Revija za teorijo in raziskave vzgoje in izobraževanja

Šolsko polje

The Language of Neoliberal Education

ed. Mitja Sardoč

Šolsko polje

Revija za teorijo in raziskave vzgoje in izobraževanja
Letnik XXIX, številka 1–2, 2018

Šolsko polje je mednarodna revija za teorijo ter raziskave vzgoje in izobraževanja z mednarodnim uredniškim odborom. Objavlja znanstvene in strokovne članke s širšega področja vzgoje in izobraževanja ter edukacijskih raziskav (filozofija vzgoje, sociologija izobraževanja, uporabna epistemologija, razvojna psihologija, pedagogika, andragogika, pedagoška metodologija itd.), pregledne članke z omenjenih področij ter recenzije tako domačih kot tujih monografij s področja vzgoje in izobraževanja. Revija izhaja trikrat letno. Izdaja jo *Slovensko društvo raziskovalcev šolskega polja*. Poglavitni namen revije je prispevati k razvoju edukacijskih ved in interdisciplinarnemu pristopu k teoretičnim in praktičnim vprašanjem vzgoje in izobraževanja. V tem okviru revija posebno pozornost namenja razvijanju slovenske znanstvene in strokovne terminologije ter konceptov na področju vzgoje in izobraževanja ter raziskovalnim paradigmam s področja edukacijskih raziskav v okviru družboslovno-humanističnih ved.

Uredništvo: Valerija Vendramin, Zdenko Kodelja, Darko Štrajn, Alenka Gril, Igor Ž. Žagar, Eva Klemenčič in Mitja Sardoč (vsi: Pedagoški inštitut, Ljubljana)

Glavni urednik: Marjan Šimenc (Pedagoški inštitut, Ljubljana)
Odgovorni urednik: Mitja Sardoč (Pedagoški inštitut, Ljubljana)

Uredniški odbor: Michael W. Apple (University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA), Eva D. Bahovec (Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani), Andreja Barle-Lakota (Urad za šolstvo, Ministrstvo za šolstvo in šport RS), Valentin Bucik (Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani), Harry Brighouse (University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA), Randall Curren (University of Rochester, USA), Slavko Gaber (Pedagoška fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani), Milena Ivanuš-Grmek (Pedagoška fakulteta, Univerza v Mariboru), Russell Jacoby (University of California, Los Angeles), Janez Justin † (Pedagoški inštitut, Ljubljana), Stane Košir (Pedagoška fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani), Janez Kolenc † (Pedagoški inštitut, Ljubljana), Ljubica Marjanovič-Umek (Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani), Rastko Močnik (Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani), Zoran Pavlović (Svetovalni center za otroke, mladostnike in starše, Ljubljana), Drago B. Rotar (Fakulteta za humanistične študije, Univerza na Primorskem), Harvey Siegel (University of Miami, USA), Marjan Šetinc (Slovensko društvo raziskovalcev šolskega polja, Ljubljana), Pavel Zgaga (Pedagoška fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani), Maja Zupančič (Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani), Robi Kroflič (Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani), Marie-Hélene Estéoule Exel (Universite Stendhal Grenoble III)

Lektor (slovenski jezik), tehnični urednik, oblikovanje in prelom: Jonatan Vinkler
Lektor (angleški jezik): Jason Brendon Batson

Izdajatelja: Slovensko društvo raziskovalcev šolskega polja in Pedagoški inštitut
© Slovensko društvo raziskovalcev šolskega polja in Pedagoški inštitut

Tisk: Grafika 3000 d.o.o., Dob

Naklada: 400 izvodov

Revija *Šolsko polje* je vključena v naslednje indekse in baze podatkov: *Contents Pages in Education; EBSCO; Education Research Abstracts; International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS); Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA); Multicultural Education Abstracts; Pais International; ProQuest Social Sciences Journal, Research into Higher Education Abstracts; Social Services Abstracts; Sociological Abstracts; Worldwide Political Science Abstracts*

Šolsko polje izhaja s finančno podporo Pedagoškega inštituta in Javne agencije za raziskovalno dejavnost Republike Slovenije.

Tiskana izdaja: ISSN 1581–6036

Izdaja na zgoščenki: ISSN 1581–6052

Spletna izdaja: ISSN 1581–6044

Letnik XXIX, številka 1–2, 2018
Revija za teorijo in raziskave vzgoje in izobraževanja

Šolsko polje

The Language of Neoliberal Education

ed. Mitja Sardoč

Vsebina/Content

Mitja Sardoč
5 The Language of Neoliberal Education: Problems, Challenges and Opportunities

Vasco d'Agnese
11 Concealment and Advertising: Unraveling OECD's Educational Rhetoric

Mark Olssen
33 Neoliberalism and *Laissez-faire*: The Retreat from Naturalism

Michael A. Peters
57 Neoliberalism as Political Discourse: The Political Arithmetic of *Homo oeconomicus*

Rodolfo Leyva
77 Unpacking the Usage and Implications of Neoliberal Language in the Russell Group's Education Strategies

Mitja Sardoč
97 The Language of Neoliberal Education: An Interviw with Henry Giroux

Urška Štremfel
107 European Neoliberal Discourse and Slovenian Educational Space

Sarah Hayes and Petar Jandrić
127 Resisting the Iron Cage of 'the Student Experience'

145 Povzetki/Abstracts
155 Avtorji/Authors

The Language of Neoliberal Education: Problems, Challenges and Opportunities

Mitja Sardoč

For over two decades now, neoliberalism has been at the forefront of discussions not only in economy and finance but has gradually infiltrated our vocabulary in a number of areas as diverse as governance studies (Wacquant, 2009), criminology (Bell, 2011), health care (Glynos, 2014), jurisprudence (Grewal & Purdy, 2014), identity politics (Chun, 2016), education (Grek, 2009) etc. Its economistic language associated with the promotion of effectiveness and efficiency combined with indicators and other empirical data claimed to have established a 'culture of objectivity' (Porter, 1995). As Christopher W. Chun emphasizes,

> [n]eoliberal policies and practices have attempted to remake our everyday lives so that every aspect is minutely measured, assessed and evaluated as 'outputs', in accordance with manufacturing-based standards of production, and defined as 'best practices', which is another term adopted from corporate culture now widely used in education. (Chun, 2016: 558).

In fact, education has been at the very centre of the neoliberal public policy agenda as it allegedly represents one of the main indicators of future economic growth and individual well-being. Its – for many scholars dystopian – 'vision' of education as an investment is based on a [deterministic] assumption that 'better educational outcomes are a strong predictor of economic growth' (OECD, 2010: 3). Pupils' achievements is said to represent an indicator of the 'future talent pools' (PISA, 2012: 26) and should therefore be a valid or sufficient indicator of the [economic] success in the future [assumption of the translatability of learning achievements

in economic performance]. This assumption – most visible in studies discussing international large-scale student assessments, e.g. PISA etc. – has brought to the forefront of both media and political attention the various aspects of teaching and learning. Large-scale assessments and quantitative data in general have thus become an important mechanism of the 'neo-liberal toolkit' associated with the process of 'governing by numbers' (Grek, 2007).

While the analysis of the neoliberal agenda in education is well documented (e.g. d'Agnese, 2017; Giroux, 2014; Olssen, 2010; Peters, 2011), the examination of the language of neoliberal education has been at the fringes of scholarly interest (Holborow, 2015). In particular, the expansion of the neoliberal vocabulary with egalitarian ideas such as fairness (Bøyum, 2014), justice and disadvantage (Gazeley, 2018), well-being etc. has received [at best] only limited attention. For example, one of the latest additions to the neoliberal vocabulary has been the idea of talent. For much of its history, the notion of talent has been associated with the idea of 'careers open to talent'. Its emancipatory promise of upward social mobility has ultimately radically transformed the distribution of advantaged social positions and has had a lasting influence on the very idea of social status itself. Nevertheless, despite its emancipatory link with the equality of opportunity and social mobility itself, the notion of talent came to be affiliated also with some of the most pressing contemporary issues associated with (in)equality including the 'ownership' of talents (Goldman, 1987), desert (Sher, 2012), brain drain (Brock in Blake, 2015), 'war for talent' (Michaels, Handfield-Jones in Axelrod, 2001), talent management (Lewis i& Heckman, 2006), 'taxation' of talents (Hasen, 2006; Roemer, 1996 [ch. 6]; Zelenak, 2006) etc.

This shift of emphasis in the use and application of language and ideas firmly grounded in some of the well-known slogans (and other buzzwords) has had a transformative influence on our way of thinking about public policy in general. Yet, this shift of emphasis from concepts and ideas that are part of the 'standard' vocabulary of neoliberal education, e.g. effectiveness, efficiency, commodification, privatization, deregulation etc. to concepts and ideas that are part of a more egalitarian vocabulary, not only put large-scale assessments and quantitative data as its main product at the very centre of education policy-making but – perhaps equally important – has had a profound effect on education in general.

This journal special issue of *Šolsko polje* entitled 'The Language of Neoliberal Education' brings together both conceptual and empirical papers as well as an interview that addresses a wide range of problems and challenges associated with the language of neoliberalism in education

[with possible applications to other areas of public policy]. The introductory article by Vasco d'Agnese discusses some of the linguistic choices as well as the [problematic] mixture of diverse communicative registers used by the OECD in its policy documents. In his article 'Neoliberalism and *Laissez-faire*: The Retreat from Naturalism', Mark Olssen examines some of the core features characterizing the neoliberal conception of governmentality as well as sets out the distinctive features that characterize neoliberalism (with a brief investigation of their consequences for education). Next, in his article 'Unpacking the Usage & Implications of Neoliberal Language in The Russell Group's Education Strategies', Rodolfo Levya examines the latest education strategy statements of said group's individual members to identify pedagogic and institutional trends and trajectories. As he emphasizes, the findings of his quantitative content analysis show that these statements are predominantly rife with neoliberal discursive inflections, which effectively and principally equate a university education with professional development and research with economic utility. At the same time, the findings make clear that the traditional role of universities is virtually absent. The concluding section of his article discusses what this indicates for teaching and learning in British universities. Michael Peters's essay is a discussion of neoliberalism as a form of political discourse – 'the political arithmetic of *Homo Oeconomicus*'. In the first half, the essay begins with a genealogy of political discourse with an etymology from late Middle English and Medieval Latin. The second half of the essay traces the emergence of the figure of *Homo Oeconomicus* and the rise of rational choice theory by focusing on its application to education as a commodity. Finally, as the author emphasizes, the paper turns to a discussion of Foucault's understanding of neoliberalism. Based on his decades long examination of neoliberalism and its educational agenda, Henry Giroux discusses in the interview form how the neoliberal ideology came to dominate some of the commanding institutions of contemporary societies. At the same time, he also discusses the centrality of education under neoliberal modes of governance as well as the role of large-scale assessments and quantitative data in educational research. In the central part of the interview Prof. Giroux examines neoliberalism's strategy of appropriating ideas and concepts that lie outside its gravitational orbit and its transformative influence on our way of thinking about education and public policy in general. In her article, Urška Štremfel addresses some of the questions about influence of educational (neoliberal) governance in the European Union (EU) on the development of national educational policies and practice. The theoretical dispositions, as she emphasizes, are demonstrated in the case study of Slovenia, which presents an interesting

case of studying the interference between traditional post-socialist values and the Western EU (neoliberal) model of education. In the concluding article of this journal special issue, Petar Jandrić and Sarah Hayes examine how the student-as-consumer approach in the UK HE policy has recently developed into a strong rhetoric emphasizing 'the student experience' as a package, including leisure, well-being, future employment and other 'extras'.

As the articles published in this journal special issue of *Šolsko polje* testify, the neoliberal educational agenda best represented by an instrumental understanding of education, a zero-sum understanding of the relationship between freedom and equality, a distorted conception of fairness and a reductionist way of using quantitative data in educational policy has unequivocally influenced how educational problems are being tackled in both theory and practice. There is therefore ample room for further examination of these [and other] issues associated with the neoliberalism in education.

References

Bell, E. (2011) *Criminal Justice and Neoliberalism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Block, D., Gray, J. & Holborow, M. (2012) *Neoliberalism and Applied Lingustics*. London: Rougledge.

Bøyum, S. (2014) Fairness in Education – A Normative Analysis of OECD Policy Documents. *Journal of Education Policy*, 29(6), pp. 856–870.

Brock, G. & Blake, M. (2015) *Debating Brain Drain: May Governments Restrict Emigration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chun, C.W. (2016) Exploring Neoliberal Language, Discourses and Identities. In: S. Preece [ed.], *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Identity*, pp. 558–571. London: Routledge.

d'Agnese, V. (2017) *Reclaiming Education in the Age of PISA. Challenging OECD's Educational Order*. London, New York: Routledge.

Gazeley, L. (2018). Unpacking 'disadvantage' and 'potential' in the context of fair access policies in England. *Educational Review*.

Giroux, H. (2014) *Neoliberalism's War on Higher Education*. Chicago: Haymarket.

Glynos, J. (2014) Neoliberalism, markets, fantasy: The case of health and social care. *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society*, 19(1), pp. 5–12.

Grek, S. (2009) Governing by Numbers: The PISA 'Effect' in Europe. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(1), pp. 23–37.

Grewal, D.S. & Purdy, J. (2014) Introduction: Law and Neoliberalism. *Law & Contemporary Problems*, 77(4), pp. 1–23.

Goldman, A.H. (1987) Real People (Natural Differences and the Scope of Justice). *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 17(2), pp. 377–394.

Hasen, D.M. (2006) Liberalism and Ability Taxation. *Texas Law Review*, 85(5), pp. 1059–1113.

Holborow, M. (2015) *Language and Neoliberalism*. London: Routledge.

Jakobi, A.P. & Martens, K. [eds.] (2010) *Mechanisms of OECD governance: International incentives for national policy-making*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jakobi, A.P. & Martens, K. (2010) Introduction: The OECD as an actor in international politics. In: K. Martens & A. P. Jakobi [eds.], *Mechanisms of OECD governance: International incentives for national policy-making*, pp. 1–25. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Michaels, E, Handfield-Jones, H. & Axelrod, B. (2001) *The War for Talent*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press.

Nye, J.S. Jr. (1990) Soft Power. *Foreign Policy*, 80, pp. 153–171.

OECD (2010) *PISA 2009 Results: Overcoming Social Background (Equity in Learning Opportunities and Outcomes)*. Pariz: OECD.

OECD (2012) *PISA 2012 Results: Excellence Through Equity*. Pariz: OECD.

Olssen, M. (2010) *Liberalism, Neoliberalism, Social Democracy: Thin Communitarian Perspectives on Political Philosophy and Education*. London: Routledge.

Peters, M.A. (2011) *Neoliberalism and After?: Education, Social Policy, and the Crisis of Western Capitalism*. New York: Peter Lang.

Porter, T.M. (1995) *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Preece, S. [ed.] (2016) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Identity*. London: Routledge.

Roemer, J. (1996) *Egalitarian Perspectives: Essays in Philosophical Economics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sher, G. (2011) *Equality for Inegalitarians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zelenak, L. (2006) Taxing Endowment. *Duke Law Review*, 55(6), pp. 1145–1181.

Concealment and Advertising: Unraveling OECD's Educational Rhetoric

Vasco d'Agnese

Introduction

In their 2009 article "Neoliberalism: From New Liberal Philosophy to Anti-Liberal Slogan", Boas and Gans-Morse write that "Neoliberalism has rapidly become an academic catchphrase. From only a handful of mentions in the 1980s, use of the term has exploded during the past two decades, appearing in nearly 1,000 academic articles annually between 2002 and 2005." (Boas and Gans-Morse, 2009: p. 138) Interestingly enough, when tracing the history of the term, Boas and Gans-Morse note that when the term first appeared it did not have the negative normative connotation it has nowadays:

> [T]he term neoliberalism was first coined by the Freiberg School of German economists to denote a philosophy that was explicitly moderate in comparison to classical liberalism, both in its rejection of laissez-faire policies and its emphasis on humanistic values. [...] Only once the term had migrated to Latin America, and Chilean intellectuals starting using it to refer to radical economic reforms under the Pinochet dictatorship, did neoliberalism acquire negative normative connotations and cease to be used by market proponents. (Gans-Morse, 2009: p. 139)

Therefore, at present, "no one self-identifies as a neoliberal even though scholars frequently associate others [...] with this term". (Boas and Gans-Morse, 2009: p. 140). While Boas and Gans-Morse's analysis primarily referred to political and economic fields, their claims are also apt to describe educational studies. Starting in the 1990s, in fact, a large number

of scholars began to focus on what may be loosely called the neoliberal educational agenda, highlighting, in various guises and degrees, its dangers and educational fallacies. Given the purposes of this paper, I cannot summarize the whole range of criticisms against neoliberalism in education or scrutinize the documents and publications through which the neoliberal agenda is delivered worldwide. However, in order to consistently develop my argument a kind of stipulative definition of neoliberalism has to be given. Thus far, neoliberalism has been mainly understood as:

a) A political and developmental model spanning diverse fields, including education and schooling. This model places a strong emphasis on economy as a natural force producing unpredictable changes and constant renewal.[1] Within this framework, both "individuals" and "training systems"—as the European Council states—"must adapt to change". (European Council, 2000) Education and learning are thus positioned as needing to constantly chase new developments in the market economy (Apple, 1995, 2000; Connell, 2013; Hill, 2004). In Brown's words, "we are everywhere homo oeconomicus and only homo oeconomicus." (Brown, 2015: p. 33)
b) An ideology permeating the social and educational space by which a peculiar vision of individuals, students, learning and educational institutions is delivered (Clarke, 2012; Mahiri, 2005; Masschelein and Simons, 2008, 2013; Power and Whitty, 2010). This ideology places a strong emphasis on ongoing competition at all levels of education and society while weakening a vision of education as a site for sharing, togetherness and the emergence of newness. As a caveat, one peculiar characteristic of neoliberal ideology is that it presents itself, in a sense, as the only game in town. Everything falling outside the given register of performativity, economic advantage and competition is increasingly regarded as inconsequential, if not senseless at all. Such a tautological nature of neoliberalism makes criticizing and challenging its assumptions extremely difficult for, according to Hursh and Henderson "neoliberal policies" create a severe limitation of "public discourse", and "what can be said and thought" within the

1 Emphasis on the overwhelming importance of economy is widespread within critiques of the neoliberal educational agenda. In this regard, Olssen and Peters argue that under a neoliberal regime, "education is represented as an input-output system that can be reduced to an economic production function." (Olssen and Peters, 2005: 324) Along similar lines, David Harvey highlights that neoliberalism "seeks to bring all human action into the domain of the market." (Harvey, 2005: 3). For a thoughtful discussion of how and why standardization works in the neoliberal educational agenda, see Mahiri, 2005: 72–88.

political, social and educational arena. (Hursh and Henderson, 2011: p. 176)

c) A set of educational policies delivered both at a supra-national and national level that establishes what, when, how and even why one should learn. Such a control over schooling is accomplished through the allocation of substantial financial resources, which steer both the macro and the micromanagement of schooling and education (Apple, 2000; Ball, 2009; Ball and Olmedo, 2013; Biesta, 2004; Marginson, 2006).

However, it is my argument that neoliberalism doesn't only act at a political level, and by means of economic penetration. It is my contention that, when analyzing the neoliberal framework for education, we have to also analyze its linguistic level, and the widespread rhetoric that guides the representations of education and schooling we address (Alexander, 2011). Without such an analysis we run the risk to not capture the power of fascination and the pull neoliberalism exerts. Neoliberalism, in fact, also acts by means of a fascinating rhetoric and language, one in which "better jobs for better lives" (OECD, 2018a) are promised, and a "new vocabulary of performance" (Ball, 2003: p.218) reshapes teachers' and students' aims and purposes. When reading publications or documents delivered by some of the major educational agencies worldwide, we may note that a strong emphasis is placed on concepts such as "student achievement and competitiveness" (U.S Department of Education, 2018), and on "what is required to succeed" (Schleicher, 2016a) in today's complex world.

Then, it is important to note that neoliberalism's power of penetration also lies in its rhetoric and ubiquity. Neoliberal language spans from the normative frameworks through which financial resources are delivered to brochures presenting specific assessment tools; it informs both the political acts delivered by nation states and videos aimed at promoting educational equipments. We find neoliberal logic and language in a number of documents from some major educational institutions and agencies worldwide—e.g., U.S Department of Education, European Commission, Australian Department for Education and Training—as well as in private schools' advertisment.

Given these premises, in my paper I wish to unravel such a rhetorical aspect of neoliberal educational agenda, which is at the heart of the success and dissemination of educational neoliberalism. Given the diffusion and ubiquity of neoliberal rhetoric, in my paper I shall restrict my analysis to one of such examples, thus focusing my attention on one of the educational agencies involved in such a protean movement, namely, OECD.

Specifically, through close scrutiny of OECD's language, I go deep into the educational and ethical gesture underpinning OECD's rhetorical apparatus. A careful analysis of OECD's documents—including publications, documents, brochure, videos and recommendations—spanning from 2012 upto 2018, will show that the Organization, while concealing its role as one shaping educational policies worldwide, shows a remarkable prowess in communicating its ideas and mastering diverse communicative registers, such as a scientific register, on the one hand, and a language more in line with advertising style, on the other hand—thus making, as I wish to argue, a problematic mix.

The paper is framed into two sections and a conclusion: in the first section, I analyse a major feature of OECD's rhetorical strategy, namely, that of concealing its normative and performative role of steering educational policies worldwide, thus presenting its products as—just—responses to pressing needs already present in schooling and society. To be very clear, OECD creates the needs to which its products—PISA, TALIS, PIAAC—are supposed to respond. In the second section, I unravel the second feature of OECD's rhetorical strategy, namely, that of mixing two diverse logics and languages, such as a scientific logic and language, on the one hand, and a logic and language more akin to advertisement leanings, on the other. In the conclusions, I summarize and conclude my attempt.

One Test, One Vision, One School

In this section, I analyse a major feature of OECD's rhetorical strategy, namely, that of concealing its normative and performative role of steering educational policies worldwide, thus presenting its products as simple responses to needs already expressed by schools, teachers, policy makers and society at large. To be very clear, OECD, consistently with its own goals, builds a peculiar vision of education and society, ascribing such a vision not to its own interests and aims; rather, such a vision is ascribed to a widespread and unavoidable movement involving all countries around the world, and pressing needs stemming from society independently of OECD's power of persuasion and penetration. In this way, one is pushed to feel and perceive OECD's purposes and interests as one's own, while OECD comes to be seen as—just—an agency which helps us to meet the goals we already have in mind.

To introduce my analysis, I consider the OECD publication *PISA 2012 Results: What Makes Schools Successful? Resources, Policies and Practices (OECD, 2013). In the Foreword we find the following:*

> [M]ore and more countries are looking beyond their own borders for evidence of the most successful and efficient policies and practices. Indeed, in a global economy, success is no longer measured against national standards alone, but against the best-performing and most rapidly improving education systems. Over the past decade, the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment, PISA, has become the world's premier yardstick for evaluating the quality, equity and efficiency of school systems. But the evidence base that PISA has produced goes well beyond statistical benchmarking. By identifying the characteristics of high-performing education systems PISA allows governments and educators to identify effective policies that they can then adapt to their local contexts. (OECD, 2013: p. 3)

This statement, I argue, is a significant example of OECD's rhetoric. Several assumptions are included in this passage, and the statement itself, despite its plain and reassuring language, is anything but neutral and innocent. A powerful direction situates education in a well-defined value square of money, success, evidence and competition—notice, the hallmarks of neoliberalism. Moreover: as stated above, such a well-defined square is not presented as a peculiar—and legitimate—perspective of the Organization. Rather, it is presented as a neutral, unique and unavoidable reality embracing educational systems worldwide.

The question of evidence and evidence-based education is introduced in the first statement of the passage. Here, we may note that evidence itself is not questioned: it is a given. It is a given in two ways: on the one hand, it is implicitly assumed that only evidence-based data may provide meaningful information about educational systems—hardly, in fact, in OECD's educational framework may we find trace of diverse assessment models.[2] On the other hand, it is assumed that, within the range of evidence-based tools for assessing skills and competencies, PISA is the best one. Thus, as we may note, both questionable assumptions are taken for granted without arguing further. Moreover: as stated above, the need for evidence is not a specific purpose of the Organization. Rather, it arises from "more and more countries" around the world independently of OECD.

In the second statement of the passage, OECD introduces the two guidelines through which education must be conceived of: an economics and performance-based vision of education, and a strong commitment to "success" and measurement, or, better said, to

2 For more on the relationship between evidence-based epractice and neoleberal educational agenda see Au, 2011; Biesta, 2010; Hursh, 2008; Shahjahan 2011.

a—problematic—measurement of success. We are told that, "in a global economy, success is no longer measured against national standards alone, but against the best-performing and most rapidly improving education systems". Here, again, a concealing strategy is at work. By such a strategy the reader is pushed to believe the following: a) a "global economy" is an all-encompassing concept, one that can and must ground any and every educational framework; additionally, in OECD's language and ideology the concept of "global economy" is a totalizing one, namely, it stands for the world in all of its features—I will return to this in the second section. In this way both the reduction of living to economy and of education to neoliberal dictate is silently accomplished; b) success is the driven value of such a world. With respect to this, it should be noted that not just success is a problematic educational category, for in the end one could ask success in and for what; success, additionally, is also an indeterminate concept, one that, in a sense, may be filled up with anything. Otherwise stated, OECD should specify what success means in its educational perspective; and c) despite such an indeterminateness of what success means and entails, we are pushed to believe that the factors conducive to success can be clearly measured and evaluated. In this way PISA, as the best tool for measuring educational success, becomes an indispensable product at any level of education and schooling.

OECD, then, puts in place a rhetorical mechanism in which too much is taken for granted. This leads to a situation in which PISA is neither only an international survey nor an assessment tool amongst other assessment tools. Through OECD's words, we are pushed to believe that PISA mirrors an indisputable reality: the whole argument is presented as evidence. Here, it should be noted that the term "evidence" has a twofold meaning: on the one hand, the term refers to the evidence-based paradigm as the alleged gold standard for both educational assessment and scientific research; on the other hand, evidence is understood as the—grounded—reason for believing that something is true. Then, we may see that the technical and the common meaning of the term evidence reinforce one another, thus creating a kind of loop by which the reader is pushed to believe that the affirmations being made cannot be questioned—as Angel Gurrìa, the OECD Secretary General, would say, they are a kind of "mirror" of reality (Gurrìa, 2016a). OECD's rhetorical strategy equates its own vision to the vision stemming from all countries committed to educating their girls and boys.

To close the loop, in the final sentence of the passage we encounter PISA's colonialist stance (d'Agnese, 2015, 2017). Here, in fact, we read that, "PISA allows governments and educators to identify effective policies that

they can then adapt to their local contexts." In other words, PISA identifies what must be done in educational arena worldwide, with no room for uncertainty or mistake, and local countries and schools—just—have to follow, thus adapting OECD's strategies, aims and criteria to their context. That is why OECD enhances a vision of schooling in terms of adaptation and execution—gesture that is both theoretically weak and ethically problematic.

The passage quoted, then, is a significant example of OECD's rhetorical strategy, one in which OECD presents its own vision of education as an unavoidable necessity, and its work as a response to needs firmly located in schooling, educational policies and society at large. In this way OECD hinders its performative positions, thus transforming its aims in educational necessities arising from society. In this way, OECD creates the premises, the market, if you wish, in which its own products may be sold. In this case, rhetorical strategy prepares and grounds economic penetration.

With respect to the issues raised thus far, it should be highlighted that we are not facing an occasional passage. In several places OECD and its authoritative members emphasise the power of PISA of being "a mirror" of education thus "demonstrating to all countries what is possible" (Gurrìa, 2016a). Moreover: in Gurrìa's authoritative words, "PISA tests the readiness for an active role in today's society; it tests how [. . . students] think and how they work [...]. But first of all PISA shows what achievements are possible in education." (Gurrìa, 2016b). Left apart that, technically speaking, thinking of having a mirror of something is, scientifically, a medieval epistemological stance, what is remarkable is that according to OECD's own words, we are lead to believe that the present and the future of education are envisioned through a politics based on a two hour test.

However, this is not the only example of such a strategy. To provide further evidence of OECD's stance, I shall analyze two passages from two OECD's publication: *Education Today 2013: The OECD Perspective (OECD, 2012) and PISA 2012 Results: What Students Know and Can Do* (OECD, 2014). In the former publication we read the following:

> The OECD Skills Strategy provides an integrated, cross-government strategic framework aimed to help countries understand more about how to invest in skills to help transform better skills into better jobs, economic growth and social inclusion. To this end, the first main policy lever to address is to develop relevant skills [...]. The second main lever is to activate skills supply, encouraging people to offer their skills and to retain skilled people on the labour market [...] The third lever is to put

> skills to effective use, creating a better match between people's skills and job requirements. (OECD, 2012: p. 51–53)

Here, once again, we may see that OECD's rhetorical apparatus works through two related passages: a) in the first one, OECD presents its own vision of education as a request emerging from countries around the world, rather than its own vision of education; and b) in the second passage, to close the loop, such a vision is transformed in an unavoidable necessity. We may notice such a rhetorical mechanism in the first statement of the passage quoted above: OECD's role is merely one of helping countries "[to] understand more about how to invest in skills to help transform better skills into better jobs, economic growth and social inclusion." As a corollary, I wish to add that, if at the individual level, it is reasonable to suppose that "better jobs" depend on "better skills"—although a question can be made about the fact that which jobs are better depends on one's aims and aspirations—it is difficult to understand how OECD makes such an automatic passage from economic growth to social inclusion. That economic growth automatically produces social inclusion is not a given–again, such a position seems to be consistent to neoliberal ideology (Brown, 2015; Hill, 2004).

The second rhetorical passage OECD makes, namely, that of turning its vision of education into the one and only vision possible, is accomplished in the second part of the passage. Here, we may notice that "activat[ing] skills supply, encouraging people to offer their skills and to retain skilled people on the labour market [...], creating a better match between people's skills and job requirements", are well-known neoliberal rules. Schooling, otherwise stated, does no exhaust its mandate with furnishing the "right skills". Schools also have a much broader ethical, affective, and social role. However, even when limiting schools' role to such "right skills", it should be highlighted that schools should have a role in determining which the "right skills" are, and which the method for teaching and assessing them shoud be. Otherwise, we run the risk of transforming schools in mere executors of OECD's politics. In other words, too much of what schooling is about is being left behind by OECD's picture.

OECD's rhetorical strategy becomes even more evident in a 2014 publication, *PISA 2012 Results: What Students Know and Can Do,* where the twofold hindering of its own position as a performative one, and of its own view as the only view in town, is clearly at work. Given the relevance of the issue, it is worth quoting the passage at length:

> Equipping citizens with the skills necessary to achieve their full potential, participate in an increasingly interconnected global economy, and

> ultimately convert better jobs into better lives is a central preoccupation of policy makers around the world. Results from the OECD's recent Survey of Adult Skills show that highly skilled adults are twice as likely to be employed and almost three times more likely to earn an above-median salary than poorly skilled adults. In other words, poor skills severely limit people's access to better-paying and more rewarding jobs. Highly skilled people are also more likely to volunteer, see themselves as actors rather than as objects of political processes, and are more likely to trust others. Fairness, integrity and inclusiveness in public policy thus all hinge on the skills of citizens. (OECD, 2014: p. 3)

For the sake of clarity, it will be useful schematizing my point. At least four elements are significant in OECD's reasoning: a) the exchange between OECD's and policy makers' "preoccupation"; b) the linear relationship OECD stages between "necessary skills", "better jobs" and "better lives"; c) the equivalence OECD makes between what one is expected to learn, do and be as a citizen and what one is expected to learn, do and be as a—particular kind—of worker; and, as a result of such an equivalence d) the link being made between the propensity "to trust others", the "[f] airness, integrity and inclusiveness" we may find in public policy, and the necessity to produce "[h]ighly skilled people".

The first element, that is, the exchange between OECD's and policy makers' "preoccupation", is evident in the first statement of the passage. Here we learn that "[e]quipping citizens with the skills necessary to achieve their full potential, participate in an increasingly interconnected global economy, and ultimately convert better jobs into better lives is a central preoccupation of policy makers around the world." To be very clear, I do not wish to deny that "[e]quipping citizens with the skills necessary to [...] participate in an increasingly interconnected global economy" is *one* of the preoccupations of *some* or *many* policy makers around the world, nor I wish to deny that this is an aim worth to pursue—although the question remains as to what such skills are and which the conception of an "interconnected global economy" precisely is. The problem, again, is that this is not the whole picture. To put it clearly, why does OECD speak for all policy makers? And why does OECD speak just in terms of "global economy"? Again, such a preoccupation is the output of a peculiar, neoliberal vision of education, not *the* whole picture.

Following OECD's statement, we come to the second point, namely, that of transforming "better jobs into better lives". Here, one may ask when and how the conversion of "better jobs into better lives" does occur. To be very clear: At which point, and within which system of reduction,

does the translation from life to a two-hours test occur? Here, I do not wish to be naïve: a job is a relevant part of living, and life may hardly be good when making a bad job. However, the problem with equating "better jobs" to "better lives" is that not only—as argued above—what is good depends on who you are and what you wish to achieve; moreover, a good job is part of good life, for it is common sense that one's life depends on several factors, such as love, health, social and familiar relationships and so on. In this way, OECD enhances a vision in which a "good job" is the only commitment one should have, in that happiness strictly depends on which a job one obtains. Such a gesture comes to enhance a narrow and misguided vision of life, society, relationships and education. Once again, it should be noted that the use of the term "interconnected global economy", in which the term "economy" stands for the term world, is significant of such a narrowing down of living to its economic features. In OECD's picture of education students are not required to participate in the world; rather, they are "required to [...] participate in an increasingly interconnected global economy" —an argument OECD recalls in its PISA trifold brochure (OECD, 2017). The difference is pivotal, in that being in the world and with the world, means seeing oneself and others as active part of such a world; it means exercising criticism, while listening to others' reasons and debating. It means, also, questioning the very structure of our questioning.

Then, we may note that OECD, with its taken-for-grantedness strategy, by which a particular view of society is presented as the world in all of its features, erases the very conditions for sharing and debating, conditions without which schooling makes little sense. For schooling to be inclusive, one has to provide a framework in which students may also question the very order in which they find themselves. This is not the case with PISA, in which a conception of economy comes to frame education in all of its features, thus silencing from the very beginning even the need and the desire for questioning and thinking otherwise.

The third point I wish to raise is that of levelling what one is expected to learn, do and be as a citizen and what one is expected to learn, do and be as a worker. This is clear in OECD's statement that "[h]ighly skilled people are also more likely to volunteer, see themselves as actors rather than as objects of political processes, and are more likely to trust others." Here, the following question arises: how does OECD draw the conclusion that political participation and active citizenship linearly derives from high-skills qualification? Which studies offer evidence for such a conclusion? Again, OECD draws sharp conclusions and boldly makes claims about slippery and controversial arguments, without further qualification.

The fourth point I wish to discuss is strictly connected to the one discussed above, and it is that of the link OECD makes between "[f]airness, integrity and inclusiveness in public policy" and "the skills of citizens." Here, it is difficult to see why "[f]airness, integrity and inclusiveness in public policy" should depend on "the skills of citizens". To put the point directly: what have skills to do with fairness and integrity? It is common sense that one may be both un-skilled and fair, or, alternatively, skilled and unfair. The point is even more paradoxical when we come to inclusiveness, in that one would expect that such a founding value should be enacted regardless which skills one has. Moreover, society should be more inclusive exactly towards those who are less skilled, in that it is expected that highly skilled people are either already included, or have strong means to be included.

Then, through the analysis of OECD's own words, I hope to have argued that in OECD's model students—and society as well—are conceived as a kind of container for the right skills and competencies. By rendering education subservient to learning and learning subservient to predetermined set of skills, OECD makes dealing with education a question of mere functionality, a matter of put and remove. The only possible option for education, in OECD's vision, is to follow and adapt to the existing—neoliberal—regime.

Moreover: the supposed leap OECD claims to perform from the given contents of national curriculum to skills and competencies apt to manage real-life situations, is only an ostensible one. This is true for OECD repeats the mistake of the "traditional schooling model" (OECD, 2016) OECD itself criticizes, namely, that of rendering students subservient to a framework lowered from above. We should note that both the model OECD criticizes, and OECD's own framework come to schools from above, as already settled and defined. The whole set of skills and learning outcomes which students are expected to perform comes as a package from OECD to Nation States to schools, and OECD seems to know in advance which the aims and purposes of girls and boys worldwide are. In other words, both the "traditional schooling model" and OECD conceive of schooling as just a matter of reproduction and adaptation. The only difference between them lies in what is to be reproduced—predefined contents, on the one hand, and predefined skills, on the other. The uncritical adherence to the social and economic model in force OECD pursues ends in betraying education.

It should be highlighted that such a model affects and limits both students and society. On the one hand, students are forced to meet preconceived standards and values; as a matter of fact, students are implicitly

asked to renounce enacting their own projects and subjectivities—and this is another way in which PISA exerts its colonialist stance upon educational subjects. On the other hand, society loses the possibility to be challenged and modified by students. Such a model affects even teachers: they are called to enact a preconceived framework, whether they relate to students, whether to curriculum. By such a framework what a student must achieve, what the subject matter of discipline entails, and even what effects teaching should produce, is established in advance. Of course, teachers have to project their actions in classrooms, being aware and competent about all this. They also should meet some teaching standards, those standards being the national curriculum, or indications emerging from the school in which they teach. Here, to be very clear, I am not arguing for a romantic or naïve interpretation of teachers as figures that stage unmediated relationships with students, thereby coming to a deep understanding of educational situations. Teachers, of course, must be capable and competent, but the discussion should not be limited to the kinds of 'capability' and 'knowledge' that they need and use. It is also relevant to discuss a) what such performative concepts leave behind and b) the *position* that the rationale of teaching has in such educational situations, for everything constituting the rational and procedural apparatus of teaching, including professional development, is framed by teachers' intentionality, namely, by teachers' being involved in leaving teaching situations (English, 2013; Todd, 2001).

Learning from Schleicher's Words. Mixing Diverse Languages and Logics

Thus far, I have attempted to highlight the first feature of OECD's rhetorical strategy, namely, that of concealing its performative and normative educational role. In this section, I unravel the second feature of OECD's rhetorical strategy, namely, that of mixing two diverse logics and languages, such as a scientific logic and language, on the one hand, and a logic and language more akin to advertisement, on the other. Along the way, other features of OECD's stance will emerge, such as a problematic uniformity of language within the Organization, and a likewise problematic narrowing down of the purposes and aims of education. To make my point, I focus on four of Schleicher's videos. The reasons for my choice are grounded, on the one hand, in the authority of the person, in being Andrea Schleicher the Director of the OECD Directorate for Education and Skills; on the other hand, such videos, in being exemplary of OECD's stance and gesture, allow us to come to full circle about the vision of ethics and education OECD enacts.

