Performativity and Pedagogizing Knowledge: Globalizing Educational Policy Formation, Dissemination, and Enactment

Parlo Singh, Griffith Institute for Educational Research,
Griffith University, Mt Gravatt campus, Brisbane, Queensland Australia
parlo.singh@griffith.edu.au

Abstract:

Critical policy scholars have increasingly turned their attention to: (1) the work of policy actors engaged in globalized and globalizing processes of policy formation, (2) the global flows or movements of education policies across multifaceted, hybrid networks of public-private agencies, and (3) the complex politics of global-national policy translation and enactment in local school contexts. Scholars have emphasized firstly, the economic turn in education reform policies, a shift from a social democratic education orientation, and secondly, policy convergence towards a dominant neo-liberal political agenda. This paper suggests that Bernstein's concepts of the totally pedagogized society (TPS) and the pedagogic device, as the ensemble of rules for the production, recontextualization and evaluation of pedagogic discourses may add to this corpus of critical policy scholarship. It does this by firstly reviewing the take up of Bernstein's concept of the TPS in the critical policy sociology literature, arguing that this interpretation presents a largely dystopian account of globalizing educational policies. In contrast, the paper argues for and presents an alternative open-ended reading and projection of Bernstein's concept of the TPS and pedagogic device for thinking about globalized processes and devices of the pedagogic communication of knowledge (s).

Keywords: performativity, globalizing policy, pedagogic device, pedagogic discourse, totally pedagogized society

Introduction

Critical education policy scholars have increasingly focused attention on the globalization of education policy[1] formation, dissemination and enactment. This work has analysed discursive policy shifts from education to life-long learning, a discursive turn which has explicitly linked learning to human capital development in a global knowledge economy. Critical policy scholars have examined the ways in which new discourses of learning and the 21st century learner are produced and travel across the globe (see Williams, Gannon, and Sawyer 2013). The rapid, almost instant movement of ideas, instruments and artefacts across increasingly porous national boundaries, in turn, produces hegemonic global-local sign systems or what Rizvi and Lingard (2010) refer to as a dominant global social imaginary about the means and ends of education. Policy analytic work on globalizing education policies has examined the ways in which the emergence and enactment of discourses of learning, the 21st century learner, and quality teaching disassembles and reassembles education processes and systems. Within this globalized and globalizing discursive ensemble the learner is made increasingly visible. The enhanced prominence or visibility of the learner does not lead to a reduction in power relations governing the work of teachers. Rather, power relations through new 'datafication' mechanisms which firstly construct the 'teacher-as-problem' or barrier to quality learning, and then embed accountability/responsibility instruments into schools to fix the 'teacher problem' become more invasive (Robertson 2012; Thompson and Cook 2014, 11). Learning and quality teaching are increasingly aligned to the 'discourses of neo-liberalism or the ideologies of the market' (Ball 1998, 122). Discourses of marketization or privatization, ideologies of the market, simultaneously 'construct quasi-markets in education so that parents and students are constructed as consumers rather than citizens with democratic rights' (Rizvi and Lingard 2010, 125),

and reshape and reframe professional practices within schools through new public management discourses of performance targets, efficiency measures and audit practices (Lingard and Sellar 2013). Teachers are held accountable to ensure that the work on learning and the learner is undertaken through a regime of instruments or technologies of measurement and comparison (Fenwick, Mangez, and Ozga 2014). The learning of whole populations, for example national and global cohorts of learners, is measured and rendered visible on websites, a public display of performance. Moreover, learning performance is benchmarked not only at the level of the region, district, school, classroom and teacher, but across the globe to track the competitive potential of human capital. In this way, schooling systems increasingly play an important role in the work of governing whole populations to meet the instrumentalist needs of neo-liberal economic productivity (Novoa and Yariv-Mashal 2014).

This sketch of the complex investigative work of critical policy scholars highlights the enormity of the educational changes taking place across the globe[2], that is, an epochal shift from a social democratic education policy program towards a dominant neo-liberal education reform agenda. Increasingly, critical policy scholars have turned to the work of the sociologist Basil Bernstein, particularly his concept of totally pedagogized society (TPS) to think about globalizing education policy discourses and practices.

My aims in this paper are three fold. First, I examine the take up of the concept of the totally pedagogized society in the critical policy studies literature. I propose that much of this work projects a dystopian account of globalized and globalizing education policy discourses and practices[3] (Ball 2009). Second, I elaborate on Bernstein's concept of the totally pedagogized society (TPS) in the context of more recent theoretical developments on educationalization, public pedagogy, performativity and governing

knowledge. Third, I outline the unique focus of Bernstein's theoretical project which focuses simultaneously on: issues of power and control, social reproduction and social contestation, and the 'processes and mechanisms' of the 'pedagogical communication and reproduction' of educational knowledge (Gordon 2009, xi). Put another way, the Bernstein project focusses on 'how knowledge is mobilised in and through pedagogy' (Green 2010, 47). The latter Bernstein theoretical corpus, including work on the TPS, emphasises the performative role of pedagogic discourses and practices realised in new modes of state governance and governmentality[4]. But crucially the focus is not simply on new regimes of power, but also on the communication principles of social control. It is through new complex hybrid systems of pedagogic communication that social identities, relations and order are constituted, contested, formed, and re-formed[5]. It is through these new modes and networks of pedagogic communication that social inequalities are re-produced, challenged, interrupted, and re-shaped in new ways. This dual focus on power and control relations in the evolution of education systems is underpinned in the Bernstein sociological project by an open-ended problematic and empirically focused mode of investigative inquiry (Moore 2013).

TPS: A Conceptual Device for Critical Policy Scholars of Educational Globalization

Policy scholars[6] have interpreted Bernstein's (2001a, 2001b, 2001c) work on the TPS as a call to critical action. And indeed, it is in the work of sociologists of policy, particularly, critical policy studies, that the TPS concept seems to have found a home. For example, Gewirtz (2008, 416) suggests that Bernstein's concept of the TPS and powerful critique of the learning society cuts across and synthesises elements from 'three contrasting sociological approaches: theories of reflexive modernity, neo-Marxist critiques of contemporary economic change, and post-structuralist theories of governmentality'. Thus, Gerwitz (2008) draws on Bernstein's work of the TPS to engage in a systematic critique of discourses of the learning society. Following

Foucault, Bernstein (1990, 135) defines discourse as 'ways of relating, thinking and feeling' which 'specialize and distribute forms of consciousness, social relations, and dispositions'. Discourses are not prescriptive or deterministic. Rather, discourse 'constrains and enables what can be said' and discursive practices 'produce, rather than merely describe, the subjects and objects of knowledge practices' (Barad 2007, 146-147). Moreover, the possibilities of the thinkable and unthinkable, indeed, the relational dynamic between the thinkable and unthinkable in discursive formations (Bernstein, 1990) is 'not static or singular but rather is a dynamic and contingent multiplicity' (Barad, 2007, 146-147).

Drawing on this Foucauldian/Bernsteinian concept of discourse, Gerwitz (2008) distinguishes between learning for life and life-long learning, two dominant discourses of the so-called knowledge or learning society. The first category of discourse refers to the spread or proliferation of learning discourses in all facets and aspects of everyday life. Learning discourses thus take up a totalising role in governing or regulating all of life experiences. The second category of discourse refers to ongoing and continuous learning, a never ending cycle of learning courses and programs from cradle to grave (see also Ball 2009). So the first category refers to learning discourses totalising every aspect of everyday life. The second category refers to the continual need to learn for the duration or totalisation of the life cycle[7]. Gerwitz (2008) suggests that both categories of learning discourses are totalising or totalitarian. Because they have become so pervasive in every facet of life these learning discourses take on a regulatory role, whereby individuals avail themselves to be trained and retrained. Gerwitz (2008, 417-420) suggests that Bernstein's concept of trainability 'as a pedagogic expression of flexible capitalism' 'represents an impoverished form of pedagogy, one that fosters atomism and is therefore "socially empty"'. But what does the term socially empty signify? From the perspective of critical policy scholars, it seems to suggest a shift in the principles or moral code regulating the selection and organization of knowledge, the pedagogic communication of knowledge, or the pedagogization of knowledge. What is

the nature of this shift? At a very general level, critical policy scholars seem to be suggesting that the moral code of entrepreneurial individualism increasingly regulates the principles of the pedagogic communication of knowledge (see Tsatsaroni and Evans, 2013). Put another way, at a very general level, the logic of the market increasingly regulates the selection, organization and evaluation of learning, what is deemed valid learning, how it is to be taught, and what is recognized as valid acquisition of learning.

