much of the current ‘reproduction’ research gives attention to positions in terms of more or less status rather than to relations. In this sense, we consider the equity problematic as therefore embodied in conservative, liberal and left rhetorics when the images and narratives of the arguments are examined. The problematic thus has little to do with classifications related to ideology and more to do with overlapping discursive fields through which ‘reason’ is constructed about problems and practices of social action.

The equity problematic, with its different ideological positions, has dominated social policy and research throughout Europe, North America and Australia. Inclusion in the problematic of equity underlies different policies of the post-1945 welfare states, such as the comprehensive school reforms and most discussions of multiculturalism.

This discussion of the ‘equity problematic’ focuses initially on the distinctions that organize the research in the European countries in which our research project was undertaken. The distinctions are: (1) economic inclusion in which education is related to labour markets, with issues of class and social stratification privileged; (2) cultural inclusion in which access issues are broadened to include cultural representations of gender, race, ethnicity and religious minorities; and (3) inclusion of the disabled. The governing problem in these studies locates how access or inclusion for certain groups or individuals is accomplished or prevented. The final section explores these distinctions of inclusion and exclusion through the concept of the state that is pivotal in the problem of governance in European and US research. Our discussion of the concept of the state, however, is more than descriptive. It also provides a comparative strategy as we move to the second problematic of knowledge in the final section.

Inclusion and Exclusion in Labour Markets: class and social stratification

There are numerous discussions of the changing relation of society, economy and culture in contemporary literature. We distinguish that literature which is laudatory and descriptive of the changes from that which is analytical and interpretative of the changes (for general discussions of the changing economy as related to cultural phenomena, see Harvey, 1989; Boyer & Drache, 1996; Kuttner, 1991; Wagner, 1994; in education, Bourdieu, 1989/1996).

The descriptive but optimistic literature of change in the policy-oriented literature is most pronounced in that from the Organization of Economic and Cultural Development (OECD), which relates labour markets and education. It assumes a technical concept of social stratification rather than class in its analyses. The OECD literature assumes that schools have functioned as a sorting device that restricts social access by certain groups. Thus its practices run counter to national social goals. The problem pointed to in the OECD literature is the need to equalize an unequal playing field through eliminating exclusionary practices and thus promote greater inclusion.

Current OECD studies of governance conceptualize the problem of inclusion and exclusion in a manner that directly relates education to the workplace (Isance, 1997;
Evans, 1996; OECD, 1995, 1997; Pave, 1996). Schooling should promote access and success in the economic field. OECD discussions of education and social exclusion focus on the relationship of social and economic environment using the relationship of education and income level as the indicators to judge a society’s level of social inclusion/exclusion. Discussions note that there are changes in the distribution of poverty through creation of new groups (e.g. children and parents in single-parent homes, and elderly women). The reports also document anomalies (The Netherlands and Sweden) that counter trends that relate social background and educational careers.

The optimism of current OECD literature is in identifying the governing solution through neoliberal ideas of markets. It is assumed that improved quality of schools will occur through parental selection of schools (‘choice’). Governance of educational practice is in policies that promote parental choice, constructing a competitive school system. This international agency literature coincides with particular national literatures in citing the new possibilities of policy (in the US, see Chubb & Moe, 1990).

More elaborate and critical empirical discussions focus on the changing economic context that affects educational attainment. Educational literature, for example, has sought to understand the changes from a Fordist, bureaucratic model of production to one that is built on a post-Fordist, flexible paradigm of work organization for school achievement and student attainment (Brown, 1990, 1995; Brown & Lauder, 1996). Aronowitz and DeFazio (1994) consider these technological changes in the economy as having profound effects as knowledge becomes a productive force and thus at the centre of selection processes in the economy.

The changing patterns of work, it is argued, have produced different selection processes as access to cultural capital has shifted in education (see International Labour Organization, 1994). An emphasis on ascription and merit has been replaced with a greater emphasis on personality, resources and cultural capital or what Max Weber labelled charismatic characteristics in the selection processes (Brown, 1995). These changes in the codes of recruitment into the labour force, Brown asserts, also produce new patterns of exclusion, although this exclusion is not further discussed.

Within examination of the relation of economy to education, connections are sought between class origin, class destination and education (Boudon, 1974; Erikson & Goldthorpe, 1992; Halsey et al., 1980; Ishida et al., 1995; Lindblad & Pérez Prieto, 1989; Jonsson & Mills, 1993; Müller & Karle, 1993). Finnish studies, for example, explore exclusion as a problem of marginalization that occurs before education as well as one of the unequal distribution of education. It is argued that new social divisions were produced through the dramatic cultural changes and increases in unemployment in the early 1990s (Ritakallio, 1994; Suikkanen et al., 1996; Kangas, 1998; Kangas & Ritakallio, 1996; Rinne, 1997; Salavuo, 1997). Ritakallio (1991), for example, has noted that only one-third of those receiving sustenance allowance have attained a vocational degree leading to a specific occupation. Also, those with only a basic comprehensive school degree tend to have greater long-term unemployment problems.

A different pattern of studies that relate class and education emerges in Britain. These studies have followed the policy discourses of neoliberalism discussed earlier (in Sweden, see e.g. Englund, 1994; in the US, see Molnar, 1996). Researchers focus on, for example, how class-related cultural factors shape parents’ compliance with teachers’ requests for parental participation in schooling (Lareau, 1987). Research on governmental policies examines the uneven effects of efforts to increase parent options and involvement in the schools through school choice policies (Walford, 1994, 1997; Whitty, 1997a, b). School choice in the Greater London area, for example, was found to involve an interplay
between social class and cultural capital as parents looked at the different types of schooling for their children (Ball et al., 1995).

Classroom qualitative research is also deployed to understand the mechanisms through which differentiation occurs. Swedish studies since the early 1970s have focused on factors that produce differentiation in the classroom processes of education. Mixing a phenomenological concern with an interest in the relation of schooling to social stratification, Lundgren (1972) showed that the teaching process in practice excluded 10–25% of the students through the ways cultural differences were responded to by teacher practices. Callewaert and Nilsson (1980), who analyzed the teaching process based on a structuralist reading of Pierre Bourdieu, found a persistent lack of individualization (a cornerstone in the comprehensive idea) and a superficial equality as differences among students were neglected in the teaching process. Lindblad and Sahlström (1998) found new patterns of inclusion/exclusion in the comprehensive school based on weakened procedural framing, such as through emphasizing informal and group teaching, as an instructional goal tends to lead to systematic opportunities for students to withdraw from the teaching process.

While class is still the major category in which to consider the relation of governance and social inclusion/exclusion, studies within the equity problematic have more recently added gender, ethnicity and race as targeted groups for policy and policy research about inclusion.

**Cultural Representations and Gender**

Gender is currently a major site in Europe in exploring the relation of governance and inclusion/exclusion. Although a targeted policy area of governance to promote social inclusion in most European nations, it is important to recognize important differences in national politics and gender studies in many European contexts, as well as distinctions from those found in the US (see e.g. Scott, 1997).

As in the class and stratification research above, the equity problematic in gender studies is defined through questions of the relationship of economic access and gender. Research in the Nordic countries, Australia and the United States provides exemplars, for example, the work of Elgqvist-Saltzman and her colleagues in the Nordic countries (see e.g. Elgqvist-Saltzman, 1992a, b; Bjeren & Elgqvist-Saltzman, 1994; and Fenemna & Carpenter, 1998, in the US for a related set of assumptions but a different empirical approach that is classroom bound). Elgqvist-Saltzman (1992a, b) conducted empirical studies of labour markets and education to explore the different trajectories of men and women in the movement in and out of the labour markets. Her work extends to the Nordic countries to understand the ways in which women’s occupational roles have expanded in certain vocational areas while, at the same time, they have not progressed in other areas. Käller (1990) described and analyzed ruling techniques and school careers from a gender perspective. Finnish studies examined regional, socioeconomic and gender-related inequality (Jakku-Sihvonen et al., 1996; Jakku-Sihvonen & Lindström, 1996). Kivinen and Rinne (1995, 1996), for example, found that there still exists a strong and quite stable social inheritance of educational careers and that inequality of educational opportunities occurs through the whole lifespan as a function of gender. If we move to Australia, Blackmore (1997) historicizes issues of gender inclusion by exploring the relationship of vocationalism and the idea of skill in governmental policy toward education. She argues that the relevant policies have consistently been part of a wider discourse of vocationalism that is gender specific (and
Educational governance and social inclusion and exclusion

A different strand of studies has explored the structural relation of the categories of class and gender in education. In Greece, for example, there are important debates about structural issues of base and superstructure; that is, what categories are privileged or which are to be understood as relational in exploring social inclusion and exclusion in relating gender and class. In some instances, religious and ethno-cultural minorities are studied to consider their relationship to class in the compulsory educational system (Persianis, 1978; Kazamias, 1978; Kazamias & Psacharopolous, 1985; Eliou, 1978).

While also examining the structural position of gender policies, a different approach to the equity problematic is found in certain studies that focus on the systems of representation in policy discourses. The research is concerned with deciphering the coding of structural distinctions of class, gender and race. Weiner et al. (1997), for example, focus on recent gender discourses in Britain that are concerned with ‘male disadvantage’. They consider how policy discourses construct the underachieving black and/or male working class as a threat to law and order, and male middle-class underachievement as deriving from problems of ‘attitude, complacency, and arrogance’. Weiner et al. also disaggregate data on sex differences in achievement to point to a labor market that is still sex divided, segregated and largely disadvantaging female workers.

