

**Totally Pedagogised Society: Contributions to Critical Policy Studies
Educationalization, Pedagogisation and Globalisation**

Parlo Singh,

Griffith University

Griffith Institute for Educational Research

Mt Gravatt campus, 173 Messines Ridge Road

Brisbane, QLD, Australia 4122

Email: parlo.singh@griffith.edu.au

Paper prepared for the 8th International Basil Bernstein Symposium 2014, at Nanzan University's Nagoya Campus, Nagoya, Japan, 8 July –12 July

Abstract:

At the end of the sixth Basil Bernstein symposium held in 2010 in Brisbane, Australia, Bill Tyler developed ten points for theoretical progression of the Bernstein sociological oeuvre. This paper picks up on Tyler's (2010) call to explore the possibilities of Bernstein's last paper on the totally pedagogised society (TPS). Specifically, the paper takes up Tyler's (2010: 1) call that Bernstein's 'models of pedagogic discourse could re-theorise the post-structuralist debates on class and culture'. It does this by firstly reviewing the take up of Bernstein's concept of the TPS in the critical policy sociology literature, arguing that this work presents a dystopian view of education aligning it directly to the instrumental needs of neoliberal economic productivity. The paper suggests that this interpretation of the TPS concept does not do justice to the complexity of the whole Bernstein theoretical corpus, specifically the work on pedagogic discourse, pedagogic device, pedagogic modalities and pedagogic codes. The paper positions the TPS concept within the larger Bernstein research project, with its dual focus on power relations and symbolic control in and through 'the processes and mechanisms of the pedagogic communication of knowledge' (Gordon, 2009: xi). It examines Bernstein's (2000: 111) attention not only to issues of social reproduction in and through education systems, but also to the production/fabrication of social identities and relations of whole populations through pedagogic means in a period of 'reorganising capitalism'.

Introduction

Critical education policy scholars have increasingly focused attention on the globalisation of education policy formation, dissemination and enactment. This work has analysed discursive policy shifts from education to life-long learning, a discursive turn which has explicitly linked learning to human capital development in a global knowledge economy. Policy analytic work on globalising education policies has examined the ways in which the emergence and enactment of discourses of learning, disassembles and reassembles education processes and systems by reconfiguring the what, how, who, when and where of teaching-learning relations. Critical policy scholars have examined the ways in which new discourses of learning are produced and travel across the globe. The rapid, almost instant movement of ideas across increasingly porous national boundaries, in turn, produces global-local sign systems or meanings about education. Within this globalised and globalising discursive ensemble the learner is made increasingly visible, while the teacher becomes increasingly invisible. The enhanced prominence or visibility of the learner does not lead to a reduction in power relations governing the work of teachers. Rather, power relations through new mechanisms of teacher accountability become more invasive (Robertson, 2012). Learning and the learner are increasingly aligned to the 'discourses of neo-liberalism or the ideologies of the market' (Ball, 1998: 122). The main purpose of learning is to enhance national economic productivity and competitiveness in the context of a global knowledge economy. Teachers are held accountable to ensure that this work on learning and the learner is undertaken through a regime of instruments or technologies of measurement and comparison (Fenwick, Mangez, & Ozga, 2014). The learning of whole populations, for example national and global cohorts of learners, is measured and rendered visible on websites, a public display of performance. Moreover, learning performance is benchmarked not only at the level of the region, district, school, classroom and teacher, but across the globe to track the competitive potential of human capital. In this way, schooling systems increasingly play an important role in the work of governing whole populations to meet the instrumentalist needs of neoliberal economic productivity (Novoa & Yariv-Mashal, 2014).

This sketch of the complex investigative work of critical policy scholars highlights the enormity of the educational changes taking place across the globeⁱ. Increasingly, critical policy scholars have turned to the work of the sociologist Basil Bernstein, particularly his concept of totally pedagogised societies, to think about globalising education policy discourses and practices.