The first passage is taken from a video presenting the *PISA-based Test for Schools*, a tool aimed at measuring and benchmarking schools' competitiveness and efficiency. I quote two significant passages from the video and then provide my commentary:

> For more than ten years now PISA, the world's premier students assessment, has evaluated and compared student's systems all around the world. [...]
> [PISA-based Test for Schools task is] provide tangible insights on how to leverage improvements. And that is exactly what PISA-based Test for Schools is about. They [policy makers, teachers, educators] know how important it is for their students to enter a global economy where they will be competing for the best jobs with young people from all over the world. And in a global economy the benchmark for educational success is no longer improvement by national standards alone, but the best-performing education systems internationally. (Schleicher, 2016a)

Above all, we may note a clear similarity – if not uniformity – with both Gurrìa's words and several OECD's documents (see Gurrìa 2016a, 2016b; OECD, 2014, 2016). The language being spoken, the terms used, the syntax emerging from comparison and even the 'mood' which permeates both Schleicher's, Gurrìa's and OECD's words seem to come from the same source. Of course, consistency and concord within organizations are expected. However, here a different mechanism seems at work: OECD and its authoritative members speak in unison, with one voice, so to speak. Such a stance reveals a problematic gesture toward society and education, for one would expect more nuanced and even diverse positions within such a complex and articulated organization as OECD is, especially on a matter such education that is, by definition, complex, uncertain and multifaceted. Education, in fact, is related to societies, which are, by definition, complex and variegated. The argument I raise is related to the overall politics enacted by OECD: in narrowing down education, living and society, in uniforming them to one's vision one must use a well-defined and standardized language, a language in which diversity and differences are not allowed. Then, such uniformity is but another example of the severe reduction of education enacted by OECD.

Returning to Schleicher's statements, we find a clear expression of the features education must have in OECD's framework: a) success and money as the measure for a good education; b) competition as the basic educational engine; and c) a performance-based conception of education. Such elements are clearly expressed in the last four lines:

> They [policy makers, teachers, educators] know how important it is for their students to enter a global economy where they will be competing for the best jobs with young people from all over the world. And in a global economy the benchmark for educational success is no longer improvement by national standards alone, but the best-performing education systems internationally.

Students, once again, enter a "global economy", not a global world. The difference is not a philosophical one. Rather, it has important political, ethical and pragmatic bearings. Entering a global world, in fact, is a global process, in that all of one's and others' personality are involved in such an encounter: new relationships emerge, and new encounters are being made. On the contrary, when entering "a global economy" individual features come to be subservient and reduced to the economic features of life. Living, then, comes to be reduced to competition "for the best jobs", meaning that other human beings come to be seen as your competitors—and that is why education is a performance-based system and PISA dangerously narrows down education to a zero-sum game, one in which one wins if one's opponents lose.

However, as previously argued, benchmarking educational success is the key-means by which OECD's politics is accomplished—and, in fact, "Measuring Student success around the World", as PISA homepage recites (OECD, 2016), appears the key-objective of PISA's politics.

The same concepts are expressed in another video, titled *Use data to build better schools*. I quote three significant passages and then provide my commentary:

> So this tells us that, in a global economy, it is no longer national improvement that is the benchmark for success, but the best performing education systems internationally. The trouble is that measuring how much time people spend in school or what degree they have got is not always a good way of seeing what they can actually do. Look at the toxic mix of unemployed graduates on our streets, while employers say they cannot find the people with the skills they need. And that tells you that better degrees don't automatically translate into better skills and better jobs and better lives. [...]
>
> High-performing systems also share clear and ambitious standards across the entire spectrum. Every student knows what matters. Every student knows what's required to be successful. [...]
>
> If we can help every child, every teacher, every school, every principal, every parent see what improvement is possible, that only the sky is the

limit to education improvement, we have laid the foundations for better policies and better lives. (Schleicher, 2016b)

Here, let me say that I acknowledge that, as Schleicher states, "better degrees don't automatically translate into better skills and better jobs and better lives." But I believe that the reason for this mismatching Schleicher has in mind is dramatically erroneous. It is not so much that better degrees do not automatically guarantee better skills, as if better skills could automatically lead to better jobs and, in turn, better lives—as OECD states (OECD, 2014: p.3). It is that the whole string, which should conduct from "better skills" to a "better life" is both scientifically unfounded, and ethically problematic. This is so for scientifically, the last passage—that converting better jobs into better lives—is a leap between incommensurable entities. Ethically, through such a leap a severe reduction and impoverishment of what living may be is enacted. Students, in fact, are pushed to believe that education is just a matter of acquiring the right skills' set, one that, in turn, should conduct to a fulfilling life. Schleicher, in fact, states that "[e]very student knows what matters. Every student knows what's required to be successful." I believe that this ostensibly simple statement has to be carefully scrutinized. By such a statement the equivalence between "what matters" and success is enacted. In other words, what matters in education, and living as well, is reaching success. Again, we are pushed to ask about the opportunity to use an ambiguous concept like success as the key-aim for a delicate matter such as education.

Here, let me make an additional remark about the concluding claim. When reading that "we have laid the foundations for better policies and better lives", one cannot help to think how much such a statement is vague, and, in a sense, presumptuous. Thinking that one, whether that one is an individual or an organization, has "laid the foundations for better policies and better lives", is an affirmation that is more in line with advertisement language than with scientific language—and here, I wish to recall that what is problematic is not advertisement language in itself, but the mixture of scientific authority and advertisement fascination, which OECD enacts. Specifically, we cannot help to ask what such foundations for better lives are, if such a better life is to be evaluated through a two-hour test. To be very clear: what kind of evidence does OECD have in mind for assessing such a betterment of living? Otherwise stated, when hearing that "employers say they cannot find the people with the skills they need. And that tells you that better degrees don't automatically translate into better skills", we are within what, from a scientific and political perspective, may well be argued and sustained. However, when we come to living as a

whole, things change, and we enter an undefined – and perhaps undefinable – matter.

We find a further instance of such a gesture in the webpage devoted to explain aims and structure of the PISA-based Test for Schools, we find the following:

> It is expected that the PISA-based Test for Schools will provide [...] the opportunity [...] to improve learning and build better skills for better lives." (OECD, 2018b).

Such a statement is not an isolated case. In several places OECD affirms its capacity to identify which the way for a "better life" is. In a sense, such a call for "a better life" is an OECD's brand.

We find such a gesture in a OECD's 2012 publication with the meaningful title *Better Skills, Better Jobs, Better Lives*. We find it, again, in a 2014 publication, where OECD, again, speaks about "convert[ing] better jobs into better lives" (OECD, 2014, p. 3). By combining scientific authority and advertisement fascination OECD produces a kind of mix of superficial optimism and scientific evidence that is highly ambiguous and difficult to debunk.

However, it is my contention that such a problematic approach does not derive from lack of conceptual knowledge or awareness. Rather, it is the consequence of a precise choice and communicative approach. OECD, in its claims and findings mixes two diverse logics and languages: a) a scientific logic and language, with OECD being a center for data collection and elaboration in diverse fields; and b) an advertising logic and language, through which OECD may spread its ideas in all levels of population. Such a question is not a merely linguistic or theoretical one. Analyzing OECD's language, in fact, we may note that, on the one hand, OECD strongly reclaims a scientific role while, on the other hand, in its communications through webpages, videos and brochures, OECD's language and overall gesture mirrors advertisement's language—see, for instance claims such as "convert better jobs into better lives" (OECD, 2014) or "PISA results reveal what is possible in education" (OECD, 2016: p. 2) which hardly could find space in a scientific publication.

Such a twofold gesture is highly problematic, in that, when listening to an advertisement, one is aware that languages and images are intended and prepared in order to capture listeners' attention, thus persuading people to buy the product advertised rather than the concurrent one; features and benefits of products are, then, intentionally overestimated. The question is that people are well aware about the amount of pretense contained in advertisement and, in turn, such a pretense, due to the nature

of the message and people's awareness, does not work as a deceit; rather, it is an explicit rule of the commercial game. However, this is not the case when listening to institutions claiming scientific authority –as in the case of OECD. When playing the game of research, as it were, we have to abide by quite a different rule. Here, one would expect a kind of inclusive approach, and the possibility to fairly take into account different and even opposite opinions, gestures and options – a gesture that in advertisement would be senseless and, as it were, masochistic. So, OECD, through such a twofold gesture and language, one that speaks at the very same time and with respect to the same contents through scientific publications and brochures, enacts a politic that is, in my opinion, highly ambiguous. If one would stress the question, one could say that OECD misuses its reputation as a scientific authority, thus making claims that hardly may be found in a scientific publication, but that, due to their captivating nature, aim to convince people about the goodness of its own products—PISA, in this case.

This is clearly expressed in third video I analyse, namely, *Pisa for School. What and Why?*

> PISA, the world's premier students' assessment has evaluated and compared school systems all around the world. The modern world no longer pays people for just what they know [...] but for what they do with what they know [...]. Even the best performing High School in the United States have room for emprovement in order to reach the performance level of the highest performing systems internationally [...] They [teachers and policy makers] know how important it is for their students to be prepared to enter a global economy where they will be competing for the best jobs with young people from all over the world. And in a global economy the benchmark for education success is no longer improvement by national standards alone, but the best performing education systems internationally. (Schleicher, 2018a)

A first thing to be noted is that, once again, Schleicher expresses the same questionable concepts: PISA is the "world's premier students' assessment", PISA-based Test for School is necessary for students to succeed, a "global economy" as an all-encompassing concept which comes to erase the complexity and diversity of world and societies. Once again, these questionable concepts are taken for granted without further argument or reasoning. However, this is not the only thing worth analysing in this passage. While Schleicher's discourse is focused on schooling at large, the attention is just on competing "for the best jobs". The "education success" and "the best performing education systems internationally"

are—just—committed to prepare girls and boys to strive in the market arena. Education, then, is narrowed down to supplying young people with the skills needed in order to compete for such "best jobs".

Related to this, is the fourth video I present, which is extrapolated from the *London Conference on Employer Engagement in Education and Training.* In this video we learn that

> Our role is really to develop better policies for better lives ... Developing for example the right skills for people [...] and making sure that children from early ages all over the world [. . .] may get the kind of skills they need. PISA works "to make sure children have this kind of perspective of what they could be [...] so they can look out at in all [...] successful professions. (Schleicher, 2018b)

When reading this passage, a number of questions arise: which is the concept of "better live" Schleicher has in mind? Is it possible to establish a unique set of skills needed by people in order to accomplish such a better life? Which is the model for children development Schleicher has in mind?

Once again, a totalizing logic is at work, and such a gesture is even more problematic when addressing subjects at earlier and earlier age. This is true for when people, since childhood, are conceived of as a kind of recipient for the the "right skills", education – and society as well – are no longer the space where diverse perspectives, desires, aspirations, feelings, and ideas meet and confront one another, joining, connecting, colliding, melting, and giving rise to diverse feelings, ideas, perspectives and aspirations. Education, schooling and society alike are narrowed down to a perpetual arena, where girls and boys are trained to compete since their childhood for "successful professions".

Conclusions

In my paper, I have argued that in order to understand neoliberal educational agenda and its power of persuasion and penetration, a thorough analysis of its rhetoric and language is required. In order to accomplish this task, I have focused my attention on OECD's language and rheroric, analyzing its public documents from 2012 to 2018. I have argued that, along with a severe standardization of education and language, and the concealment of its normative and performative role, we find in OECD's educational documents a mix of diverse logics and languages, namely, scientific and advertisement language. Such a mix confers OECD an unduly advantage, namely, that of captivating people attention while reassuring them about the truthfulness, impartiality and objectivity of its own assertions. I have also argued that OECD presents a narrow vision of what

education is and should be. OECD, in a sense, accomplishes a fourfold reduction of education. OECD, in fact, narrows down education to learning, learning to assessment, assessment to a performance-based accountability measure system and performance-based accountability measure system is finally turned into PISA. OECD, in this way, ossifies the register of human actions and ways of being—a gesture, I would highlight, that is even inconsistent with OECD's commitment to innovation. To be very clear, OECD does not invite another interpretation of education than that of competition amongst countries, students, teachers, and schools. As a result, schooling comes to be seen as just a means through which boys, girls, and even children, acquire the necessary skills to strive and compete for "successful professions" (Schleicher, 2018b).

In this way, OECD fails to recognize teachers', policy makers', students', and even people's capacity to autonoumously share, discuss and set which goals to pursue, thus reducing schooling to a perpetual training activity aimed at producing one set of skills, namely, those assessed by PISA and provided by OECD's and connected agencies' educational programmes. That is why OECD's model for schooling ends in producing ethical disengagement in educationalists. Being ethically involved, in fact, entails being concerned with the aims and purposes of education. When discourse about educational ends is all risolved in advance, we are within what may well been called an authoritarian model of teaching, authoritarianism being understood as any and every way of educating in which educational goals and overall vision of schooling are pre-established in advance. For authoritarian teaching to be enacted you do not necessarily need students repeating sentences, ideas and ways of behaving over and over again. For authoritarian teaching to be enacted it is sufficient to cut the cord which binds values, aims and purposes to the concrete practice of education. OECD, despite its commitment to an education for life, tends to construe an artificial model of education, one in which the uncertainties, fissures and vagaries of living are neither considered, nor addressed. If we believe that schooling is not just a matter of accomplishing aims lowered from above, but an ethical space in which both students and society renew and rethink themselves, in which the "startling unexpectedness" (Arendt, 1998/1958: p. 177–178) characterising human condition may arise, OECD's penetration and influence on education and schooling has to be unmasked for what it is: an unduly attempt to totalize and fix the register of human experience.

References

Alexander, R. (2011) Evidence, rhetoric and collateral damage: the problematic pursuit of 'world class'standards. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 41(3), pp. 265–286.

Apple, M.W. (1995) *Education and power.* New York: Routledge.

Apple, M.W. (2000) *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age.* NewYork: Routledge.

Arendt, H. (1998/1958) *The Human Condition*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Au, W. (2011) Teaching under the new Taylorism: high stakes testing and the standardization of the 21st century curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 43(1), pp. 25–45.

Ball, S.J. (2003) The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy* 18(2), pp. 215–228.

Ball, S.J. (2009) Privatising education, privatising education policy, privatising educational research: network governance and the 'competition state. *Journal of Education Policy* 24 (1), pp. 83–99.

Ball, S.J. and Olmedo, A (2013) Care of the self, resistance and subjectivity under neoliberal governmentalities. *Critical Studies in Education* 54(1), pp. 85–96.

Biesta, G.J.J. Education (2004) Accountability and the ethical demand: Can the democratic potential of accountability be regained? *Educational Theory* 54(3), pp. 233–250.

Biesta, G.J.J. Education (2010) *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Boulder, Co: Paradigm Publishers.

Boas, T.C. & Gans-Morse, J (2009) Neoliberalism: From New Liberal Philosophy to Anti-Liberal Slogan. *Studies in Contemporary International Development* 44(2), pp. 137–61.

Brown, W. (2015) *Undoing the Demos. Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. New York: Zone Books.

Clarke, M. (2012) The (absent) politics of neo-liberal education policy. *Critical Studies in Education* 53(3), pp. 297–310.

Connell, R. (2013) The neoliberal cascade and education: an essay on the market agenda and its consequences. *Critical Studies in Education* 54(2), pp. 99–112.

d'Agnese, V. (2015) PISA's Colonialism. Success, Money, and the Eclipse of Education. *Power and Education* 7(1), pp. 56–72.

d'Agnese, V. (2017) *Reclaiming Education in the Age of PISA. Challenging OECD's Educational Order*. London, New York: Routledge.

English, A. (2013) *Discontinuity in Learning. Dewey, Herbart and Education as Transformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

European Council (2000) *Lisbon European Council Presidency Conclusion*. Available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/lis1 en.htm, p. 3 Accessed August 15, 2018.

Gurrìa, A. (2016a) *Strong Performers and Successful Reformers in Education. A Video Series Profiling Policies and Practices of Education Systems that Demonstrate High or Improving Performance in the PISA Tests*. Available at: http://learningisopen.org/oecd/. Accessed August 15, 2018.

Gurrìa, A. (2016b) *Strong Performers and Successful Reformers in Education. A Video Series Profiling Policies and Practices of Education Systems that Demonstrate High or Improving Performance in the PISA Tests*. Available at http://learningisopen.org/oecd/. Accessed August 15, 2018.

Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hill, D. (2004) Books, Banks and Bullets: Controlling Our Minds – The Global Project of Imperialistic and Militaristic Neo-liberalism and its Effect on Education Policy. *Policy Futures in Education* 2(3), pp. 504–22.

Hursh, D. (2008) *High-Stakes Testing and the Decline of Teaching and Learning: The Real Crisis in Education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hursh, D. & Henderson, J.A. (2011) Contesting Global Neoliberalism and Creating Alternative Futures. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 32(2), pp. 171–185.

Mahiri, J. (2005) From 3 r's to 3 c's: Corporate Curriculum and Culture in Public Schools. *Social Justice* 32(3), pp. 72–88.

Marginson, S. (2006) Engaging Democratic Education in the Neoliberal Age. *Educational Theory* 56(2), pp. 205–219.

Masschelein, J. & Simons, M. (2008) The Governmentalization of Learning and the Assemblage of Learning Apparatus. *Educational Theory* 58(4), pp. 391–415.

Masschelein, J. & Simons, M. (2013) *In Defence of the School: A Public Issue*. Leuven: E-ducation: Culture & Society Publishers.

OECD (2012) *Education Today 2013: The OECD Perspective*. Paris: OECD Publishing. Available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/edu_today-2013-en. Accessed August 15, 2018.

OECD (2013) *PISA 2012 Results: What Makes Schools Successful? Resources, Policies and Practices (Volume IV)*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD (2014) *PISA 2012 Results: What Students Know and Can Do* (Volume I, Revised edition) *Student Performance in Mathematics, Reading and Science*. Available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264208780-en. Accessed August 15, 2018.

OECD (2016) PISA homepage. *About PISA*. Available at www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa. Accessed August 15, 2018.

OECD (2017) PISA trifolre. Available at https://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/PISA-trifold-brochure-2014.pdf. Accessed August 15, 2018.

OECD (2018a) "*OECD Test for Schools (based on PISA): Frequently Asked Questions (and answers)*. Available at http://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/oecdtestforschoolsintheus.htm. Accessed August 15, 2018.

OECD (2018b) *How Does PISA Shapes Education reform?* Available at http://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/. Accessed August 15, 2018.

Olssen, M. & Peters, M.A. (2005) Neoliberalism, Higher Education and the Knowledge Economy: From the Free Market to Knowledge Capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy* 20(3), pp. 313–345

Power, G. & Whitty, S. (2010) Teaching new subjects? The hidden curriculum of marketised education systems. *Melbourne Studies in Education* 37(2), pp.1–21.

Schleicher, A. (2016b) *Use Data to Build Better Schools*. Available at www.ted.com/talks/andreas_schleicher_use_data_to_build_better_schools/transcript?language=en#t-984031. Accessed August 15, 2018.

Schleicher, A. (2016a) *Andreas Schleicher, Director of the OECD Directorate for Education and Skills, on the PISA-based Test for Schools*. Available at www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/pisa-based-test-for-schools.htm. Accessed August 15, 2018.

Schleicher, A. (2018a) *Pisa for School. What and Why?* Available at http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisa-based-test-for-schools/. Accessed August 15, 2018.

Schleicher, A. (2018b) *Video from London Conference on Employer Engagement in Education and Training.* Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NnbHRPJNeVo. Accessed August 15, 2018.

Shahjahan, R.A. (2011) Decolonizing the Evidence Based Education and Policy Movement: Revealing the Colonial Vestiges in Educational Policy, Research, and Neoliberal Reform. *Journal of Education Policy* 26(2), pp. 181–206.

Todd, S. (2001). 'Bringing More Than I Contain': Ethics, Curriculum and the Pedagogical Demand for Altered Egos. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 33(4), pp. 431–450.

U.S Department of Education homepage 2018. Available at http://www.ed.gov/. Accessed August 15, 2018.

Neoliberalism and *Laissez-faire*: The Retreat from Naturalism[1]

Mark Olssen

The Problem of *Laissez-faire* in Neoliberal Thought

Foucault's (2008) analysis of the ordo liberals in Germany focused on the discrepancy between their advocacy of laissez-faire and the polarity between their views on the role of government. On the one hand, the German ordo liberals distrusted large concentrations of power and opposed action to 'interfere' in markets, through wages and price fixing, or administrative or bureaucratic involvement, but on the other hand, they favoured and supported the actions of government to reinforce and strengthen the institutional infrastructures, to arrange and enable the 'conditions' necessary for the market to operate. This was supported, for instance, by ordo liberals such as Walter Eücken, who took the view that the economy required an 'economic constitution,' which must be created and protected by the state. The possible conflict with free market principles is evident in the following statement:

> A solution of this task of which much depends (not only men's economic existence), requires the elaboration of a practicable economic constitution which satisfies certain basic principles. The problem will not solve itself simply by our letting economic systems grow up spontaneously. The history of the last century has shown this plainly enough. The economic system has to be consciously shaped. (Eücken, 1992: p. 314)

1 Some paragraphs in this paper draw from my previous writings on neoliberalism, specifically Olssen (2010, 2016, 2018) and Olssen, Codd, O'Neill (2004). The publishers of those articles and books are thanked for any replication in this paper.

Eücken sought to chart the basic principles of 'economic politics' [*Wirtschaftspolitik*] in order to establish the 'conditions' for a competitive market order to arise and continue. Establishing competition as the cornerstone of the economy became the key principle of a neoliberal order. It was concerned not with 'interfering' with the day-to-day processes of the economy, but seeking to establish and protect the 'conditions' that were favourable to an effective and efficient economic system. As Eücken put it, "[t]he answer is that the state should influence the *forms* of economy, but not itself direct the economic process" (p. 95).

It was also supported amongst the US free market advocates, such as Henry Calvert Simons. As 'father' of the Chicago School of free market economics, Simons was expected to champion a consistently traditional approach accepting the classical postulates of *laissez-faire*. This was as a natural equilibrium between supply and demand which ensured the 'self-regulation' of the economy, as if directed, in Adam Smith's phrase, by an 'invisible hand', i.e., laws of nature. Yet, in his pamphlet, *A Positive Program for Laissez-Faire,* Simons seems ambivalent over *laissez faire*:

> The representation of *laissez-faire* as a merely do nothing policy is unfortunate and misleading. It is an obvious responsibility of the state under this policy to maintain the kind of legal and institutional framework within which competition can function effectively as an agency of control. The policy should therefore be defined positively, as one under which the state seeks to establish and maintain such conditions that it may avoid the necessity of regulating 'the heart of the contract' – that is to say, the necessity of regulating relative prices. Thus, the state is charged, under this 'division of labor', with heavy responsibilities and large 'control' functions: the maintenance of competitive conditions in industry, the control of the currency ... the definition of the institution of property ... not to mention the many social welfare functions. (Simons, 1947: p. 42)

Indeed, Ronald Coase was so shocked at Simons pamphlet that he questioned Simon's credentials as a classical liberal and free market advocate:

> I would like to raise a question about Henry Simons ... [His] *Positive Program for Laissez-Faire* ... strikes me as highly interventionist pamphlet ... [I]n antitust, [Simons] wanted to ... restructure American industry.... In regulation ... he proposed to reform things by nationalization ... I would be interested if someone could explain ... (cited, Kitch, 1983: pp. 178–79)

Coase maintains that Simons' *Positive Program* constitutes a blueprint for intrusive state interventions in the market of the sort advocated

by social democrats and socialists who Simons most vehemently opposed and who advocated forms of state regulation of economic processes because they distrusted unregulated marketplace interactions. According to J. Bradford De Long of Harvard University, who also cites the quotation above (1990: p. 601), Coase's question (above) raised some interesting responses:

> Simons former Chicago pupils, his successors as upholders of classical liberalism in economics, did not rise to his defense. Instead, they responded as follows: First, they acknowledged that Simons was not a pure liberal but at best a mixed breed. "You can paint him with different colors ...," said Harold Demsetz. It's quite a mixed picture", said George Stigler. Second, they admitted that Simons ***was*** an 'interventionist,' that he did not believe that in general economic activity should be organized through free markets. "[H]e was the man who said that the Federal Trade Commission should be the most important agency in government, a phrase that surely should be on no one's tombstone", joked Stigler. "Everything Ronald Coase says is right." And Milton Friedman joined in: "I've gone back and re-read the *Positive Program* and been astounded.... To think that I thought at the time that it was strongly pro-free market in orientation!. (cited, De Long, pp. 601–2.)

Not only did Simons advocate regulation, but he even advocated nationalization. As Simons states in his pamphlet:

> Political control of utility charges is imperative ... for competition simply cannot function effectively as an agency of control.... In general... the state should face the necessity of actually taking over, owning, and managing directly, both railroads and utilities, and all other industries to which it is impossible to maintain effectively competitive conditions. (Simons, 1947: p. 57)

De Long defends Simons as a classical liberal on the grounds that "[Simons] thought that a primary function of government in a free society is to manage competition" (De Long: p. 610). Simons represented a strain of thinking in liberal economics that had been prominent in Europe in the work of the German Ordo Liberals, foremost amongst them, economists such as Eücken and Röpke, who distinguished the 'conditions' necessary to sustain a free market economy from the intervention of the government in the processes or actual functioning of the economy itself.

State intervention is necessary for the ordo Liberals in order to establish the conditions under which *laissez-faire* can effectively operate. Indeed, Eücken appears to be quite dismissive of what is central to *laissez-faire*:

> The solution to the problem of control was seen by [the advocates of *laissez-faire*] to be in the 'natural' order, in which competitive prices automatically control the whole process. They thought that this natural order would materialise spontaneously and that society did not need to be fed a 'specific diet', that is, have an economic system imposed on it, in order to thrive. Hence, they arrived at a policy of *laissez-faire*; this form of economic control left much to be desired. Confidence in the spontaneous emergence of the natural order was too great. (Eücken, 1989: p. 38)

This interventionist current in liberal thought was alive and well in America amongst other liberals than Henry Simons. James Buchanan, the founder of Public Choice theory, shares with the ordo liberals this more directive orientation to state action. Although the classical liberal tradition had stressed the role of markets as 'self-regulating,' representing a strong commitment to liberalism as a naturalistic doctrine, and as supported by arguments based on the freedom of the individual from the state, Buchanan so distrusted that the required efficiency gains would emerge through automatic mechanisms of the market that, in a way similar to writers like Röpke and Eucken, he supported efficiency achievements through a the deliberate tightening of state control. As he says in his criticism of Hayek:

> My basic criticism of F. A. Hayek's profound interpretation of modern history and his diagnosis for improvement is directed at his apparent belief or faith that social evolution will, in fact, ensure the survival of efficient institutional forms. Hayek is so distrustful of man's explicit attempts of reforming institutions that he accepts uncritically the evolutionary alternative. (1975: p. 194n)

It was on this ground that he opposed Hayek's naturalist faith in markets as spontaneous self-ordering systems which had been the hallmark of the classical liberal view since its inception. In Buchanan's view, the state should actively construct the competitive market economy and utilise supply-side monitoring in the interests of promoting efficiency in market terms.

Foucault, Röpke and Neoliberalism

Michel Foucault studied neoliberalism in his 1978 course at the College de France, *The Birth of Biopolitics*. For Foucault, neoliberalism signals "a shift from exchange to competition in the principle of the market" (2008: p. 118). Competition assumes the role of a fundamental principle that subtends democracy, which is to say, that the basic ordering of society as an enterprise culture structured by competition is to be enforced by government across all domains of the society. It becomes, as it were, the organising framework guaranteed by the state rather than as a function of the market. Foucault marshals evidence by citing Eücken who tells us that the government must be "perpetually vigilant and active" (p. 138), and must intervene to establish this context through both regulatory actions (*actions régulatrices*) and organizing actions (*actions ordonnatrices*) (p. 138).

Although during the first half of the twentieth century western welfare states were constituted through democratic determination, the accomplishment of neoliberalism, for the ordo liberals at least, was to attempt to establish the principle of competition as prior to and outside of democratic decision making; as determining the 'framework' through which the market would rule. The framework must attend to both the population, the order of justice and opportunity, as well as the techniques, such as the availability of implements concerning such things as population, technology, training and education, the legal system, the availability of land, the climate, all seen by Eucken as the 'conditions' for the market. Foucault refers to this active, top-down, positive role of the state as constituting a "sociological liberalism" (p. 146, footnote 51), or a "policy of society" (p. 146) which permits a new 'art of government' which differs radically from Keynesian-type systems. What is crucial is that for neoliberalism the object of government action becomes "the social environment" (p. 146) acting on behalf of capital, or those the create wealth. The aim is to engineer competition:

> It is the mechanisms [of competition] that should have the greatest possible surface and depth and should also occupy the greatest possible volume in society. This means that what is sought is not a society subject to the commodity effect, but a society subject to the dynamic of competition. (p. 147)

Competition becomes the new "*eidos*" (p. 147), the new dynamic of this new form of society:

> Not a supermarket society, but an enterprise society. The ***homo oeconomicus*** sought after is not the man of exchange, or man the consumer; he is the man of enterprise and production. (p. 147)

Wilhelm Röpke fundamentally sets out the neoliberal social policy in his text 'The Orientation of German Economic Policy' where he says that social policy must aim at:

> the multiplication of the enterprise form within the social body...It is a matter of making the market, competition, and so the enterprise, into what could be called the formative power of society. (cited by Foucault: p. 148)

In his book A *Humane Economy: The Social Framework of the Free Market* (1960)[1958], Röpke's new form of liberalism becomes even more readily apparent. The book aims to establish the appropriate foundations of the market economy by outlining the conditions necessary for the free market beyond the previously accepted context of supply and demand. For such a market order cannot function, he says, "in a social system which is the exact opposite in all respects" (p. 94). The cultural context of the social structure is a part of this and must support this:

> We start from competition.... Competition may have two meanings: it may be an institution for stimulating effort, or it may be a device for regulating and ordering the economic process. In the market economy competition...constitutes therefore an unrivalled solution of the two cardinal problems of any economic system: the problem of the continual inducement to maximum performance and the problem of continuous harmonious ordering and guidance of the economic process. (p. 95)

The foundation for this is not *laissez-faire*; Röpke, like Eucken, and like Simons, is not describing a naturalistic but has succumbed to advocating an historical thesis. *Laissez-faire* was the naïve thesis of early liberalism. For Röpke it was a fiction. "In all honesty, we have to admit that the market economy has a bourgeois foundation" (98).

> The market economy, and with it social and political freedom, can thrive only as a part and under the protection of a bourgeois system. This implies the existence of a society in which certain fundamentals are respected and color the whole network of social relationships ... (p. 98)

Röpke's conception of liberalism is clearly more authoritarian in the sense that it seems to represent an imposed order. Such a view seems reinforced when he acknowledges that:

> In a sound society, leadership, responsibility, and exemplary defense of society's guiding norms and values must be the exalted duty and unchallengeable right of a minority that forms and is willingly and respectfully recognized as the apex of the social pyramid hierarchically structured by performance.... What we need is true *nobilitas naturalis*.... We need a natural nobility whose authority is, fortunately, readily accepted by all men, an elite deriving its title solely from supreme performance and peerless moral example and invested with the moral dignity of such a life .... No free society...which threatens to degenerate into mass society, can subsist without such a class of censors.... (p. 131)

Röpke adds that "the task of leadership falls to the natural aristocracy by virtue of an unwritten but therefore no less valid right which is indistinguishable from duty" (p. 133). Only such persons can save us from the "slowly spreading cancers of our western economy and society" (p. 151), which include the "irresistible advance of the welfare state ..." (p 151).

Hayek and Neoliberalism

Did Friedrich Hayek also accept this new view of 'economic politics'? My answer is not in the same sort of way, although he shared their pro-free market values that they supported. Hayek was too steeped in the classical liberal tradition to easily give up its naturalistic assumptions concerning *laissez-faire* and the conception of the subject who should be trusted as a rational, autonomous citizen and who should remain unconditioned or uncoerced by the state. Yet the theoretical difficulties that afflicted Simons, Buchanan, Eücken, and Röpke, also weighed heavily on Hayek. He not only struggled with the notion of *laissez-faire*, but also appreciated that over time the democratic will of citizens tends to favour restrictions on the free market economics and supports an expanded role for government as respects to both welfare and redistribution.[2]

Although I have written several articles and chapters on Hayek, one is always learning new things. In a PhD doctoral *viva voce* examination on Foucault and neoliberalism that I had the honour to examine at the University of Brighton in 2018, Lars Cornelissen, the disputant, alerted me to several works of Hayek that I had been unaware of. One was an article by Hayek, titled 'Marktwirtschaft und Wirtschaftspolitik'[3], published

2 Hayek blames this on the fact that the prevailing conception of democracy, is as Cornelissen puts it, "rooted in the collectivist tradition, and that as a result, 'the particular set of institutions which today prevails in all Western democracies' is inherently inclined towards unlimited government" (2017a: p. 246). Cornelissen cites Hayek, *Law, Legislation and Liberty*, (2013: p. 345); *New Studies,* (1978, pp. 92, 107, 155).

3 'Market Economy and Economic Politics' (translation).

in the journal *ORDO* in 1954 where Hayek laments the fact that classical economists had not adequately defined 'intervention' because, as Cornelissen summarizes Hayek's view, "many of them held 'economic politics', of the sort advocated by Eucken and Ropke, to be antithetical to 'the fundamental principles of liberalism'" (Cornelissen, 2017: p. 206; citing Hayek, 1954: p. 4).

Being aware of the controversy between classical liberalism and the 'economic politics' of Eucken and Ropke, Hayek is more careful to limit the active role of the state to establishing the juridical structure of society. For Hayek, the creation and maintenance of a competitive order is primarily a *legal* affair. The only type of intervention for an 'economic politics' is in the "permanent juridical framework" as opposed to "constant intervention of state force [*Staatsgewalt*]" (Cornelissen: p. 206; Hayek: p. 5). Hayek thus restricts intervention of the state to the legal order and thus has a much narrower view of active state intervention to establish the 'conditions' of economic activity than does either Röpke or Eücken.

Planning and the Rule of Law

Throughout his career Hayek remained steadfastly committed to the idea that markets best guaranteed the freedom of citizens, and on this ground remained staunchly opposed to all forms of state planning and control. What essentially undermines state planning in Hayek's view is that real knowledge is gained and true economic progress made as a consequence of locally generated knowledge derived from "particular circumstances of time and place" and the state is not privy to such knowledge (Hayek, 1949b: 79). Planning ignores this localistic character of knowledge and thus interferes with the self-regulating mechanism of the market.

It is on these grounds that Hayek argues that the state should only be concerned with the protection of individuals by 'general rules', such as the 'rule of law', but not with what he refers to as "central planning." If we look to Hayek, both to *The Road to Serfdom* (1944) and *The Constitution of Liberty* (1960) where Hayek discusses planning and the rule of law, in contrast to the rule of law's *formal*, and *a priori* character, the plan's approach to decision-making is *ad hoc* and *arbitrary*. A plan also embodies, says Hayek (1944: p. 91) 'substantive' commitments on ends and values, whereas the rules constitutive of the rule of law are 'general', 'formal', 'impartial' and 'systematic' (p. 90-92). Formal rules operate "without reference to time and place or particular people" (p. 92). They refer to "typical situations.... Formal rules are thus merely instrumental in the sense they are expected to be useful to yet unknown people" (p. 92). On the other hand, planning involves "a conscious direction towards a single aim"

(1944: p. 72), and "refuses to recognize various autonomous spheres in which the ends of individuals are supreme" (p. 72). As such the plan embodies general substantive goals linked to the "'the general welfare', or the 'common good', or the 'general interest'" (p. 72). Yet, it is Hayek's view that the welfare of people "cannot be adequately expressed as a single end" (p. 73) for to have such a conception of the general welfare requires a "complete ethical code," which would require knowledge of everything. The difference between the two kinds of approach, says Hayek, is like the difference between the "'Rules of the Road', as in the Highway Code, and ordering people where to go" (1944: p. 91).

A Critique of Hayek's Concept of Planning

Hayek acknowledges that while his distinction between formal rules, and planning "is very important…at the same time [it is] most difficult to draw precisely in practice" (1944: p. 91). This, it seems to me, understates what is problematic about his argument. While his points about the need for general rules that are formal, and apply to all, are highly important, his characterization of planning is largely a caricature, and his arguments against it do not stand serious scrutiny. Indeed, it would seem, as many economists in his own Department at the LSE believed, that any serious analysis of Hayek's arguments leads us straight to Keynesian conclusions.[4]

Hayek's arguments against central planning have been seriously challenged.[5] What is conflated in his treatment is a failure to distinguish 'central planning', as exemplified by the model of the Soviet Union, and aspects of planning in general, as adopted routinely in western democracies.[6] While his arguments may be persuasive against the idea of highly centralized decision-making for the entire economy, beyond this the assessment of his legitimate empirical arguments are difficult to untangle from what is the deeply ingrained ideological nature of his opposition to social democracy or socialism. Certainly the emergence of highly centralized economies of Eastern Europe from the 1920s could be seen to inhibit the emergence of Schumpeter-styled entrepreneurs, and to erode possibilities for enterprise and initiative. As developed in the Soviet Union after

4 Hicks, Kaldor, Lerner. Scitovsky, and Shackle, all deserted Hayek, and became Keynesians in the 1930s.

5 See, for instance, Gray (1984), Hindess (1990), Tomlinson (1990), Gamble (1996).

6 It can be claimed as a bold conjecture at the outset that empirical research has not revealed any significant erosion of democracy in a country like Britain during the period after the inception of the welfare state. Leaders like Asquith claimed that the state was in fact necessary to safeguard freedom.

the Revolution of 1917, the model of state capitalism (*capitalisme de parti*) which was based on the attempts by a single political party to manage the operations of the economy through the direct transmission of orders from the center, including the establishment of centralized socialist trusts, involving the direct control of recruitment, production schedules and wages met with severe problems of the sort Hayek describes. Beyond this, however, it can be claimed that the problem is not so much with planning, but with the broader political model in operation.

That Hayek extends his objections from a concern with Soviet-styled central planning to forms of state planning in western societies, and specifically against those forms of general planning being developed in countries like Britain at the onset of the welfare state constitutes a major problem. For what can be claimed is that there is no objection to planning as such, nor even to central planning, but only against types of planning that are ad hoc and arbitrary, and not subject to democratic controls of auditing, accountability, contestation, debate and revision. Planning, in fact, is amenable to the same types of assessment as Hayek conducts for the rule of law, and like the rule of law, it should comprise codified procedures which are formal, systematic, a priori (written in advance) and general or impartial. Planning also must be democratically accountable. Planning, in this sense is compatible with open economies, individual initiative, local autonomy in decision-making and decentralization.[7]

One important issue that Hayek never considers is whether markets and planning could (or should) co-exist? That is, whether there is not some middle ground position between the 'serfdom' associated with state planning, and the 'freedom' associated with markets. As Jim Tomlinson (1990: 49 fn. 3) notes:

> [I]n his 1945 article, ['The Use of Knowledge in Society'] Hayek typically dismisses any mid-way point between centralised and decentralised planning except 'the delegation of planning to organised industries, or, in other words, monopoly' (p. 521). Plainly this does not exhaust the possibilities of levels of planning, nor does it provide a helpful starting point for discussing mechanisms of planning.[8]

7 There is no evidence that the development of the welfare state, either in Britain from 1945, or New Zealand from 1933, resulted in an erosion of democracy, or human rights under the law, which, if corroborated, would offer an empirical refutation of Hayek's thesis in *The Road to Serfdom* (1944).