Another class of literature within the equity problematic relates structural categories to phenomenological approaches in the study of gender. Öhrn (1993) in Sweden considers the systems of representations that form gender in classroom interactions. She ethno-graphically examines how girls in middle schools come to understand and use gender constructions and subordinate position to gain influence and overcome their powerlessness. The study gives attention to gender patterns constructed in student–teacher interactions as ideological demonstrations and generative in the reproduction of a society.

Embedded in the equity problematic, gender stands as a category of actors whose representation in structural or institutional practices signals an inclusive society. Gender, like class, performs as an essential platform, in both philosophical and ideological terms, for exploring the lines that separate the inclusion from the exclusion of groups and individuals assigned to the category. Questions of governance are related to implications of governmental policy in access and representation of various social actors.

Cultural Issues of Representation and Ethnicity and Race

The third literature of ethnicity and race overlaps with studies of class (and with social stratification) and gender. As with the previous literature in this problematic, governance is related to the institutional and organizational rules and processes through which groups act and participate in social life.

The Francophone literature provides an illustration of this interrelation. It has tended to move from earlier studies of a confictual unity that opposed labour to capital in modern industrial societies to discussions about the social issue of a dualistic fracture between the integrated and the excluded. This metamorphosis of the social issue (Castel, 1995; Rosanvallon, 1995; Gorz, 1997) corresponds to a change in the way immigration in European countries like France is envisaged, no longer seen as a phenomenon of economic nature, but as an ethnic and cultural phenomenon (Wirwierka, 1996; also Noiriel, 1996/1998). The very construction of the school system, it is argued, produces relative exclusion in the context of the new social issue of ethnicity, and the effect of
educational qualifications in labour markets, which increase the depreciation of diplomas.

The ethnic and racial focus among different countries vary according to historical patterns of migration particularly after World War II and continuing into the present. Greek studies, for example, recently have re-examined their concern with class structuring in education to consider issues of social exclusion as they relate to ethno-cultural minorities as well as other ethnic and religious groups. One focus of Greek studies is gypsies. Also, immigration from Russia and the Balkans (particularly Albania) and labourers from Poland, the Philippines and Arabian countries have produced a range of policy discourses and social science discussions about issues of social inclusion.

Prominent in this literature is the concern with educational attainment and qualifications that was identified previously in the discussion of gender. Ogbu (1994) examines stratification patterns and schooling in the United States. (Also see Gibson & Ogbu, 1991.) He argues that social differentiation occurs through a complex pattern that needs to be understood through a racial rather than a class theory. Heath and McMahon (1987) use the concept of ethnic penalty to give focus to the sources of disadvantage that lead ethnic groups within Britain to do less well in labour markets than similarly qualified whites.  

The studies differ in part in the location of the ethnic and racial groups. Here, a particular difference in studies between US and British research on the one hand, and European research on the other hand, makes the point. The United States and Britain have mobilized policies around ‘urban education’, policies concerned with poverty and racism’s dilatory effects on education. In continental European cities, the ethnic and racial groups cannot afford to live in the city and are located in the suburbs. In France, for example, the issue of exclusion is often related to ethnicity and the movement to the city fringes, which are called the exile quarters (Dubet, 1992).

Like previous studies of class and gender, the above exemplars focus on access and participation of actors defined as excluded or marginalized as central to issues of governance and inclusion policy research. The focus is to identify the forces, processes or practices that limit or permit inclusion. Structural and phenomenological (qualitative and quantitative) methods are used, such as studies of classroom interaction as well as statistical analysis of achievement levels across groups.

**Cultural Issues of Inclusion of the Disabled**

A fourth category of studies is related to a class of students labelled as ‘disabled’ and in need of ‘special’ education. The category of the child who is labelled ‘disabled’ is a prominent problem of social inclusion among European countries. Vislie (1997) argues that special educational studies have tended to be organized through the categories that were presented by the British Warnock Commission in the late 1970s (p. 128) and related to the defining of ‘special educational needs’. The notion of governance refers to formal educational policies that influence the provisions provided for disabled children.

The research in special education considers the relative efficacy of integration versus segregation and the characteristics and effects of integrated provisions (Vislie, 1997). Inclusion is understood to be measured by the increase in the number of students who attend regular classes. The Finnish National Board of Education policy in special education since the 1970s has been integration, which has meant an increase in the volume of part-time special education, but not a decrease in the volume of full-time special education (Blom et al., 1996). Finnish research has explored the stability of
students in special education during the last 20 years (16%) (Kivirauma, 1991; Moberg, 1996) while pointing out that the number of special education settings has decreased during the 1990s, for the first time in the history of comprehensive schooling. Indicators of inclusion relate to, for example, special education students entering further education after the comprehensive school (Jahnukainen, 1997) and the dropout rate (which is much higher than that of the general population) (Kivirauma, 1995).

Historical discussions of disabled students have sought to identify the relationship of social class and special education categories. Franklin (1994), for example, explored the movement from a commonsense notion of ‘backwardness’ for disabled children to one that labels that as ‘at risk’. The later category in policy and research entails a more professionalized, rational discourse in which the problems are made to seem scientific and neutral rather than social and moral.

In this literature on special education, the question of inclusion and exclusion is not clear cut. This ambiguity is related to the criteria of ‘disability’ being discussed as well as the criteria of ‘success’ and goals accepted as essential to the educative process. But such ambiguity can also be understood in questions of ethnicity and gender where there are arguments for separate schools as issues of identity formation are argued.

The State as an Entity that Governs: the sovereign model of power

We can use the concept of the state to think about the rules that have organized the different research subjects discussed above as ‘belonging’ to the equity problematic. We do this for two reasons. First, while much of the above literature assumes that the state is the governing entity whose social policy acts to alter the dimensions of inclusion or exclusion, the state is rarely given explicit attention, especially in US policy studies. Second, the concept of the state provides a pivotal comparative point as we move later to the knowledge problematic.

The State as a Sovereign Entity

The equity problematic centres on the role and the rule of the state as the legal-administrative practices of government. Governance in the equity problematic inscribes the state as a sovereign actor whose rational actions produce the collective expectations and entitlements of individuals and group interests. Power in this conceptual landscape is something that people can own, and that ownership can be redistributed among social groups that maintain or challenge inequities; hence the use of the term ‘sovereignty’. For example, a sovereignty notion of power is embodied in educational literature that sees the consequence of school reforms as a state institution reproducing hierarchies in society which make gender, racial and class distinctions in society (Carlson, 1992). Governance is the state administration of institutions and social actors in which the correct mixture of policies and procedures produces an inclusive society and thus eliminates (at least theoretically) the exclusions of targeted groups of social actors. Power originates with the state agencies and practices that are authorized to make decisions and allocate values within communities. The state, thus, controls and mediates the benefits in existing arrangements.

In operational terms, the state is viewed as a central actor whose relations and policies govern through (a) organizing funding, (b) regulating through policy and law, and (c) defining provision and delivery (Dale, 1997). State-sponsored research, policies and administrative rules are to function to encourage participation and the allocation of
resources in tackling problems of inclusion and exclusion. Dale (1997), for example, reviews literature on the formal governmental policies and bureaucratic practices related to school choice to understand their implications for questions of access. Esping-Andersen’s (1996) discussion of changes in the welfare state follows this pattern of defining power and governance through the effects of the administrative-legal apparatus of the state welfare policies on the relationship of the social welfare net and labour practices.

The Non-State State: the United States

A central premise of this notion of governance is that society entails certain groups, social interests, and forces whose practices dominate and organize the collective allocation of values within a differential, stratified social structure (Green, 1990; Torres, 2000). In Nordic and continental European welfare state traditions, the state assumes a positive, guardian function as the collective moral commitments of the society. In Anglo-American contexts, the moral guardian function of the state exists through national social security and pension schemes and civil rights legislation. But at the same time, there is a strong ideology of individualism that is accompanied with an undercurrent of distrust. The distrust places the state as an entity that prevents rather than encourages reform and quality through, for example, an intransigent bureaucracy and—in a reappearing populism—the lack of decision making by those who are close to the problems. One can locate the neoliberal policies of Thatcherism and Reaganism within this broader historical tension of liberalism within Anglo-American state traditions.

The different traditions of state sovereignty have implications for how the relationship between governance and social inclusion/exclusion is treated in research and policy. In US literature, the sovereign power of the state is expressed indirectly through the ways policy debates are argued and governance and inclusion/exclusion are studied. Policies and policy research concerning systematic school and restructuring reform movements in the US assume a state as a governing entity, but the rhetoric talks about decentralization and local control as a governing strategy of state reforms (Popkewitz, 1996). Research is to help ‘policymakers’ (Peterson, 1998; Darling-Hammond, 1998) with the policy discussions embodying conceptions of the state as a governing mechanism. At the same time, social movements outside the state embrace the sovereignty of the state in producing inclusionary practices. Diverse efforts to influence the school are brought together by the strategies that make the state into the governing institution in which to promote, for example, multicultural curriculum, the insertion of ‘character education’ and sex education curriculum in schools, and calls for ‘back to basics’ and the decision to teach reading as phonics or whole language. The governing function of the state to produce inclusion in civil society is assumed.