My aims in this paper are three fold. First, I examine the take up of the concept of totally pedagogised society in the critical policy studies literature. I propose that much of this work projects a dystopian account of globalised and globalising education policy discourses and practicesⁱⁱ (Ball, 2009). Research begins and ends with a critique of a global educational agenda tied in different ways to the logic of neoliberal economic reforms. Second, I elaborate on Bernstein's concept of the totally pedagogised society (TPS) in the context of more recent theoretical developments which have coined the terms educationalization (Depaepe, 2012; Depaepe & Smeyers, 2008) and learnification (Beista, 2005). All three concepts, pedagogisation, educationalization and learnification, aim to describe and analyse the globalisation of education processes and practices. Third, I outline the unique focus of Bernstein's theoretical project which attempts to 'hold together and specify both the interactional (control) and structural (power) relations', and attend simultaneously to the conditions of social re-production, interruption, and change (Bernstein, 2000: 91). The Bernsteinian theoretical corpus focuses simultaneously on: issues of power and control, social reproduction and social contestation, and the 'processes and mechanisms' of the 'pedagogical communication and reproduction' of educational knowledge (Gordon, 2009: xi). Put another way, the Bernstein project focusses on 'how knowledge is mobilised in and through pedagogy' (Green, 2010: 47). The latter Bernstein theoretical corpus, including work on the TPS, emphasises the performative role of pedagogic discourses and practices realised in new modes of state governance and

governmentalityⁱⁱⁱ. But crucially the focus is not simply on new regimes of power, but also on the communication principles of social control. It is through new complex hybrid systems of pedagogic communication that social identities, relations and order are constituted, contested, formed, and re-formed. It is through these new modes and networks of pedagogic communication that social inequalities are re-produced, challenged, interrupted, and re-shaped in new ways. This dual focus on power and control relations in the evolution of education systems is underpinned in the Bernstein sociological project by an open-ended problematic and empirically focused mode of investigative inquiry (Moore, 2013).

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

Policy scholars^{iv} have interpreted Bernstein's (2001a,b,c) work on the TPS as a call to critical action. And indeed, it is in the work of sociologists of policy, particularly, critical policy studies, that the TPS concept seems to have found a home. For example, Gewirtz (2008: 416) suggests that Bernstein's concept of the TPS and powerful critique of the learning society cuts across and synthesises elements from 'three contrasting sociological approaches: theories of reflexive modernity, neo-Marxist critiques of contemporary economic change, and post-structuralist theories of governmentality'. Thus, Gerwitz (2008) hitches Bernstein's work on the TPS to a critical policy studies agenda and engages in a systematic critique of discourses of the learning society. Following Foucault, Bernstein (1990: 135) defines discourse as 'ways of relating, thinking and feeling' which 'specialize and distribute forms of consciousness, social relations, and dispositions'. Discourses are not prescriptive or deterministic. Rather, discourse 'constrains and enables what can be said' and discursive practices 'produce, rather than merely describe, the subjects and objects of knowledge practices' (Barad, 2007: 146-147). Moreover, the possibilities of the thinkable and unthinkable, indeed, the relational dynamic between the thinkable and unthinkable in discursive formations is 'not static or singular but rather is a dynamic and contingent multiplicity' (Barad, 2007: 146-147).

Drawing on this Foucauldian/Bernsteinian concept of discourse, Gerwitz (2008) distinguishes between learning for life and life-long learning, two dominant discourses of the so-called knowledge, learning society. The first category of discourse refers to the spread or proliferation of learning discourses in all facets and aspects of everyday life. Learning discourses thus take up a totalising role in governing or regulating all of life experiences. The second category of discourse refers to ongoing and continuous learning, a never ending cycle of learning courses and programs from cradle to grave (see also Ball, 2009). So the first category refers to learning discourses totalising every aspect of everyday life. The second category refers to the continual need to learn for the duration or totalisation of the life cycle^v. Gerwitz (2008) suggests that both categories of learning discourses are totalising or totalitarian. Because they have become so pervasive in every facet of life these learning discourses take on a regulatory role, whereby the individual avails themselves to be trained and retrained. Gerwitz (2008: 417-420) suggests that Bernstein's concept of trainability 'as a pedagogic expression of flexible capitalism' 'represents an impoverished form of pedagogy, one that fosters atomism and is therefore "socially empty"'. But what does the term socially empty signify? If there is no coherence to the learning on offer, except the regulatory principles of learning for life and life-long learning, then learning is externally driven to meet the targets and benchmarks of the neoliberal performativity agenda (see Tsatsaroni & Evans, 2013). Learning is not internally motivated and governed by the pursuit of truth or ethics of care.