Ball (2009) also draws on Bernstein's concept of the TPS to examine the globalization of education policies and new modes of state governance or regulation through pedagogic agencies. The regulatory discourse or legitimation principle (Lyotard 1984) driving learning acquisition is the terror of performativity – 'a form of indirect steering or steering from a distance which replaces invention and prescription with target setting, accountability, and comparison' (see Ball 2005, 70-61). The logic of performativity[8], Ball (2005, 70-71) argues, works with discourses of neo-liberalism or the ideologies of the market; new institutional economics (co-ordination of individual and collective behaviour in terms of actions and choices of the rational actor); public choice theory – the logic of individual consumer choice based on information provided by the state about the performance of schools; and new managerialism – discourses of 'quality', innovation and appraisal mechanisms to regulate schooling work practices (see also Ball 2009; Ball, Maguire, Braun, and Hoskins, 2011). Moreover, Ball (2009) argues that a new social totality characterised by the discursive themes of self-reliance and enterprise, responsibility, trainability and commodity has been organised around a path of life-long learning. This social totality has constituted a new moral environment inside of which social relations and identities are intricately tied to a life of enterprise or an enterprising life. Post-welfare policies, according to Ball (2009, 205) 'are no longer

concerned with the redistribution of wealth, but rather with its creation' and the policies of the learning society are about redistribution of possibilities and opportunities, rather than resources. Both Gerwitz (2008) and Ball (2009) write of the importance of parental pedagogies, particularly the practices of intensive, total mothering, 'the heavy investment of the mother's time, energy, money and emotional commitment into enhancing the child's intellectual, physical, social and emotional development' (Ball 2009, 207) in the discursive and material configuration of the learning society.

The analyses undertaken by Gerwitz (2008) and Ball (2009) focus on the formation or production of new globalizing policy discourses of life-long learning, and the models of the learner and learning, teaching and parenting constituted within this totalising discursive regime. This is an important and insightful application of Bernstein's work on the TPS, but does not fully explore the potential of the concept for policy analytic work. In the next section of the paper, I elaborate on Bernstein's concept of the pedagogic device in order to present an alternative reading of the TPS for critical policy scholarship. I propose that Ball (2009) and Gerwitz's (2008) reading and application of the TPS to policy work is at the level of what Bernstein (1990) refers to as the distribution rule of the pedagogic device. But this work does not explore the ways in which new discourses of learning are globally relayed or transmitted, because it does not attend to the other rules of the pedagogic device, namely, policy recontextualisation and evaluation. Bernstein (2000) proposes that all education systems since the period of the medieval university have been governed by an internal logic or grammar of the pedagogic device. The pedagogic device is not a singular or essential formation, although it is the device for the relay of dominant principles of governance (see Lima 2007). In fact, the pedagogic device 'is only essential' in that it constitutes 'a

strategic "battlefield", or struggle, over the governing of education' (Bailey 2013, 809),

a crucial site 'for political struggle and contestation' (Foucault 1979, 20).

The Pedagogic Device: Networked Communications, Space-Time Compression

> State control over space and time is increasingly bypassed by global flows of
> capital, goods, services, technology, communication and information. … Thus,
> while global capitalism thrives, and nationalist ideologies explode all over the
> world, the nation-state, as historically created in the Modern Age, *seems to be*
> *losing its power, although, and this is essential, not its influence.* ... the growing
> challenge to states' sovereignty around the world seems to originate from the
> inability of the modern nation-state to navigate uncharted, stormy waters between
> the power of global networks and the challenge of singular identities (Castells
> 1997, 243-244, emphasis added)

In his theory of the TPS, Bernstein (2001a, 365) picks up on Castells' notion of

information networked societal modes, the reduced power but not influence of the

nation-state, and the ways in which the nation-state mediates the power of global

networks and identity politics (constituted around singular causes, for example,

feminism, environmentalism, religious fundamentalism and so forth). Specifically,

Bernstein (2001a, 2001b, 2001c) explores the formation of discursive codes around

learning and the influence of the state in the production, recontextualization and

evaluation of these discursive codes. Discursive codes refer to 'different modalities of

communication' which 'select and integrate meanings' (Bernstein 1996, 91). So

discourse refers to systems of meanings, and codes refer to the communication

principles which select and integrate these meanings. The focus of Bernstein's (2001a,

365) theoretical inquiry is on the 'voice of pedagogic discourse', that is, the ensemble of

principles/rules of the pedagogic device. He argues that the new societal modes

heralded by Castells signal the emergence of new symbolic orders of regulation and

control through pedagogic means – 'the second totally pedagogized society'[9].

Pedagogic discourse refers to the regime of rules or principles of power and control by

which knowledge (content, skills, and processes) is selected and organised for

pedagogic purposes. Thus, pedagogic discourse is the ensemble of power and control

principles regulating or constraining what is selected as valid educational knowledge

(curriculum), how it is taught/learnt (sequenced, paced), and when learning is deemed to

have happened (evaluation). Bernstein (2001a, 2001b, 2001c) suggests that increasingly

the state exerts its influence and rules or governs whole populations through pedagogic

means.

Bernstein (1990) argues that the pedagogic device 'is the principal producer of

symbolic control as well as of social destinies' (Tyler 2010, 149). The device sets the

conditions for 'the production, reproduction and transformation of culture' (Bernstein

1990, 180). The pedagogic device 'provides the intrinsic grammar of pedagogic

discourse through *distributive rules, recontextualizing rules, and rules of evaluation'*

(Bernstein 1990, 180)[10]

> These rules are themselves hierarchically related in the sense that the nature of the
> distributive rules regulates the recontextualizing rules, which in turn, regulate the
> rules of evaluation. These distributive rules regulate the fundamental relation
> between power, social groups, forms of consciousness and practice, and their
> *reproductions and productions.* The recontextualizing rules regulate the
> constitution of specific pedagogic discourse. The rules of evaluation are constituted
> in pedagogic practice (Bernstein 1990, 80, emphasis added).

The compression of space and time with globally networked technologies, that

is, new modes of digital communication, means that ideas and information flow rapidly

within and across borders. This does not lead to the production of common,

standardised or homogenized discursive codes across the globe, that is, the

'MacDonaldization' of both what is taught and how it is taught. Rather, there is likely to be increased differentiation and complexity of discursive codes, through the emergence of new social movements organised around a politics of identity (see Castells 1997). As Dale (2007, 26) argues globalization processes, in which the Western state is an active player, 'will not lead to convergence between national education systems; while there may be appreciable sharing of educational agendas, these agendas will continue to be addressed in specific ways, within the limits of what is a new functional and scalar division of labour of educational governance'.

Struggles for Control over the Evaluative Rule of the Pedagogic Device

Given the proliferation of sites external to schools, for the generation and dissemination of knowledge, the state's control over curriculum and pedagogy are increasingly undermined. The evaluative site thus increasingly comes under state control, both in the form of national and international high stakes testing, but also the very public reportage of testing data. This line of Bernstein inquiry emerging from the concept of the TPS has been taken up by only a few scholars. For example, Tyler (2010) engages in an exploratory diachronic and synchronic analysis of two global evaluative devices produced by two main global players in the game of international testing regimes, TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study) and PISA (Program for International Student Assessment). The diachronic analysis traces the historical genealogy of the two instruments. Here Tyler (2010, 145) argues:

> [T]he aims, testing, sampling methods and pedagogical emphases of these two
> testing regimes could not appear more different …. While TIMSS is age-graded
> and aimed at testing mastery of science and mathematical curricula, PISA aims to
> capture the students' abilities to use their knowledge and skills in the challenges of
> real-life situations at the end of their primary [compulsory] schooling

Moreover, Tyler (2010) argues that the national political response to performances on TIMMS has played out in Australia, the UK and US in calls for a return to a 'back to basics', traditional or collection code national curriculum, what some have described as a regime of neo-conservatism (Depaepe 2012). Such political interpretations of the international test data attempt to re-centre state control over education systems 'through setting and assessing standards in a de-centred environment' (Tyler 2010, 150). The crucial insight offered by Tyler (2010) about Bernstein's theory of the TPS, revolves around the internal logics of the pedagogic device. From this perspective, the apparent differences between TIMSS and PISA uncovered through a diachronic or genealogical analysis are negated. Rather, Tyler (2010) shows through a synchronic analysis how the discursive codes of both international testing regimes are recontextualized to reassert state control over education systems through new modes of pedagogic governance (see also Kanes, Morgan, and Tsatsaroni 2014). In other words, control over the evaluative rule of the pedagogic device becomes the means by which the state attempts to re-assert control over the increasing proliferation of modes of knowledge distribution and recontextualisation through new circuits or networks of pedagogic communication.