Equity Studies and State Practices for Social Inclusion

Early European studies in the Nordic countries and Britain focused on state legal-administrative governing practices in producing social inclusion. Historically, studies of inclusion and integration have been viewed as a way of steering educational governance to produce an economically more equitable society. One of the best examples of this is Swedish research. The early research on social inclusion in Sweden, for example, paid attention to the extent to which different categories in Swedish society get access to educational opportunities (see e.g. Husén, 1969). However, the idea that education served as an instrument for increased social mobility was questioned in a number of
quantitative studies (Härnqvist, 1978; Armn & Jönsson, 1983). Arfwedson (1983) presented the notion of school codes, in which patterns of traditions and interaction with segregated school surroundings produced different, and socially biased, school cultures. Studies in Scotland, however, which examined Scottish comprehensive school reform between 1945 and 1970, found that such schools did reduce socioeconomic segregation in schools (McPherson & Willms, 1997).

These studies assumed the importance of the state in guaranteeing education will meet the twin goals of national development of global economies and a more inclusive society. Halsey et al. (1997) argue, for example, that post-1945 education took a central position in the functioning of advanced industrial society as a key investment in the promotion of economic growth and a means of promoting social justice. This position has increased with the new centrality in current globalization: competitive advantage of a nation is defined in terms of the quality of national education and training systems judged according to international standards. The state has sought to make a tighter relationship between economy and work, particularly with post-Fordist economies that place a demand for highly educated workers (Brown & Lauder, 1992).

The political and ideological shifts in the 1980s and 1990s have focused not only on who are selected or omitted from participation in, for example, higher education and working life, but also on the new state discourses of educational governance and the actors who set the political agenda and the rules of debate and interpretation. For a comparative approach in the UK and Sweden, see contributions in Kallós & Lindblad (1994). Lindblad and Wallin (1993), for example, discuss changes from the late 1970s to the beginning of the 1990s in Swedish education as both a product and a cause of the transformation of the old centralist welfare state, with pedagogical governance strategies and research giving recognition to differences, based on, for example, social origin, gender and school experience between different actors.

There is extensive literature in Sweden and Britain, for example, concerning neoliberal ideas of governance, a label attached to shifts to more market-type approaches within education. The political and academic arguments related to neoliberalism focus on the policies of governance that are to move toward a lean state that retreats from intervention except for creating conditions for individual agents to act on their own interests, with markets the central metaphor of policy. Research projects explore how policies of marketization and privatization of public sector activities have affected educational performances and outcomes (Chubb & Moe, 1990, 1992; Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). Further, research has sought to understand the implications and consequences of neoliberalism as an equity principle related to inclusion and exclusion (Ball et al., 1995; Grace, 1997; Whitty, 1997a, b). In Britain, for example, Whitty (1997a) reviewed the existing literature on marketization and privatization as having mixed results in relation to issues of equity. In Sweden, Englund (1996a, b) analyses the re-emergence of a pluralistic school system for the private good, gradually replacing the former equity-based school system for the common good, and fears that the result of the pluralistic system will be a return to an older, strongly segregated society.

At a different level, research has examined the new sets of governing relationships between the state and localities as more centralized systems assume centralization in establishing the legal and financial parameters of the school system and decentralization patterns that give some decision making to regions and municipalities. In Finland, as in most countries, research has been on the policy effects of government rather than on government (Tiihonen, 1994; Hovi et al., 1989). Further, there is a tendency to consider decentralization as a particular form of governance that is separate from a concept of the
state. Icelandic research, in contrast, has considered shifts in governmental policy through considering the form and content of the comprehensive school reform in 1974 (Finnbogason, 1995a, b; Proppé, 1983).

Another approach to research is to consider the changing governance practices as a governing at a distance in which centralization and decentralization practices reorganize the regulation systems of education (see e.g. Kivinen & Rinne, 1991, 1992a, b; Konttinen, 1996). The research has focused on ‘the managerialist approach’ by which education governance is produced through its evaluation system (this is described as a policy goal in Laukkonen (1995, 1997). The emphasis is on efficiency and effectiveness as a concern with implementation of policy. The new system of governing gives greater latitude to local-levels agents, with a new relationship between the local and the governmental centre organized through ‘information steering’ in which educational evaluation is of greatest importance. Proppé et al. (1993) examine the changing historical organization of schools in the post-1945 era as new notions of ‘teacher professionalism’ and ‘centralized decentralization’ align with an emerging pan-European landscape in the global economy. The movement is from ‘assessment to evaluation’ in which the loose link between central educational authorities and evaluation research has been essential.

**Distinctions and Mythologies in the Relation of State and Civil Society in the Equity Problematic**

The equity problematic inscribed a dualistic structure that we can focus on as the distinction between two sovereign entities: the state and civil society. This dualistic structure is embodied in the distinctions between centralization and decentralization of school reforms related to ‘site-based management’, charter schools, and ‘school choice’ in the US. The different ways in which state and civil society are made to seem separate is a rearticulation of 17th-century political theory that separates arenas in which power functions and governing patterns are produced. While the state is a the moral upholder of the collective good, its sovereignty is assumed to be limited vis-à-vis social, cultural and economic arenas in liberal democracies.

The conceptual distinction between the state and civil society is almost non-existent in US research. In part, this taking the state for granted relates to the greater ideological emphasis on governance as a problem of individual actions and ‘situated learning’ and the assumption that issues of power are phenomenological properties rather than structural elements. Policy literature in the US problematizes governance as producing procedures and processes for increased teacher and parent participation in schools and within community institutions. The discussion seems to be one of increasing involvement of elements of civil society—parents, community, local groups and so on—and thus makes the school a place where parents and local communities govern (are ‘empowered’) through their participation. Thus the literature tends to focus on the negotiated character of power, on ‘learning communities’ and notions of voice (concepts embedded in a tacit category of a ‘civil society’), none of which seems to have any relation to structural entities such as the state. The reform strategies place governance practices as naturally emerging from groups of the civil society as opposed to centralized state authorities. Even the discussions of neoliberalism in the US tend to rhetorically place decision making in the realm of civil society while its actual practices reconstitute state/individual relations through the market strategies that redesign governing procedures, such as found in performance-based mandates and curriculum standards.

The lack of theoretical attention in the US to issues of the state as a governing institution is also built into the mythology constructed through histories of the school.
The categorical denial is embedded in a mythology that tells a history of US schools as decentralized, localized institutions. This story is bolstered by discussions of local elections for school boards and local curriculum; election laws in some communities do not allow political party classification to ensure the separation of schooling from politics.

The lack of conceptualization has important effects in the problematic of inclusion. Research identifies groups, social interests, and forces outside the state that have historically been dominated and repressed by other groups but which the state can organize to represent in its policy practices. The relation of state to civil society in practices of governing are elided in research.

**Some Concluding Comments Concerning the Equity Problematic**

To summarize our discussion at this point, we have explored a particular research orientation toward governance and inclusion/exclusion which we call an equity problematic. By using the term ‘problematics’, we have emphasized the relationship of methods, concepts and theories of social affairs in constructing ways of thinking and ordering action and of understanding results. The equity problematic gives attention to practices that include or provide access and participation to groups and individuals in social and institutional processes. Inclusion and exclusion are viewed as distinct categories, with exclusion standing in opposition as something that can be eliminated through policies of inclusion. Categories of inclusion/exclusion are formulated typically in relation to class, race, ethnicity and gender, although the concept of ‘disabled’ also has a place within school discourses. We have argued further that the equity problematic imposes a particular conceptualization of the state. The state is a sovereign actor that can increase inclusion through legal-administrative practices that foster greater involvement of groups in civil society, such as discussed under the categories of class, gender, ethnicity, race and the disabled. Governance is defined as those practices that steer, organize and administer the equal representation of social groups.

In the following section, we focus on a different problematic of the relationship of governance and inclusion/exclusion which draws on postmodern social and political theories that intersect with certain feminist and postcolonial literature. In contrast to the equity problematic, which focuses on the representation of groups or individuals, the knowledge problematic is concerned with the historically embedded rules that make that representation possible and reasonable for action. This problematic argues that knowledge is the governing system that classifies, differentiates and divides the objects of the world and self to be known. But the question is not only of knowledge but of knowledge as the effect of power. The systems of ‘reason’ that order and divide the objects reflected on are viewed as material practices that not only tell what is inside of ‘reason’ (e.g. the child who develops normally or learns ‘successfully’) but also inscribes what is outside of reason itself and thus excludes through the ordering and differentiating devices of the reason applied to solve problems.

This relation of knowledge to power provides a different way to think about and explore the relation of governance and inclusion/exclusion and involves different notions of confronting the politics of education and the issues of change (see Popkewitz, 1997). Our analytical purpose in relating the equity and knowledge problematics is not to argue the superiority of one or the other, but to recognize how different problematics enter into the field of educational problem solving and to provide comparative strategies. Further, we will argue in the following essay that equity and knowledge problematics deal with different intellectual trajectories and politics that need to be understood as overlapping.
This overlapping requires rethinking the problematics of intellectual work, which is not merely an additive problem of doing a little of one (equity) and a little of the other (discursive analyses). It requires, we believe, rethinking the conceptual ways in which we have organized research on governance and inclusion/exclusion. We can think of our concern in this research as understanding the relations of the groups of actors influential in educational decision making and the discursive rules about inclusion/exclusion deployed to construct the subjects and subjectivities that differentiate the different groups. This is not an equity problem nor is it solely one of knowledge per se, but a relational question of fields of interaction in which questions of knowledge are not consigned to those of epi-phenomena.