8 Hayek, F. (1945) 'The use of knowledge in society', *American Economic Review*, 35(4): pp. 519–530.

Knowledge and Planning

Markets are also preferred to planning on grounds of efficiency and because of the local nature of knowledge. When planning takes the place of markets, mistakes and errors become 'entrenched' because only the price mechanism can coordinate the diverse activities of individuals, says Hayek. Partly, this is due to the absence of local or contextual knowledge which actors in the marketplace have and state bureaucrats don't have. But, although Hayek distinguishes important characteristics of local knowledge, he fails to consider whether other sorts of knowledge might not be important; or perhaps whether or not knowledge might not work differently at the macro, meso, and micro orders of society. To use Hayek's language, from 'The Use of Knowledge in Society', while he celebrates knowledge of 'time and place' which is not accessible to planners, he gives no value to the benefits of 'aggregated' or 'statistical-type' knowledge, which enables perspective, and which could be held to constitute an equally important type of knowledge which 'planners' *do* have, and which is *denied* to agents in local contexts. This later type of knowledge might be claimed to be concerned with general guidelines, limits, or contexts, and coordination, rather than specifically with day to day operations. It therefore maintains a different relation to time and place, and hence, the practical problem which Hayek notes about transmitting information about events which are situationally local, need not arise.[9] Certainly, if planning sought to replace or override market mechanisms, or disregard, interfere with, or over-ride local knowledge, one could see that would constitute a serious problem, but this does not mean that markets and planning cannot compliment and assist each other in turn.[10]

9 Hayek makes this point repeatedly in 'The Use of Knowledge in Society' (1945: p. 525, 526). My point is that a different type of knowledge, concerned with guidelines, or limits, or 'steering', may not be so sensitive to issues of time and place, but may have a longer term frame of reference. An additional point might be that advances in communications technology may make the transmission of what knowledge is relevant to the centre, easier and faster to transmit.

10 Hayek's argument against early communist regimes which sought to replace markets with state planning are indeed valid, but these were based on the idea that markets were not important, and sought amongst other things, to override the price mechanism as a routine matter of policy. I am accepting Hayek's argument that markets convey an important form of knowledge through the price mechanism which determines that the context of operations should be semi-autonomous from the state. This also applies, I would argue, to the family, the educational system, the health system, and personal life, although clearly, there is no such thing as the price mechanism as an indicator of quality. But I am suggesting that the knowledge generated by markets, or in other local contexts, is not the only form of knowledge necessary to a healthy social structure, and that planning can (and must) compliment markets in this quest.

Various distinctions could be made which Hayek also does not make, between 'normal' versus 'exceptional' operations of markets, between the 'macro', 'meso', or 'micro' levels of the economy, or the distinction made above, concerning the context effectively regulated by supply and demand and the price mechanism (where a rough equilibrium may persist for a certain time) versus the context of coordination (requiring macro-management, planning, agenda setting, and steering). While it may well be so that local knowledge and the fragility of the price mechanism means that normal day-to-day operations of markets should be relatively autonomous from the arbitrary interference of the state, there will be exceptional circumstances where 'communicating knowledge to a board' for urgent or non-urgent action is highly appropriate. Within normal markets, behavior which signals exceptional development ('a run on the pound'); or behavior which signals unusual development ('a contaminated product'; 'a suspicious behavior') are cases in point. Just as the doctor-patient relation for the most part is a private contract, evidence of certain types of symptoms must be immediately reported. In addition, there will be routine situations where guiding the economy within established limits require specific actions in line with established policies. Introducing policies to counter economic inequalities in capital accumulation, or to assist in creating fair opportunities, also constitute legitimate activities that can be planned for. Hence, there are different sorts of functions which require different types of coordination, and different types of knowledge.

"In a democratic society", wrote Karl Mannheim, "state sovereignty can be boundlessly strengthened by plenary [planning] powers without renouncing democratic control" (1940: p. 340). Yet, Hayek maintains that democratic assemblies have problems producing a plan. Either they cannot manage the whole view, or obtain adequate knowledge, or, if delegated, they cannot integrate it. (Hayek, 1944: pp. 82–84). Such a claim is highly dubious, especially given the sophisticated planning instruments and communication technologies available today. But regardless of that, government has responsibility to oversee and steer the whole. The delegation of particular powers to separate boards and authorities is a part of that responsibility. Yet the parliamentary system renders the state as democratically accountable, and is as necessary to the formal legitimacy of the rule of law as it is to the formal legitimacy of planning.

Amongst existing democratic mechanisms, parliament is one mechanism of accountability; the official opposition are charged with discussion and debate, and with highlighting abuses, identifying shortcomings, as well as criticizing delegated or contracted groups whose performance is not up to the mark. In addition, the free mass media, as well as institutions

of judicial review, make existing democratic assemblies and procedures crucial underwriters to both the formality and generality of policy, whether through law, or planning, and they legitimate *both* law *and* planning. It is the democratic assemblies which both enable and legitimate the formality of the rule of law, and are accountable for good as opposed to bad legislation.[11] What Hayek doesn't seem to realize is that they are similarly able to perform this function in relation to planning. Through various codified and formal rules of procedure and process, planning can be legitimate or illegitimate. Hence, I would reject Hayek's thesis that "planning leads to dictatorship" (p. 88) or that "dictatorship is essential if planning on a large scale is to be possible" (p. 88), just as I would reject the thesis that planning is necessarily arbitrary.

Another factor makes planning important here. At the start of the twenty-first century, collective action and sophisticated planning operations have become increasingly necessary on all manner of issues ranging from matters relating to general security and the response to crisis and urgency, to arranging social insurance, and the provision of opportunities, structures, and capabilities. on a fair and equitable basis. Increased pressures associated with global population growth, climate change, ecological degradation, nuclear proliferation, terrorism, or economic or political collapse, create a situation in which *not* planning is simply *not an option*. Believing that *laissez-faire* will deliver security and stability for all on a global basis simply constitutes the naïve faith of classical economic liberalism.

While Hayek's opposition to all forms of state planning might be seen as viable if he can argue that the economic system is naturally self-regulating, should this later thesis founder, so the former will also be in difficult straights. Yet, just as we found for Simons, Buchanen, Eücken and Röpke, Hayek's views on the self-regulating capacity of the system, implying *laissez-faire*, do not inspire confidence. Although he had substituted his 'empirical conception' (of *laissez-faire*) for what he considered to be the inadequate neoclassical conception, his 'knowledge papers' of the 1930s and 1940s revealed increasing doubts about both its theoretical and practical viability. In his paper 'Economics and Knowledge,' first presented in 1937, he notes that although traditional experience has more or less

11 Hayek of course sees legislation as emerging in the spontaneous order of society and formed solely out of natural rights. His faltering commitment to laissez-faire and naturalism would make this assumption problematic even on his own terms. But that negative and positive liberty, or state action on such a ground, could be used to justify law *vis-a-vis* planning is disingenuous. The law even it is claimed only to codify natural rights needs *interpreting* and *being acted upon*, and these functions imply a positive dimension to all state action, whether law or planning.

confirmed equilibrium theory "since the empirical observation that prices do tend to correspond to costs was the beginning of our science" (1949a: p. 51), his own confidence in the idea was waning. The following statement is not exactly brimming with confidence:

> I am afraid that I am now getting to a stage where it becomes exceedingly difficult to say what exactly are the assumptions on the basis of which we assert that there will be a tendency toward equilibrium and to claim that our analysis has an application to the real world. I cannot pretend that I have as yet got much further on this point. Consequently all I can do is to ask a number of questions to which we will have to find an answer if we want to be clear about the significance of our argument. (1949a: p. 48)

In the same article, Hayek observes that both Smith and Ricardo had noted that the stability of community structures were essential preconditions for any equilibrium to operate (1949a: 48, note 13).[12] By 1945 in 'The Use of Knowledge in Society', he recognizes that the concept of equilibrium was irrelevant for practical purposes, had "mislead [...] leading thinkers" [in economics], and he represents it as "no more than a useful preliminary to the study of the main problem" (1949b: p. 91). In 'The Meaning of Competition' of 1946, also, he notes how "the modern theory of competitive equilibrium assumes the situation to exist" (1949c: 94). In his doubts, expressed across all of these papers, Hayek's was also to observe that even if it can be recast as an empirical proposition, subject to verification, equilibrium theory then becomes only a possibility rather than an actuality. More to the point, Hayek was by no means certain what sorts of empirical tests could validate it, and he very much doubted "whether [any] such investigations would tell us anything new" (1949a: p. 55). He also notes how simply to assume equilibrium overlooks the negative externalities and global disparities associated with markets, including increasing inequalities of wealth and resources, and increasingly monopolistic behavior of large companies and multinationals. His confidence did not improve in later years.

It was related to these doubts that many economists from Hayek's own Department – Hicks, Kaldor, Lerner. Scitovsky and Shackle

12 He quotes Smith (*The Wealth of Nations*, Bk. I, 116): "In order, however, that this equality [of wages] may take place in the whole of their advantages or disadvantages, three things are required even when there is perfect freedom. First, the employment must be well known and long established in the neighbourhood..."; and David Ricardo, (Letters to Malthus, October 22nd, 1811: p. 18): "It would be no answer to me to say that men were ignorant of the best and cheapest mode of conducting their business and paying their debts, because that is a question of fact, not of science, and might be argued against almost every proposition in Political Economy."

– retreated to Keynesianism under the influence of the Cambridge Model in the 1930s. Shackle reasoned that given Hayek's conception of history emphasizing as it did the limits to reason, uncertainty, spontaneous unpredictable choices, as well as the unpredictability of unintended effects at any single point in time we can have little faith in the logical coherence of market equilibrium over time to 'self-regulate' unless we believe in a metaphysic of nature as functionally optimal at the economic and social levels, or as tending towards the functionally optimal. If the market cannot be relied upon, then what mechanism can guarantee socially optimal consequences for distribution and for the continuance of the market mechanism as a predictable framework in terms of which economic interactions between humans can be guided? Further, what mechanism can guarantee that the effects of the market are not dysfunctional in relation to the social and physical environment? In Shackle's view, these ideas suggest a coordinative mechanism is required, not to substitute for the rational decisions for individuals, but to ensure distribution, security and liberty and to undertake collective action in areas where individuals are unable to address. For Shackle, and his fellow Keynesians at least, planning was clearly back on the agenda.

Keynes had argued something similar to this in his theoretical justifications for the welfare state. In Keynes view, as a general consequence of our ignorance of the future, planning was an essential feature of the welfare state. In a letter he wrote to Hayek while on the ocean liner *en route* to Bretton Woods Conference in June 1944, after reading Hayek's book *The Road to Serfdom*, in what could possibly be seen as a case of classic understatement, Keynes (1980: pp. 385–8) raises the issue that he regards Hayek as not addressing or resolving:

> I come finally to what is really my only serious criticism of the book. You admit here and there that it is a question of knowing where to draw the line. You agree that the line has to be drawn somewhere [between free markets and planning], but that the logical extreme is not possible. But you give us no guidance whatever as to where to draw it. In a sense this is shirking the practical issue. It is true that you and I would probably draw it in different places. I should guess that according to my ideas you greatly under-estimate the practicality of the middle course. But as soon as you admit that the extreme is not possible, and that a line has to be drawn, you are, on your own argument, done for since you are trying to persuade us that as soon as one moves an inch in the planned direction you are necessarily launched on the slippery path which will lead you in due course over the precipice. I should therefore conclude

> your theme rather differently. I should say that what we want is not no planning, or even less planning, indeed I should say that we almost certainly want more.

Lars Cornelissen on Hayek and Democracy

One question remains for Hayek is how, if the state can intervene only in the legal structures of society, through formal processes, is Hayek able to protect free market economics from the possibility of democratic rejection. This is, after all, why Eücken and Röpke wanted state intervention to establish the 'conditions' of an enterprise culture in a much broader sense; not only legal, but political, cultural, and educational as well. This is an important question for Hayek especially given his own doubts about the efficacy of *laissez-faire*. The answer is, as Cornelissen argues, Hayek has a vastly attenuated conception of democracy which:

> must give way to a form of constitutionalism that explicitly seeks to eliminate popular sovereignty. This … does not entail a principled rejection of democracy. Rather, it comprises a far reaching restriction of the democratic mechanism, such that democratic citizens may exert an influence on the governmental apparatus but are simultaneously prevented from changing the overarching legal framework. (2017: p. 222)

Hence, Cornelissen argues that "the primary aim of Hayek's democratic theory is to banish popular sovereignty from political thought" (p. 223).

Noting that Hayek's democratic theory constitutes the "privileged object of analysis for a critical account of the place occupied by democracy in neoliberal thought" (p. 226), Cornelissen start's by noting Hayek's "ambivalence towards democracy" (p. 244), and his decision to limit it to "describe a method of government – namely majority rule" (p. 244). Democracy then constitutes a "method of deciding but emphatically not 'an authority for what the decision ought to be'" (p. 244). In general terms Hayek claims to support democracy as the best method of change; as the best mechanism compatible with liberty, and as the best method for educating the majority, because it has better results overall. At the same time, Hayek makes frequent negative comments about democracy, or aspects of democracy. Cornelissen notes Hayek's antipathy to what he refers to as "the doctrinaire democrat" (cited from Cornelissen: p. 245). In a previous article of my own I also noted Hayek's disparaging reference to forms of "plebiscitarian dictatorship" (1944: p. 86), which may suggest a rather disrespectful slur on citizens in general. Various negative comments can be

found, such as in *The Constitution of Liberty* (1960) where Hayek says: "[t]hose who profess that democracy is all-competent and support all that the majority wants at any given moment are working for its fall" (1960: p. 183). Cornelissen concedes however that as he aged, Hayek became inclined to mount a principled defense of democratic government" (p. 245). Where he falters, in Cornelissen's view, is in the model democratic constitution he develops in volume 3 of *Law, Legislation and Liberty.* Here, Hayek favours the establishment of both a representative government as well as an upper house legislature, the latter which would "completely be insulated from popular control" (p. 253). As Cornelissen continues:

> In Hayek's model constitution, then, the average citizen can exert some influence on the direction of government, thus modestly guiding the allocation of public resources, but has virtually no control over the law, which is articulated by a council, consisting of 'wise and fair' legislators, that can neither be recalled nor corrected by the people. In Hayekian democracy, concisely put, each individual citizen is equal before the law over which they can exert no significant control. (pp. 253–54).

It is perhaps unfair to suggest that Hayek's model constitution invokes 'echoes' of Plato's Guardian Rulers.[13] Yet, Cornelissen notes that Pierre Rosanvallon also observes that Hayek has "'abandoned' the 'democratic idea,' in "radically severing the concept of democracy from legislation" and thereby in insulating legislation from popular sovereignty (Cornelissen: p. 254, citing Rosanvallon: p. 153).[14]

Education

For Foucault, the fear of power does not in his case give rise to an unbridled love of markets. Foucault makes it clear in 'The Risks of Security' that the he is no supporter of those who denigrate the state:

13 Unfair, of course, in that Plato was not a democrat, and opposed democracy. Yet, many of the details of Hayek's constitution seem to be excessively protective of the legislators with respect to immunizing them from economic hardship once they have served their time. He specifies, for instance, elaborate conditions and 'safeguards' such as that members of the legislature should be elected for reasonably long periods, of fifteen years so that they would not be subject to insecurity. Only people "who have proved themselves in the ordinary business of life" should be eligible for election; they should only be removable for "gross misconduct"; after serving their term "they should not be re-eligible nor forced to return to earning a living in the market but be assured of continual public employment." See Volume III of *Law, Legislation and Liberty*, pp. 95–96, 448–50.

14 Cornelissen argues that the separation of legislation from democracy became increasingly pronounced in Hayek's thought over time, reaching its ultimate status as part of the spontaneous order of society in Volume 3 of *Law, Legislation and Liberty.* There is, it seems more scope for further study of Hayek's conception of democracy.

> In fact, the idea of an opposition between civil society and the state was formulated in a given context in response to a precise intention: some liberal economists proposed it at the end of the eighteenth century to limit the sphere of action of the state, civil society being conceived of as the locus of an autonomous economic process. This was a quasi-polemical concept, opposed to administrative options of states of that era, so that a certain liberalism could flourish. (2000: p. 372).

Foucault's writings on neoliberalism represent it as a dis-equalizing and anti-democratic force.[15] What is more important, however, is that while liberalism represented man as free and uncoerced, who obeyed market laws because they were natural laws, as if ruled by an 'invisible hand,' in Smith's words, neoliberalism is authoritarian in important respects. This is in the sense that the faltering confidence in *laissez-faire* and naturalism by liberals led those we can dub as neoliberals to advocate the necessity of the state constructing the 'framework' and the 'conditions' by which the free market could be assured. What we have seen is that for the German ordo liberals, their distrust in *laissez-faire* has meant that rather than see the market as natural they see it as historical and in need of conditioning by the state. There is the danger, of course, that this function will be progressively 'immunized' from genuine democratic contestation or control.

Amongst the public sector institutions who constitute part of the 'conditions' for a competitive market economy, are the various educational institutions, from pre-school to higher education, including universities. In higher education, for instance, neoliberal governmentality has subverted what I have called elsewhere a 'collegial-democratic' model and replaced it with a new model based upon external audits and performance appraisals, premised upon performance incentive targets and increased monitoring and managerialism.[16] You can see the top-down, authoritarian aspect of neoliberalism in the new forms of governmentality implemented from the 1980s in universities. It gives a new significance to the notion of 'rule by managers' when one understands that the neoliberal theorists advocated the interpellation of a new strata of managers to counter the classical liberal conception of professionalism, based as it was upon an autonomy of spheres, and to counter it as a form of what Buchanan refers to as 'rent-seeking' behavior. In Britain, four years after Margaret Thatcher was elected, for instance, the Griffith Report of 1983 premised reforms for the health sector, which included the creation of a new senior management

15 But see Zamora and Behrent (2016) who maintain a contrary thesis.

16 See Raaper and Olssen, 2016.

roles in the NHS, in order to replace the traditional management functions in health as carried out by professional medical staff. This emergence of a stratum of dedicated professional managers quickly became embedded in legislation and transferred laterally from health to higher education and then across the entire public sector. Ideas of 'internal markets' were also current in relation to health in the 1980s, and received expression in health the 1989 White Paper, 'Working for Patients'. New models of 'student-led' funding and new corporate managerial models of governance and line-management were also implemented at this time, feeding off theoretical ideas developed in supply-side economics, public choice theory, agency theory, and transaction-cost economics. Ideas of line-management, based upon 'principal-agent' hierarchies of command and compliance replaced 'collegial-democratic' patterns of governance based upon classical liberal models of professionalism premised upon autonomy and self-governance, exercised through Senates. Suggestions that universities should increase the appointments of lay and business personnel on councils and boards of governors, as advocated in America by McCormick and Meiners (1988), was intended to reduce academic internal influence and increase the responsiveness of universities to the outside business community. Further governance ideas and techniques saw the downgrading of the influence of Senates, the rise of closed 'executive boards,' to augment the implementation of line-management systems. In Britain, the major responsibility for all of these developments emanates directly from the state through the funding councils. The major levers are all imposed by the state, which itself responds to global interests. The revolution in the way universities were run was world-wide. Collegial models of self-governance premised upon autonomous institutional spheres are replaced by 'top-down' managerial models, directed from the center – the state and global capital.

This also undermines universities semi-autonomous power within civil society, which is itself historically important in terms of understanding liberalism as a natural autonomous system of the different spheres of society and of the free expression of rational individuals. Universities, as once-upon-a-time, a fifth estate, a critical bulwark for the safeguarding of democracy, are now in this new age of neoliberalism, compromised in relation to the powers of business, superbly administered by the state. The neoliberals' analysis seems particularly apt as a form of market rationality. The abolition of tenure and the enforcement of new norms with regards to research, research funding, and teaching, means that most academics are too intent on watching their backs to speak of opposition or serious critique. The assessment of 'impact' in Britain escalates this process, and

seeks now to control and monitor the 'content' of what universities produce, to render knowledge production as 'useful' for the society. In this sense, it constitutes a very worrying 'sign' especially given the epistemic difficulties with the way impact is capable of being assessed. The implications for democracy here are in a number of senses: in relation to the end of self-governance through collegial models of academic participation, as well as externally through the erosion of the independent critical authority of universities, relatively free of dependence on finance, in relation to business and the state.

In higher education, state conditioning or engineering has substantially undercut the university as a traditional liberal institution. For the difference between liberal and neo-liberal is important here. The liberal university was premised upon the freedom of the subject and the dispersal of power across different domains. The parallel at the institutional level was what I have called elsewhere the 'collegial-democratic' model administered and managed by academics themselves institutionally provided for by democratic forum of senates.[17] The neoliberal university is top-down, run from the center. While neoliberals typically heralded their policies with catch-cries of freedom and liberty, neo-liberalism is in fact a highly centrist, authoritarian, form of liberalism. Distrusting *lasissez-faire* naturalism, they came to share the same perspective on the economy as writers like Karl Mannheim[18] and Karl Polanyi[19] who saw the market order as a historical rather than a natural construct. Whereas Mannheim and Polanyi argued that the government should control and condition the market in order to redistribute wealth in the interests of greater equality, and protect freedom, the neoliberals argued that it should work in the interests of capital by creating the conditions for the market to operate as efficiently as possible. The state conditions the market in order that subjects conform.

Perhaps we could conclude this paper by asking a number of questions designed to highlight the possible problems with neoliberal governance: Why did the neoliberals feel uneasy with naturalistic explanations of the market and start seeing it as an historical phenomenon that must be conditioned? Is there a problem with naturalistic explanations? Does intervention by the state to establish and maintain the conditions for the market run the risk of frustrating the democratic aspirations and rights of citizens? Could such action by the state be seen to contradict the core

17 See Raaper and Olssen (2016).
18 See Mannheim (1940, 1977).
19 See Polanyi (2001).

principles upon which classical liberalism was founded upon? In whose interests ought the government to act in legislating laws for society? In creating the conditions for competitive market behaviour, is the state reflecting the interests of the whole society or of particular groups in the society? Is it appropriate to subject higher education institutions, such as universities, to market norms of competition as a general strategy of administration and governance? In what ways is education not like other consumer commodities? What are the costs and benefits of such policies in relation to education? The neoliberals said that academics, teachers and educators were not subject to reliable standards of accountability, but, could accountability be organized that didn't involve the competitive restructuring of the entire system of education? Do competitive norms conflict with those norms that are deemed to be important in education? What is the difference between treating education as a market commodity, as opposed to treating it as a public good? Do supply-side funding policies, such as student fees, exercise conservative pressures on curriculum planners? If so, in what ways? What other effects might they have? Given the relatively modest salaries that are paid to academics and educators, to what extent are academic change-management strategies, such as restructuring, which were initially introduced for those in management on very high incomes, acceptable to use in education institutions? To what extent are managers any less biased or subject to 'provider-capture' than academics? Have managers or educators and academics become more or less professionalized over the last thirty years? Is there a conflict of interest between professional managers on the one hand and educators on the other?

References

Buchanan, J. (1975) *The Limits of Liberty: Between Anarchy and Leviathan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cornelissen, L.S. (2017a) The Market and the People: On the Incompatibility of Neoliberalism and Democracy. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the University of Brighton for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, December, 2017.

Cornelissen, L.S. (2017b) How Can the People Be Restricted?: The Mont Pelerin Society and the Problem of Democracy, 1947–1998. *History of European Ideas* 43(5), pp. 507–524.

Cornelissen, L.S. (2017c) The Secularization of Providential Order: F. A. Hayek's Political-Economic Theology. *Political Theology*, 18(8), pp. 660–676.

DeLong, J. B. (1990) In Defense of Henry Simon's Standing as a Classical Liberal. *Cato Journal*, 9(3), pp. 601–18.

Eücken, W. (1951) *The Unsuccessful Age, Or, The Pains of Economic Progress*, Edinburgh, 1951, William Hodge and Company.

Eücken, W. (1989) What Kind of Economic and Social System? In A. Peacock & H. Willgerodt *[*eds.*]*, *Germany's Social Market Economy: Origins and Evolution*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Eücken, W. (1992 [1940]) *Foundations of Economics: History and Theory in the Analysis of Economic Reality [*trans. T. W. Hutchinson*]*. Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Foucault, M. (2000) The Risks of Security. In: J. Faubion *[*ed.*]*, *The Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954–1984: Vol. 3: Power*, pp. 365–381. London: Allen Lane/The Penguin Press.

Foucault, M. (2008) *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978-1979 [*ed. M. Senellart, trans. G. Burchell*]*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gamble, A. (1996) *Hayek: The Iron Cage of Liberty,* New York: Avalon Publishing.

Gray, J. (1984) *Hayek on Liberty*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hayek, F.A. (1944) *The Road to Serfdom*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hayek, F.A. (1945) The Use of Knowledge in Society. *American Economic Review*, 35(4), pp. 519–530.

Hayek, F.A. (1949a) Economics and Knowledge. In: F.A. Hayek, *Individualism and Economic Order*, pp. 33–56. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hayek, F.A. (1949b)[1945] The Use of Knowledge in Society. In: F.A. Hayek, *Individualism and Economic Order*, pp. 77–91. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hayek, F.A. (1949c) The Meaning of Competition. In: F.A. Hayek, *Individualism and Economic Order*, pp. 92–106. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hayek, F.A. (1949d) Socialist Calculation I: The Nature and History of the Problem. In: F.A. Hayek, *Individualism and Economic Order*, pp. 119–147. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hayek, F.A. (1949e) Socialist Calculation II: The State of the Debate' [1935]. In: F.A. Hayek, *Individualism and Economic Order*, pp. 148–180. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hayek, F.A. (1949f) Socialist Calculation III: The 'Competitive' Solution. In: F.A. Hayek, *Individualism and Economic Order*, pp. 181–219. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hayek, F.A. (1954) Marktwirtschaft und Wirtschaftspolitik. *ORDO: Jahrbuch für die Ordnung von Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 6(4), pp. 3–17.

Hayek, F.A. (1960) *The Constitution of Liberty.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hayek, F.A. (2013) *Law, Legislation & Liberty: A New Statement of Liberal Principles of Justice and Political Economy (3 Vols.).* London: Routledge Classics.

Hayek, F.A. (1978) *New Studies in Philosophy, Politics, Economics and the History of Ideas,* London: Routledge.

Hindess, B. (1990) Liberty and Equality. In: B. Hindess [ed.], *Reactions to the Right*, pp. 7–31. London: Routledge.

Keynes, J.M. (1980) Keynes letter to Hayek, 28th June 1944. In: D. Moggridge [ed.], *Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes*, Vol. 27, (Activities 1940–1946), pp. 385–388. London: Macmillan/Cambridge University Press.

Kitch, E. W. (ed.) (1983) The Fire of Truth: A Remembrance of Law and Economics at Chicago, 1932–1970. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26(1), pp. 163–234.

Mannheim, K. (1940 [1935]). *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction*, trans. E. Shils, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.

Mannheim, K. (1977 [1951]). *Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning*, Arbington: Routledge.

Olssen, M., Codd. J., O'Neill, A-M. (2004) *Education Policy: Citizenship, Globalization, Democracy*. London: Sage.

Olssen, M. (2010) *Liberalism, Neoliberalism, Social Democracy: Thin Communitarian Perspectives on Political Philosophy and Education*. New York: Routledge.

Olssen, M. (2016) Neoliberalism and Higher Education Today: Research, Accountability and Impact. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 37(1), pp. 129–148.

Olssen, M. (2018) Neoliberalism & Democracy: A Foucauldian Perspective on Public Choice Theory, Ordo Liberalism and the Concept of the Public Good. In: D. Cahill, M. Konings, M. Cooper & D. Primrose [eds.], *Sage Handbook on Neoliberalism*, pp. 384–396. London: Sage Publications.

Polanyi, K. (2001 [1944]). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, 2nd edition, Boston: Beacon Press.

Raaper, R. & Olssen, M. (2016) Mark Olssen on the Neoliberalisation of Higher Education and Academic Lives: An Interview. *Policy Futures in Education*, 14(2), pp. 147–163.

Röpke, W. (1971) [1958]. *A Humane Economy: The Social Framework of the Market Economy*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, Inc.

Rosanvallon, P. (2011[2008]) *Democratic Legitimacy: Impartiality, Reflexivity, Proximity*, trans, A. Goldhammer, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Simons, H. (1934) *A Positive Program for Laissez-Faire: Some Proposals for a Liberal Economic Policy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Simons, H. (1947) *Economic Policy for a Free Society*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tomlinson, J. (1990) Market Socialism: A Basis for Socialist Renewal? In: B. Hindess *[*ed.*]*, *Reactions to the Right,* pp. 32–49. London: Routledge.

Zamora, D. & Michael C. B. *[*eds.*]* (2016) *Foucault and Neoliberalism*, London: Polity.

Neoliberalism as Political Discourse: The Political Arithmetic of *Homo oeconomicus*

Michael A. Peters

Of all 'discourse', governed by desire of knowledge there is at last an 'end', either by attaining or by giving over. And in the chain of discourse, wheresoever it be interrupted, there is an end for that time. If the discourse be merely mental, it consisteth of thoughts that the thing will be, and will not be; or that it has been, and has not been, alternately. So that wheresoever you break off the chain of a man's discourse, you leave him a presumption of 'it will be,' or 'it will not be,' or 'it has been,' or 'has not been.'
Hobbes (2009) Of Man, Being the First Part of *Leviathan*, p. 22. Cited in Hasse (2007)

Introduction: Genealogy of Political Discourse

The Middle English *discours* comes from the Medieval Latin *discursus*, meaning argument argument, or conversation, although it does also have the connotation in Latin of the act of running about, from *discurrere* (*dis-* + *currere* to run). The late Middle English denotes the process of reasoning and adds the sense of a verbal exchange of ideas, or more precisely, a formal and orderly and usually extended expression of thought on a subject as a means of organizing knowledge and experience rooted both in language and history. Critical discourse thus refers to the capacity of discourse to order our thoughts on a topic or institution in a rational way. This exemplifies the use of Hobbes in the opening quotation where refers to the chain of discourse 'governed by the desire of knowledge'. It was also commonplace in the late 17th century when 'political discourse' became an established branch of discourse that dealt with and theorised civil society in relation to its principles and prime elements. The conception of political discourse and its analysis was revived in the twentieth century especially in the work of Michael Foucault and those following him (such as Fairclough, and Ball) turn political discourse into a specific mode of theoretical analysis for understanding politics and policy more specifically. Political discourse analysis has also been put to good use in Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's blended Marxist, poststructuralist, and psychoanalytic theory (Torfing, 1999; Smith, 1998). In particular, there was an explosion of interest in discourse theory with the production of leadings texts by the critical historian Hayden White (1978) who wrote

Tropics of Discourse strongly influenced by Foucault, and van Dijk (1984) who edited an early handbook from the perspective of social linguistics.

At the beginning of the 1990s there were a spate of new texts including van Burman and Parker (1993); Dijk (1997); Potter and Wetherell (1987) as well as new journals such as *Discourse and Society*, *Discourse Studies*, and *Discourse Processes* and new textbooks (Macdonnell, 1986; Mills, 1997; Williams, (1999).[1] This disciplinary formation indicated that the early interests of Foucault and Barthes in the 1970s, themselves a product of developments in structural linguistics, literary analytics and the 'linguistic turn' more generally, were developed as standard methodologies in the late 1980s and 1990s and the became the new common-sense procedures in the social sciences in opposition to empiricist and positivist research. Discourse analysis and political discourse analysis had arrive truly arrived and become academically institutionalised as a, perhaps *the*, major theoretical and methodological approach of the late twentieth century.

Part of the appeal and promise of these new discourse approaches and methodologies is that they provided relatively easy access to policy as discourse and to new theoretical understandings of the old Marxist question of ideology and power. Certainly, one of the major questions facing us as social scientists is how the ideology of the market finds its way into ordinary language in advanced liberal democracies that were once welfare states, to become so much public common-sense and part of our everyday reality? Today discourse theory and approach are routinely adopted as methodologies to explain the behaviour of people and events as well as the formation of public policy. How does discourse analysis become second nature? How does the discourse become the preferred form of political conversation and analysis in a fundamental movement from a moral vocabulary of social democracy to a language of rational choice and marketspeak?

We can be certain that this is not just a shift of discourse but rather a more profound shift in the underlying philosophy of language and political reality that guides the historical transition from liberalism to neoliberalism – let's say the *shift of governmentalities* reflected in the emergence of neoliberal discourses (in the plural): philosophical discourses in the form of doctrines, treatises, and scholarly works in related disciplines of political philosophy and political economy; statements, party manifestoes and political advertising; conferences presentations and the development

1 I based my brief survey here on the useful footnote (fn. 1) by David Howarth and Yannis Stavrakakis (2000) 'Introducing Discourse Theory and Political Analysis' in Howarth; Norval & Stavrakaki (2000).

methodologies, academic articles and books, and not least policies that aim at implementing and giving concrete expression and application to a range of related ideas to reconstruct society as economy.

One of the most enduring revolutionary make-overs of the humanities and the social sciences came with the turn to language. In the early twentieth century under the influence of a variety of formalisms, language entered into a structuralist mode of understanding that quickly became a scientific and systematic orientation to poetics and to language, considered as a system through semiotic means. This was not *one* tendency and was open to various technical developments: Russian, Czech and Polish Formalisms (Shklovsky, Jacobson, Levý) in literary theory that became the basis for Prague and French structuralism (e.g., Levi-Strauss, Barthes, Foucault), aided by Saussurian insights from structuralist linguistics that became the predominant approach to cultural phenomena such as myths, rituals, and kinship relations. This movement in language philosophy and linguistics was also supported by different moments in analytical philosophy that took the form of verificationism and later, ordinary language analysis, after Wittgenstein and Austin. Nor should we forget the growing influence of the powerful paradigm in semiotics developed by Peirce as the philosophical study of signs, based on the triadic relations of sign, its object, and its interpretant; or, Bakhtin's dialogism maintaining that all language and thought is dialogical, meaning that all language is dynamic, relational, and engaged in a process of endless redescriptions of the world. Ideal language philosophy promised to develop a language based on symbolic logic free from all ambiguity to create a picture of reality. Ordinary language philosophy saw language as the key to both the content and method proper to philosophy fostering the view that philosophical problems are linguistic problems that can be resolve through linguistic analysis. Continental structuralism a method of interpretation and analysis of aspects of culture, cognition and behaviour analysable through the relational aspects of language as a system. Poststructuralism defined itself by opposition to the critique of structuralism, decentring the centrality of structures in culture, consciousness and language with an approach to the text and textual analysis that focused less on the author and more on the reader, a fictional view of the self as a unitary autonomous subject, and the text as a result of multi-faceted interpretations interrupted by power and social relations.

If there is one word that emerged from this divergent configuration it was the concept of discourse, now so commonplace and taken for granted that it is ever barely mentioned accept in a methodological sense. Discourse modelled on coded conversation became the window to the social world of practices and policy directed to the analysis of statements.

Discourse as the monster concept of the twentieth century, along with 'discursive formation', was applied to disciplines like political economy and public policy, and across the social sciences. Discourse related to a formal way of thinking through language defining different genres, and identifying theoretical statements, that led to questions of power and questions about the state. The concept soon gave way to 'discourse analysis' especially in a political sense during the 1970s that served as the means for analysing public policy in a post-positivistic approach that was sensitive to institutions, bodies of knowledge and questions of power. In the first instance, it drew methodological lessons and analytical tools from literary structuralism, textual exegesis and hermeneutics. 'Critical discourse analysis' (CDA) developed in the 1970s as a methodology for analysing political speech acts by relating them to the wider socio-political context. Michel Foucault was one of the first to theorise discourse as social practices that organise knowledge in relation to larger historical *epistemes*. The discourses are seen to be produced by the effects of power which legitimate knowledge and truth, and construct meaning and certain kinds of subjects.

By the time neoliberalism first came on the scene in the first phase of the shift from political philosophy to policy in the 1980s, well after Hayek's formation of the Mt Perelin Society, with the elections of Thatcher and Reagan, the apparatus for the social anatomy of policy through 'critical discourse analysis' was well established. The political evolution of neoliberalism as a Discourse (with a big D, as opposed to a small d, standing for discourses) can be traced through the emergence of the figure of *homo oeconomicus* as a construction of human beings as economic agents who operate consistently in markets as rational and self-interested 'utility maxmisers'. The term historically appeared in early works of political economy such as Mill's (1836) 'On the Definition of Political Economy, and on the Method of Investigation Proper to It.' Adam Smith in *The Wealth of Nations* spelt out the notion of self-interest. Economists of the nineteenth and twentieth century built *mathematical* models based on these assumptions. The inherited philosophical concepts and assumptions of rational choice actually go back to the beginnings of political economy that experienced various revivals through to the development of the main schools of economic liberalism in the twentieth century that Foucault (2009) identifies in *The Birth of Biopolitics*.

Discursus Politicus

In 'The History of Discourse as Literary History' Fee-Alexandra Haase (2007) traces 'discourse' to dialectics in the Greek philosophical tradition

where discourse was practiced and learned by the public speakers in Athenian democracy according to logic principles. While its origins goes back to antiquity and specifically to the problem of truth and rhetoric in democracy the concept emerges in the medieval era as type and genre with early works by Ockham, Godefroy and Causanus and in Latin writings in Europe, for example, *Discursus Politicus de Societatis Civilis Primis Elementis* by Johannes Gotthard von Böckel (1677), that provide the following typology of modern times:

> *Discursus Politicus - Political Discourse - Deliberation*
> Discursus Academicus – Academic Discourse - Education
> Discursus -Panegyricus - Panegyrical Discourse - Entertainment
> Discursus Iudicialis - Legal Discourse – Law
> (From Haase, 2007: p. 6)

Haase (2007) provides a potted history of discourse – 'European Reception of the Concept "Discourse" and the Literature on Discourse in the 15th to 19th Century' starting with Hobbes and working through to Hume, and Locke. Descartes, he suggests, was the first to write about reason and discourse in his *Discourse On the Method of Rightly Conducting the Reason*. In the 19th century discourse was rendered as rhetoric by the likes of Theodore W. Hunt who wrote *The Principles of Written Discourse*. Haase's (2007) brief history mentions Wittgenstein on the limits of discourse as well as the dominant theorists of Saussure and Foucault. Haase's (2007) paper is insightful but inconsistent and risks losing its focus – the link between Saussure (misspelt) and Foucault is tenuous and left unexplained. One of the problems is that he uses secondary texts to explain different theorists including Foucault.

There is no doubt of Foucault's importance as one of the thinkers who encouraged the development of discourse theory and in particular political discourse theory. One has to go no further than Foucault inaugural lecture at the College de France when he was elected to the college in 1970. 'The Order of Discourse', a classic text by Foucault in every sense – bold, complex, historically detailed, shadowing the early concept of power/knowledge – was an inaugural lecture at the Collège de France, given on Dec. 2, 1970, and published in French as *L'Ordre du Discours* (Paris: Gallimard, 1970). He begins self-referentially by commenting on the context of his own lecture and commenting "that in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organised and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade

its ponderous, formidable materiality" ("The Order of Discourse" 52). He mentions the 'procedures of exclusion': prohibition; division of discourses (based on madness and reason); the opposition between truth and falsity; and, internal procedures, including the principles of order within discourse: commentary (canonical texts and their commentary); the author, as an organising principle (the author-function); disciplinarity and how discourse constitute autonomous knowledge systems. Foucault also approaches the conditions to the access of discourse: how and who enters the discourse; societies of discourse; doctrines; appropriations, in particular its social appropriation. He comes at last to philosophical themes and the notion of ideal truth as the law of discourse, a kind of immanent rationality as the principle for the development of discourse and what he calls the founding subject, the rational autonomous self that is the agent of liberal, the holder of rights, and the foundation of Kantian morality.