There are two points that can be added to Tyler's (2010) thinking about international testing regimes with the assistance of Bernstein's concepts of the TPS, pedagogic device and pedagogic identities. The first is a critique of the globalizing educational policy literature which asserts that international testing regimes are a 'fourth message system' alongside the three messages of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation, identified by Bernstein (see Thompson and Cook 2014; Rizvi and Lingard 2010). Such analyses, however, miss the crucial theoretical point about the rules or logic of the pedagogic device under conditions of late or liquid capitalism. From a Bernsteinian

perspective, international testing regimes are an extension of the third message system of evaluation, increasingly de-located from the human agency of individual teachers, and re-located in an ensemble of techniques, instruments, data banks and machine logics of the state (international, supranational and nation state). As the state increasingly loses power over the rules of knowledge dissemination and recontextualization (curriculum and pedagogy), it attempts to exert greater control over evaluation and credentialing. Yet the struggles over the evaluative rule of the pedagogic device are intense for the stakes are high in these power conflicts. It could be argued that the state, through 'general tactics of governmentality', has redefined what is within its competence and what is not, what needs to be outsourced, privatized, and what is kept public (Foucault 1979: 20). In this way, struggles and contestations over pedagogic discourse are focussed though not limited to high stakes testing regimes, and deflected from other areas of the pedagogic device, production, distribution and recontextualization, as well as other evaluative rules.

The second point is that struggles over international testing and high stakes national testing are a highly visible aspect of the evaluative rule of the pedagogic device. But the evaluative rule of the pedagogic device is not limited to high stakes or international testing. Rather, the evaluative rule refers to all processes of knowledge acquisition, and the formation of the self-governing pedagogic subject, who is open to continuous and ongoing evaluation. From this perspective, subjectivity is constituted not only via highly visible mechanisms such as international testing, and public comparative displays of test results, but by constant evaluative monitoring devices, often hybrid human-nonhuman devices, which monitor the body and mind (sleep, heartbeat, breath rhythms; anxiety and activity levels; brain activity and so forth). These evaluative monitoring devices constitute the new regulative principles of pedagogic

discourse, and thus regulate the selection and organisation of valid or worthwhile knowledge for consumption. The pedagogic gaze of evaluation is increasingly removed from the teacher and placed in hybrid devices, products of the agencies and agents in the increasingly complex field of symbolic control. It is these devices which play an increasingly important role in pedagogic governance.

The Pedagogic Device: An Ongoing Project of Western Modernisation

According to some scholars, such as Depaepe (2012) who also draws on the concept of the TPS, the globalization of education policy and indeed the global spread of schooling institutions is a continuation of the Western processes of modernisation. Specifically, Depaepe (2012, 34, emphasis added) argues that

> the history of modern education is characterised more by a continuity with the past than by radical breaks. Against this background, therefore, it will readily be understood that an increase in educational opportunities does not in practice automatically mean increased independence for pupils, but rather, it brings with it *longer dependency* on their part. Then again, it is without doubt also true that no other institution in human memory has succeeded better than the school to bring about the *emancipation of the individual*, despite all the attempts to control it, and the social pressures that have been brought to bear upon it.

From this perspective, processes of educationalization were accompanied by the formation of the bureaucratic school with a whole raft of methods including expanded curriculum, timetable of activities, textbooks, charts, large instruction boards, design and arrangement of furniture, organisation of children in groups, routines and rituals of praise and punishment (see also Lima 2007; Hunter 1993, 1994). Moreover, an increasingly feminised teaching profession was trained in the conduct of new pedagogical methods, including psychological approaches for regulating student behaviour and instilling shared values. These were all realisations or apparatuses of the

pedagogic device. The crucial point here is that these new pedagogic methods generated two paradoxical, or contradictory tendencies – on the one hand, increased dependency and on the other hand, emancipation of the individual – or increased individualization, and modes of self-regulation. Depaepe (2012, 135) suggests that processes of educationalization are dependent 'in part on the asymmetric fundamental pattern in the educational relationship', that is, 'the authority of the teacher' to discipline and mould 'pupils in the direction of socially desirable behaviour.' Ironically, therefore, increased pedagogy, does not 'result in more autonomy for the child but could, inversely, also issue in an extended dependency' (Depaepe 2012, 135). Moreover, Depaepe (2012, 135) emphasises the importance of women in the professional discourses of education and the new 'soft' modes of regulation or governance which converted the 'brutalising elements of physical violence' into 'psychological threats … which seemed to produce a kind of interiorised anxiety about freedom in the child'.

The *grammar* of educationalization, that is, the regime of discourses and discursive practices of the ongoing education project or the pedagogic device, Depaepe (2012, 30-40) argues incorporates a 'subtle paradox': on the one hand, 'the pastoral compulsion of the educator' positioned in an asymmetrical power relation to the student/pupil, and 'the liberating experience of the learning, knowledge-acquiring individual on the other' (see also Hunter 1994).

> As an agent of modern nation-building since the Enlightenment, the schooling project manifested itself as a secularized version of Christianization. The teacher incarnated the pastoral compulsion regarding education; being the source of authority, wisdom, good behaviour, and morals, the teacher acted as the pilot to which the students were subjected in the classroom. The teacher knew the way that had to be followed and the best techniques to apply. The principal concern was to "save" the child, to offer it help so that it would not be subject to harm. This increased attention on the pedagogical sphere was also meant to achieve the moral

elevation of people. Educationalization was bound up with moralization. More pedagogy, therefore, did not necessarily result in more autonomy for the child but could, inversely, result in extended dependency (Depaepe 2012, 168).

The concerns that Depaepe (2012, 172) raises about processes of educationalization, which constitute 'the logical response to globalization and modernization in our own time' are not only about extended dependency and associated infantalization of young people. Rather, Depaepe (2012, 172) suggests that 'the phenomenon of educationalization spread steadily thanks to the neoconservative context', a context in which 'the self constantly has to prove its market value by means of "employability," "adaptability," "flexibility," "trainability," and the like'. Within this discursive regime, 'all creativity is subordinated to the regulatory discourse of the knowledge economy and technology', and learning discourses produce 'a personality oriented toward the self, not looking back, thinking only of the short term' (Depaepe 2012, 172).

So, Depaepe (2012) extends on the work of critical policy scholars who adopt Bernstein's concept of the TPS by tracing the evolution and expansion of the modernist project of schooling across the globe. Moreover, Depaepe (2012) examines the unique features of the pedagogic device of pastoral pedagogy, including increased regulation through soft governance, and the asymmetrical pedagogic relation inherent in pedagogic work. However, despite this complex explanation of the global spread of the grammar or pedagogic device of schooling, Depaepe (2012) again moves to a dystopian conclusion, with deterministic claims about the sapping of creativity and the production of short-term selfism.

An Alternative Reading of the TPS: Emergent, Open-Ended.