Similarly, Ball (2009) draws on Bernstein's concept of the TPS as well as the concept of recontextualisation to examine the globalisation of education policies and new modes of state governance or regulation through pedagogic agencies. The regulatory discourse or legitimization principle (Lyotard, 1985) driving learning acquisition is the terror of performativity – 'a form of indirect steering or steering from a distance which replaces invention and prescription with target

setting, accountability, and comparison' (see Ball, 2005: 70-61). The logic of performativity^{vi}, Ball (2005: 70-71) argues works with discourses of neo-liberalism or the ideologies of the market; new institutional economics (co-ordination of individual and collective behaviour in terms of actions and choices of the rational actor); public choice theory – logic of individual consumer choice based on information provided by the state about the performance of schools; and new managerialism – discourses of 'quality', innovation and appraisal mechanisms to regulate schooling work practices (see also Ball, 2009, 2010). Moreover, Ball (2009) argues that a new social totality characterised by the discursive themes of self-reliance and enterprise, responsibility, trainability and commodity has been organised around a path of life-long learning. This social totality has constituted a new moral environment inside of which social relations and identities are intricately tied to a life of enterprise or an enterprising life. Post-welfare policies, according to Ball (2009: 205) 'are no longer concerned with the redistribution of wealth, but rather with its creation' and the policies of the learning society are about redistribution of possibilities and opportunities, rather than resources. Both Gerwitz (2008) and Ball (2009) write of the importance of parental pedagogies, particularly the practices of intensive, total mothering, 'the heavy investment of the mother's time, energy, money and emotional commitment into enhancing the child's intellectual, physical, social and emotional development' (Ball, 2009: 207) in the discursive and material configuration of the learning society.

In addition, Biesta (2005: 57) raises concerns about the shift in discourses from education to learning, and the accompanying 'shift in attention away from the teacher to the student', and the 'silent rise in learning' with more hours spent in learning in every facet of life, and a mode of learning that is 'individualistic and individualised'. Learning from this perspective is a commodity, with the student a potential consumer of learning, and the educational institution a provider of learning (see also Gerwitz, 2008; Ball, 2009). A major reason to be against the rise of discourses of learning, Biesta (2005: 59) argues '– is that the underlying assumption that learners come to education with a clear understanding of what their needs are, is a highly questionable assumption'.

It both misconstrues the role and position of the educational professional in the process, and the role and position of the learner. It forgets that a major reason for engaging in education is precisely to find out what it is that one actually needs – a process in which educational professionals play a crucial role because a major part of their expertise lies precisely there (Biesta, 2005: 59).

Also from a critical policy angle, Robertson (2012) draws on the TPS concept to analyze the instruments of regulation or governance of teachers' work produced by supranational organisations (see also Ball, 2003). Specifically, Robertson (2012: 2) examines 'the nature and extent of the denationalisation of teachers' work, the consequences for teachers as professionals, and how these processes might be contested'. Her contribution to extending the concept of the TPS is twofold. Firstly, she makes use of Bernstein's (2000) concept of the field of symbolic control, classification (power) and framing (control) relations to examine the new visibility of teachers in the 'unfolding education policy drama' (Robertson, 2012: 3). Secondly, her empirical investigation engages in a diachronic and synchronic analysis of globalising teacher policies and practices. The diachronic analysis adopts an 'historical approach that aims to register epochal changes' in regulating or governing teachers' work, while the synchronic analysis examines the systematic ways in which two projects by the OECD and the World Bank around teachers' work 'seek to enrol national and sub-national sites in the globalising of teacher policy' (Robertson, 2012: 4). The analyses highlight: (1) the increasing regulation or governance of teachers' work by global agencies and (2) the contradictions and tensions in global discourses about teachers' work projected for example, by the OECD, which adopts a 'pragmatic, European ordo-liberal', humanist approach keeping 'open a role for the state in managing the market', and the World Bank which views 'education problems and their solutions within a free market framework' (Robertson, 2012: 7). The survey instruments devised by these two

global agencies, namely the OECD's Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) and the World Bank's System Assessment and Benchmarking for Education Results (SABER) programme, are interpreted as particular types of pedagogic devices that govern inside national territories through the production of knowledge about the 'good teacher', 'professional development practices', and 'good teaching methods' and link this knowledge to student results (PISA, TIMSS). Robertson (2012: 14) argues that