The Problematic of Knowledge: governing, qualifying and disqualifying through reason

In the previous sections, we discussed the problem of the relation of the social administration of the state and problems of social inclusion and exclusion as an increasingly important cross-national welfare policy issue. This interest is not only one of the altruistic promises of modernity but is historically bound to a variety of contemporary changes that relate processes of globalization to traditions of nationalism and liberal ideals about democratic participation, which we discussed at the beginning of this essay. In this context, we explored the equity problematic through an analytical strategy that explored the system of reasoning through which the problem solving of research was ordered. We examined this problematic as focusing on questions of representation and access of individuals and groups to educational and social practices. The equity problematic makes as locus of change the actor who enacts cultural interests. Governance, within this perspective, is a concept for thinking about and judging what is appropriate for action. It is, we argued, about the means by which an ensemble of activities are controlled and directed according to some established social standard. Governance is the mixture of policies that produces inclusion and eliminates (at least theoretically) the exclusion of targeted groups of social actors, such as those defined by class, gender, race or ethnicity. Thus, inclusion and exclusion are treated in research as separate entities. The equity problematic often draws on liberal and neo-Marxist theories of social differentiation and stratification, although with different ideological agendas.

In contrast to the equity problematic, which focuses on the representation of groups or individuals, the knowledge problematic is concerned with knowledge as a material practice. But this interest in materiality responds to a different and often undertheorized and understudied dimension of the equity problematic, that is, how historically systems of reason generate principles of differentiation and division through which the representations of actors and standards of action are constructed. Thus, the knowledge problematic focuses on how the reason that makes the actor represented in the equity problematic is historically produced. This problematic approaches knowledge not as representing some other interest group but as historically constructed systems that classify, differentiate and divide the objects of the world and self to be known. The systems of classification thus function as governing principles in which individuals see, think, feel and act. Whereas the equity problematic focuses on the origins of power, the knowledge problematic concern is with the effects of power through the very ‘reason’ applied in problem solving.

But the question is not only of knowledge but of knowledge as the effect of power. The systems of reason that differentiate and divide the objects reflected on and ordering
action are viewed as maps that not only tell what is inside reason (e.g. the stages of child development), but by omission tell what is outside reason itself and thus excluded through the ordering and differentiating devices of the reason applied to solve problems.

The difference between the problematic of equity and the problematic of knowledge, then, can be stated initially as follows. The equity problematic studies the access and participation of the categories of groups or populations, typically classified through categories of race, class and gender. The knowledge problematic considers the construction of the qualities that distinguish and differentiate the individual being for action and participation. It is not race, gender or class that is the central concern of research, but the production of the race-ness, gender-ness or class-ness of individuality. This problematic focuses on how systems of reason produce the subjectivities by normalizing certain characteristics and capabilities of the individual. This normalization of knowledge is not what are commonly considered the biases, stereotypes or beliefs through which people act. Rather, the normalizations are realized through the distinctions, differentiations and categories through which qualities of being are constructed as the inner qualities and capabilities of the individual (such as the dispositions associated with a child’s ‘self-esteem’, the ‘stages of child development’, or the cognitive rational characteristics of a ‘learner’).

Knowledge, then, is not a descriptive mechanism that is produced by structural properties to include or exclude groups of people, such as a class. Rather, knowledge is a social practice that structures the field of possible action by rendering conduct calculable through inscribing the principles of performance and the modes of subjectification, that is, the rules through which individuals conduct themselves as responsible, self-motivated and competent (Dean, 1995). To explore the problematic, our discussion will consider literature that considers (1) inclusion/exclusion as map making; (2) the fabrication of identities in the maps; (3) the production of memory and forgetting in producing one’s home. We then proceed to (4) trouble the categories of representation found in the equity perspective, such as those of class, gender and ethnicity; (5) consider the construction of difference as a hybridity in inclusion/exclusion; and, finally, (6) revisit the concept of the state, but now as a set of relations that govern through rendering a field of conduct possible rather than as a sovereign agent in fields of actions.

Inclusion/Exclusion as Map Making

The relationship of governance and inclusion/exclusion can be explored through an analogy to map making (Anderson, 1991; Goodman, 1978; Douglas & Hull, 1992). As a road map tells us about distances and routes for travel, a discursive map tells us symbolically how to order the objects of the world for scrutiny and practice. If we take some of the categories of inclusion and exclusion discussed in the equity problematic, for example, we can think of the categories as forming a map that tells what lies within its territories, thus delineating the normal, and, at the same time, what lies outside the normal. The equity maps of pedagogy, for example, weave psychological categories of ‘social and personal development’, with categories of curriculum ‘learning’ and cognitive mastery. These maps of the child can also be seen in relation to other maps of groups targeted by governmental policies with other categories of teaching that lie outside of the normalcy of development, such as the ‘learning disadvantaged’, the ‘needy child’, ‘at-risk family’ and ‘disabled child’. This overlay of different categories about the child in school are not merely labels ascribed to groups of people to help us think about classroom practices. The resulting ‘reason’ about children constructs the qualities that speak about
the characteristics of achievement, affect and the competent that make for school success and completion. The systems of categories are performative in that they inscribe distinctions that order action and work upon the self through embodying what is normal and not normal in the abilities and capabilities of the child. This construction of normality is not what is explicitly spoken about as learning or achievement but a function of the pedagogical mapping of competence, achievement and dispositions toward learning.

Governance is in the practical rationalities of daily life, know-how, expertise and means of calculation that structure the field of possible actions and participation. We can take the notion of ‘auditing’ that appears in contemporary business and educational discourses about accountability and market reforms. The auditing provides a method of problem solving and a system of innovation in institutional practices and individual life choices (Dean, 1996). Auditing makes actions monitorable through some rational ordering and classification of specific practices. In accounting, it is thought of as monitoring of action in a manner that is efficient and neutral. As brought into social institutions, the system of auditing tells individuals how to engage in their own conduct as something that is testable, monitorable and calculable. Auditing, when brought into ordering teaching or pedagogy, is a map that governs problem solving through inscribing the rules for discovering critical problems for the organization and the person.

Using the map provided by auditing, we can think of reason as functioning not only to monitor but to transform conduct. Again, auditing as a method of problem solving is valuable in exploring this dual function of making the person. By rendering the activities of the person visible in terms of standards of performance or the identification of risk, a system of a condition of a particular form of life, patterns of communication and action, professional expertise, and methods of training is embodied as a regularized element in the organization of conduct and as governing patterns of innovation. One need only to look at current business efforts to apply accounting procedures to improve quality or the introduction of performance-based education as a system of accountability to understand how a system of auditing inscribes invention and creativity with its problem-solving techniques.

This ‘making of maps’ analogy can be used to understand the problem of inclusion/exclusion developed through the work of the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu’s (1984) study has enabled us to think of the production of differences through the differential systems of recognition and distinctions which divide and organize people’s participation. For example, Bourdieu examined the systems of recognition and distinctions among French primary teachers, secondary teachers, professionals and engineers in how they ‘appreciated’ art, organized their homes with furniture and art, as well as made choices about food, movies and education. These patterns of distinctions and appreciations were different from those of, for example, office workers and small shop salespeople. Bourdieu (1989/1996) also explores how the school system consecrates a social nobility through performing a series of cognitive and evaluative operations that realize social divisions.

Bourdieu’s studies direct attention to the construction of an unequal playing field in the sense of the systems of recognition governing which individuals are qualified and disqualified for participation. For example, an anomaly that continually appears in United States educational discussions is the value that parents from different social and cultural groups give to the education of their children, although there is differential achievement among the groups. If we take Bourdieu’s ideas about systems of recognition, we can recognize that the distinctions available for action and participation in schooling
are not the same among different groups, including the distinctions given when people state that they ‘value’ education (see e.g. Sieber, 1981). If we focus on current social policy related to school choice and markets, we find that its limitations as a strategy of inclusion can also be considered through focusing on the dispositions and distinctions about education that are made available among different groups within a social field (Ball, 1994, 1998). ‘Choice’ assumes erroneously that the options are equally available for all individuals.

Using the above example, we can begin to distinguish the two problematics in the following way. Whereas the equity problematic treats the significations of educational polities and practices as representative of other processes that sort and exclude, the knowledge problematic treats the systems of reason as governing practices that simultaneously include/exclude in the sense of the generation of principles that qualify and disqualify individuals for action and participation.

Fabricating Identities

At the risk of overloading a metaphor, the idea of map making can help us to consider a different facet of the knowledge problematic, that is, literature that considers the fabrication of identities through the categories and distinctions that order and divide people. Fabrication means how the identities of individuals are made up through the categories and distinctions applied. But the idea of fabrication does not mean that the making up of kinds of people is not real, as the construction of identities is deeply consequential and constitutive of what counts, in a time and place, as social reality. This ‘making up’ of people is illustrated in an important article by Ian Hacking (1986). Hacking starts by questioning the idea that before the latter part of the 19th century there was no notion of perversion and no idea of individuals as perverts. Hacking then goes on to inquire into how the ways that we categorize, differentiate and distinguish among people produce social identities that intersect with our very idea of what it means to be an individual. Hacking considers this making up people as an interplay between new realities that effectively come into being and the discursive principles through which that reality is constructed, such as the identities produced through medico-forensic-political languages of individuals and social control of the past century.