Homo Oeconomicus and The Rise of Rational Choice

> Some wag in a student blog had written: 'My neoliberal university made me a rational utility maximiser!' Another had written underneath it: 'Ok for economics but not good for me doing classics'. Someone else had typed: 'If I send me the language, will he make me one too?' Someone else again wrote: 'I'm doing economics, but utility maximization is too narrow as a model of rationality'. And another wrote: 'Where's emotion? I'm a passionate guy!' To which someone responded: 'I'm a leeming: buy, buy, buy.' And yet another student wrote: 'Ebullient losers!'. Another: 'You really know how to hurt a guy. I'm studying behavioural finance!' Others responses were hurriedly written: 'Nudge, nudge – welcome to the architecture of choice'; 'Oh rational choice – what of *The Theory of Moral Sentiments?';* "I am risk averse'; 'Can anyone tell me the difference between 'expected utility' and 'dependent utility' theory?' Immediately below some smart fellow: 'Has anyone heard of cumulative irrationality? I'm in a sinking boat in the ecosphere!' 'Hey, human judgement and decision making under uncertainty is not perfect'; 'I am into 'reciprocal altruism' and 'inequity aversion' – anyone want to play?'[2]

The theme of the knowing and founding subject is particularly apt here because it is a substantial philosophical motif animating political discourse as it is invested by the concepts of liberalism as a political ideology. The liberal self – the rational autonomous actor of liberalism developed in the prior two hundred years becomes the 'rational utility maxmiser', the

2 This is a piece of fiction I employ as a pedagogical device.

rational choice maker of neoliberalism as it is embedded in the revival of neoclassical *homo economicus*. The transition from Kantian moral theory to neoliberal economic theory via rational choice theory is complete. The discourse has generated a transformation, a mutation that springs to life as an abstract genderless creature that is radically individualist impervious to context, to culture, to desire, and a calculus. Could anything be less human?

At the same time this abstract figure of moral discourse and economic discourse represents gains and losses. It harbours of old moral categories buried deep in its formulations yet it provides an easy calculus, a means of measurement that the discourse demands. And yet *homo economicus* also is constituted through three assumptions: (1) the assumption of individualism – all choice makers are individuals and even firms are modelled on this; (2) the assumption of rationality, a rather old-fashioned out-of-date concept that suffers from its Cartesian heritage of a disembodied calculating mind; and, last but not least, the assumption of self-interest. The critique of neoliberalism, to my mind, revolves around the criticism of each of these three assumptions: their abstract economic imperialism against other behaviourial models in anthropology, philosophy and psychology; the essentialist construction based on foundationalist epistemology and ethics; the gendered nature of *homo economicus* and its culturalist abstraction of a single white male; the individualist bias against all forms of collectivist decision-making based on the family, the group and class; the profound critique of rationality by reference to the psychology of preference formation and the psychoanalytic demonstration of various forms of unconscious irrationality; the attack on the underlying concept of the self in 'self-interest' as a rational utility maximiser. Of course, these are all the mark of the beginnings of political economy as a discourse emerging from 'natural philosophy', especially in Scottish and French Enlightenment thought before the disciplinary formation of economics, politics and philosophy proper. These features or characteristics of the discourse of political economy have passed into political and economic theory mostly without revisions or reflection. The influence of social context as recognised in concepts of 'bounded rationality' or 'social rationality' only recently lead us to talk of 'situated rationality', or even 'exuberant irrationality' in behavioural finance and accounting. The old discourse of political economy of the liberal economist at the time of Marx (including Smith and Ricardo) live on in 17th century abstract figures that reflect the categories of Cartesian science.

Deconstructing neoliberal discourse in general terms we can say that a commitment to the free market involves two sets of claims: (i) claims

for the efficiency of the market as a superior allocative mechanism for the distribution of scarce public resources; and, (ii) claims for the market as a morally superior form of political economy. This simple historical naïve and unreflective revival of *homo oeconomicus* involves a return to a crude form of individualism which is competitive, 'possessive' and often construed in terms of 'consumer sovereignty' ('consumer is king'). The argument of public choice is then to set about redesigning public services by making them *consumer-driven*, and, for example, creating the student as a consumer of education, or citizen as a consumer of health which also means that these services can be easily privatised and marketised.

In terms of political economy, the market-driven ideology puts an emphasis on freedom over equality where 'freedom' is construed as the capacity to exercise a rational choice in the marketplace based on one's self-interest. This underlying concept of freedom is both negative and strictly individualistic. Negative freedom is freedom from state interference which implies an acceptance of inequalities generated by the market. The discourse of the neoliberal market thus changes the emphasis and priority of values of freedom and equality reversing these values in the transformation of welfare state discourse to neoliberal market discourse. Neoliberalism as pure theory adopts an anti-state, anti-bureaucracy stance, with attacks on 'big government' and 'big bureaucracy'. Its tries to replace state paternalism, big mummy state, arguing that the individual better placed that the state to purchase their own education and health arrangements. The attack on `big' government made on the basis of both economic and moral arguments, and tends to lead corporatisation and privatisation strategies to limit the state. Foucault draws our attention to the fact that liberalism is a doctrine of the self-limiting state – it is of course against all forms of totalitarianism and Fascism (that by contrast holds there is nothing outside the state). The doctrine of the self-limiting state has blind faith in the market as a mechanism of distribution of resources that in the long-term results in a trickled down equality. It ignores the way that markets can be controlled by huge utilities and oligarchies that care little for the rights of consumers or for the inequalities generated by the market as Thomas Pickerty has demonstrated so well. Often this discourse framed up as theory or doctrine is written up as a protection of the individual's rights against the state. In the digital age, such protection means protection of personal data and privacy but little protection for the way capitalism relies on advertising and psychological digital profiling that active in preference formation especially for the pre-verbal very young that it schools as consumers. It is also the case in practice that neoliberalism, pure market doctrine, has achieved power through a marriage

with conservativism touting a moral conservativism that is anti-socialist, anti-feminist and anti-immigrant.

Education as a Commodity

In terms of education the discourse of neoliberalism became a discourse aimed at changing the prevailing discourse of public policy that developed after WWII as one derived from social welfare, state redistributive policies, and social democracy. It aimed to convince voters that education shares the main characteristics of other commodities traded in the marketplace, and that it is not a 'public good'. The benefits of education accrue to individuals, it is argued. Often neoliberal have argued that we have been too optimistic about the ability of education to contribute to economic growth and equality of opportunity. Furthermore, they argue increased expenditure in education does not necessarily improve educational standards or equality of opportunity, or, indeed, lead to improved economic performance. The standard argument is that the education system has performed badly despite absorbing increased state expenditure. Sometimes, this argument has been supported by a manufactured discourse of 'crisis' – the crisis of educational standards, the crisis of teacher education, the crisis of literacy.

The neoliberal discourse suggest that the reason education has performed badly is because teachers and the educational establishment have pursued their own self-interest rather than those of pupils and parents; that is, they are not responsive enough to the market and consumer interests. The discourse frames this by arguing, specifically, the educational system lacks a rigorous system of accountability. There is not enough information for consumers to make intelligent choices and a lack of national monitoring so that consumers cannot compare the effectiveness of schools. The main problem under welfare state according to the neoliberal discourse is that government intervention and control has interrupted the 'natural' free-market contract between producer and consumer causing bureaucratic inflexibility, credential inflation and hence, educational inequality.

The policy solutions are prescribed by the logic of the market discourse. They fall out of the history of liberal political economy and the recent revival of homo economicus as the main theoretical motivation for neoliberal discourse. Break up and disestablish large state education bureaucracies, introduce school governance with autonomous boards, and competitive funding; re-evaluate the role of the State in the provision, management and funding of education; introduce the merits of market or quasi-market models relating to issues such as consumer choice in relation

to participation and access in education. The discourse intervenes by disputing the nature of education as a public or private good and reassesses the respective merits of public versus private provision in education and whether the benefits accrue to the community or to individuals.

Public Choice theory, a variant of rational choice theory developed by James Buchanan and Gordon Tulloch (1962) in *The Calculus of Consent*, became the theoretical discourse that functioned as a political meta-discourse comprised of the following principles that have been used to restructure the public sector:

1. An emphasis on management rather than policy;
2. A shift from input controls to quantifiable output measures and performance targets;
3. The devolution of management control coupled with new accountability structures;
4. Breaking up large bureaucracies into autonomous agencies;
5. Separation of commercial and non-commercial functions, and policy advice from policy implementation;
6. A preference for private ownership (e.g., contracting out);
7. Contestability of public service provision;
8. Emulation of private sector management styles;
9. An emphasis on short-term performance contracts;
10. Replacement of public service ethos of impartiality with monetary sanctions and incentives;
11. A preference for litigation model for redressing personal grievance;
12. An emphasis on efficiency, profit, and cost-cutting.

Public Choice quickly established itself as the very essence of new management theory and managerialism. In a few short years after Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan were elected to power in 1979 and 1980 respectively the discourse of neoliberalism with its market prescriptions was developed as public policy. The *contest of discourses* has taken place much earlier. Certainly, the Keynesian employment state seemed the answer and become the entrenched view during the Great Depression. An enlarged central welfare state carried through reforms that provided 'free education' provision at primary, secondary and tertiary levels through until the Oil Shocks of the 1970s when populations began to increase rapidly and the demand for state services seem to outpace expected revenue. The notion of public good was systematically challenged. The big state, the nanny state, was also questioned shifting the balance and responsibility back to individual citizens. The state shed its load and responsibility

and began to embark of massive state asset sales and privatisation strategies to alleviate the state of its financial and welfare responsibilities. The neoliberal discourse of individual responsibility and market choice gained traction in endless debates where these ideas contested the prevailing paradigm of social democracy.

The classical model of social democracy emphasised its pervasiveness in economic life where the state predominates over both civil society and the market with a collectivist welfare orientation based on Keynesian demand management and the mixed economy with narrow role for markets and an emphasis on full employment. The comprehensive welfare state, protecting citizens 'from cradle to grave' reflected a philosophy of egalitarianism based on an inherited value of equality. By comparison, neoliberal stressed minimal government and autonomous civil society with a philosophy of market fundamentalism based on economic individualism that accepted inequalities and provided welfare state as safety net.

Except for a brief episode of so-called Third Way, a new democratic state based on active civil society and social investment where equality is defined in terms on inclusion, neoliberalism has been the only game in town. The economic discourse of neoliberalism has presided over the social sciences and humanities as the mega-paradigm for all social behaviour. It has export its methodologies to all the social disciplines and policies and the rational autonomous chooser – 'the rational utility maximiser' – has been the modern derivation of *homo oeconomicus*. The origins of the discourse of family of discourses go back some way historical to the development of forms of economic liberalism as Foucault so expertly points out. Indeed, the meta-values of freedom and equality that sustain philosophical discourses of the 18th and 19th centuries get transcribed and re-theorised through the introduction of the discipline of political economy beginning with Callon and Adam Smith among others.

The history of equality from antiquity onward reveals that the notion of equality has been considered a constitutive feature of justice whether in its formal, proportional, or moral sense. Until the eighteenth century human beings were considered unequal by nature. The principle of natural equality only became recognized in the modern period beginning in the seventeenth century in the tradition of natural law as defined by Hobbes and Locke, and in social contract theory first postulated by Rousseau. The equality postulate of universal human worth and the idea is taken up formally in declarations and modern constitutions, notably the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (1789) (*Déclaration des droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen*), the American

Declaration of Independence (1776), The US Constitution (1787), and the Universal Declaration of Human Right (1948).

Individualism/Community – Freedom/Equality

Neoliberalism, then, represents a struggle between two forms social policy discourse based on opposing and highly charged ideological metaphors of 'individualism' and 'community' together with their operating philosophical values of freedom and equality. One form posits the sovereign individual emphasizing the primacy over community and State; the other, what might be called a rejuvenated social democratic model, inverts the hierarchy of value to emphasize community or 'the social' over the individual. As such it is an intellectual struggle that runs through twentieth century thought and traverses a range of subjects, with roots going back at least to the Enlightenment in different native traditions. It is therefore a complex, subtle and dynamic discourse, changing its historical and disciplinary forms as it matured as a political doctrine, international movement, and set of political and policy practices (Peters, 2011).

Since the early 1980s the terms 'individual' and 'community' – and their associated discourses of individualism and communitarianism together with their guiding values of freedom and equality – have defined the ideological space within which competing conceptions of the state, welfare, market, and education have been articulated. During the last forty years in countries around the world, the reform of the core public sector, the massive privatisation program involving state assets sales, the restructuring of health and education, the welfare benefit cuts bear witness to the triumph of a discourse of individualism over one of community. Indeed, since the mid- 1980s many countries have experienced the effects of an experiment modelled on a neoliberal view of community: broadly speaking, that of a society in which free individuals pursue their own interests in the marketplace. This view of community as 'the free society' implies a restricted role for government with clear limitations in providing certain common goods by way of taxation – the 'night-watchman' state. In short, this neoliberal view rests on a discourse of individualism as the most fundamental and unifying premise which emphasizes individual responsibility within a free-market economy and, thereby, defends the notion of the minimal state on moral as well as efficiency grounds.

Foucault on Neoliberalism

Michel Foucault was one of the very first philosophers to explore the conceptual genealogy of neoliberalism as one of the four main forms of economic liberalism emerging in the early twentieth century with links back

to the late sixteen century. Foucault's account of neolberalism linking it to forms of governmentality provides an understanding of its inherent longevity, its tenacity and resistance to all counter-evidence, and its dynamic ever-changing character as a discourse that is both expansive in in social field and modifiable in the face of world events.

One of the four main forms of economic liberalism analyzed by Michel Foucault (2008) in his historical treatment of the birth of neoliberalism in *The Birth of Biopolitics* was American neoliberalism represented by the late Gary Becker. It was Becker (1962) who on the basis of Theo Schultz' work and others introduced the concept and theory of human capital into political economy, privileging education in his analysis. This "chapter" traces the inception of human capital theory and analyses it in terms of Foucault's analysis of how Becker developed an approach that is not a conception of labour power so much as a "capital-ability". Foucault captures this point in the following comment: "the replacement every time of *homo oeconomicus* as partner of exchange with a *homo oeconomicus* as entrepreneur of himself, being for himself his own capital, being for himself his own producer, being for himself the source of his earnings."

The *responsibilization of the self* – turning individuals into moral agents and the promotion of new relations between government and self-government – has served to promote and rationalize programs of individualized "social insurance" and risk management. By defining Foucault as part of the critical tradition we can get some purchase on his theoretical innovations – particularly his impulse to historicize questions of ontology and subjectivity by inserting them into systems or structures of thought/discourse (an approach that contrasts with the abstract category of the Cartesian-Kantian subject). His notion of governmentality was developed and played out against these tendencies.

Foucault's account of classical liberalism is related to a set of discourses about government embedded in the 'reason of state' (*ragione di stat*o) literature of the later Italian renaissance beginning with Giovanni Botera and Machiavelli, and later in the emergence of the 'science of police' (*polizeiwissenschaft*) in eighteenth century Germany where it was considered a science of internal order of the community. Reason of state reinforces the state by basing the art of government on reason rather than God's wisdom or the Prince's strategy. It is essential a set of techniques that conform to rational principles that are based on new forms of expert knowledges about the state – its measurement and so-called "political arithmetic" – and issues in a kind of pastoral care that teaches social virtues and civil prudence. This new art of government represents a break with Christian doctrine as it progressively becomes concerned with

the emergence of civil society based on rights. Foucault's genealogy of the emerging political rationality grafts reason of state on to 'science of police' (*polizeiwissenschaft*) which come to prominence with the rise of market towns. The police are a condition of existence of the new towns and co-extensive with the rise of mercantilism in particular regulating and protecting the market mechanism. They are a correlate of the rise of capitalism and the new science of political economy.

Neoliberalism can be seen as an intensification of moral regulation resulting from the radical withdrawal of government and the responsibilisation of individuals through economics. It emerges as an actuarial form of governance that promotes an actuarial rationality through encouraging a political regime of ethical self-constitution as consumer-citizens. Responsibilisation refers to modern forms of self-government that require individuals to make choices about lifestyles, their bodies, their education, and their health at critical points in the life cycle, such as giving birth, starting school, going to university, taking a first job, getting married, and retiring. Choice assumes a much wider role under neoliberalism: it is not simply 'consumer sovereignty' but rather a moralization and responsibilisation, a regulated transfer of choice-making responsibility from the state to the individual in the social market. Specifically, neoliberalism has led to the dismantling of labor laws that were an important component of the welfare state and to increased reliance on privatized forms of welfare that often involve tougher accountability mechanisms and security/video surveillance.

A genealogy of the entrepreneurial self, reveals that it is a relation that one establishes with oneself through forms of personal investment (including education, viewed as an investment) and insurance that becomes the central ethical and political components of a new individualized, customized, and privatized consumer welfare economy. In this novel form of governance, responsibilised individuals are called upon to apply certain managerial, economic, and actuarial techniques to themselves as citizen-consumer subjects – calculating the risks and returns on in- vestment in such areas as education, health, employment, and retirement. This process is both self-constituting and self-consuming. It is self-constituting in the Foucauldian sense that the choices we make shape us as moral, economic, and political agents. It is self-consuming in the sense that the entrepreneurial self creates and constructs him- or herself through acts of consumption.

In *The Birth of Biopolitics* Foucault (2008) provides an account of how American neoliberalism is a form of governmentality based on the production of subjectivity, and in particular how individuals are

constituted as subjects of 'human capital'. Seven of the twelve lecture are devoted to German and American neoliberalism. In the ninth lecture he turns explicitly to American neoliberalism to focus on its differences with the German versions and its claim to global status, turning immediately to human capital theory as both an extension of economic analysis including the classical analysis of labour and its imperial extension to *all* forms of behaviour (those areas previously consider the belong to the non-economic realm). In this context Foucault examines the epistemological transformation that American neoliberal effects in the shift from an analysis of economic processes to one that focuses on the production of human subjectivity through the redefinition of *homo oeconomicus* as "entrepreneur of himself." In this same context, he examines the constitutive elements of human capital in terms of its innate elements and genetic improvements and the problem of the formation of human capital in education and health that together represent a new model of growth and economic innovation.

In the tenth lecture, again he discusses American neoliberalism including the application of the human capital model to the realm of the social and the generalizability of the enterprise form to the social field. In this lecture, he also discusses aspects of American neoliberalism in relation to delinquency and penal reform, *homo oeconomicus* as the criminal subject and the consequences of this analysis for displacing the criminal subject and 'disciplinary society.' In the eleventh lecture, he returns to the question of how *homoo economicus* in American become generalizable to every form of behaviour. This is the genealogy of *homo economicus* that begins as the basic element of the new governmental reason appeared in the eighteenth century before Walras and Pareto. In Hume and British empiricism we witness 'the subject of interest' that is differentiated from the legal subject and juridical will, representing contrasting logics of the market and the contract. He also charts and discusses the economic subject's relationship with political power in Condorcet and Adam Smith, the link between the individual's pursuit of profit and the growth of collective wealth. In this environment political economy emerges as a critique of governmental reason.

In the course of discussion Foucault mentions Gary Becker twelve times, as the Vice-President of the Mont Pelerin Society in 1989, winner of the Nobel Prize in 1992 and author of 'Investment in human capital: a theoretical analysis', published in the *Joumal of Political Economy* in 1962, and considerably expanded into *Human Capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education* in 1964. He regards Becker as 'the most radical of the American neo-liberals' and writes:

> Becker says: Basically, economic analysis can perfectly well find its points of anchorage and effectiveness if an individual's conduct answers to the single clause that the conduct in question reacts to reality in a nonrandom way. That is to say, any conduct which responds systematically to modifications in the variables of the environment, in other words, any conduct, as Becker says, which "accepts reality," must be susceptible to economic analysis. Homo economicus is someone who accepts reality. Rational conduct is any conduct which is sensitive to modifications in the variables of the environment and which responds to this in a non-random way, in a systematic way, and economics can therefore be defined as the science of the systematic nature of responses to environmental variables (Foucault, 2008: p. 269).

The importance of this 'colossal definition' is to make economic analysis amenable to behavioural techniques defined in its purest form by B.F. Skinner where conduct can be understood "simply in seeing how, through mechanisms of reinforcement, a given play of stimuli entail responses whose systematic nature can be observed and on the basis of which other variables of behaviour can be introduced" (p. 270). This speaks to Becker's analysis which inherently points to manipulation and control of the subject. But there is another more important aspect in which Foucault is interested. In the eighteenth century *homo oeconomcus* is someone who pursues his own interest (historically a male subject), and whose interest is such that it converges spontaneously with the interest of others. 'From the point of view of a theory of government, *homo oeconomcus* is the person who must be let alone" (Foucault, 2008: p. 270). Yet in Becker's definition

> … *homo oeconomicus,* that is to say, the person who accepts reality or who responds systematically to modifications in the variables of the environment, appears precisely as someone manageable, someone who responds systematically to systematic modifications artificially introduced into the environment. *Homo oeconomicus* is someone who is eminently governable (Foucault, 2008: p. 270).

Thus Foucault argues, 'From being the intangible partner of *laissez-faire, homo oeconomicus* now becomes the correlate of a governmentality which will act on the environment and systematically modify its variables' (*op.cit.*, pp. 270–1). This is Becker's major innovation and Foucault leaves us in no doubt that in the grim methodology of human capital leaves little room for human freedom except as a form of consent assumed by market agents or consumers who operate by making choices in the marketplace.

Foucault leaves us in no doubt about the production of subjectivity that issues from an abstract conception of human nature as fixed, essential, rational, self-interested and universal and the method by which in liberal cultures human beings have been *made* subjects through political discourse and regimes of power/knowledge that operates as a form of political economy, a manner of governing liberal states through the economy that depends on the government of individuals in era dominated by global markets.

Some critics point out that Foucault was the first political thinker to take Nietzsche seriously. He says in a biographical fragment that he started reading Nietzsche in 1953 and immediately understood Nietzsche's basic ethos that questions of power stand at the center of philosophy, a condition exercised by all living beings determining who they are in terms of their beliefs and values. Foucault's early understanding of Nietzsche enabled him to understand power as distributed, positive and constitutive of the subjects operating though their subjectivities – to understand power outside both liberal and Marxist political discourses that hypothesis power metaphysically as an entity with essential characteristics possessed by the State. As is now well known, Foucault utilising Nietzsche's fundamental insight of power in relation to 'knowledge' begins to develop the institutional and discursive formation of human subjects – they do not exhibit an essence but rather are made through discourse and the networks of power that define normativity – what is proper, what is 'good' and 'bad', what is 'rational', what is 'criminal', indeed, what is 'human': 'Power produces knowledge...knowledge and power directly imply one another' (Foucault, 1977: p. 27).

One of the strongest influences on Foucault's (1970) 'The Order of Discourse' is to be found in Nietzsche's (1887) *Genealogy*. A year later after the inaugural lecture on discourse Foucault (1971) publishes 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, and History' where he makes his debt obvious and traces Nietzsche's use of the term *Herkunft* to question the origin of moral preconceptions. In the *Genealogy* Nietzsche begins with 'My thoughts on the descent of our moral prejudices' (p. 4) which is hidden from us – as he says 'We are unknown to ourselves, we knowers: and with good reason' (p. 3); and he describes his 'characteristic scepticism' formed when he was just a boy about morality and the origin of moral categories 'good' and 'bad'. Thereupon he puts the questions:

> under what conditions did man invent the value judgments good and evil? and what value do they themselves have? Have they up to now obstructed or promoted human flourishing? Are they a sign of distress,

> poverty and the degeneration of life? Or, on the contrary, do they reveal the fullness, strength and will of life, its courage, its confidence, its future? (p. 4)

These are the questions that Nietzsche addresses to the discourse of morality – not to the origin of morality but to the *value* of morality: 'we need a critique of moral values, the value of these values should itself, for once, be examined' (p. 7). Foucault presents Nietzsche as a philologist of a certain kind--an investigation of concepts that is a philological genealogy that does not simply trace changing meanings of a term but exposes the historically contingent origins of moral ideals and practices. As such Nietzsche's genealogy becomes a radical historicist critique that through discursive shifts demonstrates the historically contingent nature of moral concepts and categories that pretend to be transcendentally guaranteed or universally given.

In this sense, *Homo Oeconomicus* is that philosophical term embedded in the value of rationality, agency, individualism and self-interest that crystallises the history of political economy and its succession of economic discourses leading to its revival as the main philosophical approach to the subject and to the methodological calculus – political arithmetic (William Petty's term) – of neoliberalism as a political discourse.

References

Becker, G. (1962) Investment in human capital: a theoretical analysis. *Joumal of Political Economy*, 70(5), Part 2: Investment in Human Beings (Oct., 1962), pp. 9–49

Becker, G. (1964) *Human Capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Böckel, J.G. von (1677) *Discursus Politicus de Societatis Civilis Primis Elementis*. Paul Zeising.

Burman, E. & Parker, I. [eds.] (1993) *Discourse Analytic Research*. London, Routledge.

Descartes, R. (2009 [1635]) *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting the Reason and Seeking Truth in the Sciences*. Auckland: Floating Press.

Dijk, T. van [ed.] (1985) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* [4 volumes]. London: Academic Press.

Dijk, T van [ed.] (1997) *Discourse Studies* [2 volumes]. London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Foucault, M. (1970) The Order of Discourse [*L'Ordre du Discours*]. In: R. Young [ed.], *Untying the Text*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Foucault, M. (2000) Nietzsche, Genealogy, and History. In: J. Faubion [ed.], *The Essential Works of Foucault, Volume II: 1954–84*, pp. 369–93. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Allen Lane.

Foucault, M. (2008) The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hasse, F.A. (2007) The History of Discourse as Literary History: On the Historicity and Documentation of a Concept Exemplified by the Philosophical discourse, *A Parte Rei* 71(13), pp. 1–15.

Hobbes, T. (2009) Of Man, Being the First Part of Leviathan, https://www.bartleby.com/34/5/

Hunt, T.W. (1884) *The Principles of Written Discourse*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing.

Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.

Macdonnell, D. (1986) *Theories of Discourse*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Mill, J.S. (1836) On the Definition of Political Economy, and on the Method of Investigation Proper to It. In: *Essays on Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy* [2nd ed.]. Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer.

Mills, S. (1997) *Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Nietzsche, F. (1987) *On The Genealogy of Morals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peters, M.A. (2011) *Neoliberalism and After? Education and Social Policy in the Age of Knowledge Capitalism.* New York: Peter Lang.

Peters, M.A. (2017) Education, Neoliberalism, and Human Capital: *Homo Economicus* as "Entrepreneur of Himself. In: S. Springer, K. Birch & J. MacLeavy [eds.], *The Handbook of Neoliberalism*, pp. 297–307. London: Routledge.

Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1987) *Discourse and Social Psychology*. London: Sage.

Smith, A. M. (1998) *Laclau and Mouffe.* London: Routledge.

Smith, A. (1776) *The Wealth of Nations.* London: Strahan & Cadell.

Torfing, J. (1999) *New Theories of Discourse.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

White, H. (1978) *Tropics of Discourse*. Baltimore: John Hopkins.

Williams, G. (1999) *French Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Unpacking the Usage and Implications of Neoliberal Language in the Russell Group's Education Strategies

Rodolfo Leyva

Introduction

Since at least classical antiquity, higher education has been equated with the goal and process of cultivating reasoning skills, critical thinking, moral character, conscientious citizenship, and a disposition to seek truth and justice (Pavur, 2009). Following the period of the 18th-century Enlightenment, these classic humanist ideals have generally been paired with the Humboldtian principles of academic freedom and primacy of pure science over specialised professional training and instrumentalist research, to form the traditional paradigmatic model of a university (Ash, 2006; Michelsen, 2010). Historical accounts disagree on the degree to which the academies of yore actually practiced this model, but most seem to broadly agree that elements of it considerably influenced many of the policies and practices of Western universities till about the 1970s (Ash, 2006; Michelsen, 2010; Nybom, 2003). Indeed, this model continues to be an influential, if perhaps overly idealistic and romanticised, normative conception for what higher education should entail (Mountz et al., 2015; Newfield, 2018).

However, the past thirty years have seen the birth, uptake, and discursive dominance of the neoliberal university model, which gives primacy to the makertization and commodification of education and research. To date, the scholarly literature on this institutional transformation mostly describes the policy processes or individual academics' accounts of the neoliberalization of universities (see e.g., Ball, 2012; Morrissey, 2015; Mountz et al., 2015; Shore & Davidson, 2014). As such, there is a relative

dearth of empirical studies that have gaged the extent to which contemporary universities have replaced humanist and enlightenment educational ideals and principles with neoliberal ones. Therefore, to begin to fill this gap, the present content analysis study examines the latest education strategy statements of the 24 elite British public universities that collectively form the Russell Group, and tests whether these statements are significantly more reflective of neoliberal university discourses than traditional ones. This article continues with a brief review of the literature on neoliberalism and higher education. It then proceeds to discuss this study's methods, findings, and implications.

Neoliberalism and Higher Education

Neoliberalism refers to a political-economic paradigm based on an ideology that calls for the commercialization of, and state facilitation or implementation of market mechanisms into, many aspects of public and private life (Ball, 2012; Leyva, 2018). To wit, neoliberal theorists and policy-makers argue that countries should seek to maintain international competitiveness and induce and accelerate economic growth in large part by: eliminating or drastically reducing government public expenditures, trade barriers, and business regulations; partially or fully privatizing their state enterprises and services; and focusing on generating exports. In so doing, countries can gain from their comparative advantages in factor endowments, ensure market credibility, achieve fiscal solvency, and attract foreign direct investment. Over time, the successful enactment of these goals and processes is hypothesised to engender prosperous and dynamic, but stable and efficient national and international markets in addition to the skilled, self-reliant, and flexible workers needed to sustain and compete in them (Friedman, 2002; Hartwell, 1995). Neoliberalism, as approximately described above, rose to prominence in the 1980s in the United Kingdom and the United States, and has since significantly shaped the 21st-century world order (Ellwood, 2011; Hall & Rustin, 2015). This section, however, will only briefly review features of neoliberal education policies and practices and their effects on contemporary Anglo-American universities.

According to neoliberal doctrine, education institutions need to be essentially turned into fiscally solvent commercial entities whose primary function is to condition and train a professionally skilled and extrinsic-value orientated workforce. It follows from this logic that funding for schools should be allocated based on market principles of cost-effectiveness, accountability, productivity, and consumer demand (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Friedman, 2002). To expedite this institutional restructuring, neoliberals advocate for policies that A) force schools to compete for state

funding against public and private for-profit educational organisations. B) Increase public-private partnerships whereby selective school functions are outsourced to the private sector, or where businesses and corporations provide funding to schools in exchange for publicity, advertisement space, or research and development. And C), lead to the implementation of corporate style managerial practices and accountability metrics to help eliminate wastefulness, incentivize positive performances, fire or discipline underperforming faculty, and measure student-customer satisfaction (Ball, 2012; Boyles, 2005; Mountz et al., 2015). In the specific context of higher education, these policy inputs and outputs have manifested in and transformed this sector in the following ways.

To start with, universities currently have to prioritize and produce research that as Mohrmana, Ma, and Baker (2008: p. 9) put it is "beyond the intellectual curiosity of the investigator; [as] scholars are expected to push their ideas to application and ultimately to the market". This means that contemporary academics are continuously pressured to engage in research with industrial, medicinal, or other instrumental applications in order to bring in revenue. Such pressure normally comes in the form of performance targets, whereby an academic researcher's chances for promotion or, in many instances simply their job security, is tied to specific amounts of publications in leading journals and procured research income. These now common institutional practices and imperatives also mean that researchers are explicitly less incentivized to pursue basic science or abstract research aimed at gaining a fundamental understanding of natural, social, and mathematical phenomena. In other words, pursuing knowledge for its own sake has according to several accounts of individual academics, become untenable, because prestigious journals, grant funding bodies, and university administrators are primarily interested in promoting and rewarding applied research that has the potential for immediate commercial application or social policy impact (Chubb & Watermeyer, 2017; Gaffikin, & Perry, 2009; Lojdová, 2016).

Furthermore, as Gaffikin, & Perry (2009) argue, university degree programmes now pursue a more vocationally oriented pedagogy, "pitch tuition fees on a more lucrative basis, and are valued in terms of their output of knowledge-intensive human capital" (p. 120). That is, universities are now primarily concerned with ensuring financial solvency through maintaining continuous annual recruitment of fee-paying students, and their managers generally seek accomplish this in three main ways although these will vary by university. The first means is by expanding the construction of new teaching buildings, information technology systems, and student accommodations – which is often done via

public-private partnership deals. Correspondingly, the second means is by massive spending on domestic and international advertising campaigns. These tend to feature a given university's new and/or planned infrastructure developments, various subject rankings, international demographic profile, research accomplishments, career services, graduate employment figures, and/or 'rock-star' scientists if any. Accordingly, one of, if not the main purpose of these building investments and advertisements is to recruit both domestic and foreign students by convincing them that they are getting 'value for their money'.

The third means is by the imposition of standardized curriculums, embedding of transferable and professional skills into course content, and regular deployment of course and teaching evaluation questionnaires. While one can be generous and assume that these impositions are well-intended and meant to improve the student experience, in practice, they are gradually carving away at departments' and individual lecturers' academic freedom. For instance, course and teaching evaluations are used to discipline and regulate academics. This, in turn, promotes grade inflation and watered down curriculum, because low scores reported by disgruntled students could lead to the closure of a programme and/or firing of a lecturer. Additionally, the aforementioned impositions effectively force academics to base their course content on how well it can prepare students to attain gainful employment. Hence, in addition to undermining academics' freedom of what and how to teach, this also goes directly against the Humboldtian objective of a university pedagogy -which is one of fostering "an approach to learning, an attitude of mind, a skill and a capacity to think rather than specialised knowledge" (Ash, 2006: p. 246).

So to summarize, in total contrast with the traditional liberal-humanist model, the neoliberal model defines and aims to transform the modern university into:

> A self-interested, entrepreneurial organization offering recursive educational experiences and research services for paying clients. In such institutions, academics become managed knowledge producers who should follow prescribed sets of organizational processes. Their research and pedagogy must be justified as beneficial for the university through quantitative measures. Students are recast in the role of knowledge consumers, and have a voice in determining the manner in which educational services are packaged and delivered to them. (Hadley, 2015: p. 6)

Methodology

Having briefly contrasted the two leading university models, the present content analysis study thus examines the following research questions.

RQ1: What is the paradigmatic portrait of prioritized educational and research objectives and values in the Russell Group's education strategy documents?

RQ2: To what extent are Russell Group universities committed to preserving and promoting higher education's historically humanist and enlightenment principles and commitments?

Inclusion Criteria

Each Russell Group member's latest and official education strategy as of June 2018, was retrieved from their respective website. Nine of these strategies came in the form of mission and vision statements. Analysis of these pdf files covered the entire document but focused on sections specifically about teaching, learning, and research. All other sections including, for example, those to do with employment recruitment, widening participation, and environmental initiatives were examined, but not included in the analysis below as these were not relevant to this study's foci. Three universities did not have accessible pdf files, and so their teaching and learning strategies were collected directly from their dedicated web-pages and copied onto separate word files. In total, 24 units of analysis were compiled into a single dataset and analyzed via the use of NVivo software.