... we can discern four distinct, though not disconnected, denationalising processes at work which are reconstituting the field of symbolic control over the governance of teachers. Concretely, these denationalising tendencies have the potential to further recalibrate the power and control of the global agencies, though I will argue that this process is both uneven, and contested. These processes include the invocation of a global imaginary of both shared risk and a shared future; the emergence of new forms of transboundary relations which further erode the national; the relationally interconnected nature of global teacher learning, and the rise of new forms of private authority that sits beyond national spaces of representation and democratic accountability.

By contrast, Tyler's (2010) focus is on two main global players in the game of international testing regimes, TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study) and PISA (Program for International Student Assessment). Like Robertson (2012), Tyler engages in an exploratory diachronic and synchronic analysis of these global evaluative devices. The diachronic analysis traces the historical genealogy of the two instruments. Here Tyler (2010: 145) argues:

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

Moreover, Tyler (2010) argues that the national political response to performances on TIMSS has played out in Australia, the UK and US in calls for a return to a 'back to basics', traditional or collection code national curriculum, what some have described as a regime of neo-conservatism (Depaepe, 2012). Such political interpretations of the international test data attempt to re-centre state control over education systems 'through setting and assessing standards in a de-centred environment' (Tyler, 2010: 150). The crucial insight offered by Tyler (2010) about Bernstein's theory of the TPS, revolves around the internal logics of the pedagogic device. Bernstein (1990) argued that the pedagogic device 'is the principal producer of symbolic control as well as of social destinies' (Tyler, 2010: 149). The device sets the conditions for 'the production, reproduction and transformation of culture' (Bernstein, 1990: 180). The pedagogic device 'provides the intrinsic grammar of pedagogic discourse through *distributive rules, recontextualising rules, and rules of evaluation*' (Bernstein, 1990: 180)

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

From this perspective, the apparent differences between TIMSS and PISA uncovered through a diachronic or genealogical analysis are negated. Rather, Tyler (2010) shows through a synchronic analysis how the discursive codes of both international testing regimes are recontextualised to

reassert state control over education systems through new modes of pedagogic governance (see also Kaner, Morgan, & Tsatsaroni, 2014). In other words, control over the evaluative rule of the pedagogic device becomes the means by which the state attempts to re-assert control over the increasing proliferation of modes of knowledge distribution and recontextualisation through new circuits or networks of pedagogic communication.

The analyses undertaken by many scholars drawing on Bernstein's theory of the TPS seem to suggest that globalising education policies, particularly the focus of current policies on life-long learning and the logic of performativity, represent a radical disruption, departure or distinct shift from past practices (see Ball, 1998, 2003, 2009; Robertson, 2012). By contrast, other scholars such as Depaepe who also draws on the concept of TPS, suggest that increases in the length and time spent in schooling, and the spread of schooling institutions across the globe, is a continuation of the Western processes of modernisation. Specifically, Depaepe (2012: 34, emphasis added) argues that

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

From this perspective, processes of educationalization were accompanied by the formation of the bureaucratic school with a whole raft of methods including expanded curriculum, timetable of activities, textbooks, charts, large instruction boards, design and arrangement of furniture, organisation of children in groups, routines and rituals of praise and punishment. Moreover, an increasingly feminised teaching profession were trained in the conduct of new pedagogical methods, including psychological approaches for regulating student behaviour and instilling shared values. The crucial point here is that these new pedagogic methods generated two paradoxical, or contradictory tendencies – on the one hand, increased dependency and on the other hand, emancipation of the individual – or increased individualisation, and modes of self-regulation. Depaepe (2012: 135) suggests that processes of educationalization are dependent 'in part on the asymmetric fundamental pattern in the educational relationship', that is, cultivating self-regulating, self-governing individuals, the 'authority of the teacher', the disciplining, *casu quo* the moulding, of the pupils in the direction of socially desirable behaviour.' Ironically, therefore, increased pedagogy, does not 'result in more autonomy for the child but could, inversely, also issue in an extended dependency'. (Depaepe, 2012: 135). Moreover, Depaepe (2012) emphasises the importance of women in the professional discourses of education and the new 'soft' modes of regulation or governance which converted the 'brutalising elements of physical violence' into 'psychological threats ... which seemed to produce a kind of interiorised anxiety about freedom in the child.'