The importance of the making up of people, according to Hacking, is that it has not only to do with what people did, do and will do, but also with what they might have done and may do. That is, the making up of people changes the space of possibilities for personhood. His example is the institutionalization of the homosexual person in law and official morality, which in turn produced a life of its own. The fabricated identities that are placed outside normalcy and reason also function as a counter-memory as expressed in the organization of the gay liberation movement.

The idea of fabrication enables a focus on the ways in which the educational practices assign identities or form subjectivities prior to the actual measurement of populational groups that appear in the official statistics of school leavers or the marking of transitional points. Danziger (1990), for example, explores how the emergence of 20th-century quantification and statistics in the historical development of psychological research produces its subject through the techniques employed, such as through statistical inferences and the ways in which survey and interview instruments are constructed. Moving through continental European, British and American contexts, Danziger focuses on how the social techniques used in the study of personality, learning and the mind appear also to constitute the individuality of the person through statistical inferences. If
we think of mental testing or psychological experimentation, Danziger argues, the identities assigned to research subjects are created in order to construct a situation for study; further and importantly, that construction stands as an unmediated truth of the context that historically separates the observer from the subject in order to understand characteristics of childhood, personality, etc.

Such studies point to the ‘reason’ that makes for school achievement, and social and psychological competence as social practices that have material consequences through the fabrication of identities. Baker’s (1998) examination of the child study movement in the US around 1900, for example, points to the embodied divisions that placed girls and African Americans outside of the systems of reason through the distinctions and divisions deployed in the construction of identity. Fendler’s (1998) historical study of the changing constructions of the ethos and practices that make for the ‘educated subject’ also enables us to consider how subjectivities are fabricated in social practices through an inscription of normalcy and non-normalcy.

Knowledge as a governing principle in the educational field has a particular social and political significance. It directs attention to how the knowledge inscribed in conceptions of the educated person qualifies and disqualifies individuals from participation through processes that normalize the being of the child. It is the making of the dispositions, sensibilities and awarenesses that are embodied in the representations that order participation that constitutes the systems of inclusion/exclusion in this problematic. To grasp this historical problem of making up people, the problem of research is not only to identify what is made visible through official reports and policy discourses but to identify and study what does not appear—the silences—in the official maps of policy making and research.

Producing New Memories and Forgetting of Nation-ness and Citizenship

We can tie together the idea of knowledge as forming maps and fabricating identities through considering the production of cultural narratives and images that perform as national (and intra-national) imaginaries. Current discussions of European identity as well as anxieties about the qualities of a nationhood that exist in debates about multiculturalism and the literary canons illustrate the materiality of such fabrications. Historical and cultural studies have, for example, given attention historically to the fact that there is no natural national community tied to a geographical territory, but communities that are forged into a collective ‘identity’ through discourses that historically fabricate a nation-ness (Balibar & Wallerstein, 1991, p. 49; also Huysse, 1995). This problematic argues that there are no natural ‘heritages’ of nationality, only national imaginaries or collective images of nation-ness that are constructed through communication structures that interrelate the territory of the state with the identities of individuals. Anderson (1991) has called this institution of a unity an imagined community. It is produced through the cultural representations that locate who and how one belongs in a collectivity, with this belonging also embodying systems of exclusions about what is not part of the cultural distinctions to ‘make’ the collectivity.

The significance of the construction of national imaginaries is the forging of the memories that embody cultural and political identities. The imaginaries are not simply the putting together and regaining of a memory of the past which tell of the present collective nation-ness, neither are they the result of a somehow ‘natural’ generational forgetting that could be counteracted through some form of a more reliable representation. National imaginaries produce new memories that contain its opposition—forgetting
of other possible ways of representing self in society (see Jehlen, 1986; Wald, 1995; Rabasa, 1993). The construction of cultural memory and forgetting is given in the very structure of representation itself (p. 3). Huyssen (1995) argues, ‘The past is not simply there in memory but it must be articulated to become memory. Memory is recherché rather than recuperation’ (p. 3).

A comparative study of the historical construction of national imaginaries that related to conceptions of the citizen, immigrant and nationality in France and the US provides a way to consider how systems of reason are practices that produce systems of inclusion/exclusion. Noiriel (1996/1998) focuses on the consequences of the different ways in which the two countries fabricate national imaginaries in producing systems of inclusion and exclusion. While the total of foreign born in the US and France are comparable in percentage, there are historically different ways in which the two countries have represented immigrants in political discourses.

In France, immigrants are absent from collective memory. Immigrants through categories of ethnicity were not considered as legitimate components of public life. For example, France’s centralization efforts in the formation of the modern state as well as the French Revolution discredited the idea of ‘origin’, which included the identification of one’s previous country of birth. Further, a Cartesian binary logic held in official categorization did not permit mixed categories; one was either French or foreign born. Finally, the census-taking apparatus disregarded the use of language, religion and race as criteria of classification. There are no races in the system of bureaucratic system of ‘reason’ but only French people. The French construction of the national citizen focuses on socio-professional categories and juridical criteria of nationality. This led to a cultural celebration of ethnic cultures but did not allow a politicization of ethnicity as an object of public controversy. In contrast, the 19th-century US classification system defined racial and ethnic categories in extreme detail, and the notion of the ‘hyphenated-American’ became a legitimate designation of a citizen within the larger social/cultural project of Americanization.

The recognition that national memory is a construction of the past in the present has important implications for the study of governance and inclusion/exclusion. The school has historically played a pivotal role in constructions of national representations and the structuring of systems of inclusion and exclusions (Meyer et al., 1997). Current revisionist histories of national and European identity that look either nationally to the contributions of different social and ethnic groups within national narratives or to a pan-European sense of self, for example, are not merely the movement toward a more truthful representation of the past. The restructuring of cultural memories is a cultural practice of the present which forges narratives to instantiate visions of the citizen, the nation and the new intra-national state of the European Union. Discourses about the traditional values, and conservative restorations, for example, have little to do with what the past was; the discourses construct new sets of collective representations and principles for action and participation. The cultural images and narratives of a national family and traditional values of collectivities and individuality exist only as part of present constructions rather than as past realities.

But the new cultural practices inscribed in the construction of national imaginaries contain ambiguities and contentions as the new cultural territories are assembled (see e.g. Chatterjee, 1993; Rose, 1996; Shapiro, 1997; Wald, 1995; Balibar & Wallerstein, 1991). At one level, old images of nation and self are dissociated from the new memories as people reimagine themselves with another collective narrative that relates to political projects bound to cultural identities. The estrangements are found in the images and
narratives of educational reforms as new cultural imaginaries are constructed about the child and the teacher (Gee \textit{et al.}, 1996; Popkewitz, 2000). In part, the imagined unity of the new child in teaching and teacher education is instituted against other possible unities, interpretive contentions, and analytic capacities of people.

The focus on these constructions of memory/forgetting, estrangements and anxieties enables a consideration of the relationship of governance and inclusion different from that embodied in the equity problematic. The new system of cultural imaginaries constructs systems of reason through which the capabilities of individuals are organized and classified as fitting in as reasonable persons (and what are not signified in the maps put as outside of ‘reason’ and normalcy are inscribed). Thus, embedded in the national imaginaries are systems of representation that produce governing systems of social inclusion and exclusion.

\textit{Troubling the Categories of Gender, Ethnicity and Class}

Here, we can think of postmodern social theories as revising the politics of inclusion/exclusion from that embodied in the equity problematic. The problem is not only access and participation, but the rules through which divisions and distinctions qualify and disqualify individuals for action (see e.g. Rajchman, 1995).\textsuperscript{17}

The historical construction of the subject is located in literature that examines the idea of blackness and woman-ness. Gilroy (1993), for example, explored how the concept of blackness has historically developed through migrations among places in the Atlantic among Africa, Europe and the Americas through exploring discourses of social analysis, music and the arts. Feminist scholarship has, as well, sought to understand how, at different historical times, women are made into subjects through a weaving of different social practices and institutional patterns. Riley (1988), for example, locates how changing concepts of ‘woman’ construct the subject of women in changing patterns of power that normalize gender relations. She explores how the concept of ‘women’ has shifted during the past few hundred years from its placement in religious spaces as a ‘soul’ dominated by the church to social spaces that revisioned women through their bodies and sexuality. Riley argues that there is no ‘essential’ concept of woman, but one that is historically formed in power relations. Fraser (1992), as another example, explored the discursive practices in the Senate hearings concerning the sexual harassment charges against the now United States Supreme Court Justice, Clarence Thomas. She argues that certain discursive relations were produced that interrelated gender, race and class in a way that is fluid rather than stable and fixed in establishing identities, for example as discursively positioning the black female accuser of Justice Thomas as discursively white through the strategies deployed.