Yet Bernstein's work does not adopt a reductionist, determinist position suggesting that

pedagogic discourses are simply reproductions of neo-liberal economic discourses and 'subordinated to the regulative discourse of the knowledge economy' (Depaepe 2012, 172). Rather, the Bernsteinian project is an open-ended problematic and inquiry. Bernstein's approach is inseparably epistemological and ontological (onto-epistemological)

> Epistemologically, he [Bernstein]… states that he is not a realist in the sense that would require scientific theory to deliver loyal representations of what is given, of reality. For Bernstein, social science is not representative but, rather, *generative*; it produces something new: new truths. It means conquering a "new world", a "new outside". Ontologically, he proposes the obverse of the same coin: that *the social real … is ambivalent, open. It is a whole, an open multiplicity from which that which does not yet exist … can appear as an "event", "news" or as "fresh air" …* Ideally, the aim of a "fighting" sociology would be to map such "events" and their possibilities, which would constitute a very powerful means to stopping history from becoming a closed and backward-looking chronicle of what are always the same things simply under different masks. (De Queiroz 2011, 57, emphasis added)

Bernstein (2001a, 365) does signal a secularisation of knowledge and pedagogy, and a departure from the first 'totally pedagogized society … of the medieval period initiated by Religion' (Bernstein 2001a, 365). But crucially, Bernstein (1990, 133) argues that '*the more abstract the principles of the forces of production the simpler its social division of labour but the more complex the social division of symbolic control* .

Bernstein (2001b, 25) describes the increasing complexity of the division of labour of agencies of symbolic control 'based upon the differentiation of discursive codes appropriated by agents favourably placed in the class structure by pedagogic capital obtained from higher education'. Agents of symbolic control specialize in dominant discursive codes increasingly made available in the higher reaches of the education system. These discursive codes shape legitimate ways of thinking, ways of relating, ways of feeling, forms of innovation and so specialize and distribute forms of

consciousness, disposition and desire (Bernstein 2001b, 24). Bernstein (2001b) also distinguishes between the mode of production of discursive codes – between agencies that predominantly receive government funding and so operate in the field of symbolic control, and agencies that are largely funded by commercial interests and so operate in the cultural field, a subset of the field of economic production. At the same time, he suggests that the expansion of the cultural field 'may bring together or blur the relationship between the cultural field and the field of symbolic control', and lead to the emergence of hybrid agencies (Bernstein 1990, 157)

Two points need to be highlighted here which differentiate my reading of Bernstein's TPS concept from that of other policy scholars (see Ball, 2009; Gerwitz 2008; Depaepe, 2012). The first relates to a focus not only on education processes and mechanisms as realised in the bureaucratic organisation of schooling systems, or even the notion of trainability realised as short-term courses of learning from cradle to grave and across all facets of life. Rather, the object of inquiry of the TPS has broadened to encapsulate the significant growth in industries (agencies and agents) related to the production and dissemination of discursive codes, and thus the growth of the field of symbolic control and the cultural field, as knowledge increasingly becomes the dominant mode of economic production. What Bernstein (2000) is signalling is that the two categories of knowledge of the first totally pedagogized society organized by the Christian church, that is the Trivium and Quadrium, are increasingly governed by the market principle of performativity. Here, the performativity turn refers to the production of knowledge not as representation, but as the constant act of performance, fabrication and construction, that is the constitution of worldly configurations in and through the production of knowledge (Barad 2007; Lyotard 1984). The number of agencies and

agents engaged in knowledge production and dissemination grows enormously, producing not only a variety of knowledge(s), but also accelerating knowledge growth.

The second point, relates to the emergence of new discursive codes, produced through the 'revolution in communication control systems' (Bernstein 1990, 157). Examples of the new communication codes include new modes of control over 'genetic codes' through bio-engineering, and machine learning as 'computer systems initiate, co-ordinate, plan, model, are reflexive to their own learning, generate problems, and anticipate breakdowns through self-regulating controls' (Bernstein 1990, 157). These discursive codes are produced in and through the growth of agencies and agents of social control in the field of symbolic control and the cultural field, and the merging of agencies across these fields to constitute hybrid formations. The term hybrid formations of agencies and agents does not only refer to the merging of organizations or institutions, that is the merging of private and public sector organisations as public agencies outsource or contract out services (see Ball, 1998). Rather the term, hybrid also refers to the merging of human and non-human entities (new smart technologies) for the production, recontextualisation and evaluation of social scientific knowledge. As Bernstein (2000) hypothesises in the second totally pedagogised society the relation between the Trivium and the Quadrium changes, and the Trivium is increasingly comprised of social scientific knowledge which includes the vast array of knowledge produced and practised by psychiatric services, counselling, child guidance, mental health, home support, robotic care, phone/skype counselling and so forth. Here Bernstein (1990) signals a 'revolution in communication control systems' via both bio-genetic engineering and smart computer technologies which self-regulate and learn to learn.

Scholars drawing on Actor Network Theory have recently coined the concept of public click pedagogies to explore learning/teaching processes through the hybrid processes of the merging of human and non-human entities (new smart technologies). For example, Bigum et al., (2014) write about the importance of public click pedagogies in networked learning societies. The term public click pedagogies signals two meanings. First it is used to signal the growing proliferation of internet sites where learning processes are made public, so that followers can learn from tracing the learning journeys of other folk (e.g., YouTube talks about how to cook, dress, fix a phone and so forth). Second, it is used to signal the ways in which computers generate, store and track people's consumption habits, including navigating websites, purchases of books, music, clothes, recreation ventures, and through these processes develop consumer profiles and recommendations about future forms of consumption. The work of public click pedagogy scholars is optimistic not dystopian. It is beginning to explore post-humanistic learning processes, that is, the integral hybrid connections between machine and human learning, in a context of increasingly smart machines.

However, this work does not systematically engage with the Bernstein (2000) problematic of power struggles for control over the pedagogic device, that is, the grammar or system of rules or principles generating pedagogic discourse. What happens to the pedagogic device, that is, the processes and mechanisms of the pedagogizing of knowledge, given the changing conditions for the production, circulation and acquisition of knowledge(s). The Bernsteinian project is interested in the rules of distribution (who gets access to what types of knowledge), recontextualization (principles regulating selection and organisation of educational knowledge), and evaluation (acquisition and credentialing processes). The emerging work on policy as assemblage (Koyama and Varenne, 2012) synthesised with the work on public click

pedagogies (Bigum et al., 2014) provides possible avenues for extending Bernstein's original work on the TPS.

TPS vs Public Pedagogy Scholarship

What does the TPS concept signal that is not already signalled by scholarship in the field of public pedagogies? Sandlin, O'Malley and Burdick (2011, 338) argue that the term public pedagogy 'has been widely deployed as a theoretical construct in educational research to focus on processes and sites of education beyond formal schooling, with a proliferation of its use by feminist and critical theorists occurring in the mid-1990s'. Like the term TPS, the concept of public pedagogy has been used to explore a wide variety of pedagogic discourses and practices including, '(a) citizenship within and beyond schools, (b) popular culture and everyday life, (c) informal institutions and public spaces, (d) dominant cultural discourses, and (e) public intellectualism and social activism' (Sandlin et al., 2011, 340). Scholars in this field often draw on the cultural studies literature, particularly the notion of 'culture as inherently pedagogical' (Sandlin et al., 350) to explore the ways in which racist, sexist, classist power relations are produced and reproduced in a variety of forums, including museums, films, digital environments, children's toys, and so forth. A key theorist of public pedagogy, Giroux (2004) has turned his critical media literacy approach to critiques of neo-liberal policies and has focussed on the ways in which the notion of the 'public' has been redefined within these policy regimes. He has advocated the importance of public pedagogy scholarship in contesting neo-liberal policy discourses, and the role of the public intellectual in social activism through critical or radical pedagogies which 'educate the public in some form of disciplinary or political knowledge' and thereby generate 'democratic public spaces that transform social problems' (Sandlin et al., 2011, 355).

Bernstein (2000) distanced his sociological approach from the work of critical and radical scholars, questioning the radical possibilities and potentialities of critical pedagogic modes[11]. The public pedagogic scholarship of the type advocated by Giroux (2004) is categorised here as a form of critical/radical pedagogy. Similarly, Hunter (1994) argued that radical pedagogies fail to engage with the complex historical apparatuses of schooling, that is the historically constituted ensemble of rules of the pedagogic device. Consequently, radical scholars place huge demands on teachers to become public intellectuals and as the agents of social change, demands which simply cannot be achieved (Hunter, 1994). In addition, Sandlin et al. (2011, 358) conclude that 'the term public pedagogy has been used in mythologizing and "totalizing" ways … diminishing its usefulness as a sensitizing concept for researchers interested in learning and education outside of schools.' Moreover, Sandlin et al. (2011, 359) argue that there is a 'general lack of clarity among many authors regarding how they are theorizing the term' public pedagogy.