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

As an agent of modern nation-building since the Enlightenment, the schooling project manifested itself as a secularized version of Christianization. The teacher incarnated the pastoral compulsion regarding education; being the source of authority, wisdom, good behaviour, and morals, the teacher acted as the pilot to which the students were subjected in the classroom. The teacher knew the way that had to be followed and the best techniques to

apply. The principal concern was to “save” the child, to offer it help so that it would not be subject to harm. This increased attention on the pedagogical sphere was also meant to achieve the moral elevation of people. Educationalization was bound up with moralization. More pedagogy, therefore, did not necessarily result in more autonomy for the child but could, inversely, result in extended dependency (Depaepe (2012: 168).

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

Basil Bernstein’s project on the TPS is aligned with the work of critical policy scholars. For example, Bernstein (2001) undertakes an historical analysis of the evolution of education processes in the West and writes of the increasing pedagogisation of society, and the increased regulation of whole populations through pedagogic means. Moreover, Bernstein (2001) writes of the asymmetrical relation inherent in pedagogic activity and defines pedagogic work as ‘a purposeful intention to initiate, modify, develop or change knowledge, conduct or practice over time by someone ... who already possesses, or has access to, the necessary resources and the means of evaluating acquisition’ (Bernstein & Solomon: 1999: 268). He also differentiates between three types of pedagogic work, namely, implicit, explicit and tacit.

Yet Bernstein’s work also adds another dimension. He focuses specific attention on the processes of pedagogisation and thus the grammar of pedagogic discourse which generates new modes of state governance or regulation through the continuation of the modernist project of educationalisation (see Sadovnik, 1991). Moreover, Bernstein’s work does not take the reductionist, pessimistic path and propose that creativity has been ‘subordinated to the regulative discourse of the knowledge economy’ (Depaepe, 2012: 172), or that the future is likely to be dystopian aligned to the performative logic of the neo-liberal economic agenda (Ball, 2009). Rather, the Bernsteinian project is an open-ended problematic and inquiry. He does signal a secularisation of knowledge and pedagogy, and a departure from the first ‘totally pedagogised society ... of the medieval period initiated by Religion’ (Bernstein, 2001a: 365). Given the complexity of the social, and the open-ended possibilities of the project of education/learning, it is simply not possible to project or predict a definitive future scenario of educational / learning systems. What the Bernsteinian project does enable is a projection of possible futures and the pedagogic conditions needed to generate these possible futures (see Young & Muller, 2010). Between generation and realisation is another gap, what is generated is always subject to change as it moves from one context to another in the processes and movements of recontextualisation.

The next section of the paper picks up and elaborates on these ideas of the TPS, as a continuation of the modernisation project of Western post-industrial, networked societies (see Castells, 2000, 2009). It focuses on both the dependency and liberating aspects of new pedagogic methods, and on the possibilities for regulating the ‘thinkable’ and generating the ‘unthinkable’ (Bernstein, 2000).

Totally Pedagogised Society – An Overview

The more abstract the principles of the forces of production the simpler its social division of labour but the more complex the social division of symbolic control (Bernstein, 1990: 133)

How are social identities and relationships constituted through 'learning' formations in an era of rapid global flows of ideas, information, music, images, finances and people across increasingly porous national boundaries? How are symbolic orders constituted via pedagogic means in an epoch characterised by chaos, mess, fluidity, where signs and sign systems rapidly morph and change – a period described as liquid sociality (Bauman, 2004)?