This consideration of how knowledge constructs difference in classrooms through the systems of representations in classroom practice can be explored in two types of studies. There are the gender studies that consider how pedagogical practices are both enabling and disenabling of girls in schools (see e.g. Walkerdine, 1988 in Great Britain; Luke & Gore, 1992 in Australia and the US). Walkerdine’s (1988) studies of Piagetian psychology in education and progressive pedagogies, for example, illustrate how particular bourgeois and gendered ways of reasoning are brought into the school as seemingly universal and neutral sets of practices but then function to create divisions that exclude certain children from participation.

A different literature considers how divisions and distinctions of pedagogy ‘racialize’ the child by placing certain children in the space of the anthropological other.
Pedagogical discourses are viewed as constructing a continuum of norms that place some children outside the range of proper norms of thinking, reasoning and acting. We can consider, for example, the different educational discourses that construct certain children as ‘needy’, that is, as not being successful in school because of poverty, racism or other forms of exclusion that prevent school achievement and completion. In contemporary US reforms, these discourses about the child who needs special help and remediation are organized through distinctions and divisions that relate to urban and rural education. The urban and rural child in the United States is a child who is one that the state targets for special classes, special teaching programs and special materials in order to save the child from the processes that have produced the feeling of psychological failure and a lack of achievement.

But the particular helping projects for the needy child are systems of exclusion through the ways in which the discourses of pedagogy function to differentiate and divide (Popkewitz, 1998a, b). To understand how the discourses of pedagogy function as systems of inclusion/exclusion, a study of urban and rural education explored how children in both settings were classified according to the same sets of categories and distinctions. The capabilities of the child in both urban and rural schools were, for practical purposes, made the same through the discursive practices available to teachers: the urban and rural child was one who lacked self-esteem, had different learning styles from ‘other’ children and required teachers who had different teaching styles in order to address the differences in the capabilities of the child. The discourses of an urban-ness assumed priority in the classification of the child. Children and their parents are understood as lacking the capabilities to act properly (providing books and reading time at home, for example), of having positive self-esteem or of participating in ‘appropriate’ and ‘successful’ ways in school activities.

The qualities of the child were an absence of certain capabilities and dispositions. The embodied child was an absence of capabilities and awarenesses needed for success and achievement—the child who has a poor self-concept, who needed remediation, who learned through ‘doing’ rather than through abstract knowledge. The discourses that constructed the qualities of urban-ness and rural-ness of the child were not spoken about explicitly but were carried in the distinctions of teaching. The series of distinctions and categories divided the urban-ness and the rural-ness of the child from ‘others’ who are not explicitly named.

The distinctions of the urban and rural child have little to do with geographical settings but with qualities that are inscribed as absent from the child. But this discursive space was ‘real’ in its consequences. The urban-ness and rural-ness of the child stood outside of normality, in a social space from which the children can never become the average. If we play with language here, the absence of the norms in the child also becomes a presence that governs the constructions of teaching.

The location of a child in this discursive non-geographical space is evident when the classification of urban and rural were examined further. When the concrete discourses of teaching were examined in the everyday language of classrooms, urban and rural education deployed the same systems of reason to talk about learning, curriculum, classroom planning, assessment and so on. Further, if one looks for the categories that stand in opposition to urban and rural education, there are no equivalent categories. The opposite of urban/rural is unnamed in educational discourses yet it is present as an effect of power. Everyone ‘knows’ that the urban child is an ‘inner-city’ child who embodies norms and capabilities that are different from what continually goes unnamed. At a different point of entrance to this normalizing, urban children can live in the suburbs.
At the same time, the discursive position of the urban-ness—the urban-ness of the child as the ‘other’ is made visible when it is recognized that not all children who live in the city are classified as urban—no one speaks of the wealthy who live in US cities or those who go to private schools as urban (or as rural).

Through study of urban-ness and rural-ness of the child, attention can be given to the politics of policies and evaluation as principles of reason that qualify and disqualify individuals from participation. But this example about the production of educational reason as a system of inclusion and exclusion also throws into question the viability of the distinctions between the formulation of policy and the realization of policy—a version of the theory/practice distinctions that continually appear to give priority to localized and seemingly ‘useful’ knowledge about education. The discussion above suggests that the knowledge practices of education are social practices and attention needs to be given to the ways in which educational practices construct maps that generate the principles of action and participation that order policy and classrooms.

This relation of knowledge, governance and inclusion/exclusion is embodied in Foucault’s (1979) idea of governmentality. In the 19th century, Foucault (1979) argues, there occurred a new relationship between state-governing practices and individual behaviors and dispositions. If the state was to be responsible for the welfare of its citizens, he argues, the identity of individuals had to be linked to the administrative patterns found in the larger society. This embodied a power/knowledge relationship. New institutions of health, labour and education tied the new social welfare goals of the state to the self-reflective and self-governing principles of individuality (Donald, 1992; Hunter, 1994; Rose & Miller, 1992; Shapiro, 1992). The notion of ‘socialization’ in the equity problematic is reconceptualized, as Bourdieu’s (1984) and before him Durkheim’s and Weber’s ‘habitus’, from the anthropological universe of functional sociology to the outcome of specific social practices through which subjectivities are constructed. Whereas the equity problematic literature focuses on governance as a way to overcome the negative, repressive elements of power (to eliminate social exclusions), the problematic of knowledge directs attention to governance as a productive power that is embodied in the rules through which individuality is understood, acted on and differentiated in social practices (Foucault, 1980; Bourdieu, 1993).

**Hybridity and the Construction of Difference**

If we return to the equity problematic, inclusion/exclusion is given attention through structural categories, such as class (the most frequent distinction), gender, ethnicity and race. These categories stand as universals that speak of a unified grouping of people from whom to consider issues of equity and justice. This problematic has served a useful function in identifying groups that have been excluded from opportunities and access to social resources. When we move to the literature centred in the problematic of knowledge, we find that the idea of single monolithic identities is challenged through the concept of hybridity, that is, as an overlay or scaffolding of different discourses through subjectivities that are produced (see e.g. Gilroy, 1993; Young, 1995; Anderson, 1991; Spivak, 1992; Dhillon, 1999). Homi Bhabha (1995) speaks of hybridity as:

the traces of those feelings and practices which inform [the processes of identifying], just like a translation, so that hybridity puts together the traces of certain other meanings or discourses. It does not give them the authority of
being prior in the sense of being original: they are prior only in the sense of being anterior. (p. 211)

The idea of hybridity is underscored in the formation of political agendas for the new South Africa. Its politics embody fluid and pragmatic relations within a field of multiple power relations. The results are practices that are a residue of Marxism, a spoonful of Chicago economics, a dash of West European social democracy, and much local spice. Like postcommunists everywhere else (Ash, 1997, p. 33).

The concept of hybridity makes it possible to think of the coexistence of the problem of governance and inclusion/exclusion through examining plural assumptions, orientations and procedures in which individuals and groups are qualified and disqualified for action and participation. The hybridity of discourses is evident within the political imaginary of European Union unity. Current reforms give reference to Europe as a continent of diversity, with those built inside the Union built by the Maastricht Treaty and the different national traditions of reasoning about social policy, and those outside its walls (see Nóvoa, 2000; Silver, 1994/1995). Its discourses are both inclusionary and exclusionary through assuming that Europe is contained within the imaginaries of its member states and excluding those European states of the east while, for practical purposes, including Iceland through special agreements. In this sense, current national reform policies are also hybrids. They embody complex processes of mediation and transformations as the national discourses are scaffolded with global discourses about the modernization of schooling (Dussel et al., 2000).

Hybridity also directs attention to the interrelation of discourses of class, race and ethnicity as not single divisions but overlapping discourses of no singular origin as they enter into the problem solving of policy and educational practices. The analytic of governance is not merely one of hegemony and the dominance of the powerful over the less powerful—a power that moves, for example, from the core nations to the periphery (see Dussel et al., 2000). As recent historical discussions of colonialization illustrate, there are slippages and processes of translations of ideas of the colonial metropolis as discourses are rearticulated in different contexts from those in which they were originally produced (see e.g. Moore-Gilbert, 1997). Hybridity also raises questions about notions of empowerment and voice that rhetorically give purpose to contemporary reforms.

At the same time, the literature also explores how the metropole—Europe, North America—is itself reconstructed in a manner that is still relevant today. Europe, for example, was made by its imperial projects as much as the colonial encounters were shaped by conflicts within Europe itself (Cooper & Stoler, 1997). The inclusions and exclusions through which the 19th-century European nations refashioned notions of citizenship, sovereignty and participation cannot be adequately understood without exploring the relationship of European practices to Asian and African political movements, as well as self-doubts about the moral claims of liberalism in the face of the colonial enterprises.

The processes of mediation and transformation internal to the construction of national imaginaries also suggest either that there is no non-European voice—as current discussions seem to posit in arguments about the canons of a cultural narrative—that exists in some pristine state to be deployed to counteract the colonialism of the European, or that there exists some natural voice of marginalized groups that can be given speech to articulate their interests within a nation. While the rhetorical constructions of reforms do speak of giving marginal groups voice, studies of knowledge as a hybrid illustrate that there is no natural voice. There are only mediated distinctions and divisions that are the
historical effects of multiple discourses through which subjectivities are constructed. The construction of voice is an effect of power and is never outside of the power relations in which it is positioned.