> Across the literature, authors frequently claimed that a specific cultural item or process under investigation was a form or site of public pedagogy, yet many did so without the use of theoretical frameworks to describe how or why these pedagogies were being enacted. … those authors who are clear about their theoretical framings draw from a wide variety of theoretical work, including cultural studies, a/r/tography, postcolonialism, queer theory, and many others[12] (Sandlin et al., 2011, 359).

A Remarkable Observation: The TPS

So far I have suggested that critical policy scholars who have taken up Basil Bernstein's concept of the TPS have something to say about the proliferation of discourses about life-long learning, and the learning or knowledge society. I have also suggested that the application of the TPS concept by these scholars has been limited because it has not

fully engaged with Bernstein's (2000) complex theory of the pedagogic device. This in turn has meant that critical policy scholars have largely ignored Bernstein's (2000) remarkable observation that discourses of the learning society are not simply masking a hidden agenda. The discourses about learning are not simply a facade for the concealed political agendas of the neo-liberal performative state shaping education along market principles, that is, a performative, input-output model of education. Rather, Bernstein (2000, 81) argues 'today the market principle creates a new dislocation (between the inner and outer). Now we have two *independent* markets, one of knowledge and one of potential creators and users of knowledge' (Bernstein 2000, 81, emphasis added). But what is this market principle? Is it the social imaginary of neo-liberalism, instrumentalist input-out models, as espoused by some critical policy scholars? I propose that the dominant market principle referred to by Bernstein (2000) is that of performativity, where knowledge is produced not as 'an adequate model or replication of some outside reality', but simply, 'to generate new and fresh scientific enounces or statements, to make you have "new ideas" … or, best of all … again and again to "make it new"' (Jameson in Lyotard 1984, ix).

Lyotard (1984) contrasts this idea of performativity as creativity, novel ideas, and the re-generation of the new, with the idea of performativity as terror as a means of managerial regulation or state governance[13]. The latter definition of performativity, that is policy governance by numbers, and the terror of organizational management by the logic of numbers has received extensive attention in the critical policy studies field (see Ball 2003, 2005; Lingard 2011). However, Lyotard's (1984) theory of performativity did not focus primarily on a dystopian future of regulation or governance through numbers. Rather, Lyotard (1984, 5) suggests that ironically even the logic of managerial performativity necessitates invention, novel ideas, new synergies because improvements

in performance or 'productive power' cannot be attained through routine practices, procedures, or re-producing the familiar and thinkable. The logic of performativity necessitates new synergies, new ways of working, thinking and acting. Extra performativity, according to Lyotard (1984, 52) demands engaging with the unthinkable, and necessitates pedagogic activities which 'can increase one's ability to connect the fields jealously guarded from one another by the traditional organization of knowledge' (Lyotard 1984, 52).

When Bernstein suggests that the market principle creates a new dislocation between the inner and outer he is making reference to the emergence of the second totally pedagogized society, what Eräsaari (2009) refers to as the second modernity, and the shifting configuration of pedagogic discourse and pedagogic codes. Bernstein suggests that pedagogic discourse is comprised of instructional and regulative discourses. These are not two separate discourses. Rather, Bernstein means to signal that the instructional and regulative couplet constitute the relational aspects of the one discourse (Muller and Hoadley 2010). The regulative or moral discourse operates at different levels of the pedagogic device: production of learning (what is selected for instruction), distribution or dissemination of learning resources (how learning is organised, sequenced, paced), and evaluation (recognition that learning has taken place). For Bernstein, the regulative discourse is the dominant discourse mediating the relation between the outer symbolic order and the inner development of the mind. So what is internalised? It is not simply the message of neo-liberal economic performativity, but rather the symbolic order of the instructional discourse, constituted via the regulative discourse, that is internalised. As stated earlier, pedagogies of trainability may constitute a socially empty self, a self that has to constantly avail itself to be re-pedagogized. An alternative definition is possible. For example, Eräsaari (2009,

58) writes about open-context expertise and suggests that knowledge uncertainty, complexity and ambivalence leads to an emptying out of the self.

> There are of course different kinds of uncertainties, but generally speaking uncertainty may refer to epistemological emptiness (heterogeneousity and distribution of the epistemological core), to ambivalence of or towards novelty, innovations, redundancy or requisite variety, to actual decline of cognitive authority due to development through which knowledge has been stripped of its metaphysical and culturally specific elements or, finally, to different images of knowledge motivated, for example, by a longing for secure knowledge, or by gaining a solid body of knowledge.

In the second totally pedagogized society, the performativity principle creates a new dislocation between the inner (consciousness) and outer (material world) – one relating to uncertainty and ambivalence rather than certainty and truth. During the first totally pedagogized society educational knowledge was split between two differently specialised discourses, the Trivium and Quadrium – 'one for the construction of the inner, one for the construction of the outer – the material world' (Bernstein 2000, 85). The Trivium was studied first, so the construction of the inner 'was a guarantee for the construction of the outer' (Bernstein 2000, 85). Christianity constituted the religious foundation of this categorisation of educational knowledge, and also projected the categorisation of instructional discourse. In other words, the instructional/regulative couplet of pedagogic discourse was dominated by the sacred religious world. It constituted the principles of conduct, character and manner, that is the moral code of educational knowledge, what was taught, to whom, how, and how it was evaluated. The professions originated in this categorisation of educational knowledge, and over the next 'five hundred years there was a progressive replacement of the religious foundation of official knowledge by a humanising secular principle' (Bernstein 2000, 85). In the second totally pedagogized society, Bernstein (2000, 85) suggests that this 'humanising

secular principle' is being displaced by a 'dehumanising principle, for the organisation and orientation of official knowledge'.

> What we are seeing is the growing development of the specialised disciplines of the Quadrivium, and the disciplines of the Trivium have become the disciplines of symbolic control – the social sciences. In a sense the Trivium has been replaced by the social sciences for the management of feelings, thoughts, relations and practices. … The first dislocation between the Trivium and the Quadrivium constituted an inwardness as a prior condition of knowing; the second dislocation, the contemporary dislocation, disconnects inner from outer, as a precondition for constituting the outer and its practice, according to the market principles of the New Right (Bernstein 2000, 86).

In the Bernstein problematique the research questions of importance are: how does this new dislocation between the inner and outer produced by market principles of knowledge constitute a diverse range of agencies, agents and discourses (the outer material world), what types of communication/pedagogic modes are generated by different fractional groups; how do these give rise to competing and contradictory pedagogic discourses, and what is the relation between these outer societal practices and what is internalised as part of the inner world (orientations to meaning, identities and modalities of the self)? The issue is not one of tensions or contradictions between different market principles of knowledge production and distribution (Bernstein 1990). Rather, the market principle becomes the dominant legitimation principle regulating all forms of education. A 'crisis around education' is generated, particularly in terms of the capacity of the state to fund education for large populations over long periods of time. The crisis of education in turn produces a discursive shift from education to learning, whereby learning is dislocated from bureaucratic schooling institutions and school teachers and relocated across a spectrum of agencies in the expanded field of symbolic control and the cultural field. Moreover, the agents with control over the pedagogic

device of learning, namely the hierarchical rules of distribution, recontextualisation and evaluation are themselves regulated by new communication codes of smart technologies, the interface of human and non-human. Bernstein offers some possibilities for thinking about these new conditions. However, it is simply not possible to predict the ways in which digital technologies may morph and evolve, or the ways in which human and non-human interaction (new communication codes) may become entangled in new worldly configurations (Barad 2007).

Discussion

This paper commenced with a sketch of critical policy scholarship work on globalizing education policies, including work on global policy formation, dissemination and enactment. It proposed that Bernstein's concept of the Totally Pedagogised Society (TPS) is increasingly used by critical policy scholars to examine issues of (1) teacher professionalism (2) health and physical education, and citizenship education curriculum (3) learning society, knowledge society, and lifelong learning (4) international testing regimes and (5) the impact of research on policy. The paper then provided a detailed account of the ways in which the TPS concept was used to analyse policy discourses on learning for life and life-long learning (Ball 2009; Gerwitz 2008); processes of educationalization (Depaepe 2012), and internationalisation testing regimes (Tyler 2010; Rizvi and Lingard 2010). It highlighted the significant contributions that scholarship in all three areas made to critical policy analyses of globalizing educational policies. It looked at the dystopian projections made by critical policy scholars about pedagogies of trainability and lifelong learning, generated by a moral code or regulative principle of neo-liberal performativity.