Basil Bernstein developed his theoretical oeuvre to think about these issues. He proposes that the voice of pedagogic discourse is the dominant device^{vii} of social control and identity formation during these times. Ironically, however, in all discourses about a knowledge society, learning society, and life-long learning, there is a remarkable silence about the voice of pedagogic discourse. So what is the voice of pedagogic discourse? Simply put, the voice of pedagogic discourse is the ensemble of rules, rituals, technologies and techniques, that is, 'the processes and mechanisms of the pedagogic communication and reproduction of knowledge' (Gordon, 2009: xi). Bernstein (2000) proposes that all education systems since the period of the medieval university have been governed by an internal logic or grammar of the pedagogic device. As stated previously, the pedagogic device is comprised of three rules or principles which are hierarchically organised, namely distribution rules, recontextualisation rules, and rules of evaluation

The Pedagogic Device: Implications of Space-Time Compression

State control over space and time is increasingly bypassed by global flows of capital, goods, services, technology, communication and information. ... Thus, while global capitalism thrives, and nationalist ideologies explode all over the world, the nation-state, as historically created in the Modern Age, seems to be losing its power, although, and this is essential, *not its influence*. ... the growing challenge to states' sovereignty around the world seems to originate from the inability of the modern nation-state to navigate uncharted, stormy waters between the power of global networks and the challenge of singular identities (Castells, 1977: 243-244, emphasis added)

In his theory of the TPS, Bernstein (2001a, 365) picks up on Castells's notion of information networked societal modes, the reduced power *but not influence* of the nation state, and the ways in which the nation state mediates the power of global networks and identity politics (constituted around singular causes, for example, feminism, environmentalism, religious fundamentalism and so forth). Specifically, Bernstein (2001a,b,c) explores the formation of discursive codes around learning and the influence of the state in the production, dissemination and evaluation of these discursive codes. Discursive codes refer to 'different modalities of communication' which 'select and integrate meanings' (Bernstein, 1996: 91). So discourse refers to system of meanings, and codes refer to the communication principles which select and integrate these meanings. The focus of Bernstein's (2001a: 365) theoretical inquiry is on the 'voice of pedagogic discourse', that is, the ensemble of principles/rules of the pedagogic device, as he argues that the new societal modes heralded by Castells signal the emergence of new symbolic orders of regulation and control through pedagogic means – 'the second totally pedagogized society'. Bernstein (2001a,b,c) suggests that increasingly the state exerts its influence and rules or governs whole populations through pedagogic means.

What is Pedagogic Discourse?

Pedagogic discourse refers to the regime of rules or principles of power and control by which knowledge (content, skills, and processes) is selected and organised for pedagogic purposes. Thus, pedagogic discourse is the ensemble of power and control principles regulating or constraining what is to be learnt, how it is learnt, and when learning is deemed to have happened. Bernstein suggests that pedagogic discourse is comprised of instructional and regulative discourses. These are not two separate discourses. Rather, Bernstein means to signal that the instructional and regulative couplet constitute the relational aspects of the one discourse (Muller & Hoadley, 2010). The regulative or moral discourse operates at different levels of the pedagogic device: production of learning (what is selected for instruction), distribution or dissemination of learning resources (how learning is organised, sequenced, paced), and evaluation (recognition that learning has taken place). For Bernstein, the regulative discourse is the dominant discourse mediating the relation between the outer symbolic order and the inner development of the mind.

Bernstein argues that the symbolic order of the instructional discourse, constituted via the regulative discourse, is internalised. How is this symbolic order constituted? Symbolic orders are constituted in discursive codes and material configurations of practices, which are in turn, generated by the principles of power and control relations. Power relations refer to the strength of the insulation demarcating categories, for example, disciplinary categories such as natural and social sciences, arts, humanities – the ‘what’ of knowledge. Power relations are also realised through the strength of the insulation boundaries demarcating the sequencing and pacing of knowledge acquisition – the ‘how’ of knowledge acquisition. And power relations are constituted through insulations constituting ‘what’ is to be evaluated as recognition of learning acquisition. Inherent in the power relations of discursive codes are implicit assumptions about learning, ways of knowing, and desiring relations to knowledge. Control relations are realised in the forms or modalities of communication. Power relations are re-produced, contested and produced anew through the control relations of communication.