Procedure

The coding procedure followed a summative and contextual approach. This entails quantifying the usage and unpacking the subtext of keywords that are initially derived from a literature review and/or a researcher's interests, and then searched for, identified, and contextualized during the analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Krippendorff, 2004). Correspondingly, the present study's analysis began with the search for an examination of the syntactic and semantic context in which the following or synonymous words and phrasings are used: research, employability, learning, citizenship, volunteerism, business, industry, autonomy, curiosity, partnerships, curriculum, critical, knowledge, independent, rankings, and justice. This preliminary perusing revealed that these words and phrasing are often used parsimoniously, superficially, repeatedly, or concurrently in the same sentences and paragraphs. Hence following this initial examination, I drew on the literature discussed in the previous sections and developed a coding scheme consisting of four codes that

correspond to neoliberal university discourses and four to traditional university discourses (see Tables 1 and 2 below). I then examined each document line by line, and coded individual sentences or groups of consecutive sentences -in instances where these provided better contextual and semantic clarity, based on whether they predominantly mirrored one of the eight codes. For example, the following excerpt from Queen University Belfast's *Education Strategy 2016-2021: Summary* document has linguistic markers that reflect both the 'Employability' and 'Global Citizenship & Moral Character' codes: "Our graduates will help shape tomorrow, will be highly sought after by employers for being professional, dynamic, forward thinking, and enterprising, and will be equipped with the skills to be global citizens and to address global challenges". However, this excerpt is arguably and overall more discursively in line (and was thus coded) with the 'Employability' code. Moreover, formulations that include relevant keywords and phrasings but which lack a clear or preponderant discursive inflection, or are otherwise too ambiguous to be coded with the aforementioned coding scheme, were left un-coded. For example, this included excerpts such as the following:

- "[The] University will provide opportunities and support for all students to have a positive experience in all aspects of their time at Cambridge and to develop themselves to be able to pursue their lives and careers when they leave the University – not just in terms of academic qualifications and intellectual capability, but also in terms of self-esteem, personal resilience and self-confidence." -From Cambridge University's *Learning and Teaching Strategy, 2015-18*
- "The creation, dissemination and application of knowledge will remain at the heart of all that we do and builds on the University's history and traditions". -From Leeds University's *Strategic Plan 2015-2020*

Table I: Codebook For Neoliberal University Discourses

Codes	Code Applications	Recording Unit Examples
Employability	Sentences that directly or otherwise primarily communicate institutional commitment to enhancing student professional development. This includes for example, excerpts that indicate or stress the planned embedding of employment skills with course objectives; the increase in career advice resources, public-private partnerships, internship opportunities, study abroad programmes; and/or other initiatives to improve students' ability to successfully compete for graduate-level jobs.	"Review, reshape and expand our portfolio of taught postgraduate masters' and continuing professional development programmes to ensure they are fit for purpose in the national and international marketplace in terms of their content, structure and modes of delivery, and maximise their potential to boost the employability of our graduates.". -From Bristol University's *Our Vision. Our Strategy.* "Provide information for employers on teaching excellence within the University to allow employers to choose graduates with appropriate skills sets." -From Queen's University Belfast's *Education Strategy 2016-2021: Summary*
Value For Money	Sentences that emphasize the given university's reputation, status, and commitments to raising their national and international profile; strategies for sustaining or expanding income streams such as adding courses that are commercially viable; and/or investments in infrastructure and services to help ensure student recruitment and satisfaction. In other words, these excerpts directly or implicitly speak to a given university's concerns or plans to increase student enrollment figures and investments in other areas to maximize institutional growth and financial sustainability.	"We will protect our main income sources and improve competitiveness through a focused and market-driven approach to our educational provision. We will rapidly adjust our programme portfolio to changes in demand." -From Nottingham University's *Global Strategy 2020* "We will need to make explicit the value that is added to students' experience through the cultural, volunteering and sporting opportunities available on our exceptional campus and in the city that is our home. In a more competitive fee environment, we must become the destination of choice". -From Birmingham University's *Shaping Our Future; Birmingham 2015*

Codes	Code Applications	Recording Unit Examples
Instrumental Research	Sentences that highlight examples of applied research, or which indicate that time, support, and financial resources will be afforded to applied research. This includes research which has immediate commercial or industrial utility; social, cultural, or policy 'impact'; and/or some other potential to generate income from interested private, governmental, or third-sector organisations.	"Our ambition is to be a world-leading university, where researchers produce work of the highest significance and impact. We will be distinguished by our interdisciplinary research, for training outstanding researchers and giving parity of esteem and to discovery, application, and knowledge transfer and impact." -From *Manchester 2020 The University of Manchester's Strategic Plan* "We will continue to improve the volume and quality of collaborative research with commercial organisations to increase our research income and economic impact." –From Southampton University's *A Connected University. Vision 2020*
Performativity	Sentences which suggest that auditing and evaluation instruments will be used to measure departments' and faculty's teaching and/or research performance. These instruments include for example, the Research and Teaching Excellence Frameworks, student satisfaction surveys, and graduate employment figures.	"All staff on teaching and research contracts will achieve outcomes that meet institutional policy principles of world-leading and internationally excellent research and impact by 2026". –From Liverpool University's *Research And Impact Strategy 2016-2021* "We now collect a good deal of information from our students about how they feel about UCL and their education – in module surveys, internal surveys and through the National Student Survey (NSS). We will invest more comprehensively in this rich resource." –From University College London's *Education Strategy 2016-21*

Table II: Codebook For Traditional University Discourses

Codes	Code Applications	Recording Unit Examples
Academic Freedom (Teaching)	Sentences that communicate institutional commitment to protecting or otherwise ensuring the liberty for faculty to decide on how and which subjects to teach – irrespective of a subject's commercial utility or viability or controversial content.	"These aims are firmly grounded in an institution where, for the majority of programmes, students are required to be in residence, and where: there is a significant level of local autonomy in delivery of provision (the quality of which is assured by proportionate central mechanisms)". –From Cambridge University's *Learning and Teaching Strategy, 2015-18* "To our staff, we commit to the promotion of a collegial community, supporting academic freedom and alert to the needs and aspirations of its members." -From Queen Mary University of London *Strategy 2014 – the Next Five Years*
Pure Research	Sentences which indicate that time, support, and financial resources will be afforded to the pursuit of intellectual curiosity driven research that generates new ideas, theories, models, or principles, but which may not be immediately utilized, have commercial application, or a sociocultural impact. This is sometimes also referred to as basic or blue skies research.	"We prize academic independence and curiosity driven research at Durham". –From the *Research and Engagement* web-section of Durham's *University Strategy 2017-2027* "A great university both conveys the knowledge created by its community and is open to new ideas generated elsewhere. We will maintain the freedom for individuals and research groups to decide what to research". –From Oxford University's *Strategic Plan 2013-18*

Codes	Code Applications	Recording Unit Examples
Encouraging Student Intellectual Curiosity	Sentences which primarily indicate that teaching, courses, educational events, and/or other learning resources will be made available, which are geared towards enabling students to pursue their intellectual interests and critically and actively engage with their chosen and other disciplines irrespective of whether these are related to a future profession.	"An education at Imperial will give them insight and guidance into how they progress from a superficial engagement with this information to a deeper understanding. We will teach students how to process information in a way that extracts meaning, connects concepts and derives insight. Mastery of their chosen discipline requires them to develop conceptual and practical skills and practically apply this as they process knowledge and information" –From Imperial College London's *Learning and Teaching Strategy* "Our teaching aims to inspire our students, challenge them, develop their curiosity and encourage them to take greater ownership of their learning, avoiding being passive recipients of knowledge." -From *Learning and Teaching at the University of Sheffield 2016-2021*
Global Citizenship & Moral Character	Sentences that primarily emphasize institutional efforts and/or commitments towards helping students to develop into thoughtful, well-rounded, and conscientious global citizens.	"Students will develop as global citizens, socially and environmentally aware, and sensitive to international contexts and cultures." -From York University's *Learning & Teaching Strategy 2015-2020* "Students who undertake an education at King's do not just engage in a transaction, but a commitment to serve society and to be active and responsible citizens". –From King's College London's *Education Strategy 2017-22*

Admittedly, the codes listed above are rough and not entirely mutually exclusive, but it should be noted that even the most rigorous and objective of quantitative content analysis coding procedures will have inescapable elements of subjective hermeneutic interpretation. This is because words and phrases are very often polysemous, and because determining the content producer's communicative intent is usually beyond the scope of the content analysis method. Instead, this method is used to extrapolate and approximate the discursive mediations and effects of texts via the application of a reliable coding scheme that represents a fairly accurate model of what a given body of text is effectively communicating (Krippendorf, 2004). Therefore, to ensure the reliability of my coding scheme, a second researcher was asked to code 6 randomly selected documents (25% of the sample corpus), using the codes shown in Tables 1 and 2. Furthermore, to avoid linguistic priming and consequent coding bias, the second coder was only given the codes and their definitions, but was not told about the broader discursive formations that they corresponded to nor about the purpose of the study. Following consultation, we generated acceptable inter-coder reliability estimates with percent agreements for all 8 codes ranging from 83% to 100%.

Analysis and Results

Table 3 below shows the number of times each of the 8 discursive codes was identified in each Russell Group university's education strategy statements where applicable. Note that percentages were rounded to the nearest tenth. Furthermore, as shown in Table 4, the frequency counts for the neoliberal discursive codes were summed to create an additive index ($M = 32.08$, $SD = 18.99$), so were the counts for the traditional university discursive codes ($M = 8.33$, $SD = 11.13$). A paired-sample T-test procedure was then conducted to determine whether the mean difference between these two sets of observations was statistically significant. The test showed that neoliberal discourses were significantly more numerous than traditional discourses $t(23) = 4.93, p < .01$. With regards to RQ1, combined, these descriptive and inferential statistics give a clear indication that the Russell Group's prioritized educational and research objectives and values, as can be gleamed from their official education strategy documents, largely reflect those extolled by the paradigmatic neoliberal university model. Specifically, these statements by and large, positively communicated their respective institutions' adoption, advancement, and planned implementation of employability, value for money, instrumental research, and performativity discursive practices.

Table 3: Frequency Of Coded Discourses Per Russell Group University

Russell Group Member	Employability	Value For Money	Instrumental Research	Performativity	Academic Freedom (teaching)	Pure Research	Encouraging Student Intellectual Curiosity	Global Citizenship & Moral Character
University of Birmingham	5.00 (13%)	11.00 (30%)	13.00 (35%)	7.00 (19%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	1.00 (3%)	.00 (0%)
University of Bristol	15.00 (37%)	17.00 (43%)	8.00 (20%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)
University of Cambridge	5.00 (23%)	8.00 (36%)	N/A	2.00 (9%)	3.00 (14%)	N/A	1.00 (5%)	3.00 (14%)
Cardiff University	5.00 (36%)	8.00 (57%)	N/A	1.00 (7%)	.00 (0%)	N/A	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)
Durham University	3.00 (10%)	14.00 (47%)	4.00 (13%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	1.00 (3%)	1.00 (3%)	7.00 (23%)
University of Edinburgh	10.00 (14%)	16.00 (22%)	25.00 (34%)	13.00 (18%)	.00 (0%)	1.00 (1%)	3.00 (4%)	6.00 (8%)
University of Exeter	8.00 (29%)	5.00 (19%)	N/A	3.00 (11%)	.00 (0%)	N/A	5.00 (19%)	6.00 (22%)
University of Glasgow	6.00 (13%)	19.00 (41%)	18.00 (39%)	1.00 (2%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	2.00 (4%)
Imperial College London	9.00 (13%)	11.00 (15%)	N/A	2.00 (3%)	26.00 (36%)	N/A	19.0 (26%)	5.00 (7%)
King's College London	14.00 (27%)	5.00 (10%)	N/A	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	N/A	12.0 (23%)	21.0 (40%)
University of Leeds	14.00 (30%)	12.00 (26%)	20.00 (43%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)
University of Liverpool	10.00 (38%)	3.00 (12%)	7.00 (27%)	5.00 (19%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	1.00 (4%)	.00 (0%)

Russell Group Member	Employability	Value For Money	Instrumental Research	Performativity	Academic Freedom (teaching)	Pure Research	Encouraging Student Intellectual Curiosity	Global Citizenship & Moral Character
London School of Economics	10.00 (37%)	5.00 (19%)	N/A	8.00 (30%)	1.00 (4%)	N/A	3.00 (11%)	.00 (0%)
University of Manchester	5.00 (6%)	19.00 (23%)	27.00 (33%)	20.00 (24%)	1.00 (1%)	.00 (0%)	3.00 (4%)	7.00 (9%)
Newcastle University	8.00 (42%)	4.00 (21%)	4.00 (21%)	1.00 (5%)	1.00 (5%)	1.00 (5%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)
University of Nottingham	15.00 (26%)	15.00 (26%)	18.00 (32%)	4.00 (7%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	1.00 (2%)	4.00 (7%)
University of Oxford	6.00 (18%)	8.00 (24%)	6.00 (18%)	2.00 (6%)	3.00 (9%)	6.00 (18%)	1.00 (3%)	1.00 (3%)
Queen Mary University of London	10.00 (14%)	21.00 (30%)	20.00 (29%)	14.00 (20%)	1.00 (1%)	1.00 (1%)	2.00 (3%)	1.00 (1%)
Queen's University Belfast	17.00 (47%)	4.00 (11%)	N/A	4.00 (11%)	1.00 (3%)	N/A	3.00 (8%)	7.00 (19%)
University of Sheffield	6.00 (50%)	1.00 (8%)	N/A	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	N/A	4.00 (33%)	1.00 (8%)
University of Southampton	7.00 (23%)	10.00 (32%)	6.00 (19%)	3.00 (10%)	.00 (0%)	2.00 (6%)	1.00 (3%)	2.00 (6%)
University College London	22.00 (29%)	28.00 (37%)	N/A	14.00 (18%)	2.00 (3%)	N/A	5.00 (7%)	5.00 (7%)
University of Warwick	8.00 (28%)	5.00 (17%)	4.00 (14%)	2.00 (7%)	1.00 (3%)	.00 (0%)	4.00 (14%)	5.00 (17%)
University of York	7.00 (29%)	3.00 (13%)	N/A	7.00 (29%)	3.00 (13%)	N/A	2.00 (8%)	2.00 (8%)

Table 4: Total Frequency Of Coded Neoliberal & Traditional University Discourses

Russell Group Member	Neoliberal University Discourses (Total Score)	Traditional University Discourses (Total Score)	Total Code Count
University of Birmingham	36.00 (97.3%)	1.00 (2.7%)	37.00 (100%)
University of Bristol	40.00 (100%)	00 (0%)	40.00 (100%)
University of Cambridge	15.00 (68.2%)	7.00 (31.9%)	22.00 (100%)
Cardiff University	14.00 (100%)	.00 (0%)	14.00 (100%)
Durham University	21.00 (70%)	9.00 (30%)	30.00 (100%)
University of Edinburgh	64.00 (86.5%)	10.00 (13.6%)	74.00 (100%)
University of Exeter	16.00 (59.3%)	11.00 (40.8%)	27.00 (100%)
University of Glasgow	44.00 (95.7%)	2.00 (4.4%)	46.00 (100%)
Imperial College London	22.00 (30.6%)	50.00 (69.5%)	72.00 (100%)
King's College London	19.00 (36.6%)	33.00 (63.5%)	52.00 (100%)
University of Leeds	46.00 (100%)	.00 (0%)	46.00 (100%)
University of Liverpool	25.00 (96.2%)	1.00 (3.9%)	26.00 (100%)
London School of Economics	23.00 (85.2%)	4.00 (14.9%)	27.00 (100%)
University of Manchester	71.00 (86.6%)	11.00 (13.5%)	82.00 (100%)
Newcastle University	17.00 (89.5%)	2.00 (10.6%)	19.00 (100%)
University of Nottingham	52.00 (91.3%)	5.00 (8.8%)	57.00 (100%)
University of Oxford	22.00 (66.7%)	11.00 (33.4%)	33.00 (100%)
Queen Mary University of London	65.00 (92.9%)	5.00 (7.2%)	70.00 (100%)
Queen's University Belfast	25.00 (69.5%)	11.00 (30.6%)	36.00 (100%)
University of Sheffield	7.00 (58.4%)	5.00 (41.7%)	12.00 (100%)

Russell Group Member	Neoliberal University Discourses (Total Score)	Traditional University Discourses (Total Score)	Total Code Count
University of Southampton	26.00 (83.9%)	5.00 (16.2%)	31.00 (100%)
University College London	64.00 (84.3%)	12.00 (15.8%)	76.00 (100%)
University of Warwick	19.00 (65.6%)	10.00 (34.5%)	29.00 (100%)
University of York	17.00 (70.9%)	7.00 (29.2%)	24.00 (100%)

Regarding RQ2, the results indicate that the majority of the Russell Group is basically disavowing their responsibility to preserve higher education's historically humanist and enlightenment principles and objectives. This is especially the case for those to do with the safeguarding and promotion of academic teaching freedom and pure scientific research. Oxford and Imperial College London are notable and relative exceptions to this trend. These are world-renowned universities with considerable endowments and income streams, and can thus for now afford to not fully adopt the neoliberal model. So despite their status, it is unlikely that the rest of the consortium will be following their example any time soon. However, the King's College London (KCL) statements had a quite bigger percentage of traditional discourses (63.5%) than neoliberal discourses (36.%). This hints to the possibility that at least on paper anyway, KCL has a stronger commitment to encouraging student intellectual curiosity, and helping students to develop into ethical and conscientious global citizens) than to promoting employability and value for money practices. Additionally, the Exeter university statements had a fairly large number of instances of traditional discourses. KCL and Exeter are another pair of prestigious universities with healthy financial resources and can, therefore, also possibly afford a way to balance staying fiscally solvent and internationally competitive with the upholding of traditional university ideals. Whether they actually do so, however, remains to be seen.

Discussion

Over the past thirty years in many Western countries, official policy discourse about public spending in education has been presented as a threat to national competitiveness (Cribb & Gewirtz, 2013; Newfield, 2018). To address this supposed threat, neoliberal education policies such as the ones described earlier have been steadily implemented. This has led to drastic cuts in government funding for higher education and consequent

increases in tuition fees and student loan debt. Resultantly, contemporary universities now have to decide whether to uphold their traditional liberal humanist mission, surrender to market pressures and norms, or find a balance between these conflicting standards. To gain an empirical sense of which of these paths British universities are most likely to pursue, the present study employed a content analysis method to examine the education strategies and commitment statements of the Russell Group, i.e., Great Britain's top 24 elite and world-leading public universities. While these documents do mostly contain empty marketing pabulum rather than binding policy proposals, they nevertheless serve as public pronouncements of said universities' current and future educational purposes, ambitions, and values. Hence, these statements shed light on the Russell Group's pedagogic practices and institutional priorities, which will, in turn, likely influence the wider British and global university sector.

The results show that these statements are predominantly rife with neoliberal discursive inflections of global competitiveness, instrumentalism, employability, and customer satisfaction, which principally equate a university education with professional development and research with economic utility. Conversely, largely absent from the majority of these statements are the traditional university mission and goals of nurturing intellectual curiosity, promoting academic freedom, generating pure scientific knowledge, and fostering character and conscientious citizenship. These results, therefore, suggest that the Russell Group's current and long-term plans for pedagogy and research strongly mirror the language of the neoliberal policy agenda for higher education, and have largely abandoned the academy's historically humanist and enlightenment principles and commitments.

Moreover, these results are consistent with the literature on the neoliberalization of universities (Ball, 2012; Lojdová, 2016; Morrissey, 2015; Mountz et al., 2015; Shore & Davidson, 2014), and are thus not especially surprising. However, one could argue that universities, particularly elite ones, have even in the current neoliberal era, been "culturally, institutionally and even statutorily obliged to assert their commitment to academic freedom" (Phelan, 2016, p. 1). So in this regard, it is somewhat unexpected to see how minimally this most basic and longstanding principle is attended to in the Russell Group's education strategy statements, such that it is not even really paid rhetorical lip service. There were a couple of exceptions to this with the most notable one being Imperial College London. Indeed, their rather lengthy education statement, which was also the only one to include a reference list, frequently and consistently expressed the urgent need to change existing curriculum and teaching practices, but

that this must first and foremost be guided, informed, and initiated by staff in congruence with their respective expertise and interests. For example, on pg. 26 of this statement, it says that the university will establish an approach to pedagogic change by: "Freeing up time of key academics who lead the transformation of specific modules, so they have the space to identify learning outcomes, to map these to optimal delivery methods, then to develop and deploy these within an active learning framework".

Additionally, there were a few other standout examples of counter-hegemonic narratives. In particular, the statement of KCL regularly expressed a seemingly sincere concern to help develop considerate, service-oriented, and cosmopolitan students. Note for example the following excerpt from KCL's statement on pg. 5. "We want our graduates to have strong disciplinary foundations from which to make sense of the world; we also want them to be socially responsible citizens who enjoy life". This sentiment was also expressed an appreciable amount of times in the statements from the University of Warwick (17%), Queen's University Belfast (20%), University of Exeter (22%), Durham University (23%), and Cambridge University (14%). That said, it bears repeating that these statements are simply public announcements of a university's proposed research and teaching plans and initiatives. Therefore, universities are not legally bound to follow the goals and proposals issued in these statements, and can pursue them in any way they see fit -which may or may not align with the intended spirit of said goals and proposals. The findings of this study are thus only able to provide rough insights into the Russell Group's pedagogic and institutional trends and trajectories. Future observational and survey research is needed to determine the extent and ways that the neoliberal discursive practices identified in this brief content analysis are manifesting in British and other Western universities, and impacting academics' everyday experiences and priorities.

Finally, I want to close by noting that I am not arguing against employability, the instrumentality of research, or accountability for lack-luster teaching. These goals and practices are not necessarily antithetical to or totally incompatible with traditional university ones. For instance, university natural science, social science, and humanities courses have since their inception been designed to foster critical thinking, communications, researching, and data analysis skills. Such skills are inherently transferable and applicable to contemporary knowledge and service economy jobs. Moreover, instrumental research has always gone hand in hand with pure research, and students certainly deserve quality teaching and pastoral care. However, when the neoliberal expression of pedagogic instrumentalism and accountability becomes totally unmoored from

and take primacy over the academy's traditional goals and practices, then this almost invariably and predictably leads to the corruption of research, hindering of new scientific discoveries, dumbing down of curriculum to inflate grades, and shutting down of academically significant but unpopular departments and fields of research. To be certain, this is currently the case across the tertiary education sector (Bachan, 2017; Havergal, 2016; McKie, 2018), such that many universities, including most of those from the Russell Group, are running the significant risk of becoming little more than degree-mills that churn out largely uncritical, self-interested, and unenlightened graduates.

However mythical it may well be, the traditional university model is revered by possibly most academics not because they are nostalgic, recalcitrant, or lazy, but rather because they are themselves products of higher education. As such, they unlike the neoliberal managers who run the universities, understand full-well that a university education is valuable because it is supposed to: 1) nurture intellectual passions and interests –irrespective of their economic utility; 2) hone the capacity to reason logically and independently investigate truth claims, and 3) cultivate communitarian values along with a sense of fairness and justice (Newfield, 2018; Pavur, 2009). It is first and foremost through the achievement of these aims that a university education can help students to self-actualize and lead them to make broader and positive cultural, societal, and economic contributions.

References

Ash, M. G. (2006) Bachelor of What, Master of Whom? The Humboldt Myth and Historical Transformations of Higher Education in German Speaking Europe and the US. *European Journal of Education*, 41(2), pp. 245–267.

Bachan, R. (2017) Grade Inflation in UK Higher Education. *Studies in Higher Education,* 42(8), pp.1580-1600.

Ball, S. J. (2012) Performativity, Commodification and Commitment: An I-spy Guide to the Neoliberal University. *British Journal Of Educational Studies*, 60(1), pp. 17–28.

Boyles, D. R. (ed) (2004) *Schools or Markets? Commercialism, Privatization and School Business Partnerships*. New York: Routledge.

Chubb, J. & Watermeyer, R. (2017) Artifice or Integrity in the Marketization of Research Impact? Investigating the Moral Economy of (Pathways to) Impact Statements Within Research Funding Proposals in the UK and Australia. *Studies in Higher Education,* 42(12), pp. 2360–2372.

Chubb, J. E. & Moe, T. M. (1990) *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution.

Cribb, A., & Gewirtz, S. (2013) The Hollowed-out University? A Critical Analysis of Changing Institutional and Academic Norms in UK Higher Education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 34(3), pp. 338–350.

Ellwood, W. (2011) *No-nonsense Guide to Globalization*. New York: New Internationalist/Verso.

Friedman, M. (2002) *Capitalism and Freedom. Chicago*: University of Chicago Press.

Gaffikin, F., & Perry, D. C. (2009) Discourses and strategic visions: The US research university as an institutional manifestation of neoliberalism in a global era. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(1), pp. 115–144.

Hadley, G. (2015) *English for academic purposes in Neoliberal Universities: A critical grounded theory*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Hall, S. & Rustin, M. [eds.] (2015) *After Neoliberalism?: The Kilburn Manifesto*. London: Lawrence and Wishart Limited.

Hartwell, M. (1995) *A History of the Mont Pelerin Society.* Liberty Fund Inc.

Havergal, C. (2016, August 19) University language departments 'at risk' as recruitment slumps. *Times Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/university-language-departments-risk- recruitment-slumps

Hsieh, H.F. & Shannon, S.E. (2005) Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research,* 15(9), pp. 1277–1288.

Krippendorff, K. (2004) *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. Sage.

Leyva, R. (2018) Towards a cognitive-sociological theory of subjectivity and habitus formation in neoliberal societies. *European Journal of Social Theory*.

Lojdová, K. (2016) The End of Academic Freedom in the Era of Neoliberalism?. *Pedagogická Orientace*, 26(4), pp. 605–630.

Mckie, A. (2018, November 23) Scrap REF and allocate QR funding by headcount, says professor. *Times Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/scrap-ref-and-allocate-qr-funding- headcount-says-professor

Michelsen, S. (2010) Humboldt Meets Bologna. *Higher Education Policy*, 23(2), pp. 151–172.

Mohrman, K., Ma, W., & Baker, D. (2008) The Research University in Transition: The Emerging Global Model. *Higher Education Policy*, 21(1), pp. 5–27.

Morrissey, J. (2015) Regimes of Performance: Practices of the Normalised Self in the Neoliberal University. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 36(4), pp. 614–634.

Mountz, A., Bonds, A., Mansfield, B., Loyd, J., Hyndman, J., Walton-Roberts, M. & Curran, W. (2015) For Slow Scholarship: A Feminist Politics of Resistance Through Collective Action in the Neoliberal University. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 14(4), pp. 1236–1259.

Newfield, C. (2018) Have We Wrecked Public Universities? The Case of the American decline cycle. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 69(2), pp. 484–493.

Nybom, T. (2003) The Humboldt Legacy: Reflections on the Past, Present, and Future of the European University. *Higher Education Policy,* 16(2), pp. 141–159.

Pavur, C. (2009) Classical Humanism has Everything to do With Justice. *Electronic Antiquity*, 13(1), pp. 1–22.

Phelan, S. (2016, January 9) The Corporate University and its Threat to Academic Freedom. *openDemocracy*. Accessed from https://www.opendemocracy.net/sean-phelan/corporate- university-and-its-threat-to-academic-freedom

Shore, C., & Davidson, M. (2014) Beyond Collusion and Resistance: Academic–management Relations Within the Neoliberal University. *Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), pp. 12–28.

The Language of Neoliberal Education
An Interviw with Henry Giroux

Mitja Sardoč

Henry A. Giroux currently holds the McMaster University Chair for Scholarship in the Public Interest in the English and Cultural Studies Department and the Paulo Freire Distinguished Scholar Professorship in Critical Pedagogy. In 2002, he was named as one of the top fifty educational thinkers of the modern period in *Fifty Modern Thinkers on Education: From Piaget to the Present* as part of Routledge's Key Guides Publication Series. In 2007, he was named by the Toronto Star as one of the "12 Canadians Changing the Way We Think". In 2005, he received an honorary doctorate from Memorial University in Canada. He is on the editorial and advisory boards of numerous national and international scholarly journals, and he has served as the editor or co-editor of four scholarly book series. He co-edited a series on education and cultural studies with Paulo Freire for a decade. He is a regular contributor to a number of online journals including *Truthout, Truthdig*, and *CounterPunch*. He has published in many journals including *Social Text, Third Text, Cultural Studies, Harvard Educational Review*, *Theory, Culture*, *& Society* and *Monthly Review*. He is on the Board of Directors for *Truthout*. His books are translated into many languages. His most recent books include: *Neoliberalism's War on Higher Education* (Haymarket 2014), *The Violence of Organized Forgetting (*City Lights 2014), *Dangerous Thinking in the Age of the New Authoritarianism* (Routledge, 2015), *America's Addiction to Terrorism* (Monthly Review Press, 2016), *America at War with Itself* (City Lights, 2017), *The Public in Peril* (Routledge, 2018), *American Nightmare: Facing the Challenge of Fascism* (City Lights, 2018), and the forthcoming *The Terror of the Unforeseen* (Los Angeles Review of Books, 2019). His

primary research areas are: cultural studies, youth studies, critical pedagogy, popular culture, media studies, social theory, and the politics of higher and public education. He is particularly interested in what he calls the war on youth, the corporatization of higher education, the politics of neoliberalism, the assault on civic literacy and the collapse of public memory, public pedagogy, the educative nature of politics, and the rise of various youth movements across the globe. His website can be found at www.henryagiroux.com.

For several decades now, neoliberalism has been at the forefront of discussions not only in the economy and finance but has infiltrated our vocabulary in a number of areas as diverse as governance studies, criminology, health care, jurisprudence, education etc. What has triggered the use and application of this 'economistic' ideology associated with the promotion of effectiveness and efficiency?

Neoliberalism has become the dominant ideology of the times and has established itself as a central feature of politics. Not only does it define itself as a political and economic system whose aim was to consolidate power in the hands of a corporate and financial elite, it also wages a war over ideas. In this instance, it has defined itself as a form of commonsense and functions as a mode of public pedagogy that produces a template for structuring not just markets but all of social life. In this sense, it has and continues to function not only through public and higher education to produce and distribute market-based values, identities, and modes of agency, but also in wider cultural apparatuses and platforms to privatize, deregulate, economize, and subject all of the commanding institutions and relations of everyday life to the dictates of privatization, efficiency, deregulation, and commodification.

Since the 1970s as more and more of the commanding institutions of society come under the control of neoliberal ideology, its notions of common sense – an unchecked individualism, harsh competition, an aggressive attack on the welfare state, the evisceration of public goods, and its attack on all models of sociality at odds with market values – have become the reigning hegemony of capitalist societies. What many on the left have failed to realize is that neoliberalism is about more than economic structures, it is also is a powerful pedagogical force – especially in the era of social media – that engages in full-spectrum dominance at every level of civil society. Its reach extends not only into education but also among an array of digital platforms as well as in the broader sphere of popular culture.

Under neoliberal modes of governance, regardless of the institution, every social relation is reduced to an act of commerce. Neoliberalism's promotion of effectiveness and efficiency gives credence to its ability to willingness and success in making education central to politics. It also offers a warning to progressives, as Pierre Bourdieu has insisted that the left has underestimated the symbolic and pedagogical dimensions of struggle and have not always forged appropriate weapons to fight on this front."

According to the advocates of neoliberalism, education represents one of the main indicators of future economic growth and individual well-being. How – and why – education became one of the central elements of the 'neoliberal revolution'?

Advocates of neoliberalism have always recognized that education is a site of struggle over which there are very high stakes regarding how young people are educated, who is to be educated, and what vision of the present and future should be most valued and privileged. Higher education in the sixties went through a revolutionary period in the United States and many other countries as students sought to both redefine education as a democratic public sphere and to open it up to a variety of groups that up to that up to that point had been excluded. Conservatives were extremely frightened over this shift and did everything they could to counter it. Evidence of this is clear in the production of the Powell Memo published in 1971 and later in The Trilateral Commission's book-length report, namely, *The Crisis of Democracy,* published in 1975. From the 1960s on the, conservatives, especially the neoliberal right, has waged a war on education in order to rid it of its potential role as a democratic public sphere. At the same time, they sought aggressively to restructure its modes of governance, undercut the power of faculty, privilege knowledge that was instrumental to the market, define students mainly as clients and consumers, and reduce the function of higher education largely to training students for the global workforce. At the core of the neoliberal investment in education is a desire to undermine the university's commitment to the truth, critical thinking, and its obligation to stand for justice and assume responsibility for safeguarding the interests of young as they enter a world marked massive inequalities, exclusion, and violence at home and abroad. Higher education may be one of the few institutions left in neoliberal societies that offers a protective space to question, challenge, and think against the grain. Neoliberalism considers such a space to be dangerous and they have done everything possible to eliminate higher education as a space where students can realize themselves as critical citizens, faculty can participate in

the governing structure, and education can be define itself as a right rather than as a privilege.

Almost by definition, reforms and other initiatives aimed to improve educational practice have been one of the pivotal mechanisms to infiltrate the neoliberal agenda of effectiveness and efficiency. What aspect of neoliberalism and its educational agenda you find most problematic? Why?

Increasingly aligned with market forces, higher education is mostly primed for teaching business principles and corporate values, while university administrators are prized as CEOs or bureaucrats in a neoliberal-based audit culture. Many colleges and universities have been McDonalds-ized as knowledge is increasingly viewed as a commodity resulting in curricula that resemble a fast-food menu. In addition, faculty are subjected increasingly to a Wal-Mart model of labor relations designed as Noam Chomsky points out "to reduce labor costs and to increase labor servility". In the age of precarity and flexibility, the majority of faculty have been reduced to part-time positions, subjected to low wages, lost control over the conditions of their labor, suffered reduced benefits, and frightened about addressing social issues critically in their classrooms for fear of losing their jobs. The latter may be the central issue curbing free speech and academic freedom in the academy. Moreover, many of these faculty are barely able to make ends meet because of their impoverished salaries, and some are on food stamps. If faculty are treated like service workers, students fare no better and are now relegated to the status of customers and clients. Moreover, they are not only inundated with the competitive, privatized, and market-driven values of neoliberalism, they are also punished by those values in the form of exorbitant tuition rates, astronomical debts owed to banks and other financial institutions, and in too many cases a lack of meaningful employment. As a project and movement, neoliberalism undermines the ability of educators and others to create the conditions that give students the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and the civic courage necessary to make desolation and cynicism unconvincing and hope practical. As an ideology, neoliberalism is at odds with any viable notion of democracy which it sees as the enemy of the market. Yet, Democracy cannot work if citizens are not autonomous, self-judging, curious, reflective, and independent – qualities that are indispensable for students if they are going to make vital judgments and choices about participating in and shaping decisions that affect everyday life, institutional reform, and governmental policy.

Why large-scale assessments and quantitative data in general are a central part of the 'neo-liberal toolkit' in educational research?

These are the tools of accountants and have nothing to do with larger visions or questions about what matters as part of a university education. The overreliance on metrics and measurement has become a tool used to remove questions of responsibility, morality, and justice from the language and policies of education. I believe the neoliberal toolkit as you put it is part of the discourse of civic illiteracy that now runs rampant in higher educational research, a kind of mind-numbing investment in a metric-based culture that kills the imagination and wages an assault on what it means to be critical, thoughtful, daring, and willing to take risks. Metrics in the service of an audit culture has become the new face of a culture of positivism, a kind of empirical-based panopticon that turns ideas into numbers and the creative impulse into ashes. Large scale assessments and quantitative data are the driving mechanisms in which everything is absorbed into the culture of business. The distinction between information and knowledge has become irrelevant in this model and anything that cannot be captured by numbers is treated with disdain. In this new audit panopticon, the only knowledge that matters is that which can be measured. What is missed here, of course, is that measurable utility is a curse as a universal principle because it ignores any form of knowledge based on the assumption that individuals need to know more than how things work or what their practical utility might be. This is a language that cannot answer the question of what the responsibility of the university and educators might be in a time of tyranny, in the face of the unspeakable, and the current widespread attack on immigrants, Muslims, and others considered disposable. This is a language that is both afraid and unwilling to imagine what alternative worlds inspired by the search for equality and justice might be possible in an age beset by the increasing dark forces of authoritarianism.

While the analysis of the neoliberal agenda in education is well documented, the analysis of the language of neoliberal education is at the fringes of scholarly interest. In particular, the expansion of the neoliberal vocabulary with egalitarian ideas such as fairness, justice, equality of opportunity, well-being etc. has received [at best] only limited attention. What factors have contributed to this shift of emphasis?

Neoliberalism has upended how language is used in both education and the wider society. It works to appropriate discourses associated with

liberal democracy that have become normalized in order to both limit their meanings and use them to mean the opposite of what they have meant traditionally, especially with respect to human rights, justice, informed judgment, critical agency, and democracy itself. It is waging a war over not just the relationship between economic structures but over memory, words, meaning, and politics. Neoliberalism takes words like freedom and limits it to the freedom to consume, spew out hate, and celebrate notions of self-interest and a rabid individualism as the new common sense. Equality of opportunity means engaging in ruthless forms of competition, a war of all against all ethos, and a survival of the fittest mode of behavior. The vocabulary of neoliberalism operates in the service of violence in that it reduces the capacity for human fulfillment in the collective sense, diminishes a broad understanding of freedom as fundamental to expanding the capacity for human agency, and diminishes the ethical imagination by reducing it to the interest of the market and the accumulation of capital. Words, memory, language and meaning are weaponized under neoliberalism. Certainly, neither the media nor progressives have given enough attention to how neoliberalism colonizes language because neither group has given enough attention to viewing the crisis of neoliberalism as not only an economic crisis but also a crisis of ideas. Education is not viewed as a force central to politics and as such the intersection of language, power, and politics in the neoliberal paradigm has been largely ignored. Moreover, at a time when civic culture is being eradicated, public spheres are vanishing, and notions of shared citizenship appear obsolete, words that speak to the truth, reveal injustices and provide informed critical analysis also begin to disappear. This makes it all the more difficult to engage critically the use of neoliberalism's colonization of language. In the United States, Trump prodigious tweets signify not only a time in which governments engage in the pathology of endless fabrications, but also how they function to reinforce a pedagogy of infantilism designed to animate his base in a glut of shock while reinforcing a culture of war, fear, divisiveness, and greed in ways that disempower his critics.

You have written extensively on neoliberalism's exclusively instrumental view of education, its reductionist understanding of effectiveness and its distorted image of fairness. In what way should radical pedagogy fight back neoliberalism and its educational agenda?

First, higher education needs to reassert its mission as a public good in order to reclaim its egalitarian and democratic impulses. Educators need to

initiate and expand a national conversation in which higher education can be defended as a democratic public sphere and the classroom as a site of deliberative inquiry, dialogue, and critical thinking, a site that makes a claim on the radical imagination and a sense of civic courage. At the same time, the discourse on defining higher education as a democratic public sphere can provide the platform for a more expressive commitment in developing a social movement in defense of public goods and against neoliberalism as a threat to democracy. This also means rethinking how education can be funded as a public good and what it might mean to fight for policies that both stop the defunding of education and fight to relocate funds from the death dealing military and incarceration budgets to those supporting education at all levels of society. The challenge here is for higher education not to abandon its commitment to democracy and to recognize that neoliberalism operates in the service of the forces of economic domination and ideological repression. Second, educators need to acknowledge and make good on the claim that a critically literate citizen is indispensable to a democracy, especially at a time when higher education is being privatized and subject to neoliberal restructuring efforts. This suggests placing ethics, civic literacy, social responsibility, and compassion at the forefront of learning so as to combine knowledge, teaching, and research with the rudiments of what might be called the grammar of an ethical and social imagination. This would imply taking seriously those values, traditions, histories, and pedagogies that would promote a sense of dignity, self-reflection, and compassion at the heart of a real democracy. Third, higher education needs to be viewed as a right, as it is in many countries such as Germany, France, Norway, Finland, and Brazil, rather than a privilege for a limited few, as it is in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. Fourth, in a world driven by data, metrics, and the replacement of knowledge by the overabundance of information, educators need to enable students to engage in multiple literacies extending from print and visual culture to digital culture. They need to become border crossers who can think dialectically, and learn not only how to consume culture but also to produce it. Fifth, faculty must reclaim their right to control over the nature of their labor, shape policies of governance, and be given tenure track lines with the guarantee of secure employment and protection for academic freedom and free speech.

Why is it important to analyze the relationship between neoliberalism and civic literacy particularly as an educational project?

The ascendancy of neoliberalism in American politics has made visible a plague of deep-seated civic illiteracy, a corrupt political system and a

contempt for reason that has been decades in the making. It also points to the withering of civic attachments, the undoing of civic culture, the decline of public life and the erosion of any sense of shared citizenship. As market mentalities and moralities tighten their grip on all aspects of society, democratic institutions and public spheres are being downsized, if not altogether disappearing. As these institutions vanish – from public schools and alternative media to health care centers– there is also a serious erosion of the discourse of community, justice, equality, public values, and the common good. At the same time reason and truth are not simply contested, or the subject of informed arguments as they should be, but wrongly vilified – banished to Trump's poisonous world of fake news. For instance, under the Trump administration, language has been pillaged, truth and reason disparaged, and words and phrases emptied of any substance or turned into their opposite, all via the endless production of Trump's Twitter storms and the ongoing clown spectacle of Fox News. This grim reality points to a failure in the power of the civic imagination, political will, and open democracy. It is also part of a politics that strips the social of any democratic ideals and undermines any understanding of education as a public good. What we are witnessing under neoliberalism is not simply a political project to consolidate power in the hands of the corporate and financial elite but also a reworking of the very meaning of literacy and education as crucial to what it means to create an informed citizenry and democratic society. In an age when literacy and thinking become dangerous to the anti-democratic forces governing all the commanding economic and cultural institutions of the United States, truth is viewed as a liability, ignorance becomes a virtue, and informed judgments and critical thinking demeaned and turned into rubble and ashes. Under the reign of this normalized architecture of alleged common sense, literacy is regarded with disdain, words are reduced to data and science is confused with pseudo-science. Traces of critical thought appear more and more at the margins of the culture as ignorance becomes the primary organizing principle of American society.

Under the forty-year reign of neoliberalism, language has been militarized, handed over to advertisers, game show idiocy, and a political and culturally embarrassing anti-intellectualism sanctioned by the White House. Couple this with a celebrity culture that produces an ecosystem of babble, shock, and tawdry entertainment. Add on the cruel and clownish anti-public intellectuals such as Jordan Peterson who defend inequality, infantile forms of masculinity, and define ignorance and a warrior mentality as part of the natural order, all the while dethroning any viable sense of agency and the political.