At the same time, it highlighted the limitations of these interpretations of the TPS, and proposed an alternative reading which foregrounded Bernstein's concepts of

the pedagogic device and pedagogic discourse, linking these to Lyotard's (1984) concept of performativity, and Castells' (1997) notion of the networked society. It suggested that the unique contribution of Bernsteinian sociology to critical policy studies is the focus on the historical evolution of education processes and systems as part of the moralising/civilising project of Western modernity (see also Lima 2007; Green 2010; Hunter 1994). In directing his gaze to the evolution of education systems, Bernstein questions the noteworthy silence about the grammar or voice of pedagogic discourse in societies increasingly characterised by knowledge as the means of production. Bernstein (2001a, 2001b, 2001c) thus sets about developing a conceptual language to analyse the grammar of educationalization, that is, the regime of rules, technologies and techniques which constitute the modern apparatus of the education/learning project. The concepts of pedagogic device and pedagogic discourse are central to an analysis of the grammar or generative principles of the processes of total pedagogisation, and the pedagogic mutations of social relations. Bernstein (2001a, 2001b, 2001c) argues that it is through the pedagogic device, and principles of pedagogic discourse (the instructional-regulative couplet) that a state with reduced power in the economic field exerts power and influence in the increasingly complex of field of symbolic control through pedagogic means. Crucially, Bernstein (1990, 133 emphasis added) argues that 'the more abstract the principles of the forces of production the simpler its social division of labour *but the more complex the social division of symbolic control.'* He suggests that state power is not simply exercised in and through the bureaucratic apparatus of state education departments and schooling institutions. Rather, state power is increasingly exercised through a field of symbolic control constituted by agencies and agents specialising in the distribution, recontextualisation and evaluation of discursive codes.

Within this new regime, the principle of performativity dominates not only the production of knowledge, but also its principles of recontextualizing in the increasingly complex field of symbolic control and the cultural field. My reading of performativity, within the Bernsteinian frame, is different from that of critical policy scholars (see Ball, 2009). The principle of performativity here refers to the production of knowledge not as 'an adequate model or replication of some outside reality', but simply, 'to generate new and fresh scientific enounces or statements, to make you have "new ideas" …, or, best of all … again and again to "make it new"' (Jameson in Lyotard, 1984, ix). The speed at which new knowledge is produced, as well as the varieties of knowledge produced by an array of diverse agencies and agents (human- and non-human), in turn, leads to *relations of ambiguity and uncertainty towards knowledge, an emptying out of the self.* This concept of 'emptying out of the self' again stands in stark contrast to that of critical policy scholars (see Gerwitz, 2008) who suggest that the self is emptied in order to be available for constant retraining. By contrast, I interpret Bernstein's phrase to signify an ambivalent, uncertain self, torn between the desire for more knowledge and the paradoxical emptiness and uncertainty that such longing brings.

This sense of ambivalence towards knowledge performativity is not only manifested in the individual self, but also at the level of agencies and agents responsible for the pedagogizing of knowledge, or the recontextualization of knowledge for pedagogic communication. As the state increasingly loses power over the rules for distribution and recontextualization of educational knowledge, it attempts to reassert control via means of prescribed curriculum, teaching methods, and over the rules of evaluation (see Tyler, 2010). The most visible form of state control over education systems is the regime of international and national high stakes testing, which constitute one of the three message systems of schooling, namely, curriculum, pedagogy and

evaluation. International testing systems are not a fourth message, as argued by some scholars, but rather a realisation of the globalizing dimension of the pedagogic device. But while highly visible, high stakes testing is only one aspect of the constant control by evaluative means in the TPS. Other means of evaluation, or constantly monitoring, include machine generated data.

The significance of Bernstein's work is the hypotheses that these global changes to education systems, and power and control struggles over the pedagogic device, are heralding a second totally pedagogized society. While the concept of the TPS is mentioned briefly in the last papers written by Bernstein (2001a, b), the concept relates explicitly to a theoretical oeuvre developed over forty years, and links directly to the work of Durkheim (1969) on the evolution of education systems, and to the parallel projects of Castells (1997), Lyotard (1984) and Foucault (1979). The TPS concept and associated concepts of the pedagogic device and pedagogic discourse have a lot to offer critical policy scholars in their work on globalizing education policy. Yet this work has focussed only the surface manifestations of the concept, and therefore the analyses are overly deterministic and back-ward mapping.

In this paper, I have presented an alternative reading of the TPS which points to the need for empirical analyses to focus on the pedagogic device, pedagogic discourse and the symbolic control work of the multiple and diverse agencies and agents in the increasing large field of symbolic control. Such a reading of the TPS points to Bernstein's position about 'a "fighting" sociology' that ' is not representative but, rather, generative; it produces something new: new truths' (De Queiroz 2011, 57).

[1] Rizvi and Lingard (2010, 4) define public policy as 'the actions and positions taken by the state, which consists of a range of institutions that share the essential characteristics of authority and collectivity…. Public policies are … normative, expressing both ends and means designed to steer the actions and behaviour of people.'

[2] Ball (1998, 122) writes of the new educational orthodoxy and the shifting 'relationship between politics, government and education in complex Westernised post-industrialised countries'. He identifies five elements of this new orthodoxy:

(1) Improving national economics by tightening the connection between schooling, employment, productivity and trade.

(2) Enhancing student outcomes in employment-related skills and competencies.

(3) Attaining more direct control over curriculum content and assessment.

(4) Reducing the costs to government of education.

(5) Increasing community input to education by more direct involvement in school decision making and pressure of market choice.

[3] Ball (2009, 213) perhaps presents one of the most dystopian accounts of the 'learning society' project with his statement: 'Perhaps then what we are witnessing is a profound Epistemic shift from a modernist to postmodernist education paradigm – leaving behind the 'authentic' modernist/welfare learner to create a depthless, flexible, lonely, responsive and responsible learner (collectively represented as human capital), devoid of 'sociality', the ultimate commodification of the social'.

[4] Agencies and instruments of governmentality by which whole populations are governed or regulated by non-violent means, so that in fact, governance is internalised to constitute self-governing, self regulating populations. Foucault (1979, 20) traces the historical evolution of this mode of governance as the 'result of the process through which the State of Justice of the Middle Ages, which becomes the Administrative State during the 15th and 16th centuries, gradually comes to be "governmentalised"'. Bernstein (2001a, 2001b, 2001c) suggests that liquid capitalism in the 21st century in the West is characterised by a specialized form of governance. This is governance by pedagogic means.

[5] Thompson and Cook (2014, 6) draw on the work of Deleuze to write about 'the logic of a control society' which regulates whole populations through the 'increasing use of computers and digital language'. The logic of control does not attempt to discipline through normalisation, rather individuality is emphasised and becomes 'modulated as samples, data, markets or banks'. Importantly, control systems 'do not replace discipline', but are 'superimposed over disciplinary logics'.

[6] Bernstein's concept of the TPS has been used extensively in the field of critical policy studies, or sociologies of policy to examine the globalisation of education policies around (1) teacher professionalism (Beck 2009; Bonal and Rambla 2003; Robertson 2012); (2) health and physical education, and citizenship education curriculum (Evans, Rich, Allwood, and Davies 2008; Evans, Davies, Rich, and DePian 2012; Evans and Rich 2011; Magalhaes and Soer 2003; Pykett 2009, 2010), (3) learning society, knowledge society, and lifelong learning (Ball 2009; Gerrard 2013; Gerwitz 2008; Pasias and Roussakis 2012; Rønning Haugen 2010); (4) international testing regimes (Kanes, Morgan, and Tsatsaroni 2014; Tyler 2001, 2010), and (5) the impact of research on policy (Lingard 2011).

[7] From a different angle, Kleon (2014) argues that pedagogic agency enhances visibility in a world saturated with information and ideas. How can specific ideas, information be heard in an era where knowledge grows exponentially, and so many ideas are clamouring for attention? Kleon (2014) suggests that pedagogy is the answer – it adds value to new ideas, it connects people to knowledge work. Pedagogic relations are not a means of giving away ideas, but rather a means of connecting others to your knowledge work. The slogan adopted by

Kleon (2014, 68) is: 'get rich by out-teaching your competition'. From this perspective, pedagogy becomes the dominant mode of connectivity in a knowledge saturated society.