The compression of space and time with globally networked technologies, that is, new modes of digital communication, means that ideas and information flow rapidly within and across borders (Singh, 2004). This does not lead to the production of common, standardised or homogenized discursive pedagogic codes across the globe, that is, the ‘MacDonaldization’ of both what is taught and how it is taught (Holton, 2000; Singh & Doherty, 2004). Rather, there is likely to be an increased differentiation and complexity of discursive codes, through the emergence of new social movements organised around a politics of identity (see Castells, 1997). In Castells’ (1977: 243-244) terms ‘the growing challenge to states’ sovereignty’ is around navigating the ‘uncharted, stormy waters between the power of global networks and the challenge of singular identities’. State administered high stakes testing becomes one powerful means of navigating these uncharted stormy waters. In other words, state influence over the evaluative rules of the pedagogic device is strengthened, as control over the distributive (who gets what knowledge) and recontextualising rules (pedagogising of knowledge) weakens (see Tyler, 2010).

So far I have suggested that Basil Bernstein has something to say about the proliferation of discourses about life-long learning, learning society and knowledge society. His remarkable observation is that these discourses are not simply masking a hidden agenda. The discourses about learning are not simply a facade for the concealed political agendas of the neoliberal performative state shaping education along market principles, that is, a performative, input-output model of education. Rather, Bernstein turns his gaze to the historical evolution of education processes and systems as part of the moralising/civilising project of Western modernity (see also Green, 2010; Hunter, 1994). In directing his gaze this way, he questions the remarkable silence about the

grammar or voice of pedagogic discourse in societies increasingly characterised by knowledge as the means of production. Bernstein (2001a,bc,) thus sets about developing a conceptual language to analyse the grammar of educationalization, that is, the regime of rules, technologies and techniques which constitute the modern apparatus of the education/ learning project. The concepts of pedagogic device and pedagogic discourse are central to an analysis of the grammar or generative principles of the processes of total pedagogisation. Bernstein (2001a, b, c) argues that it is through the pedagogic device, and principles of pedagogic discourse (instructional-regulative couplet) that a state with reduced power in the economic field exerts power and influence through pedagogic means. Moreover, he suggests that state power is not simply exercised in and through the bureaucratic apparatus of state education departments and schooling institutions. Rather, state power is increasingly exercised through a field of symbolic control constituted by agencies and agents specialising in the distribution, recontextualisation and evaluation of discursive codes.

Bernstein (2001b: 25) describes the increasing complexity of the division of labour of agencies of symbolic control 'based upon the differentiation of discursive codes appropriated by agents favourably placed in the class structure by pedagogic capital obtained from higher education'.

Agents of symbolic control specialize in dominant discursive codes increasingly made available in the higher reaches of the education system. These discursive codes shape legitimate ways of thinking, ways of relating, ways of feeling, forms of innovation and so specialize and distribute forms of consciousness, disposition and desire (Bernstein, 2001b: 24)

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

Thus, for Bernstein the focus is not only on power relations, but also on 'symbolic control (how people exist as individuals when education controls their borders and so defines the field and the nature of their relationships)' (De Querioz, 2011 : 59). He attends not only to issues of social order and cohesion, and the reproduction of social inequalities through education, but also to questions relating to identity and 'modalities of the self' (De Querioz, 2011: 59). Thus, Bernstein's approach is inseparably epistemological and ontological.

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

Three developments need to be highlighted here. The first relates to a focus not only on education processes and mechanisms as realised in the bureaucratic organisation of schooling systems. Rather, the object of inquiry has broadened to encapsulate the significant growth in industries (agencies and agents) related to the production and dissemination of discursive codes as knowledge

increasingly becomes the dominant mode of economic production. The second relates to the emergence of new discursive codes, produced through the 'revolution in communication control systems' (Bernstein, 1990: 157). Examples of the new communication codes include new modes of control over 'genetic codes' through bio-engineering, and machine learning as 'computer systems initiate, co-ordinate, plan, model, are reflexive to their own learning, generate problems, and anticipate breakdowns through self-regulating controls' (Bernstein, 1990: 157). The third relates to the growth of the agencies and agents of social control in the fields of symbolic control and cultural field, and the possible merging of agencies across these fields to constitute hybrid formations.