The culture of manufactured illiteracy is also reproduced through a media apparatus that trades in illusions and the spectacle of violence. Under these circumstances, illiteracy becomes the norm and education becomes central to a version of neoliberal zombie politics that functions largely to remove democratic values, social relations, and compassion from the ideology, policies and commanding institutions that now control American society. In the age of manufactured illiteracy, there is more at work than simply an absence of learning, ideas or knowledge. Nor can the reign of manufactured illiteracy be solely attributed to the rise of the new social media, a culture of immediacy, and a society that thrives on instant gratification. On the contrary, manufactured illiteracy is political and educational project central to a right-wing corporatist ideology and set of policies that work aggressively to depoliticize people and make them complicitous with the neoliberal and racist political and economic forces that impose misery and suffering upon their lives. There is more at work here than what Ariel Dorfman calls a "felonious stupidity," there is also the workings of a deeply malicious form of 21st century neoliberal fascism and a culture of cruelty in which language is forced into the service of violence while waging a relentless attack on the ethical imagination and the notion of the common good. In the current historical moment illiteracy and ignorance offer the pretense of a community in doing so has undermined the importance of civic literacy both in higher education and the larger society.

Is there any shortcoming in the analysis of such a complex (and controversial) social phenomenon as neoliberalism and its educational agenda? Put differently: is there any aspect of the neoliberal educational agenda that its critics have failed to address?

Any analysis of an ideology such as neoliberalism will always be incomplete. And the literature on neoliberalism in its different forms and diverse contexts is quite abundant. What is often underplayed in my mind are three things. First, too little is said about how neoliberalism functions not simply as an economic model for finance capital but as a public pedagogy that operates through a diverse number of sites and platforms. Second, not enough has been written about its war on a democratic notion of sociality and the concept of the social. Third, at a time in which echoes of a past fascism are on the rise not enough is being said about the relationship between neoliberalism and fascism, or what I call neoliberal fascism, especially the relationship between the widespread suffering and misery caused by neoliberalism and the rise of white supremacy. I

define neoliberal fascism as both a project and a movement, which functions as an enabling force that weakens, if not destroys, the commanding institutions of a democracy while undermining its most valuable principles. Consequently, it provides a fertile ground for the unleashing of the ideological architecture, poisonous values, and racist social relations sanctioned and produced under fascism. Neoliberalism and fascism conjoin and advance in a comfortable and mutually compatible project and movement that connects the worse excesses of capitalism with fascist ideals – the veneration of war, a hatred of reason and truth; a populist celebration of ultra-nationalism and racial purity; the suppression of freedom and dissent; a culture which promotes lies, spectacles, a demonization of the other, a discourse of decline, brutal violence, and ultimately state violence in heterogeneous forms. As a project, it destroys all the commanding institutions of democracy and consolidates power in the hands of a financial elite. As a movement, it produces and legitimates massive economic inequality and suffering, privatizes public goods, dismantles essential government agencies, and individualizes all social problems. In addition, it transforms the political state into the corporate state, and uses the tools of surveillance, militarization, and law and order to discredit the critical press and media, undermine civil liberties while ridiculing and censoring critics. What critics need to address is that neoliberalism is the face of a new fascism and as such it speaks to the need to repudiate the notion that capitalism and democracy are the same thing, renew faith in the promises of a democratic socialism, create new political formations around an alliance of diverse social movements, and take seriously the need to make education central to politics itself.

European Neoliberal Discourse and Slovenian Educational Space

Urška Štremfel

Introduction

In the field of education, the global convergence on neoliberal discourses that direct domestic reforms has been increasingly discussed in the last few decades from the viewpoint of different social sciences (including the political and educational science). The important part of these scientific debates are the studies of neoliberal governmentality,[1] understood as the political philosophy of governance (Mitchell, 2006), which strategically use particular discourse and technology to steer society towards optimal market gains and profit. Its success lies in self-management, responsibility and calculative rationality/choices of individual actors. Neoliberalism is conceptualised not as standardized universal technology, but as the logic of governing that migrates and interacts with situated circumstances and is selectively taken up in diverse political contexts (Mitchell, 2006; Ong, 2007; Wahlström and Sundberg, 2018).[2] Within that framework, Europeanisation research attempts to determine how specific EU neoliberal governance structures and processes influence the development of national educational spaces (e.g. Dale and Robertson, 2012).

Although each EU member state is characterised by country-specific peculiarities in the educational system, some clusters of countries

1 According to Larner (2000) studies of neoliberalism can be divided into three distinct analytical categories: policy framework, ideology, governmentality.

2 Mitchell (2006) argues that neoliberalism is often cohabiting and/or overlapping with other regimes. She explains that the socio-democratic project and neoliberalism in the EU present "a complex mix of `third-way' type claims to fairness, social justice, social cohesion, and `open' government, accompanied by a sharp institutional transition to a more market-driven logic".

share commonalities that can, to some extent, determine similarities in the manner by which they accept the EU (neoliberal) agenda. Researchers (e.g. Alexiadou and Lange, 2013) agree that from this perspective, new member states represent particularly interesting objects of investigation. Silova (2009: p. 295) argues that a special group of new member states, i.e. post-socialist member states, "share several educational characteristics, as reflected in a number of educational legacies inherited from the socialist regime and a proclaimed aspiration to embrace Western (neoliberal) educational values". Chankseliani and Silova (2018) report that despite commonalities between post-socialist states in the reception of the EU neoliberal agenda, "there is little evidence of educational convergence towards neoliberal educational goals, when looking beyond policy rhetoric and digging deeper into local educational contexts". By studying the reception of the EU neoliberal agenda, in particular member state specific cultural tradition, state-society-economy relationship and political competition should therefore be taken into consideration. Discursive institutionalism has been recognised (Schmidt, 2008) as a particularly promising theoretical approach for explaining Europeanization of education policy field (influence and reception of the EU neoliberal agenda and national policy changes).

The article is positioned in the heart of neoliberalism discourse research and fits into many identified research gaps in the field. Souto-Otero (2017) reports that "With respect to the provision of empirical data, it is neoliberalism as seen through the lens of governmentality that is most commonly under-researched". The question of how neoliberal discourse becomes rearticulated in a specific national context and infiltrates into its educational system is commonly overlooked (Takayama, 2009) and most studies of neoliberal governmentality are generally abstracted from actually existing subject and spaces (Mitchell, 2006). Similarly, Alexiadou and Lange (2013) view the scope of impact of EU governance not only as being the most important for understanding its successful performance, but also being the most problematic due to lacking in depth information on whether, and how, its policy instruments are adopted and considered within (new) member states. Delanty and Rumford (2005) denote discursive institutionalism in theorizing Europeanization as a very promising, but still neglected field.

The article aims to offer new insights into how EU (neoliberal) governance has helped member states increasingly perceive themselves as being aligned with EU agendas in terms of which educational changes are important and necessary. By using discursive institutionalism approach, it sheds light on how using neoliberal discourses have contributed to new

modes of regulating educational policy, with real effects on policy and practice in national systems of education (Dale and Robertson, 2012). Here, the article does not examine neoliberal ideas and their value bases, origins, constructions and implications but is rather focused on communicative discourse through which ideas are translated to the national level (Alexiadou, 2016: p. 3; Schmidt, 2008). A case study on Slovenia is an interesting endeavour because it helps us ascertain how EU neoliberal educational discourse is received at the national level and how these influence the transformation and development of the post-socialist educational system (Silova, 2009).

The article originates primarily from policy studies, which are recognised as important meso-level theories for explaining Europeanisation. It is qualitatively oriented and draws on theoretical and empirical evidence. To address the research aim, we employ the following methods: (a) an analysis of relevant literature and secondary sources (a comprehensive review of the academic literature on EU (neoliberal) governance), (b) an analysis of formal documents and legal sources at the EU and national levels (an analysis of Slovenian educational legislation, EU official documents in the field of educational policy, non-official documents, press releases), (f) questionnaire distribution [mailed questionnaires that were sent to Slovenian educational experts who are also active at the EU/international level (n = 22), educational policy makers (n = 8), and stakeholders (headmasters) (n = 91)] (Štremfel, 2013).[3]

The first section is a review of theoretical considerations and empirical evidence on EU (neoliberal) educational governance as governance of goals, comparisons, problems/crisis and knowledge. In the second section, we focus on theoretical considerations of discursive institutionalism and its implications for Europeanization research. The third section deals with empirical evidence regarding the reception of the EU neoliberal governance discourse in the Slovenian educational space. Finally, the main findings are synthesised to serve as an explanation of relative openness of Slovenia towards EU neoliberal discourse and the implications of these insights for the understanding of the widening and deepening of the European educational space.

European Neoliberal Educational Governance

A number of authors (e.g. Walters and Haahr, 2005; Mitchell, 2006; Dale, 2008; Lange and Alexiadou, 2010; Gunter et al., 2016) have confirmed that the EU governance in the field of education policies has deeply rooted

3 We found questionnaires distributed for the purpose of the study (Štremfel, 2013) particularly interesting for illustrating theoretical premises of this article.

neoliberal premises and, as an instrument, reflects the ideas and mechanisms of the new public management. The EU is thus involved in the definition, structuring, monitoring, as well the evaluation of education and through the use of "soft governance" tools such as goals, benchmarks, indicators and international comparative achievement scales it coordinates the thinking and acting of EU member states, institutions and individuals (Nordin, 2014: p. 115).[4] In scientific debates, summarized below, EU educational governance is presented as governance of goals, comparisons, problems/crisis and knowledge.

Governance of Goals

Quantitative measurements of progress of commonly agreed goals have become a central instrument for governing education in the EU and, at the same time, an important part of the normative discourse communicating what course of action is considered desirable and persuading the actors to perform in a similar way. Indicators and benchmarks (also developed on the basis of the findings of international comparative assessment studies) enable the assessment and comparison of the performance of member states in achieving common EU goals *(governance of goals)*. Grek (2009) believes that within *governance of goals*, data and their management play a key role. Data enables governance through goal setting, whereby participant output is directed towards achieving goals. Upon publishing, these data serve as the instruments of encouragement and judgement of participants in terms of their output. They thus simultaneously represent the control of context and the autonomy of the actors operating within the context in relation to how they will achieve their goals. This is a system of discipline based on the judgement and classification of participants in achieving (jointly defined) goals.

Governance of Comparisons

Knowledge about member state performance in achieving commonly agreed goals is almost always contextualised in relation to other systems. Comparisons (commonly shown as an international spectacle of achievement or underachievement on comparative achievement scales) strengthen participants' mutual responsibility for achieving common goals, legitimise political actions and thus create a new mode of governance. They mostly encompass a rationalistic approach to policy making, wherein (assessed) participants are implicitly under pressure to arrive as close as possible to what is considered 'the best' in accordance with special criteria

4 Ball (2015) denotes such measurement and monitoring tools as preferred techniques within the normative ideal of neoliberalism.

within a certain context of comparisons. In this regard, the leading assumption is that the most efficient (rationalist approach) and the most suitable (constructivist approach) decisions are adopted on the basis of objective data (March and Olsen, 1998). International comparative achievement scales hence exert double pressure on EU member states [the sense of their own (un)competitiveness compared with the performance of other members states, the feeling of ineffectiveness resulting from (non)achievement of common goals] and direct them towards achieving the strategic goals of the EU (Alexiadou, 2007; Ioannidou, 2007). Some authors (e.g. Nóvoa and Yariv-Mashal, 2003) point out that in this respect, governance by comparison not only creates convergence (of goals and outcomes), but may also lead to uniformity in activity and thinking. Within the neoliberal philosophy, such competitive neutrality establishes relationships of rivalry as a means of increasing productivity, accountability and oversight.

Governance of Problems/Crisis

As far as transnational problem resolution is concerned, the governance of problems pertains to a situation wherein a group of countries recognise a common policy problem and unite their efforts in resolving this problem. Nóvoa (2002: p. 145) argues that the 'expert discourses' that emerge from the European Commission tend to homogenise 'problems' and 'solutions' and create the illusion of a common agenda. When an EU member state perceives a policy-related problem based on its ranking on an international comparative achievement scale, the most efficient policy models for problem resolution have often already been developed at the EU level. Member state uncertainty, how to resolve the problem itself and the pressure of competitiveness can explain their receptiveness to apparently neutral external solutions. Under this approach, then, the EU governance is seen as a way of gradually solving national problems by shifting problem solving capacity from the national to the supranational level (see also Alexiadou, 2014: p. 128).

Nordin (2014) points out that *crisis discourse* presents an important instrument of EU neoliberal educational governance.[5] The crisis discourse has an epistemological approach coordinating ideas and exercising persuasive power to guide human thinking and action in a certain direction when communicated by powerful policy actors such as the EU. The crisis

5 Nordin (2014) recognised the similarities between crisis discourse and risk society (Beck, 1992). He argues that "While the risk society calculates possible risks in a distant and unknown future, the crisis discourse calls for immediate action in response to a situation already known (at least for those powerful actors communicating the crisis), changing the time horizon for those involved in the policy-making process in a more reactive direction" (Nordin, 2014: pp. 122–123).

discourse implies that action has to be taken urgently and immediately and that there is no option other than to act. According to Nordin (2014), it is especially evident in the EU documents from 2005 onwards, when EU realised its progress towards realizing Lisbon goals was very limited and from 2008 onwards, when global economic crisis emerged.[6] The result shows that this normative discourse is becoming an important and powerful instrument of the EU seeking public legitimacy for extensive (EU and national) reforms (Robertson, 2008; Nordin, 2014: p. 109).

Governance of Knowledge

As evident from the discussion above in all presented forms of governance – governance of goals, comparisons and problems/crisis, apparently objective expert data play a key role. Apple (2001: p. 413) points out the essential advantage of the neoliberal discourse is in its efforts for political strategies to become neutral. When public policies and policy instruments are considered to be neutral, they turn into technical solutions to policy problems and are thus in lesser need of critical assessment or of being discussed by a wide circle of actors (Cort, 2010). With apparent neutrality (and the resulting emphasised role of experts and the expert knowledge), the EU neoliberal educational governance steers the member states towards achieving political (economic oriented) goals. The neoliberal shift towards economic goals is not only a shift in terms of the content of education, but also encompasses the entire ideology on how to steer society.

The neoliberal ideology as a means of steering society in the early stages of reinforcement of mutual cooperation in the field of education, was not only appealing for the EU because of the changes in the aim of education towards economic objectives (e.g. Holford and Mohorčič Špolar, 2012), but has also proven highly suitable when the EU was entering a sensitive policy field, where the member states had previously not been willing to relinquish their political power. It seems that it was only neutrality of the neoliberal discourse that was able to persuade them into a more committed mutual cooperation. Although cooperation between member states in the field of education remains non-mandatory, the new mode of EU (neoliberal) governance instruments contain a number of drivers that steer member states towards acting in the agreed-upon direction. Haahr

6 Schmidt (2008) recognizes the contribution of similar approaches – ideational institutionalism (Hay, 2001); constructivist institutionalism (Hay, 2006) and strategic constructivism (Jabko, 2006) – to this understanding. She justifies the added value of discursive institutionalism in terms of its focus on understanding discourse as interactive process. Since the main aim of this article is to explain the interactive process of translating neoliberal discourse from the EU to the national level, the article uses particularly discursive institutionalism as theoretical background.

(2004: p.210) argues that neoliberal governance includes a touch of freedom, yet simultaneously also the appeal of its use. Jacobsson (2004) attributes the secret behind it to a special combination of pressure it exerts and the actors' initiative and desire for voluntary policy change that it triggers. What makes neoliberal ideology (and consequently EU neoliberal educational governance) influential is the absence of questioning, surrender to what is seen as the implacable and irreversible logic of social reality (Bauman, 1999: p. 127).

Europeanization Through the Lens of Discursive Institutionalism

In theorizing EU influence of national policy, new institutionalist theories play an important role. The new institutionalisms (older new institutionalism of rational choice, sociological institutionalism, historical institutionalism, and more recent new institutionalisms, such as discursive institutionalism and constructivist institutionalism) share the conviction that the social world and actors' decision-making cannot be properly explained without taking into account the role of institutions in constituting the conditions under which actors make their moves and how they expect others to behave (Alasuutari, 2015: p. 164). "The emphasis in the new institutionalism is on how people actively construct meaning within institutionalized settings through language and other symbolic representations" (Meyer and Rowan, 2006: p. 6 in Nordin, 2014: p. 111). Yet there are significant differences between different new institutionalism approaches as to how they define the relationship between institutions and behaviour, and how they explain the origins of, and changes within, institutions (Alasuutari, 2015). Schmidt (2008) argues that the original versions of the three older new-institutionalisms tend to provide analytical ground for explaining continuity, but are less useful when we need to explain change. Discursive institutionalism therefore presents an attempt to generate more complex understandings on how structural constraints (particularly norms, values, world views, but also historical path dependence) can interact with discursive and symbolic practices, ideational flow and the agents abilities to influence the institutions and the course of change (Schmidt, 2012: p. 708).[7] Discourse as defined by Schmidt (2008), serves as a more generic term that encompasses not only the substantive content of ideas but also the interactive process by which ideas are conveyed to influence the action of policy actors.

7 E.g. Brine (2006) reports that an important argument in these documents is that the low-skilled population present high risk for knowledge-economy.

According to Schmidt (2008), ideas differ in levels of generality – whether specific to policy, encompassing a wider program, or constituting an underlying philosophy – and types – such as cognitive and normative ideas. Specific policies present particular policy solutions proposed by policy makers for adoption. General programmes underpin policy ideas and may be cast as paradigms that reflect the underlying assumptions or organising principles orienting policy. They define "the problems to be solved by policies, the issues to be considered, the goals to be achieved, the norms, methods and instruments to be applied, and the objectives and ideals which all in all frame the more immediate policy ideas proposed as solutions for any given problem" (Schmidt, 2008: p. 307). Public philosophies are background ideas, acting as underlying assumptions, which are rarely contested. The content of ideas and the pertaining ideational discursive activity is divided into cognitive and normative types (Schmidt, 2008). Cognitive ideas serve to justify policies and programmes by speaking to their interest-based logic and necessity. They provide recipes, guidelines and maps for political action and explain "what is and what to do". Normative ideas attach values to political action and serve to legitimize the policies in a programme through reference to their appropriateness. They present how policies and programmes resonate with public philosophies and provide answers to "what one ought to do" (Schmidt, 2008).

As already introduced, discourse is a more overarching concept than ideas. It refers not just to what is said (ideas) but also to who said what to whom, where, when, how, and why (discursive interactions). The interactive process of discourse may exert a causal influence beyond what discourse does in representing ideas and serves not just to express one set of actors' strategic interests (cognitive ideas) or values (normative ideas), but also to persuade others of the necessity and/or appropriateness of a given course of action (Schmidt, 2008). Discourse institutionalism distinguishes between two aspects of discursive interaction, coordinative and communicative. The coordinative interaction is related to formulating the content of ideas and sharing a set of cognitive and normative ideas of education in epistemic communities. The communicative interaction present the interactive processes through which these ideas are presented, deliberated and legitimated as necessary and appropriate to the general public (Schmidt, 2008: p. 310).

Although discursive institutionalism was already questioned from the viewpoint of its necessity to explain policy change [see Ball (2011; 2012) and Schmidt (2012) for the response], many authors exposed its advantages in studying Europeanization of (education) policies (e.g. Schmidt and Radaelli, 2004; Wahlström and Sundberg, 2018). Ideas are

not geographically bound but evolve in the communication between actors at different levels of EU governance. Discursive institutionalism enables the better understanding of the actual practices through which EU discourse is incorporated in national context by changing the beliefs and expectations of national actors, including the change of preferences and strategies (Alasuutari, 2015; Featherstone, 2003). Discursive institutionalism therefore importantly contributes to an understanding of the complex and interactive process of EU influence in the sensitive policy field, where member states formally maintain sovereignty over their educational systems. Due to a lack of EU legal power, normative discourses are central to govern the field of education in the EU. Discursive power is used to persuade EU member states to coordinate their national policies and voluntary strive towards agreed performance (governance of goals and governance of comparisons) and providing particular problematizations and proposed solutions (governance of problems/crisis) (Lange and Alexiadou, 2010; Lawn, 2011; Nordin, 2014).

Alasuutari (2015) asks what the actual neoliberal discourses are and how they are implemented in practice. Alexiadou (2016), Nordin (2014) and Wahlström and Sundberg (2018) discussed concrete examples of ideas and discourses applied in EU neoliberal educational governance in the following way. The Lisbon Summit (European Council, 2000) made up of European educational actors formed a coordinative normative discourse of common interests and similar worldviews. The paradigmatic principle following on from these background ideas was mainly that EU member states need to cooperate more closely to cope with global competition. The underlying assumption was that rapid societal changes related to the continuous development of the knowledge-based economy highlighted the need for people to be able to respond quickly to structural changes in their working lives. Accordingly, each national education system must prepare its students to be competitive in a global knowledge economy. The cognitive policy solution to this problem became lifelong learning and the key competencies concept (Wahlström and Sundberg, 2018). Through the working programmes Education and Training 2010 and 2020 (Council of the EU, 2002; 2009), these cognitive foregrounds of programmatic discourses were shared with the member states through communicative discourse. In order to realize them at the EU level as a whole, the governance architecture was built on the idea of governing member states, organisations and individuals to act consistently in accordance with the common objectives (Nordin, 2014). Benchmarks and indicators (also based on data of international comparative studies) have been introduced for monitoring progress. The data from international comparative assessment studies

have become an important indicator of national political and economic power (Wiseman, 2010). The belief occurred that the competitiveness of the economy and its position in the global marketplace will be increasingly dependent on the level of employees' knowledge and skills, whereby it is assumed there is a connection between countries' future economic performance and the current achievements of their school population. The presented discourse facilitates a deepening of the European cooperation in the field of education towards what is preferred by the EU, while the member states have over the past few years – in the circumstances of the economic crisis – been following the EU more so than before, aiming to maintain their competitiveness within the knowledge-based economy (also see Tsarouhas, 2009).

According to Alexiadou (2016) and Schmidt (2008), both, coordinative discourse, which present a neoliberal (economic oriented) content of education (e.g. knowledge-economy, human capital, competences, competitiveness) and communicative discourse, which is based on neoliberal ideology on how to steer society (e.g. through goals, standards, transparency, accountability, evidence-based policy making), are equally important. The latter covers the normative discourse about an appropriate institutional framework that enables a goal or idea to be achieved and a causal belief regarding how governance works and affects the achievement of goals. In the next section, we attempt to explain its reception on the case study of Slovenia.

Insights from Slovenia

The educational system in present-day Slovenia is characterised by a long history.[8] A turning point in its development occurred in the 1990s, following Slovenia's independence in 1991. Slovenia introduced new legislation that regulates the entire educational system, from pre-school to university education (1993–1996). Since then, legislation that regulates the management, organisation and financing of education has undergone many changes. These changes relate to specific issues and have been, at least to a limited extent, subject to conformity with the requirements of Slovenia's membership in the EU (Ministry of Education and Sport, 2007). The Slovenian White paper on education (1995) as well Slovenian researchers report that from Slovenia's independence onwards, Europe has been seen as a very important reference in reforming the Slovenian educational system (Štrajn, 2004: pp. 51–54). Kodelja (2007: p. 40) claims that the reform of the Slovenian educational system took place in line with the

8 According to Štremfel and Lajh (2012), the educational policy of Slovenia can be divided in four phases: imperialistic, supervised, sovereign and globalised.

common European heritage of political, cultural and moral values. Pluško (2004: p. 62) adds that the entry of Slovenia in the EU helped the country clarify some conceptual questions about the educational system and articulate the direction of its future educational priorities. Barle Lakota (2005) finds that in these reform processes, the EU was presented almost with mythic expectations and without any critical views about it.

Blokker (2005: p. 504) confirms the assumptions that in post-socialist countries, the West has been unproblematically presented as the embodiment of progress, providing 'the normative affirmation of the Western modernity project'. The openness towards EU (neoliberal) governance mechanisms in these states thus can be explained by a desire to leave its eastern post-socialist past and become closer to the EU western values. Being left was not politically acceptable, presented with discourse of crisis and threat to international legitimacy. By focusing on the global, post-socialist states have constructed ways of reasoning that undermine divergent visions for education reforms and limit possibilities of imaging any alternative trajectories of post-socialist transformations (Silova, 2009; Chankseliani and Silova, 2018). "Although the emergence of Western neoliberal imaginaries is clearly visible in education policy narratives in many post socialist contexts, there are also multiple tensions, complexities and contradictions associated with the ongoing reconfigurations of education purposes and values, as well as with their subsequent translations into education policy and practice" (Chankseliani and Silova, 2018: p. 19).

In the following sections, we illustrate the reception of EU neoliberal educational governance in the Slovenian educational space. In line with the orientation of the article we focus on communicative discourse (the ways of steering national actors towards realizing EU (neoliberal) ideas).

Governance of Goals

In the study (Štremfel, 2013) 90% of policy makers and 88% of experts agree with the statement that short-, medium- and long-term EU goals and indicators measuring them are taken into consideration and thus play an important role in the development of Slovenian education policies and practices. It is even more interesting that only 45% of the stakeholders said they were aware of long-, medium- and short-term EU goals, but 79% of them agreed with the statement 'I feel accountable for attaining these goals'.[9] These findings correspond to the importance of individual accountability as an important mechanism of attaining commonly agreed goals in neoliberal governance. They also confirms that EU neoliberal

9 91% of participating stakeholders agreed with the statement: "I feel responsible for results of Slovenia in international comparative assessment studies".

educational governance operates at a distance and with its latent pressures, directs actors towards achieving common EU goals, often without consciously knowing about it (e.g. Haahr, 2004).

Governance of Comparisons

The importance of international comparability of the Slovenian educational system is evident from the White Paper (2011: p. 25), indicating the following strategic goal: "At the state level, we have to clearly set and pave the way to the goal, that according to the quality of the presented knowledge, Slovenian students rank in at least the top third of the achievements of the students of the developed countries."

According to the observations of the participating actors (Štremfel, 2013), experts in communicating the results of international comparative assessment studies in Slovenia mainly point out Slovenia's ranking on international comparative achievement scales and focus on the explanations of good or poor performance of the participating countries (by means of the findings of scientific and expert research conducted in the field of education). The emphasis on international comparability in the Slovenian educational space can be explained by a post-socialist state desire to be aligned with EU western values (Silova, 2009) as well as competitiveness of the states in global knowledge economy (Wiseman, 2010).

Governance of Problems/Crisis

Actors participating in the survey (Štremfel, 2013) completely agreed with the statement that response to the results of international comparative assessment studies is more intensive, when Slovenia performs below the EU and OECD average. This is confirmed by the data that among seven identified EU strategic goals,[10] a huge majority of participating actors (75% of policy makers, 46% of experts, 51% stakeholders) agreed that the most attention in Slovenia is paid to improving reading literacy of students. As the main reason for paying such attention to this, they highlight the below average results of Slovenia in PISA survey and consequently not attaining the particular EU goal.[11] These findings confirm that any deviation from the Western norms is recognized as a crisis, a danger and a

10 Improving reading literacy of students, improving mathematical literacy of students, improving science literacy of students, increasing participation of adults in lifelong learning, increasing the share of young population with completed upper-secondary education, reducing early school leaving, increasing the number of graduates in math and science.

11 The study was performed in 2012, a year and a half after the launch of the PISA 2009 survey results, which for the first time since Slovenia's participation in international comparative assessment studies revealed that the performance of Slovenian students is below the EU and OECD average.

decline in post-socialist member states (Silova, 2012) and that the arguments for the crisis gain momentum through the use of 'soft governance' practices built on comparative data (Grek and Lawn, 2009).

Slovenian actors (policy makers and experts), according to the study (Štremfel, 2013), believe that results of international comparative assessment studies allow the identification of national policy problems when it comes to Slovenia's below-average results. However, Slovenian actors are not aware of the existence and influence of EU policy solutions to the identified national policy problems. The arguments about apparent neutrality of the neoliberal technologies, which turn into technical solutions to policy problems and are thus in lesser need of critical assessment (Cort, 2010) could explain such situation.

Governance of Knowledge

Slovenian actors (policy makers, experts, headmasters) trust the objectivity and neutrality of experts and expert knowledge operated at the EU level. For example, 100% of policy makers, 96% of experts and 84% of stakeholders participating in the study (Štremfel, 2013) responded that they trust in the expertise and objectivity of researchers and other experts involved in the design and implementation of international comparative assessment studies at the EU level. The Slovenian actors as well trust in appropriate scientific background and methodological framework of these studies. The same is true for national experts, who are perceived as the most important actors in the transfer of EU agendas to the national educational space. For example, 88% of policy makers, 91% of experts and 96% of stakeholders participating in the study agreed that researchers and other experts are the most important actors in these processes. In this context, Porter (1995: p. 45) believes in considering whether 'the numbers are accepted as valid'. The author also maintains that here, "technologies of trust" operate because of the role of experts in the construction of statistical indicators; the measures succeed by giving direction to the very activities that are being measured.

Regarding evidence-based education as an integral part of the global order, which is supported by the neoliberal agenda (Shahjahan, 2011: p. 193) and EU educational governance (Cort, 2010), Slovenian actors agree that international (including EU) cooperation triggered the introduction and development of the concept in Slovenia. The White paper on education (2011) states that one of Slovenia's most important goals in the field of education today is the establishment of a culture of quality and assessment, which is based on the concept of evidence-based policy, where the participation in international comparative assessment studies plays an

important role. However, 88% of policy makers and 96% of experts in the study (Štremfel, 2013) agreed that evidence-based education policymaking is not well developed in Slovenian educational space (meaning that Slovenian education policies and practices are not based on expert data). Additionally, 63% of policy makers, 81% of experts and 84% of stakeholders participating in the study agreed with the statement 'International comparative assessment studies in Slovenia are often used for as an argument for politically motivated changes in the field of education'. In order to overcome such shortcomings in the development and use of the evidence-based policy making in Slovenia, the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport (2017) has been establishing new comprehensive model for identifying and ensuring quality in the field of education. The new model, among other aims, plans to more systematically use the results of national research and international comparative assessment studies results in the development of Slovenian educational policies and practices. These endeavours could be understood as a desire to enhance national trustworthiness of the system and the strengthening of its international legitimacy (Chankseliani and Silova, 2018).

Conclusions

This article has attempted to demonstrate the role the EU (neoliberal) discourse plays in the Europeanization of the (post-socialist) national educational space. From that purpose, the logic behind EU neoliberal educational governance has been introduced. The way it influences national educational spaces has been theoreticized by using a discursive institutionalism approach. The reception of neoliberal discourse in Slovenia as a post-socialist EU member state has been explained by providing empirical examples and their theoretical underpinnings.

Analysed data reveals the relative openness of Slovenia towards the EU (neoliberal) educational discourse. This have been explained by interrelation of various factors, including a) the design of EU neoliberal educational governance as governance of goals, comparisons, problems/crisis; b) strong communicative and persuasive discourse (e.g. accountability, inevitability) used by European Commission for steering member states towards commonly agreed goals (coordinative discourse); c) the desire of Slovenia as new post-socialist state to comply with Western norms and d) national institutional context and specific institutional settings (as external factors which created a receptive environment for new neoliberal ideas). As such, this article contributes a small but, in light of the lack of empirical studies in the field, important understanding of the role neoliberal

discourse has in the deepening and widening of the European educational space in last two decades.

References

Alasuutari, P. (2015) The Discursive Side of New Institutionalism. *Cultural Sociology,* 9(2), pp. 162–184.

Alexiadou, N. (2007) The Europeanisation of education policy – changing governance and »new modes of coordination«. *Research in Comparative and International Education,* 2(2), pp. 102–116.

Alexiadou, N. (2014) Policy learning and Europeanisation in education: The governance of a field and the transfer of knowledge. In: Nordin, A. and Sundeberg, D. (eds.), *Transnational Policy Flows in European Education: The Making and Governing of Knowledge in the Education Policy Field*, pp. 123–140. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Alexiadou, N. (2016) Responding to 'crisis': Education policy research in Europe. *Research in Education,* 96(1), pp. 23–30.

Alexiadou, N. and Lange, B. (2013) Deflecting European Union influence on national education policy-making: the case of the United Kingdom. *Journal of European Integration,* 35(1), pp. 37–52.

Apple, W.M. (2001) Comparing Neo-liberal Projects and Inequality in Education. *Comparative Education,* 37(4), pp. 409–423.

Ball, S. J. (2011) Do we really need a new constructivist institutionalism to explain institutional change? *British Journal of Political Science,* 41(4), pp. 883–906.

Ball, S. J. (2012) Where are the institutions? The limits of Vivien Schmidt's Constructivism. *British Journal of Political Science,* 42(2), pp. 714–719.

Ball, S. J. (2015) Education, governance and the tyranny of numbers. *Journal of Education Policy,* 30(3), pp. 299–301.

Barle Lakota, A. (2005) Dejavniki oblikovanja politik na področju vzgoje in izobraževanja. *Šolsko polje,* 16(5–6), pp. 101–108.

Bauman, Z. (1999) *In Search of Politics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: SAGE.

Blokker, P. (2005) Post-Communist Modernization, Transition Studies, and Diversity in Europe. *European Journal of Social Theory,* 8 (4), pp. 503–525.

Brine, J. (2006) Lifelong Learning and the Knowledge Economy: Those That Know and Those That do not – The Discourse of the European Union. *British Educational Research Journal,* 32(5), pp. 649–665.

Chankseliani, M. & Silova, I. (2018) Introduction. Reconfiguring Education Purposes, Policies and Practices during Post-socialist Transformations: setting the stage. In: M. Chankseliani and Silova I. (eds.), *Comparing Post-Socialist Transformations Purposes, Policies, and Practices in Education*, pp. 7–25. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Cort, P. (2010) Stating the Obvious: the European Qualifications Framework is not a neutral evidence-based policy tool. *European Educational Research Journal,* 9(3), pp. 304–316.

Council of the EU (2002) Detailed work programme on the follow-up of the objectives of education and training systems in Europe (ET 2010).

Council of the European Union (2009) Council conclusions of 12 May 2009 on a strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training (ET 2020).

Dale, R. (2008). Neoliberal capitalism, the modern state and the governance of education. *Tertium Comparationis,* 17(2), pp. 183–198.

Dale, R. and Robertson, S. (2012) Toward a Critical Grammar of Education Policy Movements. In: G. Steiner-Khamsi & F. Waldow (eds.), *Policy Borrowing and Lending in Education*, pp. 21–40. London: Routledge.

Delanty, G. and Rumford, C. (2005) *Re-thinking Europe: Social Theory and the Implications of Europeanization*. London: Routledge.

European Council. (2000) *Presidency Conclusions. Lisbon European Council*. 23 and 24 March 2000.

Featherstone, K. (2003) In the name of Europe. In: K. Featherstone& C.M. Radaelli (eds.), *The Politics of Europeanization*, pp. 3–26. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grek, S. (2009) Governing by Numbers: the PISA "effect" in Europe. *Journal of Education Policy,* 24(1), pp. 23–37.

Grek, S. and Lawn, M. (2009) A Short History of Europeanizing Education. *European Education,* 41(1), pp. 32–54.

Gunter, H., Grimaldi E., Hall, D. & Serpieri, R. (eds.) (2016) *New Public Management and the Reform of Education: European Lessons for Policy and Practice*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Haahr, J. H. (2004) Open co-ordination as advanced liberal government. *Journal of European Public Policy,* 11(2), pp. 209–230.

Hay C. (2001) The 'Crisis' of Keynesianism and the Rise of NeoLiberalism in Britain: An Ideational Institutionalist Approach. In: J.L. Campbell & O. Pedersen (eds.), *The Rise of NeoLiberalism and Institutional Analysis*, pp. 193–218. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hay C. (2006) Constructivist Institutionalism. In: S. A.Binder, R.A.W. Rhodes, B.A. Rockman (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*, pp. 56–74. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holford, J. and Mohorčič Špolar, V. (2012) Neoliberal and Inclusive Themes in European Lifelong Learning Strategy. In: S.Riddell, J. Markowitsch & E. Weedon (eds.), *Lifelong Learning in Europe: Equity and Efficiency in the Balance*, pp. 39–62. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Ioannidou, A. (2007) A Comparative Analysis of New Governance Instruments in the Transnational Educational Space: A Shift to Knowledge-based Instruments? *European Educational Research Journal,* 6(4), pp. 336–347.

Jabko N. (2006) *Playing the Market*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Jacobsson, K. (2004) Between Deliberation and Discipline: Soft Governance in EU Employment Policy. In: U. Mörth [ed.], *Soft Law in Governance and Regulation: An Interdisciplinary Analysis*, pp. 81–101. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Kodelja, Z. (2007) Reforme, stroka in šolske politike. *Sodobna pedagogika*. 58(2), pp. 34–48.

Lange, B. and Alexiadou, N. (2010) Policy Learning and Governance of Education Policy in the EU. *Journal of Education Policy,* 25(4), pp. 443–463.

Larner, W. (2000) Neo-liberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality. *Studies in Political Economy,* 63, pp. 5–26.

Lawn, M. (2011) Standardizing the European Education Policy Space. *European Educational Research Journal,* 10(2), pp. 259–272.

March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P. (1998) *The Logic of Appropriateness*. ARENA Working Papers, WP 04/09. Oslo: University of Oslo.

Ministry of Education and Sport (2007) The Slovene Education System Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow. Ljubljana: Ministry of Education and Sport.

Ministry of Education, Science and Sport (2017) *Nacionalni okvir za ugotavljanje in zagotavljanje kakovosti na področju vzgoje in izobraževanja*. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za izobraževanje, znanost in šport.

Mitchell, K. (2006) Neoliberal Governmentality in the European Union: Education, Training, and Technologies of Citizenship. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 24, pp. 389–407.

Nordin, A. (2014) Crisis as a discursive legitimation strategy in educational reforms: A critical policy analysis. *Education Inquiry,* 5(1), pp. 109–126.

Nóvoa, A. (2002) Ways of Thinking About Education in Europe. In: A. Nóvoa & M. Lawn (eds.), *Fabricating Europe – The formation of an Education Space*, pp. 131–156. Dortrech: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Nóvoa, A. and Yariv-Mashal, T. (2003) Comparative Research in Education: A Mode of Governance or a Historical Journey? *Comparative Education,* 39(4), pp. 423–443.

Ong, A. (2007) Neoliberalism as a Mobile Technology. *Transactions,* 32(1), pp. 3–8.

Ozga, J. (2011) Introduction. Researching the Powerful: seeking knowledge about policy. *European Educational Research Journal,* 10(2), pp. 218–224.

Pluško, A. (2004) S prenovo vzgojno-izobraževalnega sistema uresničujemo cilje Evropske unije. *Vzgoja in izobraževanje,* 35(1), pp. 61–63.

Porter, T. (1995) *Trust in Numbers.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Robertson, S. (2008) Embracing the global: crisis and the creation of a new semiotic order to secure Europe's knowledge-based economy. In: B. Jessop, N. Fairclough, & R. Wodak (eds.), *Education and the Knowledge-based Economy in Europe*, pp. 89–108 Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Schmidt, V. A. (2008) Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse. *Annual Review of Political Science,* 11, pp. 303–326.

Schmidt, V. A. (2012) A Curious Constructivism: A Response to Professor Ball. *British Journal of Political Science,* 42(3), pp. 705–713.

Schmidt, V. A., and Radaelli, C. M. (2004) Policy Change and Discourse in Europe: Conceptual and Methodological Issues. *West European Politics,* 27(2), pp. 183–210.

Shahjahan, R. A. (2011) Decolonizing the Evidence-based Education and Policy Movement: Revealing the Colonial Vestiges in Educational Policy, Research, and Neoliberal Reform. *Journal of Education Policy,* 26(2), pp. 181–206.