[8] Ball (2000, 1-2) drawing on the work of Lyotard defines performativity as follows:

Performativity is a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation, or a system of "terror" … that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of control, attrition and change. The performances (of individual subjects or organisations) serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of "quality", or "moments" of promotion … or inspection. They stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organisation within a field of judgement. … The issue of who controls the field of judgement is crucial. "Accountability" and "competition" are the lingua franca of this new discourse of power ... A discourse which is the emerging form of legitimation in post-industrial societies for both the production of knowledge and its transmission through education.

[9] The first totally pedagogized society was 'that of the medieval period initiated by Religion' (Bernstein 2001a, 365). During this period, the Christian Church exercised power and control over the pedagogic device, that is, the rules for the distribution, recontextualization and evaluation of pedagogic discourse, what knowledge was deemed valid for teaching purposes, who received what categories of educational knowledge (distribution rule), how educational knowledge was taught to which category of student (recontextualization rule), and how educational knowledge was evaluated and students were recognized as having acquired this knowledge (evaluation rule). See also Depaepe (2012) and Durkheim (1969) on the evolution of educational thought. Crucially, Bernstein (2000, 82) following Durkheim (1969) describes the categories of educational thought in the first totally pedagogised society, the 'grouping of knowledge called the Trivium and that different specialisation of knowledge called the Quadrivium'. He then extends on Durkheim's work and suggests:

there is another level below that of word and world. I shall propose that the Trivium is not simply about understanding the word, the principles which lie behind it, the mechanics of language and reasoning, but is concerned to constitute a particular form of consciousness, a distinct modality of the self, to set limits to that form of consciousness, to regulate the modality of the self. To constitute the self in the Word, yes, but the Word of God. A particular god. The Christian God. In other words, the Trivium is there to create a particular form of the outer (the world). The dislocation between the Trivium and Quadrivium, then, is a dislocation between inner and outer. A dislocation as a precondition for a new creative synthesis between inner and outer generated by Christianity. Perhaps more than this. The Trivium comes first, because the construction of the inner, the valid inner, the true inner, is a necessary precondition that the understanding of the world will also be valid, will also be true, will also be acceptable, will also be legitimate in terms of the discourse of Christianity. The sacredness of the world is guaranteed or should be guaranteed by the appropriate construction of the inner, the truly Christian self. (Bernstein 2000, 82)

[10] Bernstein (2000, 37) distinguishes between rules of the pedagogic device: distributive, recontextualizing and evaluative; fields in which these rules operate: production of discourse, recontextualizing and reproduction; and processes: creation, transmission and acquisition. Like Foucault, these are not essentialised, fixed, or static entities rather they are conceptualised as apparatuses, ensembles and as such are key sites of power struggles and conflicts by different class fractions.

[11] See the work of Hasan, (1999, 2002, 2006) for examples of pedagogical approaches sympathetic to the Bernstein sociological approach.

[12] Recent work in social and cultural geography (Biesta, 2012; Loopmans, Cowell, and Oosterlynck, 2012; Schuermans, Loopmans, and Vandenabeele, 2012) presents yet another take on public pedagogy. For example Biesta (2012: 683) distinguishes between 'public pedagogy as a pedagogy *for* the public', 'public pedagogy as a

pedagogy *of* the public', and 'public pedagogy as the enactment of a concern for the public quality of human togetherness'.

[13] Lyotard's (1984) definition of a non-representational theory of knowledge and turn to performativity places too much emphasis on language games and the discursive. By contrast, (Bernstein 2001a) calls attention to social structures and material practices, particularly focusing attention on the agencies and agents producing, disseminating and evaluating the acquisition of new discursive codes.

Reference List

Bailey, P. L. J. 2013. "The Policy Dispostif: Historical Formation and Method." *Journal of Education Policy* 28 (6): 807-827. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2013.782512

Ball, S. J. 1998. "Big Policies/Small World: An Introduction to International Perspectives in Education Policy." *Comparative Education,* 34 (2): 119-130. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03050069828225

Ball, S. J. 2000. "Performativities and Fabrications in the Education Economy: Towards the Performative Society." *Australian Educational Researcher* 27(2): 1-23.

Ball, S. J. 2003. "The Teacher's Soul and the Terrors of Performativity." *Journal of Education Policy,* 18 (2): 215-228. doi: 10.1080/0268093022000043065

Ball, S. J. 2005. *Education Policy And Social Class: The Selected Works of Stephen Ball* (1st ed.). Hoboken: Taylor & Francis.

Ball, S. J. 2009. "Lifelong Learning, Subjectivity and the Totally Pedagogised Society." In *Governmental Studies in Education,* edited by M. A. Peters, A. C. Besley, M. Olssen, S. Maurer and S. Weber, 201-216. Rotterdam, Boston, Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Ball, S. J., Maguire, M., Braun, A., and Hoskins, K. 2011. "Policy actors: doing policy work in schools." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 32 (4): 625-639. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2011.601565

Barad, K. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway. Qantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Beck, J. 2009. "Appropriating Professionalism: Restructuring the Official Knowledge Base of England's 'Modernised' Teaching Profession. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 30 (1): 3-14. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01425690802514268

Bernstein, B. 1990. *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Bernstein, B. 1996. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity. Theory, Research, Critique*. London and New York: Taylor and Francis.

Bernstein, B. 2000. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity* (2nd ed.). Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Bernstein, B. 2001a. "From Pedagogies to Knowledges." In *Towards A Sociology of Pedagogy. The Contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research,* edited by A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies and H. Daniels, 363-368. New York: Peter Lang.

Bernstein, B. 2001b. "Symbolic Control: Issues of Empirical Description of Agencies and Agents." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology,* 4 (1): 21-33.

Bernstein, B. 2001c. "Transcript: Video Conference with Basil Bernstein." In *Towards a Sociology of Pedagogy. The Contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research,* edited by A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies and H. Daniels, pp. 369-384. New York: Peter Lang.

Biesta, G. 2012. "Becoming Public: Public Pedagogy, Citizenship and the Public Sphere." *Social & Cultural Geography, 13*(7), 683-697. doi: 10.1080/14649365.2012.723736

Bigum, C., Rowen, L., Hamilton, M., Wright, S., and Haxell, A. (2014). *Looking for Black Cats and Lessons from Charlie: Exploring the Potential of Public Click Pedagogy.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Networked Learning Edinburgh, 7-9 April.

Bonal, X. and Rambla, X. 2003. "Captured by the Totally Pedagogised Society: Teachers and Teaching in the Knowledge Economy." *Globalisation, societies and education*, 1 (2): 169-184.

Castells, M. 1997. *The Power of Identity. The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture.* (1st ed. Vol. 2). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Dale, R. 2007. "Globalizing and the Rescaling of Educational Governance. A Case of Sociological Ectopia." In *Critique and Utopia. New Developments in the Sociology of Education in the 21st Century,* edited by C. A. Torres and A. Teodoro, 25-42. Plymouth: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

De Queiroz, J.-M. 2011. "The Message the Voice." In *Knowledge, Pedagogy and Society. International Perspectives on Basil Bernstein's Sociology of Education,*

edited by D. Frandji and P. Vitale, 49-61. Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge.

Depaepe, M. 2012. *Between Educationalization and Appropriation. Selected Writings on the History of Modern Educational Systems*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Durkheim, E. 1969. *The Evolution of Educational Thought* (P. Collins, Trans.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Eräsaari, R. 2009. "Open-Context Expertise." In *Governmentality Studies in Education,* edited by M. A. Peters, A. C. Besley, M. Olssen, S. Maurer and S. Weber, 55-76. Rotterdam, Boston, Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Evans, J., Davies, B., Rich, E., & DePian, L. 2012. "Understanding Policy: Why Health Education Policy is Important and Why it Does Not Appear to Work." *British Educational Research Journal*. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2011.647679

Evans, J., & Rich, E. 2011. "Body Policies and Body Pedagogies: Every Child Matters in Totally Pedagogised Schools?" *Journal of Education Policy,* 26 (3): 361-379. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2010.500399

Evans, J., Rich, E., Allwood, R., & Davies, B. (2008). Body pedagogies, P/policy, health and gender. *British Educational Research Journal, 34*(3), 387-402. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01411920802042812

Fenwick, T., Mangez, E., and Ozga, J. 2014. "Governing Knowledge: Comparison, Knowledge-Based Technologies and Expertise in the Regulation of Education." In *Governing Knowledge. Comparison, Knowledge-Based Technologies and Expertise in the Regulation of Education. World Yearbook of Education 2014,* edited by T. Fenwick, E. Mangez and J. Ozga, 3-10. London, New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. 1979. "Governmentality." *Ideology and Consciousness,* 6 (Autumn).