In taking this perspective, problems of inclusion and exclusion are viewed as cultural struggles that relate to the production of subjectivities in an unequal field (Butler, 1996; Chatterjee, 1993; Schram & Neisser, 1997). Unlike the equity problematic, which focuses on representation and the access of groups in institutional life, attention is instead directed to less obvious cultural questions about the rules for construction and representation, national identity and citizenship that are embodied in the educational restructuring. Pressures produced by global changes in the economy, by political changes as minority groups seek greater participation, by issues of racial equality, as well as by changing migration and demographic patterns that cross nations have redefined the debates about the nature of nationhood and citizenry. The struggles over identity that now exist over minority rights and gender, for example, have produced new exclusions and taboo zones, as monolithic notions of identity clash with the convictions of identities that are heterogeneous.

The State as the Relationships that Govern Conduct

At one level, we can return to the arguments in the equity problematic about neoliberalism and the state. There, it was noted that the political rhetoric has been concerned with globalization, a decentralized state, statements about rolling back the state. There is little evidence to support this (Boyer & Drache, 1996). What has occurred are subtle changes in the allocation of resources and the governance politics related to the risk factors of modern societies. Comparative analyses in political economies, for example, have illustrated how global economics has weakened the state’s monopoly (sovereignty) in that sector but have simultaneously produced new cultural forms as pragmatic responses to the reduction of public funding and local specific pressures created by economic, demographic and social needs (Bakker & Miller, 1996). It is argued within this literature that a historical understanding of the present political economy literature requires a more nuanced theoretical outlook to examine the relationship of centralized and decentralized systems of governance in different welfare states and how these systems relate to problems of social inclusion and exclusion (see Jessop, 1998; Boyer & Drache, 1996; Kallós, 1996; Zeitlin & Herrigel, 2000; Popkewitz, 2000). The focus is on new systems of governance being produced through new sets of social and economic relations and discursive formations that are not adequately explained through arguments about the loss of the welfare state or privatization (Deleuze, 1992; Dean, 1996).

One way to approach the reconstitution of governance principles in social inclusion/exclusion is through drawing on the knowledge problematic as it has revised the politics of the state embodied in its research. The idea of the state is not as an entity that acts as a sovereign power but as sets of relations through which governance practices are constructed (Popkewitz, 1996). Analyses are less centred on the actions of actors and more on how systems of reason are scaffolded as hybrids to govern what is possible and not possible in the fields of social practices (see e.g. Ball, 1994).

This notion of the state as knowledge practices is to understand how power is deployed through multiple capillaries that produce and constitute the self as an agent of change (see e.g. Barrett & Phillips, 1992). The literature considers the ways in which the discourses of government, social science, and professionals, for example, criss-cross in the
production of disciplining strategies in administering the inner capabilities of the individual who acts as a self-responsible and self-motivated citizen, which we will later call the governing of the soul (see Foucault, 1979).

One such example is the concept of childhood. Discourses of childhood appear alongside discourses of the family and of parents as they intersect multiple institutions related to labour laws, schooling, social welfare nets, health, child rearing and so on. These institutions were concerned with problems of the social administration in the new liberal democratic societies around 1900 (see e.g. Lasch, 1979; also Finkelstein, 1989; Hamilton, 1989; Poster, 1978; Reiger, 1985). Today, the discourses circulating are constructing new images and narrative of the child who is in ‘care of the state’, a phrase used by de Swaan (1988).

The refiguring and ‘re-making’ inscribe particular principles that are to govern the family, parent and child through professional discourses about childhood, parenting and ‘community’ that circulate within social policy about childcare and pedagogy (Popkewitz & Bloch, in progress). The interest is a reform that is often phrased as democratizing the school or early childhood systems of care by making these institutional settings more responsive to their clients. When focusing on the children of the poor and marginalized social groups, the democratization is also phrased as a way to ‘rescue’ the child through rescuing the parent. It is thought that parents with the proper habits, dispositions and behaviors would enable the success of their children as they develop into adults. Discourses of ‘community’ are attached to this democratization, suggesting that the solution to democratization is localized and flexible strategies in which the new political rationalities are related to the moral and social practices of parents and children. But as discussed earlier, such discourses about rescuing the ‘needy’ also can normalize the ‘targeted’ groups in a social space that is outside of normalcy (Popkewitz, 1998b).

The state as the practice of governing through the systems of knowledge that circulate among different institutions raises an important set of questions. The questions relate to the adequacy of an existing binary of state and civil society in policy discussions of the changes in the welfare state and neoliberalism. Governance is understood as the practices that regulate the conduct of conduct as discourses circulate among different institutions that traverse the formal apparatus of the state and the institutions of civil society (Barry et al., 1996; Popkewitz, 1996).

The overlapping of the formal, legal-administrative apparatus of government and civil society is illustrated in the practices of birth control in China. Sigley (1996), for example, argues that most Anglo-American literature has viewed the changes in the state through certain ideological lenses of liberalism that see a distinction between the private and the public. By focusing on Chinese policy on birth control, Sigley explores the difficulties of such distinctions that underlie categories of state and civil society. He argues that the Chinese state is loosening screws in one area (liberalization) and tightening them in another. If we focus on the policy discourses with the problematic of governing the conduct of conduct (Sigley, 1996, p. 459), it helps us to consider the anomaly of increased liberalization in most areas and then increased penetration of the state into the family in another. If we use China as an example, it is not a liberal political theory orientation of state reasons in terms of a moralistic and cosmological order of an art of living; rather, it is a hybrid of a classic Confucian maxim on achieving social harmony that mixes with Maoism and capitalism to produce a relation between the cultivation of the self, that flows into the good management of the family, in terms that allow for effective government of the state and ensures peace under heaven for the individual (p. 464).

Our argument to this point is that if we view the state as confined to governmental
agencies in the current historical conjuncture, we misrecognize the power relation through which the governing practices are formed. While similar ‘reform’ practices about decentralization and autonomy circulate among many of the countries in this study, there are historical distinctions in the constituting of relations and power in the educational arena. These governing practice cross civil society and the formal governmental agencies that are typically associated with the state. Rather than an entity that exercises power, the state is understood as a series of relations through which governance is constructed and inclusion/exclusion produced through the rules of reason and the reasonable person.

**Some Concluding Remarks: relational concepts of actors and knowledge**

In the previous sections, we have discussed the problem of the relationship of the social administration of the state and problems of social inclusion and exclusion as an increasing cross-national welfare policy issue. This interest is not only one of the altruistic promises of modernity but is historically bound to a variety of contemporary changes that relate processes of globalization to traditions of nationalism and liberal ideals about democratic participation. The concern with governing and social inclusion and exclusion is a focus of the European Union, which is funding the research project in which this conceptual review has formed. These changes relate to, among others, migration patterns and questions of citizenship, the work patterns and educational requirements in the new economies, as well as shifts in the politics of cultural movements and demands for representation. In conjunction with these changes are changes in the models of participation and the welfare safety nets which have been labelled ‘neoliberalism’ as the welfare state is redesigned in current processes of globalization and economic restructuring.

More general concern with the relationship of state policy and issues of social inclusion and exclusion is explicit within the educational arena. Economic issues of equity and justice prominent in the assessment of the role of school coincide with a recognition of international competition that is deemed as relating directly to the performance of national educational systems. Education is to forge the new cosmopolitan image of the citizen/worker/individual whose ‘home’ is a hybrid such as one that joins the images of a European Union and national citizen. This construction of new ‘homes’ also involves new cultural anxieties and systems of governing inclusion and exclusion.

This review argues against current policy research that assumes rather than interrogates the links between governance and inclusion and exclusion. That research situates itself within the same framework as its objects of study and its results become nothing more than recapitulation of given systems of reference in state policy rather than knowledge produced through critical analysis. In contrast, we argued in the sections above that policy research needs to interrogate the relation of assumptions about governance and social inclusion/exclusion in educational policy research.

Our first task in this review was to consider the conceptual difficulties in that task. We discussed the multiple literatures and the different subcategories that are involved in conceptualizing each of the concepts. We also explored some of the possible dangers and limitations of using such categories as social exclusion, such as eliding previously highlighted categories of class and social stratification. The problem of this review was also bound by the fact that the conceptual relationship of governance and inclusion/exclusion was not explicitly explored in previous literature except tacitly in, for example, discussion of the relationship between governmental policies of labour markets and employment or educational access.

We proceeded to examine two different problematics that underlie such research. We
called the different approaches ‘problematics’ to emphasize how the methods of science and concepts and theories of social affairs produce ways of thinking and ordering action and of understanding results. Our task was to explore the different sets of principles that organize the construction of educational problems and policy about governance and social inclusion/exclusion (see e.g. Popkewitz, 1997). We chose this analytic approach to explore the relationship between governance and inclusion/exclusion which often goes unexamined in that research, while recognizing that such an approach can also ignore the differences in which the boundaries may be pushed and possible points of overlap that occur in practice between problematics. We acknowledge the risk, but believe that such an approach can enable us to consider how epistemological questions inscribed in research can function in material ways to structure principles for action and participation through the mobilization of discursive practices in research, policy and the lived world of schooling.

Our discussion sought to explore two different problematics for understanding the relation of governance and inclusion/exclusion. For analytical purposes, we located one problematic in the relation of governance and inclusion/exclusion as one of equity. This dominant problematic has many variations and different ideological agendas but can be summarized as defining the issue of governance through examining the policies and practices through which individuals and groups are given access and opportunity to participate in social, economic and cultural activities. Class concepts and access to labour markets have been the most prominent in this approach, although concepts related to ethnicity, race and gender have assumed greater prevalence in recent years. The particular mix and emphasis have depended on the national context.