Silova, I. (2009) Varieties of Educational Transformation: The Post-Socialist States of Central/Southestern Europe and the Former Soviet Union. In: R. Cowen & A.M. Kazamias (eds.), *International Handbook of Comparative Education*, pp. 295–320 Dordrecht: Springer.

Silova, I. (2012) Contested Meanings of Educational Borrowing. In: G. Steiner-Khamsi & F. Waldow (eds.), *Policy Borrowing and Lending in Education*, pp. 229–245. London: Routledge.

Souto-Otero, M. (2017) Neo-liberalism, Discursive Change and European Education Policy Trajectories. In: N. Lendvai & P. Kenneth-Bainton (eds.), *Handbook of European Social Policy*, pp. 284–301. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Štrajn, D. (2004) Evropska unija in Slovenija v procesih sprememb sistemov vzgoje in izobraževanja. *Vzgoja in izobraževanje,* 35(1), pp. 51–55.

Štremfel, U. and Lajh, D. (2012) Development of Slovenian Education Policy in the European Context and Beyond. *Bulgarian journal of science and education policy,* 6(1), pp. 130–154.

Štremfel, U. (2013) Nova oblika vladavine v Evropski uniji na področju izobraževalnih politik [New mode of EU governance in the field of education policies (PhD thesis)]. Ljubljana: Faculty of Social Sciences.

Takayama, K. (2009) Is Japanese Education the "Exception"?: Examining the Situated Articulation of Neo-liberalism Through the Analysis of Policy Keywords, *Asia Pacific Journal of Education,* 29(2), pp. 125–142.

Tsarouhas, D. (2009) The Open Method of Coordination and Integration Theory: Are There Lessons to be Learned? Paper presented at the 11th European Union Studies Association Biennial Conference, 23.–25. April, Los Angeles, USA.

Wahlström, N. and Sundberg, D. (2018) Discursive institutionalism: towards a framework for analysing the relation between policy and curriculum. *Journal of Education Policy,* 33(1), pp. 163–183.

Walters, W. & Haahr, J.H. (2005) *Governing Europe: discourse, governmentality and European integration.* London, New York: Routledge.

White Paper on Education in Slovenia (1995) Bela knjiga o vzgoji in izobraževanju v Republiki Sloveniji. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za šolstvo in šport.

White Paper on Education in Slovenia (2011) Bela knjiga o vzgoji in izobraževanju v Republiki Sloveniji. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za šolstvo in šport.

Wiseman, W. A. (2010) The Uses of Evidence for Educational Policymaking: Global Contexts and International Trends. *Review of Research in Education,* 34 (1), pp. 1–24.

Resisting the Iron Cage of 'the Student Experience'

Sarah Hayes
Petar Jandrić

As higher education (HE) has come to be valued for its contribution to the global economy, priorities have been placed on study for a degree to directly meet the needs of industry (Hayes, 2015: p. 125). Furthermore, in UK policy, students have been defined as 'customers' by the government since the introduction of tuition fees (Dearing, 1997; Browne, 2010). Together, these developments have emphasized the role of a degree as a consumer 'product', purchased to secure future employment (Peters, Jandrić and Hayes, 2018a), rather than an experiential learning 'process', that continues well beyond student life (Hayes, 2015 : p. 130). We examine how the student-as-consumer approach in HE policy has recently developed into a strong rhetoric emphasizing 'the student experience' as a package, including leisure, well-being, future employment and other 'extras'. This could be perceived as positive, where all elements of student life are acknowledged. Alternatively, policy discourse concerning 'the student experience' could also be critiqued as a concept that now transcends the notion of a degree as a utilitarian product. A disturbing impression is then generated, where universities are now delivering a packaged experience of 'consumption itself', to students (Argenton, 2015: p. 921). What students would individually experience, such as a 'sense of belonging and pride in the university', is delivered to students, not developed by them. To examine such concerns more closely, we analyse a sample of 20 UK university 'student experience' strategies, via a corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Drawing on themes from these texts, we question who 'the student experience' rhetoric really benefits? If a rationalized experience is constructed on behalf of students, then universities as 'cathedrals

of consumption' (Ritzer, 2010) align themselves with any other provider of consumer experiences, where the 'production' of academic life has all been taken care of. In such a discourse, students are not necessarily conceptualized as empowered consumers either (Brooks, 2017) but trapped instead within an 'iron cage', even before they set foot in the workplace. Yet, despite a distorted picture that neoliberal HE policy discourse may portray, a postdigital understanding of 'the student experience' could yet offer helpful insights into possible routes of resistance.

Introduction

The 'student-as-consumer' approach in HE policy has been critically examined by a multitude of authors in the last two decades (Driscoll and Wicks, 1998; Clarke, Newman, Smith, Vidler, and Westmarland, 2007; Molesworth, Nixon, and Scullion, 2009; Brooks, 2017; Bunce, Baird and Jones, 2017; Peters, Jandrić and Hayes, 2018; Hayes, 2018a; Hayes, forthcoming, 2019). Students were described as 'customers' in *Higher Education in the Learning Society* (Dearing 1997) and since then, higher education institutions (HEIs) 'have increasingly had to operate under forces of marketisation which demand competitiveness, efficiency and consumer satisfaction' (Bunce, Baird and Jones, 2017: p. 1958). To place these developments within a broader context of 'neoliberalism', authors have suggested that this manifests as 'a specific economic discourse or philosophy which has become dominant and effective in world economic relations as a consequence of super-power sponsorship' (Olssen and Peters, 2005: p. 314). Whilst at an economic level, neoliberalism is linked to globalization, 'it is a particular element of globalization, in that it constitutes the form through which domestic and global economic relations are structured'. (Olssen and Peters, 2005: p. 314). It should therefore be understood as 'a politically imposed discourse' (Olssen and Peters, 2005: p. 314).

The rhetoric that accompanies neoliberalism in HE tends to comprise 'common sense' but powerful forms of reasoning. It has been described by some as the language of 'new capitalism', which is characterized 'by a 'restructuring' of the relations between the economic, political and social (Jessop, 2000; Fairclough, 2000; Simpson and Mayr, 2010). This term is helpful in the word 'new' because it demonstrates that significant changes have taken place in our language, in order to accommodate new corporate policies within UK HEIs (Hayes, 2019 forthcoming). This means that alternative values can become hushed, along with other ways of organising academic labour (Couldry, 2010: p. 12). Indeed, a neoliberal agenda in HEIs has been supported for some time now by commodified forms of language referred to as buzz phrases (Mautner, 2005; Feek, 2010;

Gibbs, 2014; Scott, 2014). In previous studies, it has been pointed out that buzz phrases do not 'act alone' so to speak. The linguistic arrangement of words around buzz phrases is also significant, as it is often inferred in policy statements that these socially constructed phrases enact academic labour, rather than human beings themselves (Hayes and Jandrić, 2014; Hayes and Bartholomew, 2015; Hayes, 2016; Hayes, 2018a; Hayes, forthcoming, 2019). What this means in practice is that it is not at all unusual now to find functions related to teaching and learning discussed in policy as if these were detached marketable entities, rather than the processes of human academic labour (Hayes, forthcoming, 2019). However, this is also a discourse that no longer resides within policy documents alone, but is amplified across media channels and digital fora, via processes that might be considered complex and cumulative in a postdigital society (Jandrić, Knox, Besley, Ryberg, Suoranta and Hayes, 2018).

These concerns have become enmeshed with the 'student-as-consumer' arguments that now include pressure on HEIs to demonstrate 'value for money' (Dickinson, 2018) in exchange for student fees. Though important, this logic can also become skewed. The press may focus on generalized impressions of students as complaining customers receiving a bad deal, whilst institutions may look to address a perceived under performance by academics. Yet the reasoning that students are part of a culture where they simply seek to 'have a degree' rather than 'be learners' (Molesworth, Nixon, and Scullion, 2009) is far from proven. Some authors suggest there is a lack of empirical evidence about the extent to which students express a consumer orientation alone, and that where they do, this approach is often detrimental to their academic performance (Bunce, Baird and Jones, 2017: p. 1958). A more recent development still is the expansion of the neoliberal vocabulary and buzz phrases described above to incorporate a range of egalitarian ideas, including fairness, justice, equality of opportunity, diversity and well-being. This has recently developed into a strong rhetoric that emphasizes 'the student experience' as a package, including leisure, well-being, opportunity, future employment and other 'extras'. For example:

> Our commitment extends well beyond the student learning experience to embrace all aspects of a student's time at Newcastle (Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Strategy, Newcastle University).

An initial question comes to mind: *but should it?* Should universities 'realign their strategies based on changing government policies and pressures from the external operating environment' (Shah and Richardson, 2016: p. 352) to extend beyond learning experiences? If they do make such

fundamental changes, then it is also worth questioning: *who these changes are for*? Furthermore, we could ask: *does this change of policy alter what higher education is*? Before we know it, 'a packaged experience of consumption itself' (Argenton, 2015: p. 921) could be what is delivered to students by universities as a product that their fees have purchased. Yet the many important topics that now reside under 'the student experience' cannot simply be applied to students in equal measures, when students themselves arrive from different backgrounds, life experiences, levels of ability and resilience.

In this article, we examine firstly some parallels between the 'experience economy' (Pine and Gilmore, 1999, Argenton, 2015: p. 922) and the discourse of 'the student experience' in HE policy. Just as research on consumer behavior has revealed a shift from consumption as a utilitarian function, to a more experiential emphasis (Holbrook & Hirschman,1982), we note the way that extended patterns of consumption based around a 'student experience economy' have emerged in universities. We suggest that whilst prior concerns about commodified forms of language and buzz phrases in HEIs remains an issue, 'the student experience' discourse risks trapping students within 'an iron cage of control' (Weber, 1905/1958), as their experiences have become packaged for them into commodities. The human autonomy associated with personal and academic forms of experience are at risk if the only design available has been mass produced for students. Furthermore, in postdigital society, this entrapment within a neoliberal product is not pure bureaucracy. It may take the form of a 'velvet cage' (Ritzer, 2011), as it is delivered seamlessly back and forth between digital and physical sites of production and consumption, at the hands of human and non-human technologies. Here the labour of students themselves furthers 'the student experience' commodity. Students provide financially unrewarded labour yielding rich information by completing surveys and providing opinions, thus acting as 'prosumers' (Ritzer, 2015) manipulated by neoliberalism in HE.

Therefore, to better understand how 'the student experience' is constructed linguistically in policy (and how it might be otherwise...), we present some example extracts from a sample of 20 UK university student experience strategies we analysed, via a corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). We then discuss these findings and we consider what it means to package human senses, experience and culture into 'the student experience'. On the one hand, it could be argued that this places students within a form of 'iron cage' where universities appear to be packaging experience itself for students. Yet, given the complexities of a postdigital society, this may be more of a 'velvet cage', where students and student

unions are co-creating 'the student experience' with institutions. Either way, given the growing number of human senses discussed in this endeavour, it is important to raise the question of exactly: *who the student experience is for?* Finally, as we draw some initial conclusions on what it means to package 'the student experience' for students to *consume*, we invite others to join us in considering whether as a society, we are prepared to actually allow time for students themselves, to *produce* diverse and creative contributions to their own academic experience.

The 'Experience Economy'

Argenton (2015: p. 918) argues that experience is 'one of the major paths to growth and autonomy and as such, is of outstanding educational value'. However, experience also has a much wider sociocultural context, rooted in life itself:

> It is about learning that which cannot be taught, learning to think, which precedes all other defined forms of education. It is an encounter with the unknown, where we learn to cope with uncertainty. Though, in the same way that growth does, experience takes time. (Argenton, 2015: p. 918)

These reflections on the nature of 'experience' itself suggest that it cannot be reduced to a predictable, scheduled and assessable programme of events. Indeed, attempts to control experience risk 'flushing the unknown away, along with the formative potential of experience' Argenton, 2015: p. 918).

These are observations that create a problematic for university strategies that are based on the notion of 'the student experience', particularly when such a concept seems to be closely interwoven with 'experiential consumption' (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982). This is where commodities called 'experiences' or 'adventures' are provided through an extended service economy in a process that is closely related to the leisure and entertainment markets (Argenton, 2015). This experiential side of consumption has been said to be the hidden paradigm underpinning many aspects of modern life where even human feelings are commercialised (Bryman, 2004; Hochschild, 1983; Ritzer, 2010; Argenton, 2015).

This move from experiential consumption as concrete functions that goods can provide, towards experience-laden commodities that draw human senses into the market raises many issues, but Argenton points in particular to the issue of 'time' (Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982; Argenton, 2015). If the contemporary consumer cares less about the quality of goods they can purchase than the quantity, then when this relates to appliances there may be implications for the environment. However, when an

enhancement of the senses is involved there are also time limitations to consider. If a consumer is concerned only with 'the quantity of experience-laden commodities one can consume in a certain amount of time' (Argenton, 2015: p. 922), then there are implications when this logic is applied to academic experiences. The experience economy appears to be extending such patterns of consumption into universities as a 'student experience economy'. Furthermore, the messy post digital era we now occupy in society enables an ease of 'delivery' seamlessly back and forth between digital and physical sites of production and consumption, at the hands of both human and non-human technologies (Jandrić, Knox, Besley, Ryberg, Suoranta & Hayes, 2018).

If universities have moved into the enhancement of human senses as part of their strategy, then this begins to alter what HE is. If the labour of students themselves also furthers 'the student experience' commodity, via students completing feedback online and participating in 'the student experience' committes for free, they act as 'prosumers' (Ritzer, 2015). In so doing, they may be extending their own entrapment in time-limited forms of experiential education. Argenton therefore asks an important question of his readers in modern society: *Do we still have time for experience?* We would like our readers to consider this question adapted to the HE sector, as we ask: *Do we still have time for the diversity and creativity of individual student experiences?*

What Themes are Prioritised in 'the Student Experience' Policy Documents?

To aid us in considering this question, we analysed a sample of 20 UK university student experience strategies, via a corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). A corpus of words is 'net-like' (Hoey, 1991) and can reveal the values of those producing policy texts, whether the authors are aware of these or not. Searching a corpus (a large bank of words) does not explain why particular patterns occur, but it does yield significant empirical content to examine and discuss certain patterns in more detail. The university strategy documents we examined are freely available on university websites to download. The PDF files were converted into text files and these were examined through software called *Wordsmith* to observe patterns that emerged through corpus linguistics (Scott, 1997). Whilst not a particularly large corpus (54, 271 words), themes can be picked up via this form of analysis and then interpreted more closely through CDA to see what assumptions these grammatical patters reveal (Halliday, 1994, Fairclough, 2000). Although it is important not to read too much into the examples provided below, they do provide useful illustrative content from

current strategies to explore alongside theory. For a more detailed explanation of corpus-based CDA, please see Hayes & Bartholomew (2015).

In *Wordsmith* the frequencies of words can be examined in the form of keywords. Keywords are words that are statistically significant when measured against a comparison corpus, in this case, the British National Corpus (BNC) which contains 100 million words of written and spoken English from a wide range of sources for comparison purposes. Below the top keywords and their frequencies are shown.

The	2531
Students	874
Student	826
Experience	450
Strategy	312

It is interesting to notice that the top keyword is 'the'. The is a word that enables a certain generic quantification, when placed in front of other words. For example:

The delivery of
The development of
The enhancement of

These arrangements of words can be examined more closely in concordance lines, which show how words and phrases are ordered alongside each other in their actual context of use. The numbers at the side of the lines below are provided through the searches in *Wordsmith*, so that these examples are easily retrieved. So, it then becomes possible to see what patterns emerge across all 20 university student experience strategies.

Perceptions of 'the Student Experience' as Something Generic that can be 'Delivered'

When searches were performed to look at words that followed 'the delivery of' examples showed a form of 'strategic theme' or 'vision'

6 the delivery of the University's three strategic themes
19 the delivery of our vision

The student experience tends to be shaped within a corporate university vision or ambition. In this first set of examples, the student experience is 'delivered' with the ease of an online shopping order:

(14) It is vital that every member of staff fully understands their contribution and that of their colleagues in delivering the Student Experience

(24) The purpose of this Student Experience Strategy is to deliver the student experience ambitions of the University as set out in Strategy 2020

(78) Deliver an excellent student experience that is an exemplar of good practice in the higher education sector

In the concordance lines above, the examples are from different universities, but 'the student experience' is noticeable across all as a recognisable buzz phrase which can be 'ordered' (Hayes, forthcoming, 2019). In (14) it is emphasized that all colleagues should understand their contribution to this packaged experience. Universities can then ask the same question that any other commercial provider, such as Amazon or Argos, might ask: *what did you think of your purchase?* However, this also raises a problem in understanding staff contributions. How is such an expectation (to deliver a form of consumer experience) to be quantified and measured, when more and more features seem to be included in the deal:

(20) This wider student experience includes a sense of involvement in the life of the University, within its local communities and globally, an attractive social and residential experience, active participation in cultural, sporting and work experiences, and a sense of wellbeing and support

Indeed, how many of these features really come under a university's control, let alone under that of an academic member of staff to be able to 'deliver'? If, as an academic, I am to deliver 'a sense of involvement' or 'a sense of wellbeing and support', how will I (and indeed those responsible for my performance) know that I have delivered this across a diverse group of students? Unless there is another solution. Perhaps a 'strategy' will do it for me. As argued elsewhere, university documents are often accredited with human academic labour, as above in (24) where 'this Student Experience Strategy' is 'to deliver', rather than a person (Hayes and Bartholomew, 2015, Hayes, 2016, Hayes, 2018a, Hayes, forthcoming, 2019).

Perceptions that a Strategy or the University can do the Development for Us

When searches were performed to look at words that followed 'the development of' examples like the one below showed the intention for wider curriculum:

37 This strategy will support the development of a curriculum which makes links across and beyond the University

However, note that in (37) it is 'this strategy' (and not people) that will support the development. Furthermore, it is 'a curriculum' (and not people) that makes the links across and beyond the University.

As demonstrated in prior research, 'the strategy' or 'the student experience' is often said to enact something (Hayes, 2018a, Hayes, forthcoming 2019). Linguistically, we tend to place the student experience in the hands of entities like 'curriculum' and 'strategy', in our written policies, rather than explicitly reinforce the people (staff and students) whose individual labour actually effects change.

548 The Strategy targets the development of a high quality estate and an environment populated with facilities and services

In (548) it is 'the strategy' that targets 'the development' of a range of facilities and services. Exactly who will make this happen is not mentioned, but at some point, actual human labour is required to develop these facilities.

564 The University is committed to supporting the development of all its staff and to the enhancement of the staff experience

In (564) 'the university' is credited with the commitment to enhance 'the staff experience' too. People provide 'commitment' though, not organizations or buildings. Once more, in an age where so much emphasis is placed on metrics and measurements, it is important to ask exactly how enhancement of 'the staff experience' is understood, in relation to academic autonomy. Categories of staff contracts have never been more variable, leading to important questions on widening participation for progression of diverse university staff (Hayes, 2018b). Yet it is assumed in the discourse that something generic entitled 'the staff experience' can be enhanced across the board, by 'the university'.

In wider consumer culture, it is not unusual to find many commercial products such as cars, holidays and other posessions invested with human qualities in order to sell these. However, along with the notion that 'the experience' a university wishes us to have can be 'delivered' to students or staff, comes the concept that this can also be provided by an 'environment' and indeed that a 'sense of' something (whatever that may be) can be 'enhanced' by an environment (not by people) for all students.

Perceptions that Students' 'Senses' can be Collectively Enhanced

Instead of treating 'a sense' of something as personal and diverse, it is inferred in the next set of examples that students' senses are collective, rather than individual:

(13) We will seek to design and establish an attractive and sustainable environment that enhances students' sense of belonging and pride in the university

(23) Well-resourced, inclusive learning environments will support our educational provision and enhance student life

(25) The university will improve transition experiences to enhance students' sense of belonging to our university community

(39) Developing shared spaces to enhance the sense of community, encourage group learning, and support people from across academic disciplines to come together

In this set of examples, notice firstly, in (13) how it is an 'environment' (and not people) that enacts the process of 'enhances'. In (23) it is the 'well-resourced, inclusive learning environments' (not people) that will 'support our educational provision and enhance student life'. Then it is assumed that students as a collective group will have a 'sense of belonging and pride in the university' in which they study. It is indicated that it is this students' sense that is being enhanced. This is repeated in (25) when 'the university' (not staff) is credited with improving transition experiences. This is then expected 'to enhance' students' sense of belonging to a university community. In (39) it is 'shared spaces' (not people) that are expected 'to enhance' rather a lot of things: 'the sense of community, encourage group learning, and support people from across academic disciplines to come together'. If 'shared spaces' can really achieve all of these things then it is a wonder that we keep staff on the payroll at all!

Surely what a student 'senses' cannot be assumed, and certainly not placed collectively with what other students may 'sense'. In the example below an article describes a hotel as a 'teenager' and discusses the 'sense of grandeur' guests will experience:

> While it's a mere teenager as a hotel, the long history of the building provides it with a genuine sense of grandeur (Northamptonshire Telegraph, 2012).

There are similarities to be found in line (20) mentioned earlier. Not a sense of grandeur perhaps, but certainly the idea that 'a sense' of something that a human would 'experience' can be included in a social construct called

'the' 'student experience'. If university strategy comes to resemble hotel advertisements, then before we know it, 'a packaged experience of consumption itself' (Argenton, 2015: p. 921) could be what is delivered to students by universities as a product their fees have purchased.

Surely 'a sense of involvement' and 'a sense of wellbeing' are deeply personal and individual experiences and therefore can only be discussed in the plural. These 'senses' of something cannot be sprinkled into 'the student experience' buzz phrase, like ingredients into a cake.

Packaging Human Senses, Experience, Culture and Belonging into 'the Student Experience'

Human senses, in relation to experience and belonging, are a complicated matter. What students and staff encounter as 'experience' will be influenced by vision, touch, sound, smell and taste which enable people to give meaning to, and to form an attachment with, places and material things (O'Neill, 2001, Leach, 2002). What people 'see' is based on individual experiential knowledge of the world (Gibson, 1979). Together with sight, the other human senses help us gain multidimensional understanding (May, 2013: p. 134). Yet despite such complexities around what influences human experience, the broader context of 'neoliberalism' can yield rational, common sense discourse concerning what 'experience' entails and 'contains'.

Many important topics that now reside under 'the student experience'. Cultural experiences, for example, cannot simply be applied to students in equal measures, when students themselves arrive from different backgrounds, life experiences, tastes, levels of ability and resilience even. Taking the example of music as one cultural experience, what tunes we hear can evoke strong memories and emotions linked to places and situations. May suggests that music can offer a sense of 'embodied (in)security' with musical experiences playing an important part in identity, relational and cultural belonging (May, 2013: p. 135). Through digital technologies, music is now widely available alongside the devices and software to personalize our collections. Yet, the 'digital shift' or 'digital revolution' still happened 'under the watchful eye of capitalist rulers' and so this tends to serve and augment neoliberal capitalism (Mazierska, 2018). That said, 'manufactured' forms of music now exist alongside live performances in postdigital society. Just as 'digitalisation has made live music more important and has expanded its variations' (Mazierska, 2018), we will now speculate on how a postdigital understanding of 'the student experience' could offer helpful insights into routes of resistance.

The Iron and Velvet Cages of Policy Discourse in Postdigital Society

Fawns (2018) argues for a postdigital perspective to draw in all of education and not just that which is considered to lie outside of digital education. As such, 'the digital and non-digital, material and social, both in terms of the design of educational activities and in the practices that unfold in the doing of those activities' all need to be taken into account (Fawns, 2018). We suggest that HE policy discourse does not sit outside of these arguments either because discourse can frame human understanding within both iron and velvet cages. In times when quality is measured via excellence frameworks for teaching and research, policy must also be subject to scrutiny (Hayes, forthcoming 2019). This is even more important when policy discourse concerning 'the student experience' appears to encapsulate the very senses and experiences of human beings in HE.

These days many of us assume the role of a 'prosumer' (Toffler, 1980, Ritzer and Jurgenson, 2010) undertaking both production and consumption in digital and material spaces, rather than focusing on either one (production) or the other (consumption). This is apparent in user-generated content online, where control and exploitation take on a different character than in other historic forms of capitalism (Ritzer and Jurgenson, 2010). The concept of the 'postdigital' helps to provide insights into our augmented realities as prosumers, who provide our unpaid labour to wealthy organisations. This takes the form of many voluntary activities people now undertake, such as generating our own customer orders, providing feedback on what we purchase, sharing opinions and 'likes' that constitute valuable information within algorithmic frameworks. Facebook, Amazon and Starbucks are examples amongst many, where people produce valuable demographic details for no salary, but in HE staff and students are also engaging with these forms of algorithms and analytics.

Yet, whilst these observations may sound negative, we understand the postdigital as a space of learning, struggle, and hope. In recognizing that 'old' and 'new' media are now 'cohabiting artefacts' that enmesh with our economy, politics and culture, we can gain valuable insights into the direction concepts such as 'the student experience' may be taking us in HE. Policy discourse and educational practice are deeply intertwined:

> In entering this postdigital age, there really is no turning back from a convergence of the traditional and the digital. However, this is not simply a debate about technological and non-technological media. The postdigital throws up new challenges and possibilities across all aspects of social life. We believe this opens up new avenues too, for considering

ways that discourse (language-in-use) shapes how we experience the postdigital (Sinclair and Hayes, 2018).

Given these ideas, even when time seems forever short, it is necessary to question who our written policies in HE are really for.

Who is 'the Student Experience' for?

In problematizing the buzz phrase of 'the student experience', we hope that we have given readers some reasons to pause for thought and consider who policy concerning 'the student experience' is really for. If it is really aimed at improving the experiences of students then the language needs attention. Discussing 'students' experiences' in the plural immediately makes it clearer that the intention is to address diverse needs and not simply deliver a packaged experience for one and all. As this discourse is currently presented, 'the student experience' is a construct to which all manner of expectations can be attached (Hayes, forthcoming 2019). It is also an entity that can be said to 'act' on behalf of people.

Articulated as 'a packaged experience of consumption itself' (Argenton, 2015: p. 921) this begins to change the very nature of HE when experience is delivered to students by universities, as a product that their fees have purchased. How many additional extras might then be attached to such a package is open to whatever government and media hot topics emerge. Yet this package deal then diminishes the realities of individual student experiences, such as bereavement, mental health and wellbeing, as these are experienced in diverse ways by people. The many important topics that now reside under 'the student experience' cannot simply be applied to students in equal measures.

Conclusions

We have examined through a corpus-based CDA of policy what it means to package 'the student experience' for students to *consume*. We have shown that instead of treating human senses as personal and diverse, HE policy discourse treats students' senses as collective, as if 'belonging' and 'pride' are experienced uniformly by all. We argued that these assumptions suggest that 'a sense of involvement' and 'a sense of wellbeing' can simply be included in 'the student experience' deal that gets delivered to students. As such, academic experience is treated as if it were any other generic adventure or leisure deal on offer at a local hotel.

In relation to manufactured forms of 'experience' provided by commercial organisations, Argenton asks an important question. In modern society: *do we still have time for experience?* We would like to leave

our readers with the same question, but adapted to ask: *in our universities do we still have time for the diversity and creativity of individual student experiences?*

References

Argenton, G. (2015) Time for Experience: Growing Up Under the Experience Economy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 47(9), pp. 918–934.

Brooks, R. (2017) The Construction of Higher Education Students in English Policy Documents. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, pp. 1–17.

Browne, J. (2010) *Securing a Sustainable Future for Higher Education: An Independent Review of Higher Education Funding and Student Finance*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

Bryman, A. (2004) *The Disneyization of Society. London: Sage.*

Bunce, L., Baird, A., and Jones, S. E. (2017) The Student-As-Consumer Approach in Higher Education and its Effects on Academic Performance. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(11), pp. 1958–1978.

Clarke, J., J. Newman, N. Smith, E. Vidler, and L. Westmarland. (2007) *Creating Citizen-Consumers. London: Sage.*

Couldry, N. (2010) *Why Voice Matters: Culture and Politics After Neoliberalism*. London: Sage Publications.

Dearing, R. (1997) *Higher Education in the Learning Society: Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

Dickinson, J. (2018) WONKHE. Universities should take back control of the VfM agenda. 3 June, 2018. https://wonkhe.com/blogs/universities-should-take-back-control-of-the-vfm-narrative

Driscoll, C., and D. Wicks. (1998) The Customer-Driven Approach in Business Education: A Possible Danger? *Journal of Education for Business.* 74(1), pp. 58–61.

Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, New Language? London: Routledge.*

Fawns, T. (2018) Postdigital Education in Design and Practice. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 1(1).

Feek, W. (2010) Best of Practices?. In: A. Cornwall & D. Eade [eds], *Deconstructing Development Discourse: Buzzwords and Duzzwords*. Oxfam GB.

Gibbs, G. (2014) Student Engagement: The Latest Buzzword. *Times Higher Education*, https://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/news/student-engagement-the-latest-buzzword/2012947.article

Gibson, J. (1979) *The Ecological Approach to Human Perception*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* [2nd ed.]. London: Arnold.

Hayes, S. & Jandrić P. (2014) Who is Really in Charge of Contemporary Education? People and technologies in, against and beyond the neoliberal university. *Open Review of Educational Research*. 1(1), pp. 193–210.

Hayes, S. & Bartholomew, P. (2015) Where's the Humanity? Challenging the Policy Discourse of Technology Enhanced Learning. In: J. Branch, P. Bartholomew & C. Nygaard [eds], *Technology Enhanced Learning in Higher Education*. London: Libri.

Hayes, S. (2015) Encouraging the Intellectual Craft of Living Research: Tattoos, Theory and Time. In: C. Guerin, P. Bartholomew, and C. Nygaard [eds.], *Learning to Research – Researching to Learn*, pp. 125–150. London: Libri.

Hayes, S. (2016) Learning From a Deceptively Spacious Policy Discourse. In: S. Bayne, C. Sinclair, M. de Laat & T. Ryberg, *Research Boundaries and Policy in Networked Learning*. London: Springer.

Hayes, S. (2018a) Invisible Labour: Do We Need to Reoccupy Student Engagement Policy? *Learning and Teaching* 11(1), pp. 19–34.

Hayes, S. (2018b) Widening participation and social mobility applies to university staff as well as students. WONKHE. 18 June, 2018. Retrieved from: https://wonkhe.com/blogs/widening-participation-and-social-mobility-applies-to-university-staff-as-well-as-students

Hayes, S. (forthcoming, 2019) *The Labour of Words in Higher Education: Is it Time to Reoccupy Policy?* Leiden: Brill Sense.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983) *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.*

Hoey, M. (1991) *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jandrić, P., Knox, J., Besley, T., Ryberg, T., Suoranta, J. & Hayes, S. (2018) Postdigital Science and Education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 50(10), pp. 893–899.

Leach, N. (2002) Belonging: Towards a Theory of Identification With Place. *Perspecta*, 33, pp. 126–133.

Mautner, G. (2005) The Entrepreneurial University: A Discursive Profile of a Higher Education Buzzword, *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2(2), pp. 95–120.

May, V. (2013) *Connecting Self to Society: Belonging in a Changing World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mazierska, E. (2018) The Postdigital in Film and Popular Music. *Postdigital Science and Education*, pp. 1–4.

Molesworth, M., E. Nixon, and R. Scullion. (2009) Having, Being and Higher Education: The Marketisation of the University and the Transformation of the Student into Consumer. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14(3), pp. 277–87.

Northamptonshire Telegraph (2012) County Hall hotel gives stunning location for sightseeing and a sense of grandeur https://www.northantstelegraph.co.uk/lifestyle/travel/county-hall-hotel-gives-stunning-location-for-sightseeing-and-a-sense-of-grandeur-1-4449049

Olssen, M. & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, Higher Education and the Knowledge Economy: From the Free Market to Knowledge Capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), pp. 313–345.

O'Neill, M. E. (2001) Corporeal Experience: A Haptic Way of Knowing. *Journal of Architectural Education*, 55(1), pp. 3–12.

Peters, M.A., Jandrić, P. & Hayes, S. (2018) The Curious Promise of Educationalising Technological Unemployment: What can places of learning really do about the future of work? *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, pp. 1–13.

Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (1999) *The Experience Economy: Work is Theater and Every Business a Stage*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Ritzer, G. (2010) *Enchanting a Disenchanted World: Continuity and Change in the Cathedrals of Consumption*. Pine Forge Press.

Ritzer, G. (2011) *Globalization: The Essentials*. London: John Wiley & Sons.

Ritzer G (2015) Prosumer Capitalism. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 56(3), pp. 413-445.

Ritzer, G. and Jurgenson, N. (2010) Production, Consumption, Prosumption: The Nature of Capitalism in the Age of the Digital 'Prosumer'. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 10(1), pp. 13–36.

Scott, P (2014) Student experience is the new buzzword, but what does it mean? *The Guardian*. http://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/feb/04/university-education-not-just-about-student-experience

Shah, M. and Richardson, J.T.E. (2016) Is the Enhancement of Student Experience a Strategic Priority in Australian Universities? *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(2), pp. 352–364.

Simpson, P. & Mayr, A. (2010) *Language and Power*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Sinclair, C., & Hayes, S. (2018) Between the Post and the Com-Post: Examining the Postdigital 'Work'of a Prefix. *Postdigital Science and Education*, pp. 1–13.

Toffler, A. (1980). *The Third Wave*. New York: William Morrow and Company.

Weber, M. (1905/1958) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Scribner.

Povzetki/Abstracts

Mitja Sardoč

The Language of Neoliberal Education

For over two decades now, neoliberalism has been at the forefront of discussions not only in the economy and finance but has infiltrated our vocabulary in a number of areas as diverse as governance studies, criminology, health care, jurisprudence, education etc. Interestingly enough, education has been at the very center of the neoliberal public policy agenda as it allegedly represents one of the main indicators of future economic growth and individual well-being. While the analysis of the neoliberal agenda in education is well documented, the analysis of the language of neoliberal education is at the fringes of scholarly interest. In particular, the expansion of the neoliberal vocabulary with egalitarian ideas such as fairness, justice, equality of opportunity, well-being etc. has received [at best] only limited attention. This introductory article to 'The Language of Neoliberal Education' journal special issue presents some of the main delineating features of this shift of emphasis associated with the language of the neoliberal agenda in education. It also introduces the articles and the interview that are part of this journal special issue.
Keywords: neoliberalism, education, OECD, ideology

Jezik neoliberalnega izobraževanja

Neoliberalizem je že več kot dve desetletji v ospredju razprav ne samo v gospodarstvu in financah, temveč se je vključil v naš besednjak tudi na številnih drugih področjih kot so politična teorija, kriminologija, zdravstveno varstvo, pravo, vzgoja in izobraževanje itd. Hkrati je tudi zanimivo,

da je izobraževanje v samem središču neoliberalnih javnih politik, saj naj bi predstavljalo enega od glavnih kazalnikov prihodnje gospodarske rasti oz. individualne blaginje. Medtem ko je analiza neoliberalne agende v vzgoj in izobraževanju dobro dokumentirana, je analiza samega jezika neoliberalnega izobraževanja na robu zanimanja. Še posebej zanemarljive pozornosti je bila deležna razširitev samega neoliberalnega besednjaka z z egalitarnimi idejami kot so pravičnost, pravičnost, enakost možnosti, blagostanje itd. Ta uvodni članek v tematsko številko 'Jezik neoliberalnega izobraževanja' predstavi nekatere od glavnih značilnosti te premestitve poudarka, ki je povezana z jezikom neoliberalne agende v vzgoji in izobraževanju. Prispevek hkrati predstavi tudi članke ter intervju, ki so del te tematske številke.
Ključne besede: neoliberalizem, vzgoja in izobraževanje, OECD, ideologija

Vasco d'Agnese

Concealment and Advertising: Unraveling OECD's Educational Ehetoric

Over the last couple of decades, extensive analysis have been provided about both the role and influence OECD has in the international educational landscape, and its main tool, namely, PISA, is one of the most discussed topics in education. However, despite the amount of studies provided, little attention has been given to OECD's language and rhetoric. In this paper, by analysing OECD's public documents—including publications, reports, videos, and brochure—I go deep into OECD's linguistic choices. It is my contention that such choices and rhetoric play a pivotal role in the expansion and success of the Organization. Specifically, I shall argue that, on the one hand, OECD conceals its normative and performative role, thus presenting its products as – just – responses to pressing needs already present in schooling and society; on the other hand, the Organization shows a remarkable prowess in communicating its ideas and mastering diverse communicative registers, such as a scientific register, on the one hand, and a language more in line with advertising style, on the other—thus making, as I wish to argue, a problematic mix.
Keywords: OECD's rhetoric, neoliberal language, advertising, educational policies, PISA

Prikrivanje in oglaševanje: razvozlavanje izobraževalne retorike OECD-ja

V zadnjih nekaj desetletjih so bile opravljene obsežne analize o vlogi in vplivu OECD na mednarodnem področju ter njegovega glavnega orodja,

in sicer PISA, ki je ena izmed najbolj razpravljanih tem v izobraževanju. Kljub številu opravljenih študij,, je bilo malo pozornosti posvečeno jeziku in retoriki OECD. V tem članku se z analizo javnih dokumentov OECD – vključno z objavami, poročili, videi in brošuro – postavim globoko v OECD-jeve jezikovne izbire. Moja trditev je, da imajo take izbire in retorika ključno vlogo pri širjenju in uspehu organizacije. Natančneje, trdim, da na eni strani OECD prikriva svojo normativno in performativno vlogo ter tako predstavi svoje izdelke kot pravične odgovore na nujne potrebe, ki so v šolstvu in v družbi že prisotne. Na drugi strani pa Organizacija kaže izjemno moč pri sporočanju svojih idej in pri obvladovanju različnih komunikacijskih registrov, na primer znanstvenega registra na eni strani in jezika, ki je bolj v skladu s slogom oglaševanja na drugi in tako – kakor želim trditi – predstavlja problematično mešanico.
Ključne besede: retorika OECD, neoliberalni jezik, oglaševanje, izobraževalne politike, PISA

Rodolfo Leyva

Unpacking the Usage and Implications of Neoliberal Language in the Russell Group's Education Strategies

The Russell Group constitutes an association of twenty-four elite British public universities, and plays a leading role in influencing the values, ambitions, and practices of domestic and international higher education institutions. Correspondingly, this quantitative content analysis examines the latest education strategy statements of said group's individual members to identify pedagogic and institutional trends and trajectories. Findings show that these statements are predominantly rife with neoliberal discursive inflections of global competitiveness, instrumentalism, employability, and customer satisfaction, which effectively and principally equate a university education with professional development and research with economic utility. Conversely, virtually absent from the majority of these statements are the traditional university mission and goals of nurturing intellectual curiosity, promoting academic freedom, generating pure scientific knowledge, and fostering character and conscientious citizenship. This study suggests that the Russell Group's current and long-term plans for pedagogy and research strongly reflect the language of the neoliberal policy agenda for higher education, and have largely abandoned the academy's historically humanist and enlightenment principles and commitments. What this indicates for teaching and learning in British universities is further discussed.
Keywords: neoliberal education, content analysis, Humboldtian model, employability, Russell Group, instrumentalism

Razpakiranje uporabe in posledic neoliberalnega jezika v strategijah izobraževanja Russell group

Russell Group združuje štiriindvajset elitnih britanskih javnih univerz in igra vodilno vlogo pri vplivanju na vrednote, ambicije in prakse domačih ter mednarodnih visokošolskih ustanov. Ta kvantitativna analiza vsebine torej ustrezno preučuje najnovejše izjave o izobraževalnih strategiji posameznih članic omenjene skupine, da bi identificirale pedagoške in institucionalne trende ter smernice. Ugotovitve kažejo, da so te izjave pretežno prežete z neoliberalnimi diskurzivnimi primerami o globalnei konkurenčnosti, instrumentalizmu, zaposljivosti ter zadovoljstvu strank, ki učinkovito oz. primarno izenačujejo univerzitetno izobrazbo s profesionalnim razvojem in raziskovanje z gospodarsko koristnostjo. Nasprotno pa v večini teh trditev skorajda ni prisotno tradicionalno poslanstvo univerz ter cilji negovanja intelektualne radovednosti, ki promovira akademsko svobodo, ustvarja čisto znanstveno znanje in spodbuja značaj ter vestno državljanstvo. Ta študija kaže, da sedanji in dolgoročni načrti Russell Group za pedagogiko in raziskave močno odražajo jezik neoliberalne politične agende za visokošolsko izobraževanje in so v veliki meri opustili zgodovinsko humanistična in prosvetiteljska načela in zaveze univerze. Nadalje je obravnavano, kaj to pomeni za poučevanje in učenje na britanskih univerzah.