Gerrard, J. 2013. The limits of learning: homelessness and educating the employable self. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education, iFirst*(05 Sept). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2013.831661

Gewirtz, S. 2008. "Give us a Break! A Sceptical Review of Contemporary Discourse of Lifelong Learning." *European Educational Research Journal,* 7 (4), 414-424. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2008.7.4.414

Giroux, H. A. 2004. "Public Pedagogy and the Politics of Neo-liberalism: making the political more pedagogical." *Policy Futures in Education, 2*(3&4), 494-503.

Gordon, C. 2009. "Foreword: Pedagogy, Psychagogy, Demagogy." In *Governmentality Studies in Education,* edited by M. A. Peters, A. C. Besley, M. Olssen, S. Maurer and S. Weber (Eds.), (pp. xi-xxvi). Rotterdam, Boston, Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Green, B. 2010. "Knowledge, the Future, and Education(al) Research: A New-Millennial Challenge." *The Australian Educational Researcher,* 37 (4): 43-62.

Hasan, R. (1999). Society, language and the mind: the meta-dialogism of Basil Bernstein's theory. In F. Christie (Ed.), *Pedagogy and the Shaping of Consciousness.* Linguistic and Social Processes (pp. 10-30). London, New York: Continuum.

Hasan, R. (2002). Semiotic Mediation and Mental Development in Pluralistic Societies: Some Implications for Tomorrow's Schooling. In G. Wells & G. Claxton (Eds.), *Learning for Life in the 21st Century. Sociocultural Perspectives on the Future of Education* (pp. 112-126). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Hasan, R. (2006). Literacy, pedagogy and social change: directions from Bernstein's sociology. In R. Moore, M. Arnot, J. Beck & H. Daniels (Eds.), *Knowledge, Power and Educational Reform. Applying the sociology of Basil Bernstein* (pp. 211-225). London and New York: Routledge.

Hunter, I. 1993. "The Pastoral Bureaucracy: Towards a Less Principled Understanding of State Schooling. In *Child and Citizen. Genealogies of Schooling and Subjectivity,* edited by D. Meredyth and D. Tyler, 237-287. Brisbane: Griffith University, Institute of Cultural Policy Studies.

Hunter, I. 1994. *Rethinking the School. Subjectivity, Bureaucracy and Criticism.* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Kanes, C., Morgan, C., & Tsatsaroni, A. 2014. "The PISA Mathematics Regime: Knowledge Structures and Practices of the Self. *Educ Stud Math, iFirst*(18 April). doi: DOI 10.1007/s10649-014-9542-6

Kleon, A. 2014. *Show Your Work! 10 Ways to Share Your Creativity and Get Discovered*. New York: Workman Publishing Company.

Koyama, J., P, & Varenne, H. 2012. "Assembling and Dissembling: Policy as Productive Play." *Educational Researcher, 41*(5), 157-162.

Lima, L. C. 2007. "Schooling for Critical Education. The Reinvention of Schools as Democratic Organisations" In *Critique and Utopia. New Developments in the Sociology of Education in the 21st Century,* edited by C. A. Torres and A. Teodoro, 11-22. Plymouth: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Lingard, B. 2011. Policy as numbers: ac/counting for educational research. *Australian Educational Researcher, 38*, 355–382.

Lingard, B., and Sellar, S. 2013. "'Catalyst Data': Perverse Systemic Effects of Audit and Accountability in Australian Schooling." *Journal of Education Policy* (iFirst 14th January). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2012.758815

Loopmans , M., Cowell, G., and Oosterlynck, S. 2012. "Photography, Public Pedagogy and the Politics of Place-making in Post-industrial Areas." *Social & Cultural Geography, 13*(7), 699-718. doi: 10.1080/14649365.2012.723734

Luke, C. (Ed.). 1996. *Feminisms and Pedagogies of Everday Life*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Lyotard, J.-F. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Magalhaes, A., and Soer, S. 2003. "Performance, Citizenship and the Knowledge Society: A New Mandate for European Education Policy." *Globalisation, Societies and Education,* 1 (1): 40-66. doi: 10.1080/1476772032000061815

Moore, R. 2013. "Social Realism and the Problem of the Problem of Knowledge in the Sociology of Education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 34 (3): 333-353. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2012.714251

Muller, J., and Hoadley, U. 2010. "Pedagogy and Moral Order." In *Toolkits, Translation Devices and Conceptual Accounts: Essays on Basil Bernstein's Sociology of Knowledge,* edited by P. Singh, A. Sadovnik and S. Semel 161-175. New York: Peter Lang.

Novoa, A., and Yariv-Mashal, T. 2014. "Comparative Research in Education: A Mode of Governance or a Historical Journey?" In *Governing Knowledge. Comparison, Knowledge-Based Technologies and Expertise in the Regulation of Education. World Yearbook of Education 2014,* edited by T. Fenwick, E. Mangez and J. Ozga, 13-30. London, New York: Routledge.

Pasias, G., & Roussakis, Y. 2012. "'*Who Marks the Bench?'* A Critical Review of the Neo-European 'Paradigm Shift' through Higher Education Policies and Discourses." *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies,* 10 (1): 127-141. doi: http://www.jceps.com/?pageID=article&articleID=245

Pykett, J. 2009. "Pedagogical Power : Lessons from School Spaces." *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice,* 4 (2): 102–116.

Pykett, J. 2010. "Citizenship Education and Narratives of Pedagogy." *Citizenship Studies,* 14 (6): 621-635. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2010.5223

Rizvi, F., and Lingard, B. 2010. *Globalizing Educational Policy*. London, New York: Routledge.

Rønning Haugen, C. 2010. "Equity and Life- Long Learning: An Analysis of White Paper no. 16 (2006/2007) of Norway." *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research,* 54 (4): 357-376. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2010.493342

Robertson, S., L. 2012. "Placing Teachers in Global Governance Agendas." *Comparative Education Review,* 46 (4): 584-607. doi: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/667414 .

Sandlin, J., A., O'Malley, M. P., and Burdic, J. 2011. "Mapping the Complexity of Public Pedagogy Scholarship: 1894-20." *Review of Educational Research, 81*(3), 338–375. doi: 10.3102/0034654311413395

Schuermans, N., Loopmans, M. P., and Vandenabeele, J. 2012. "Public space, public art and public pedagogy." *Social & Cultural Geography, 13*(7), 675-682. doi: 10.1080/14649365.2012.728007

Thompson, G., and Cook, I. 2014. "Education Policy-making and Time." *Journal of Education Policy*. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2013.875225

Tsatsaroni, A., and Evans, J. 2013. "Adult Numeracy and the Totally Pedagogised Society: PIAAC and Other International Surveys in the Context of Global

Educational Policy on Lifelong Learning. *Educ Stud Math*. doi: DOI 10.1007/s10649-013-9470-x

Tyler, W. 2001. "Crosswired: Hypertext, Critical Theory and Pedagogic Discourse." In *Towards a Sociology of Pedagogy. The Contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research,* edited by A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies & H. Daniels, 339-356. London, New York: Peter Lang.

Tyler, W. 2010. "Towering TIMSS or Leaning PISA? Vertical and Horizontal Models of International Testing Regimes." In *Toolkits, Translation Devices and Conceptual Accounts: Essays on Basil Bernstein's Sociology of Knowledge,* edited by P. Singh, A. Sadovnik and S. Semel, 143-160. New York: Peter Lang.

Williams, C., Gannon, S., and Sawyer, W. 2013. "A Genealogy of the 'Future': Antipodean Trajectories and Travels of the '21st Century Learner'. *Journal of Education Policy,* 28 (6): 792-806. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2013.776117