In the equity approach, we argued that the problem is from one point of view generally to find the most effective ways to promote inclusion. Inclusion is treated as an absolute concept in which there is belief that, at least hypothetically, there exists a final point that is totally inclusive. Thus the concept of exclusion stands only for a different condition that will eventually be eliminated through wise policy and governance practices. Gender research, within this problematic, is to identify practices and strategies of inclusion of girls into school programs in which typically they have not had adequate representation, such as in the sciences and mathematics school subjects. It is assumed in policy and research, at least tacitly, that a point of inclusion can be found in which there is no exclusion related to gender. We also pointed to reproduction theories as having a different intellectual and social intent through focusing on how relations of social class or gender are reproduced within social relations, though much of the current ‘reproduction’ research gives attention to positions in terms of more or less status rather than to relations.

When the equity approach is viewed at a macro level, it assumes governance and inclusion/exclusion are tied to structural concepts. One prominent structural category is the state as an actor whose legislation, admission policies and steering efforts govern through fiscal policy, legislation and bureaucratic practices. Thus, the state stands as an entity whose legal-administrative practices influence, if not determine, who is to be included and excluded. At a system level, conceptualization of neoliberalism and marketization of education provides one example of current policy research concerned with a problematic of equity, even when the literature is critical of the basic assumptions of the policy orientation. Discussions of decentralization are another category of governance that is linked to practices of inclusion and exclusion.

The second problematic relates to governance and inclusion/exclusion as related to a problematic of knowledge. We have, in certain respects, elaborated the conceptual
distinctions that relate governance and inclusion/exclusion in the problematic of knowledge. We did this because it is a dimension of power which is often missed in discussions of governance and inclusion/exclusion. We focused on literature that gave attention to the ways in which the rules and standards of reason organize principles that function to qualify and disqualify individuals as the level of being, that is, the dispositions, sensitivities and awarenesses that govern participation and action. In exploring this problematic, we used the metaphor of map making to consider how the rules for ordering and classifying objects produce distinctions and differentiations that divide and normalize the individuality of people. This ordering and classification, we argued, functions to govern individuals differentially in making possible participation. These systems of reason are not individual or personal in nature, but are socially constructed and the effects of power that produce different principles for action and participation.

It is at the level of governing action and participation that this problematic focuses on the relation of governing to inclusion and exclusion. We discussed, for example, the move from structural and social issues of inclusion and exclusion to those of cultural projects related to constructions of identity. From this analytic, the problematic explored a different way of considering current clashes about identity, minority rights and gender from that of the equity problematic. Among the conceptual apparatuses in studying the relationship of governance and inclusion/exclusion were concerns with the fabrication of identities, the construction of memory and forgetting as it relates to nation-ness, and troubling of the categories of gender, ethnicity and class through considering categories as hybrids discursively formed as effects of power. The literature examined governing and governance as a relational concept, posing the idea of the state as the mobilization of discursive practices through which power circulates and subjectivities are produced. This notion of the state as a relational concept related to knowledge crosses over institutional analyses when one considers, for example, the idea of childhood and gender in education.

In exploring these different problematics, we recognize a need to join the equity and knowledge problematics. This joining of the two problematics, however, is not merely an additive problem of doing a little of one (equity) and a little of the other (discursive analyses). It is, we believe, rethinking the conceptual ways in which we have organized research on governance and inclusion/exclusion. We can think of our concern in this research as understanding the relations of the groups of actors influential in educational decision making and the discursive rules about inclusion/exclusion deployed to construct the subjects and subjectivities that differentiate the different groups. This is not an equity problem nor is it solely one of knowledge per se, but a relational question of fields of interaction.
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NOTES

1. Our task was very much facilitated by the work of Jennifer Gore, Bob Lingard and James Ladwig from the Australian partner, Hannu Simola, Riisto Rinne and Joel Kivirauma from the Finnish team, Edwin Keiner from the German team, Andreas Kazamias, Yiannis Roussakis, Evie Zambeta and Eleni Karadjia from the Greek Team, Sigurjón Myrdal, Gunnar E. Finnbogason, Ingólfr Asgeir Johannesson, Guðrún Geirsdóttir, Olafur Johann Proppe and Thorsteinn Valdimar Gunnarsson from the Icelandic team,
António Nóvoa, Natália Alves and Riu Canário from the Portuguese team, Miguel A. Pereyra from the Spanish team, László Lundahl and Johanna Swandberg from the Swedish team, and Jenny Ozga and Martin Lawn from the British team. We also appreciate the comments given on earlier drafts by Lynn Fendler, Jim Gee, the graduate seminar on educational reform at the University of Wisconsin—Madison, and the seminar group at the Pedagogical Institution, Umeå University, Sweden.

2. While the word ‘multiculturalism’ is used in many European settings as it is in the United States, this does not mean that the word should be treated as having the same meaning in the different contexts. Different historical traditions of state governing, pedagogical discourses, national imaginaries around which the collective purpose is constructed, as well as changes in immigration/migration patterns need to be accounted for when thinking about the discourses of multiculturalism as a problem of social inclusion. The same word does not necessarily mean the same thing in different situations.


4. This hybridity is illustrated in the new enterpreneur in the European Union who is born in Madrid or Budapest, educated in the United States or Italy, now lives in London or Paris, speaks and works in multiple languages, and feels no nationality except some general sense of being European (Stanley, 1998).

5. We will use the phrase ‘inclusion/exclusion’ throughout this essay except when it is necessary to distinguish the two. Our choice of a single word is theoretical, to argue the oneness of the concept, an argument that is elaborated on in the section on the problematic of knowledge.

6. The discussion is formed within a cross-national research project ‘Education Governance and Social Integration and Exclusion in Europe’ (EGSIE) which is financed by the European Union Programme on Targeted Socio-Economic Research. The European countries are: Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom (England and Scotland). Australia is a contributing partner in the study. See Lindblad & Popkewitz (1998).

7. The politics of postmodern political and social theories in education is discussed in Jóhannesson, 1998; also see Callewaert, 1999.

8. We are expressing this relationship to avoid the distinction of theory and practice, discourse and lived experience which permeates theories of action and misrecognizes, in Bourdieu’s (1993) sense, the problem of knowledge as a ‘practice’.

9. The term social inclusion, however, has been picked up by the Labour government in Britain.

10. In New Zealand, as a contrasting context, the principle is not individual participation as the basis of inclusion but group representation. The Maori are given an allocation of seats in the parliament through group representation rather than through a one-person/one-vote rule. At a different layer of analysis, the history of the ruling party within the Mexican state is such an example, as it has routinely sought to incorporate oppositional groups into the government so as to neutralize their agendas (Dryzek, 1996).

11. Deploying a citational search with the keywords of ‘policy’, ‘theories of the state’, ‘policy networks’, ‘management’, ‘governance’ and ‘implementation’, there were 47 possible combinations of references located in the period 1978–1993. A second search of the ERIC database for descriptors related to governance and social inclusion/social integration indicated descriptors of ‘social exclusion’ entailed four significant entries, but the category of ‘social integration’ yielded 2385 entries; ‘educational policy’ and ‘educational discrimination’ produced 101 articles. When the entries were placed into a matrix that crossed ‘governance/educational policy’ with ‘social integration/exclusion’ across level of education and level of governance (local, national, global), the matrix produced 100 possible combinations in which to search for relevant literature.


13. For a penetration of these stances, see e.g. Olin Wright, 1997.


15. US literature often assumes that there is no state, as the organization of education is thought of as a decentralized process in which the federal government is a remote actor. The notion of the state as a formal actor in school governance does appear in British studies of education as referenced in this section, as well as in continental European literature (see e.g. Kivinen & Rinne, 1996). An exception in the US literature is Torres & Morrow (1995) and Torres (2000). For discussion of conceptions of governance and state theory, see Popkewitz (1996).

16. There is a debate between theories of ‘modernity’ (within the equity problematic) and those of ‘postmodernity’ (within the knowledge problematic) which is a version of the ‘chicken and egg’ argument. That argument is what comes first: the physical and social changes that knowledge represents and interprets, such as the structural arrangements and power differentials that produce the reason of an age or a group in society? Or is the reason itself a material practice whose effects produce power relations? The latter points to how modern capitalism would not be possible unless multiple historical trajectories
had not occurred, including important shifts in mentalities that enabled one to think of business through accounting rationalities and individualities as ‘classes’ of people. This review, however, will not resolve this argument except to say that there are times when the questions raised in the equity problematic are intellectually and politically important, such as in civil rights movements; and times when the knowledge problematic is central to analysis (see Popkewitz & Burell, 1998). The feminist movement is an example of the need for both: changing the actor positions that women hold in society, as well as the knowledge systems through which gendered subjectivities are constructed. The resolution to the theoretical and philosophical debate is pragmatic and related to social movements and assumptions about the nature of the ‘political’ and the change that underlies social projects. When dealing with the problems of schooling which are historically concerned with the social administration of ‘mentalities’, it is intellectually difficult, we believe, not to weave together equity questions with those of knowledge.

17. We are putting together what are called postmodern social theories, which include feminist studies, cultural theories and postcolonial studies, together within this problematic.
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