Ključne besede: neoliberalno izobraževanje, analiza vsebine, Humboldov model, zaposljivost, Russell Group, instrumentalizem

Mark Olssen

Neoliberalism and *Laissez-faire*: The Retreat from Naturalism

This article starts by restating the core theoretical differences between liberalism and neoliberalism, most essentially concerning the principle of the active or positive state that I have claimed characterizes neoliberal governmentality, premised upon a distinction between naturalistic and anti-naturalistic views of state functioning and entailing the abandonment or severe qualification of *laissez-faire*. Of the differences between liberal and neoliberal government, I will recommit to my original thesis of the distinction between the positive state and the erosion of *laissez-faire*, as well as to the distinction between naturalism and anti-naturalism as being important to understanding the two variants of liberalism and to understanding as well the anti-democratic tendencies of the neoliberal variant. Here I will maintain that the key neoliberals in a theoretical sense are the European ordo liberals, such as Walter Eücken and Wilhelm Röpke; as well as US writers such as James Buchanan (Public Choice theory) and

Henry Simons, while others, such as Friedrich Hayek although politically mobilizing for and actively supporting the advent and ascendency of neoliberalism, as witnessed by his formative role in establishing the Mont Pelerin society, was, I will argue, much more cautious about jettisoning *laissez-faire* and of adopting an anti-naturalistic perspective. After setting out the distinctive features that characterize neoliberalism, the consequences for education will be briefly investigated.
Keywords: laissez-faire, naturalism, ordo liberalism, state planning, free-markets, Walter Eücken, Wilhelm Röpke, Henry Simons, Friedrich Hayek, Lars Cornelissen

Neoliberalizem in *laissez-faire*: umik iz naturalizma

Ta članek se začne s ponovitvijo temeljnih teoretičnih razlik med liberalizmom in neoliberalizmom, ki se večinoma nanašajo na načelo aktivne ali pozitivne države, za katerega trdim, da označuje neoliberalno vladovanje, ki temelji na razlikovanju med naturalističnimi in proti-naturalističnimi pogledi na delovanje države, ki hkrati zajemajo opustitev ali hudo kvalifikacijo *laissez-faire*. Pri razliki med liberalno in neoliberalno vlado bom ponovno poudaril mojo izvirno tezo o razliki med pozitivno državo in erozijo *laissez-faire*, pa tudi distinkcijo med naturalizmom in anti-naturalizmom, ki je pomembna za razumevanje dveh različic liberalizma in razumevanje tudi antidemokratskih tendenc neoliberalne različice. Tu bom poudaril, da so ključni zagovorniki neoliberalizma v teoretičnem smislu evropski ordo liberali, kot so Walter Eücken in Wilhelm Röpke; kot tudi ameriški avtorji, kot so James Buchanan (teorija javne izbire) in Henry Simons, medtem ko so drugi, kot je Friedrich Hayek, čeprav politično aktivirajo in dejavno podpirajo prihod in vzpon neoliberalizma, kakor priča njegova formativna vloga pri ustanovitvi združenja Mont Pelerina, kakor trdim, preveč previden pri odvajanju *laissez-faire* in sprejemanju anti-naturalistične perspektive. Po določitvi posebnih značilnosti, ki označujejo neoliberalizem, so na kratko predstavljene tudi posledice za izobraževanje.
Ključne besede: laissez-faire, naturalizem, ordo liberalizem, državno načrtovanje, prosti trgi, Walter Eücken, Wilhelm Röpke, Henry Simons, Friedrich Hayek, Lars Cornelissen

Mitja Sardoč

The Language of Neoliberal Education: An Interviw with Henry Giroux

In this interview, Prof. Henry Giroux engages with some of the most challenging issues associated with the neoliberal educational agenda. In the

introductory part, he discusses neoliberalism's different operating registers including the 'war over ideas'. In particular, he examines how the neoliberal ideology came to dominate some of the commanding institutions of contemporary societies. At the same time, he also discusses the centrality of education under neoliberal modes of governance as well as the role of large-scale assessments and quantitative data in educational research. In the central part of the interview Prof. Giroux examines neoliberalism's strategy of appropriating ideas and concepts that lie outside its gravitational orbit and its transformative influence on our way of thinking about education and public policy in general. In the closing part of the interview, Prof. Giroux identifies the most pressing negative effects of neoliberalism for democratic societies.
Keywords: neoliberalism, critical pedagogy, active citizenship, education

Jezik neoliberalnega izobraževanja: intervju s Henryjem Girouxom

V tem intervjuju se prof. Henry Giroux ukvarja z nekaterimi najbolj zahtevnimi vprašanji, ki jih povezujemo z neoliberalno agendo v vzgoji in izobraževanju. V uvodnem delu razpravlja o različnih operativnih registrih neoliberalizma, vključno z 'vojno nad idejami'. Poseben poudarek je namenjen temu, kako je neoliberalna ideologija prevzela nadzor nad nekaterimi vodilnimi institucijami sodobnih družb. Hkrati obravnava osrednji položaj izobraževanja v okviru neoliberalnega načina upravljanja kot tudi vlogo obsežnih raziskav in kvantitativnih podatkov v izobraževalnih raziskavah. V osrednjem delu intervjuja prof. Giroux proučuje strategijo neoliberalizma v okviru katere prevzame ideje in koncepte, ki ležijo izven njegove gravitacijske orbite ter s tem povezan vpliv na način razmišljanja o izobraževanju in javnih politikah nasploh. V zaključnem delu intervjuja prof. Giroux opredeli najbolj pereče negativne učinke neoliberalizem za demokratične družbe.
Ključne besede: neoliberalizem, kritična pedagogika, aktivno državljanstvo, izobraževanje

Michael A. Peters

Neoliberalism as Political Discourse: The Political Arithmetic of *Homo oeconomicus*

This essay is a discussion of neoliberalism as a form of political discourse – 'the political arithmetic of *Homo Oeconomicus*'. In the first half, the essay begins with a genealogy of political discourse with an etymology from late Middle English and medieval Latin to denote a process of reasoning

and a means to order our thoughts on a topic. Although the term can be traced to the early Greeks concerned with the problem of truth and rhetoric in democracy, it gains foothold in the 17th century with Böckel (1677) and a determinate reading in the twentieth century with Foucault (1970). In the second half, the essay traces the emergence of the figure of *Homo Oeconomicus* and the rise of rational choice theory by focusing on its application to education as a commodity. In this context, the essay discusses the twin discourses of Individualism and Community with associated concepts of Freedom and Equality. Finally, the paper turns to a discussion of Foucault's understanding of neoliberalism.
Keywords: neoliberalism, political discourse, *Homo Oeconomicus,* education

Neoliberalizem kot politični diskurz: politična aritmetika *Homo oeconomicus*

Ta esej je razprava o neoliberalizmu kot obliki političnega diskurza – »politična aritmetika *Homo Oeconomicus*«. V prvi polovici, esej začne z genealogijo političnega diskurza z etimologijo iz poznega srednjeveškega angleškega jezika in srednjeveškega latinskega jezika, ki označuje proces razmišljanja ter sredstvo za ureditev svojih misli o temi. Čeprav je izraz mogoče zaslediti pri zgodnjih Grkih, ki se ukvarjajo s problematiko resnice in retorike v demokraciji, se je v 17. stoletju uveljavil z Böckelom (1677) in odločnim branjem z Foucaultom v dvajsetem stoletju (1970). V drugi polovici leta, esej obravnava nastanek figure Homo Oeconomicus in vzpona teorije racionalne izbire, s poudarkom na njeni uporabi na področju izobraževanja kot blaga. V tem kontekstu se v eseju razpravlja o dvojnih diskurzih individualizma in skupnosti s povezanimi koncepti svobode in enakosti. V zaključku članek preide na razpravo o Foucaultovem razumevanju neoliberalizma.
Ključne besede: neoliberalizem, politični diskurz, Homo Oeconomicus, izobraževanje

Urška Štremfel

European Neoliberal Discourse and Slovenian Educational Space

In the article we address political and educational science relevant questions about influence of educational (neoliberal) governance in the European Union (EU) on the development of national educational policies and practices. The identified question is examined by theoretical dispositions of new modes of EU governance as governance of goals,

comparisons, problems/crisis and knowledge (e.g. Grek, 2009; Nordin, 2014; Ozga, 2011) and discursive institutionalism (e.g. Schmidt, 2008; 2012) as a promising "multifaceted set of concepts to explore the lending and borrowing of transnational education policies and their application at the national and local levels" (Wahlstörm and Sundberg, 2018). Applied theoretical framework explains how policy discourses can perform coordinating and communicative functions and lead to institutional change. Concretely, it contributes to understanding how certain EU (neoliberal) policy model (involving cognitive scripts, categories and ideas about EU strategic goals and solutions to identified policy problems) shape identities, structures and behaviours at the national level of EU member states (e.g. Alasuutari, 2015). As such article tries to recognise "how the global discourses of neo-liberalism have been made possible through the re-articulation and re-contextualisation of local historical contestation and politics" (Takayama, 2009) and provides understanding how neoliberal cognitive and normative discourses (Schmidt, 2008) motivate national level actors to comply with the EU agendas instead of protecting sovereignty of the national educational space. The theoretical dispositions are demonstrated on the case study of Slovenia, which presents an interesting case of studying interference between traditional post-socialist values and western EU (neoliberal) model of education.
Key words: discursive institutionalism, EU, neoliberalism, education, Slovenia

Evropski neoliberalni diskurz in slovenski izobraževalni prostor

V središču članka je politološko in edukacijsko znanstveno relevantno vprašanje o vplivu (neoliberalne) vladavine v Evropski Uniji (EU) na razvoj nacionalnih izobraževalnih politik in praks. Vprašanje naslavljamo s teoretskimi predpostavkami vladavine EU kot vladavine, ciljev, primerjav, problemov/krize (npr. Grek, 2009; Nordin, 2014; Ozga, 2011) in diskurzivnim institucionalizmom (npr. Schmidt, 2008; 2012) kot večplastnim sklopom konceptov, ki skuša pojasniti prenos globalnih izobraževanih politik in njihovo sprejemanje na nacionalni ravni (Wahlstörm and Sundberg, 2018). Uporabljeni teoretski okvir ponazarja, kako koordinacijske in komunikacijske funkcije javnopolitičnega diskurza vodijo do institucionalnih sprememb. Konkretno, prispeva k razumevanju, kako določeni EU (neoliberalni) javnopolitični modeli (podprti s konkretnimi politikami, programi in paradigmami) oblikujejo identitete in vedenje nacionalnih akterjev (npr. Alasuutari, 2015). V tem okviru članek pojasnjuje, kako je uresničevanje globalnega neoliberalnega diskurza na nacionalni

ravni odvisno od specifičnega zgodovinskega, političnega in kulturnega ozadja nacionalnih držav (npr. Takayama, 2009) ter omogoča razumevanje, kako neoliberalni kognitivni in normativni diskurz (Schmidt, 2008) spodbuja nacionalne akterje, da se uskladijo z agendami EU, namesto da bi zaščitili suverenost nacionalnega izobraževalnega prostora. Teoretska izhodišča so prikazana na študiji primera Slovenije, ki predstavlja zanimiv primer prepletenosti post-socialističnih vrednot in zahodnoevropskega (neoliberalnega) modela izobraževanja.
Ključne besede: diskurzivni institucionalizem, EU, neoliberalizem, izobraževanje, Slovenija

Sarah Hayes and Petar Jandrić

Resisting the Iron Cage of 'the Student Experience'

As higher education (HE) has come to be valued for its contribution to the global economy, priorities have been placed on study for a degree to directly meet the needs of industry. Furthermore, in UK policy, students have been defined as 'customers' by the government since the introduction of tuition fees. Together, these developments have emphasized the role of a degree as a consumer 'product', purchased to secure future employment, rather than an experiential learning 'process', that continues well beyond student life. In this paper we examine how the student-as-consumer approach in HE policy has recently developed into a strong rhetoric emphasizing 'the student experience' as a package, including leisure, well-being, future employment and other 'extras'. A disturbing impression is then generated, where universities are now delivering a packaged experience of 'consumption itself', to students. To examine such concerns more closely, we analyse a sample of 20 UK university 'student experience' strategies, via a corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Drawing on themes from these texts, we question who 'the student experience' rhetoric really benefits? If a rationalized experience is constructed on behalf of students, then universities defined by George Ritzer as 'cathedrals of consumption' align themselves with any other provider of consumer experiences, where students are trapped within an 'iron cage' even before they set foot in the workplace. Yet, despite a distorted picture that neoliberal HE policy discourse may portray, a postdigital understanding of 'the student experience' could yet offer helpful insights into possible routes of resistance.
Keywords: higher education, neoliberalism, critical discourse analysis, student experience, cathedrals of consumption, iron cage

Odpor do železne kletke “študentske izkušnje”

Ker je visokošolsko izobraževanje (HE) postalo vrednoteno zaradi svojega prispevka k globalnemu gospodarstvu, so bile prednostne naloge namenjene študiju, ki bo neposredno zadostilo potrebam industrije. Vse od uvedbe šolnin so bili študentje v politikah Združenega kraljestva opredeljeni kot ‘stranke’. Skupaj so ti dogodki poudarjali vlogo diplome kot potrošniškega ‘proizvoda’, kupljenega za zagotovitev prihodnjih zaposlitev, ne pa procesa izkustvenega učenja, ki se nadaljuje tudi po koncu študentskega življenja. V tem članku preučujeva, kako se je pristop študentov kot potrošnikov v politikah visokega šolstva nedavno razvil v čvrsto retoriko, ki poudarja ‘študentsko izkušnjo’ kot paket, ki vključuje prosti čas, blaginjo, prihodnjo zaposlitev in druge ‘dodatke’. Nato se generira moteč vtis, kjer univerze študentom sedaj podeljujejo zapakirano izkušnjo ‘same potrošnje’. Da bi te skrbi natančneje preučili, z analizo kritične analize diskurza (CDA) analizirava vzorec 20 univerzitetnih študentskih izkušenj. Na podlagi vsebin iz teh tekstov postavljava vprašanje, komu ‘študentska izkušnja’ resnično koristi? Če je racionalizirana izkušnja zgrajena v imenu študentov, so univerze, ki jih George Ritzer opredeljuje kot ‘katedrale potrošnje’, usklajene z vsemi drugimi ponudniki izkušenj potrošnikov, kjer so študenti ujeti v ‘železni kletki’, še preden vstopijo na delovno mesto. Kljub izkrivljeni sliki, ki jo lahko predstavi neoliberalni diskurz visokošolskih politik, lahko postdigitalno razumevanje ‘študentske izkušnje’ še vedno nudi koristen vpogled v možne poti odpora.

Ključne besede: visokošolsko izobraževanje, neoliberalizem, kritična analiza diskurza, študentska izkušnja, katedrale potrošnje, železna kletka

Avtorji/Authors

Vasco d'Agnese

Vasco d'Agnese (PhD), is associate professor of Education at the Department of Psychology, University of Campania Luigi Vanvitelli, with interests in educational philosophy and theory, educational policies, Heidegger, Dewey and postmodernism. His latest publications include *Reclaiming Education in the Age of PISA: Challenging OECD's Educational Order*, London, Routledge (2017); Openness, Newness and Radical Possibility in Deweyan Work: A Response to Jasinski. *Ethics and Education* (2018); 'Not-being-at-home': Subject, Freedom and Transcending in Heideggerian Educational Philosophy, *Studies in Philosophy and Education* (2018); Courage, Uncertainty and Imagination in Deweyan Work: Challenging the Neo-Liberal Educational Agenda. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* (2018).

Vasco d'Agnese je izredni profesor vzgoje in izobraževanja na Oddelku za psihologijo na Univerzi v Kampanji, Luigi Vanvitelli. Njegovi interesi vključujejo filozofijo in teorijo vzgoje, izobraževalne politike, Heideggerja, Deweyja in postmodernizem. Njegove najnovejše publikacije so *Reclaiming Education in the Age of PISA: Challenging OECD's Educational Order* (Routledge, 2017); Openness, Newness and Radical Possibility in Deweyan Work: A Response to Jasinski. *Ethics and Education* (2018); 'Not-being-at-home': Subject, Freedom and Transcending in Heideggerian Educational Philosophy, *Studies in Philosophy and Education* (2018); Courage, Uncertainty and Imagination in Deweyan Work: Challenging the Neo-Liberal Educational Agenda. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* (2018).

Mark Olssen

Mark Olssen, FAcSS, is Emeritus Professor of Political Theory and Education Policy in the Department of Politics at the University of Surrey. His most recent books are *Liberalism, Neoliberalism, Social Democracy: Thin Communitarian Perspectives on Political Philosophy and Education* (Routledge, 2010); *Toward A Global Thin Community: Nietzsche, Foucault, and the Cosmopolitan Commitment* (Paradigm Press, 2009). He is also co-author (with John Codd and Anne-Marie O'Neill) of *Education Policy: Globalisation, Citizenship, Democracy,* (Sage, London, 2004) and author of *Michel Foucault: Materialism and Education* (Greenwood Press, New York, 1999/Paradigm Press, Boulder, 2006). He has also published many book chapters and articles in academic journals in Britain, America and in Australasia. Most recently, an interview by Raaper, Rille, titled, 'Mark Olssen on the neoliberalisation of higher education and academic lives: an interview,' *Policy Futures in Education* and 'Neoliberalism and Higher Education Today: Research, Accountability and Impact', *British Journal of Sociology of Education* (2016).

Mark Olssen, FAcSS, je zaslužni profesor politične teorije in izobraževalne politike na oddelku za politologijo na Univerzi v Surreyu. Njegove najnovejše knjige so *Liberalism, Neoliberalism, Social Democracy: Thin Communitarian Perspectives on Political Philosophy and Education* (Routledge, 2010); *Toward A Global Thin Community: Nietzsche, Foucault, and the Cosmopolitan Commitment* (Paradigm Press, 2009). Skupaj z Johnom Coddom in Anne-Marie O'Neill je tudi soavtor knjige *Education Policy: Globalisation, Citizenship, Democracy,* (Sage, London, 2004). Je tudi avtor knjige *Michel Foucault: Materialism and Education* (Greenwood Press, New York, 1999/ Paradigm Press, Boulder, 2006). Objavil je tudi številna poglavja in članke v znanstvenih revijah v Veliki Britaniji, ZDA in v Avstraliji. Nedavno je Rille Raaper v reviji *Policy Futures in Education* z njim objavila intervju z naslovom 'Mark Olssen on the neoliberalisation of higher education and academic lives: an interview'. V reviji *British Journal of Sociology of Education* je objavil tudi članek 'Neoliberalism and Higher Education Today: Research, Accountability and Impact' (2016).

Rodolfo Leyva

Rodolfo Leyva has a Ph.D in Political Sociology from King's College London. He is currently a fellow in media and communications at the London School of Economics and Political Science. His research employs experiments, quantitative, and qualitative methods, and draws on sociological and cognitive science theories. His main area of research concerns the development and empirical verification of a systems theory that can help

describe and predict a) the cognitive-affective and social-structural mechanisms through which individuals consciously and non-consciously acquire and reproduce neoliberal ideology. And b) the distinct dispositions and behaviours that can be said to typify a neoliberal subject.
Rodolfo Leyva ima doktorat iz politične sociologije na King's College v Londonu. Trenutno je sodelavec za medije in komunikacije na London School of Economics and Political Science. Njegove raziskave vključujejo eksperimentalne, kvantitativne in kvalitativne metode ter se opirajo na sociološke in kognitivne teorije. Njegovo glavno področje raziskovanja zadeva razvoj in empirično preverjanje sistemske teorije, ki lahko pomaga opisati in napovedati a) kognitivno-afektivne in socialno-strukturne mehanizme s pomočjo katerih posamezniki zavestno in nezavedno pridobivajo in reproducirajo neoliberalno ideologijo ter b) različne razprave in vedenja, za katere je mogoče reči, da tipizirajo neoliberalni subjekt.

Michael A. Peters

Michael A. Peters is Distinguished Professor of Education at Beijing Normal University Faculty of Education PRC, and Emeritus Professor at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign. He is the executive editor of the journal, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, and founding editor of five international journals, *Policy Futures in Education*, *E-Learning and Digital Media* (SAGE), and *Knowledge Cultures* (Addleton), *The Video Journal of Education and Pedagogy* (Springer), *Open Review of Education Research* (T&F). His interests are in philosophy, education and social policy and he has written over one hundred books, including most recently: *Wittgenstein and Education: Pedagogical Investigations* (2017) and *Neoliberalism and After? Education, Social Policy and the Crisis of Capitalism* (2011). He has acted as an advisor to governments and UNESCO on these and related matters in the USA, Scotland, NZ, South Africa and the EU. He was made an Honorary Fellow of the Royal Society of NZ in 2010 and awarded honorary doctorates by State University of New York (SUNY) in 2012 and University of Aalborg in 2015.
Michael A. Peters je profesor na Fakulteti vzgoje in izobraževanja na Pedagoški fakulteti Beijing Normal University ter zaslužni profesor na University of Illinois v Urbana–Champaign (ZDA). Je izvršni urednik revije *Educational Philosophy and Theory* in ustanovitni urednik petih mednarodnih revij, in sicer *Policy Futures in Education*, *E-Learning and Digital Media* (SAGE) ter *Knowledge Cultures* (Addleton), *The Video Journal of Education and Pedagogy* (Springer), *Open Review of Education Research* (T&F). Njegovi interesi so v filozofiji, izobraževanju ter socialnih politikah. Napisal je več kot osemdeset knjig, med njimi tudi *Wittgenstein*

and Education: Pedagogical Investigations (2017) ter *Neoliberalism and After? Education, Social Policy and the Crisis of Capitalism* (2011). O teh in s tem povezanimi zadevami je deloval kot svetovalec UNESCU ter vladam vladam v ZDA, na Škotskem, v Novi Zelandiji, Južni Afriki in EU. Leta 2010 je postal častni član Kraljevskega društva Nove Zelandije. Leta 2012 je prejel časten doktorat na Državni univerzi v New Yorku (SUNY) in leta 2015 na Univerzi v Aalborgu (Danska).

Mitja Sardoč

Mitja Sardoč (PhD) is a senior research associate at the Educational Research Institute in Ljubljana (Slovenia) where he is member of the 'Social Contract in the 21st Century' research programme. He is author of scholarly articles and editor of a number of journal special issues on citizenship education, multiculturalism, toleration, equality of opportunity and patriotism. He is Managing Editor of *Theory and Research in Education* [http://tre.sagepub.com/] and member of the editorial board of *Educational Philosophy and Theory* and the *Open Review of Educational Research*. He edited two books published by Wiley (*Citizenship, Inclusion and Democracy* and *Toleration, Respect and Recognition in Education*). He is also a contributing author to the *SAGE Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy*. He is editor-in-chief of *The Handbook of Patriotism* [http://refworks.springer.com/ Patriotism] that is to be published by Springer in 2018.

Mitja Sardoč (PhD) je zaposlen kot raziskovalec na Pedagoškem inštitutu v Ljubljani, kjer je član programske skupine 'Družbena pogodba v 21. stoletju'. Je avtor znanstvenih in strokovnih člankov s širšega področja vzgoje in izobraževanja ter urednik vrste tematskih številk domačih in tujih znanstvenih revij s področja državljanske vzgoje, multikulturalizma, enakih možnosti itn. Je glavni urednik revije *Theory and Research in Education*, odgovorni urednik revije *Šolsko polje* ter član uredniškega odbora revij *Educational Philosophy and Theory* ter *Open Review of Educational Research*. Je tudi urednik dveh zbornikov, ki sta izšli pri založbi Blackwell (*Citizenship, Inclusion and Democracy* ter *Toleration, Respect and Recognition in Education*), avtor monografije *Multikulturalizem: pro et contra* ter soavtor monografije *Enake možnosti in družbena (ne)enakost v družbi znanja*. Je urednik publikacije *Handbook of Patriotism*, ki bo izšla pri založbi Springer.

Urška Štremfel

Urška Štremfel, PhD, is a research fellow at the Educational Research Institute in Ljubljana and part-time research fellow at the Centre for

Political Science Research at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana. Her research interests include the European aspects of policy analysis, especially new modes of EU. In that framework she has devoted special attention to the role international comparative assessment studies play in development of Slovenian education policies and practices and the development of evidence-based education.
Urška Štremfel, doktorica politoloških znanosti, je znanstvena sodelavka na Pedagoškem inštitutu, pri svojem raziskovalnem delu pa sodeluje tudi v Centru za politološke raziskave na Fakulteti za družbene vede Univerze v Ljubljani. Njen znanstveno-raziskovalni interes predstavlja evropsko sodelovanje na področju izobraževanja in njegov vpliv na nacionalni izobraževalni prostor. V tem okviru posebno pozornost namenja vlogi mednarodnih raziskav pri oblikovanju slovenske izobraževalne politike in izobraževalnih praks slovenskih šol ter razvoju na podatkih temelječega izobraževanja.

Sarah Hayes

Sarah Hayes is a research Professor in the College of Learning and Teaching (CoLT), University of Wolverhampton. Previously Sarah was a Senior Lecturer and Programme Director at Aston University, where she taught in Education and Sociology and is now an Honorary Professor. Sarah has also taught at University of Worcester, at international partner institutions and is an external examiner. Sarah's research spans Sociology, Higher Education Policy and technological change. Her new book *The Labour of Words in Higher Education: Is it Time to Reoccupy Policy?* is forthcoming through Brill (March, 2019). Sarah has recently published articles on WonkHE *and undertaken consultancy for UK Parliament to produce* a resource for university lecturers. Sarah is an Associate Editor for *Postdigital Science and Education* (Springer). Her research publications can be found on her Orcid, Google Scholar *and* Aston Research Explorer *web pages.*
Sarah Hayes je raziskovalna profesorica na Visoki šoli za učenje in poučevanje (CoLT) Univerze v Wolverhamptonu. Pred tem je bila višja predavateljica in programska direktorica na Univerzi Aston, kjer je poučevala v izobraževanju in sociologiji in kjer je sedaj častna profesorica. Poučevala je tudi na University of Worcester ter na mednarodnih partnerskih institucijah kot zunanji izpraševalec. Sarino raziskovanje obsega sociologijo, politike visokega šolstva in tehnološke spremembe. Njena nova knjiga *The Labour of Words in Higher Education: Is it Time to Reoccupy Policy?* bo izšla pri založbi Brill (marec 2019). Pred kratkim je objavila članke o WonkHE in opravila svetovanje v parlamentu Združenega

kraljestva za izdelavo virov za univerzitetne predavatelje. Je pridružena urednica pri reviji *Postdigital Science and Education* (Springer). Njene raziskovalne publikacije lahko najdete na spletnih straneh Orcid, Google Scholar in Aston Research Explorer.

Petar Jandrić

Petar Jandrić is Professor and Director of BSc (Informatics) programme at the Zagreb University of Applied Sciences, Croatia. His previous academic affiliations include Croatian Academic and Research Network, National e-Science Centre at the University of Edinburgh, Glasgow School of Art, and the University of East London. Petar's research interests are situated at the post-disciplinary intersections between technologies, pedagogies and the society, and research methodologies of his choice are inter-, trans-, and anti-disciplinarity. His latest books are *Learning in the Age of Digital Reason* (2017) and *The Digital University: A Dialogue and Manifesto* (2018). He is Editor-in-Chief of the journal *Postdigital Science and Education*: https://www.springer.com/education+%26+language/journal/42438. Personal website: http://petarjandric.com/.
Petar Jandrić je profesor in direktor študijskega programa Informatika na Zagrebški univerzi uporabnih znanosti na Hrvaškem. Njegove prejšnje akademske povezave vključujejo Hrvaško akademsko in raziskovalno mrežo, Nacionalni center e-znanosti na Univerzi v Edinburgu, Glasgow School of Art ter na Univerzi v East Londonu. Njegovi raziskovalni interesi so umeščeni na postdisciplinarnih križiščih med tehnologijami, pedagogikami in družbo, njegove raziskovalne metodologije pa so med-, trans- in anti-disciplinarnost. Njegove najnovejše knjige so *Learning in the Age of Digital Reason* (2017) in *Digital University: Dialogue and Manifesto* (2018). Je glavni urednik revije *Postdigital Science and Education*: https://www.springer.com/education+% 26+language/journal/42438. Osebna spletna stran: http://petarjandric.com/.

Navodila avtorjem/-icam člankov v reviji *Šolsko polje*

Članek (praviloma v obsegu od 7000 do največ 10.000 besed) naj ima na začetku: 1) naslov ter ime in priimek avtorja/-ice; 2) povzetek v slovenskem in angleškem jeziku, do 300 do 350 besed; 3) ključne besede v slovenščini in angleščini (do 5); 4) kratko predstavitev avtorja/-ice (do 100 besed v slovenščini in angleščini), navedena naj bo tudi organizacija zaposlitve.

Prispevki naj bodo napisani v knjižni slovenščini ob upoštevanju veljavnega pravopisa, v nasprotnem primeru si uredništvo pridržuje pravico, da članka ne recenzira oziroma ga zavrne.

Če je prispevek že bil objavljen v kaki drugi reviji ali če čaka na objavo, je treba to izrecno navesti.

Prispevek naj ima dvojni medvrstični razmik, tip črk naj bo Times New Roman, velikost 12 pik (v opombah 10). Besedilo naj bo levo poravnano, strani pa zaporedno oštevilčene. Odstavki naj bodož ločeni s prazno vrstico.

Uporabiti je mogoče tri hierarhične nivoje podnaslovov, ki naj bodo oštevilčeni (uporabljajte izključno navaden slog, v prelomu bodo ravni ločene tipografsko): 1. – 1.1 –1.1.1

Za poudarke uporabite izključno *ležeči* tisk(v primeru jezikoslovnih besedil, kjer so primeri praviloma v ležečem tisku, lahko za poudarke izjemoma uporabite polkrepki tisk). Ležeče pišite tudi besede v tujih jezikih. Raba drugih tipografskih rezov (podčrtano, velike male črke, krepko kurzivno ...) ni dovoljena. Ne uporabljajte dvojnih presledkov, prav tako ne uporabljajte preslednice za poravnavo besedila. Edina oblika odstavka, ki je dovoljena, je odstavek z levo poravnavo brez rabe tabulatorjev prve ali katerekoli druge vrstice v ostavku (ne uporabljajte sredinske, obojestranske ali desne poravnave odstavkov). Oglate oklepaje uporabljajte izključno za fonetične zapise oz. zapise izgovarjave. Tri pike so stične le, če označujejo prekinjeno bese... Pri nedokončani misli so tri pike nestične in nedeljive ... Prosimo, da izključite funkcijo deljenja besed.

Sprotne opombe naj bodo samooštevilčene (številke so levostično za besedo ali ločilom – če besedi, na katero se opomba nanaša, sledi ločilo) in uvrščene na tekočo stran besedila.

Citati v besedilu naj bodo označeni z dvojnimi, citati znotraj citatov pa z enojnimi narekovaji. Izpuste iz citatov in prilagoditve označite s tropičjem znotraj poševnic /.../. Daljše citate (več kot 5 vrstic) izločite v samostojne odstavke, ki jih od ostalega besedila ločite z izpustom vrstice in umikom v desno. Vir citata označite v okroglem oklepaju na koncu citata: (Benjamin, 1974: str. 42). Če je avtor/-ica naveden/-a v sobesedilu, priimek lahko izpustite.

V besedilu označite najprimernejša mesta za *likovno opremo* (tabele, skice, grafikone itd.) po zgledu: [Tabela 1 približno tukaj]. Posamezne enote opreme priložite vsako v posebni datoteki (v .eps, .ai, .tif ali .jpg formatu, minimalna resolucija 300 dpi). Naslov tabele je nad tabelo, naslov grafa pa pod grafom. Prostor, ki ga oprema v prispevku zasede, se šteje v obseg besedila, bodisi kot 250 besed (pol strani) ali 500 besed (cela stran).

Na vir v besedilu se sklicujte takole: (Ducrot, 1988). Stran navedka navedite za dvopičjem: (Foucault, 1991: str. 57).

Če so trije avtorji/-ice navedenega dela, navedite vse tri: Bradbury, Boyle in Morse (2002), pri večjem številu pa izpišite le prvo ime: (Taylor et al., 1978).

Dela enega avtorja/-ice, ki so izšla istega leta, med seboj ločite z dodajanjem malih črk (a, b, c itn.), stično ob letnici izida: (Bourdieu, 1996a).

Dela različnih avtorjev/-ic, ki se vsa nanašajo na isto vsebino, naštejte po abecednem redu in jih ločite s podpičjem: (Haraway, 1999; Oakley, 2005; Ramazanoğlu, 2002).

Pri večkrat zaporedoma citiranih delih uporabite tole: (ibid.).

V članku uporabljena dela morajo biti po abecedi navedena na koncu, pod naslovom *Literatura*. Če so bili v prispevku uporabljeni viri, se seznam virov, pod naslovom *Viri*, uredi posebej. Če je naslovov spletnih strani več, se lahko navedejo tudi v posebnem seznamu z naslovom *Spletne strani*. Pri navedbi spletne strani se v oklepaju dopiše datum dostopa. Vsako enoto v teh seznamih zaključuje pika. Način navedbe enot je naslednji:

Knjige: Bradbury, I., Boyle, J., in Morse, A. (2002) *Scientific Principles for Physical Geographers*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

Garber, M. (1999) *Symptoms of Culture*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Članki: Kerr, D. (1999b) Changing the political culture: the advisory group on education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools. *Oxford Review of Education* 25 (4), str. 25–35.

Poglavja v knjigi: Walzer, M. (1992) The Civil Society Argument. V MOUFFE, Ch. (ur.). *Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship and Community*. London: Routledge.

Spletne strani: http://www.cahiers-pedagogiques.com/article.php3?id_article=881 (pridobljeno 5. 5. 2008).

O morebitnih drugih posebnostih se posvetujte z uredništvom.

Naslov uredništva: Šolsko polje, Mestni trg 17, 1000 Ljubljana; tel.: 01 4201 240, fax: 01 4201 266, e-pošta: info@theschoolfield.com; mitja.sardoc@guest.arnes.si

Naročilonarevijo:Šolskopolje,Slovenskodruštvoraziskovalcevšolskegapolja,Mestnitrg17,1000 Ljubljana, e-pošta: mitja.sardoc@guest.arnes.si; tel.: 01 420 12 53, fax: 01 420 12 66

Guidelines to the authors

The submission of an article to the *Šolsko polje* journal should be between 7.000 to 10.000 words long. At the beginning it should include

- the author's name and address;
- a summary in both Slovene and English (from 300 to 350 words);
- 5 keywords in both Slovene and English;
- a short presentation of the author in both Slovene and English (each of up to 100 words) including his/her institutional affiliation.

The submission should be accompanied by a statement that the submission is not being considered for publication in any other journal or book collection.

The spacing of the article should be double spaced, the font Times New Roman (size 12 in the main text and size 10 in the footnotes). Paragraphs should be indicated using an empty row. There are three types of hierarchical subheadings, which should be numbered as follows:

1.

1.1

1.1.1

For emphasis, use italics only. Words in a foreign language should also be italicized. Use self-numbered footnotes.

Double quotations marks should be used for quotes in the text and single quotation marks for quotes within quotes. Longer quotations (more than 5 lines) should be extracted in separate paragraphs and separated from the rest of the text by omitting the rows and by having an indentation to the right. The source of the quotation should be in round brackets at the end of the quotation, e.g. (Benjamin, 1974, pp. 42–44).

Please mark in the text the place where a graphic product (tables, diagrams, charts, etc..) should be included, e.g. [Table 1 about here]. These products should be attached in a separate file (in 'eps', 'ai', 'tif' or 'jpg' format [300 dpi resolution]). The table title should be above the relevant table or the graph.

The source in the text should be referred to as follows: (Ducrot, 1988). Please quote the page for a: (Foucault, 1991, p. 57). If there are three authors, please refer as (Bradbury, Boyle and Morse, 2002) or (Taylor et al., 1978) for four or more authors.

For the works of an author that were published in the same year, distinguish between them by adding small letters (a, b, c, etc.), e.g. (Bourdieu, 1996a). Repeatedly cited works should use the following: (ibid.). Please, use the following style for each of publication:

Books:

Bradbury, I., Boyle, J., and Morse, A. (2002) *Scientific Principles for Physical Geographers*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

Garber, M. (1999) *Symptoms of Culture*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Journal Articles:

Kerr, D. (1999b) Changing the political culture: the advisory group on education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools. *Oxford Review of Education.* 25 (1–2), pp. 25–35.

Book chapters:

Walzer, M. (1992) The Civil Society Argument. In: Mouffe, Ch. (ed.). *Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship and Community.* London: Routledge.

Websites:

http://www.cahiers-pedagogiques.com/article.php3?id_article=881 (5. 5. 2008).

Šolsko polje, Mestni trg 17, 1000 Ljubljana; tel.: 01 4201 240, fax: 01 4201 266,
e-pošta: info@theschoolfield.com; mitja.sardoc@guest.arnes.si

Šolsko polje, Slovensko društvo raziskovalcev šolskega polja, Mestni trg 17, 1000
Ljubljana, e-pošta: mitja.sardoc@guest.arnes.si; tel.: 01 420 12 53, fax: 01 420 12 66

Šolsko polje

Revija za teorijo in raziskave vzgoje in izobraževanja
Letnik XXIX, številka 1–2, 2018

Mitja Sardoč
5 The Language of Neoliberal Education: Problems, Challenges and Opportunities

Vasco d'Agnese
11 Concealment and Advertising: Unraveling OECD's Educational Rhetoric

Mark Olssen
33 Neoliberalism and *Laissez-faire*: The Retreat from Naturalism

Michael A. Peters
57 Neoliberalism as Political Discourse: The Political Arithmetic of *Homo oeconomicus*

Rodolfo Leyva
77 Unpacking the Usage and Implications of Neoliberal Language in the Russell Group's Education Strategies

Mitja Sardoč
97 The Language of Neoliberal Education: An Interviw with Henry Giroux

Urška Štremfel
107 European Neoliberal Discourse and Slovenian Educational Space

Sarah Hayes and Petar Jandrić
127 Resisting the Iron Cage of 'the Student Experience'

CENA: 10 EUR