Two Takes on Performativity

While critical policy scholars have taken up one version of the performativity thesis, the input-output model of education directed to the needs of a market knowledge economy, Bernstein (2001a,b) picks up on the double meanings of performativity in Lyotard's (1985) project and suggests that pedagogic activities are likely to constitute dominant modes of social relations under new modes of knowledge production. Crucially, he is interested in what happens to the grammar or system of rules or principles generating pedagogic work. Here Bernstein (1990) signals a 'revolution in communication control systems' via both bio-genetic engineering and smart computer technologies which self-regulate and learn to learn. So what is the double meaning of performativity?

According to Jameson (1985: ix), Lyotard deals with the non-representational turn in scientific knowledge production, suggesting that the legitimization or justification:

... of scientific work is not to produce an adequate model or replication of some outside reality, but, rather simply to produce more work, to generate new and fresh scientific *enunces* or statements, to make you have "new ideas" ..., or, best of all ... again and again to "make it new"

Lyotard (1985) contrasts this idea of performativity as creativity, novel ideas, and the re-generation of the new, with the idea of performativity as terror as a means of managerial regulation or state governance^x. The latter definition of performativity, that is policy governance by numbers, and the terror of organisational management by the logic of numbers has received extensive attention in the critical policy studies field (see Ball, 2003; 2005; Lingard, 2011). However, Lyotard's (1985) theory of performativity did not focus primarily on a dystopian future of regulation or governance through numbers. Rather, Lyotard (1985: 5) suggests that ironically even the logic of managerial performativity necessitates invention, novel ideas, new synergies because improvements in performance or 'productive power' cannot be attained through routine practices, procedures, or reproducing the familiar and thinkable (see also Seddon, 2008). The logic of performativity necessitates new synergies, new ways of working, thinking and acting. Extra performativity, according to Lyotard (1985: 52) demands engaging with the unthinkable, and necessitates pedagogic activities which 'can increase one's ability to connect the fields jealously guarded from one another by the traditional organization of knowledge' (Lyotard 1985, 52)^{xi}.

Bernstein (2000: 81) argues 'today the market principle creates a new dislocation (between the inner and outer). Now we have two independent markets, one of knowledge and one of potential creators and users of knowledge' (Bernstein, 2000: 81). In the Bernstein problematique the research questions of importance are: how do these different market principles of knowledge constitute a diverse range of agencies, agents and discourses (the outer world), what types of communication/ pedagogic modes are generated by different fractional groups; how do these give rise to competing and contradictory pedagogic discourses, and what is the relation between these

outer societal practices and what is internalised as part of the inner world (identities and modalities of the self)? The issue is not one of tensions or contradictions between different market principles of knowledge production and distribution (Bernstein, 1990). Rather, the market principle becomes the dominant legitimisation principle regulating all forms of education. A 'crisis around education' is generated, particularly in terms of the capacity of the state to fund education for large populations over long periods of time. The crisis of education in turn produces a discursive shift from education to learning, whereby learning is dislocated from bureaucratic schooling institutions and school teachers and relocated across a spectrum of agencies in the expanded fields of symbolic control and cultural field. Moreover, the agents with control over the pedagogic device of learning, namely the hierarchical rules of distribution, recontextualisation and evaluation are themselves regulated by new communication codes of smart technologies, the interface of human and non-human. Bernstein offers some possibilities for thinking about these new conditions. However, it is simply not possible to predict the ways in which digital technologies may morph and evolve, or the ways in which human and non-human interaction (new communication codes) may become entangled in new worldly configurations (Barad, 2007). Computerization, Lyotard (1985: 66-67) argues:

... could become the "dream" instrument for controlling and regulating the market system, extended to include knowledge itself and governed exclusively by the performativity principle. In that case, it would inevitably involve the use of terror. But it could also aid groups discussing meta-prescriptives by supplying them with the information they usually lack for making knowledgeable decisions. The line to follow for computerization to take the second of these two paths is, in principle, quite simple: give the public free access to the memory and data banks. Language games would then be games of perfect information at any given moment. But they would also be nonzero Sum games, and by virtue of that fact discussion would never risk fixating in a position of minimax equilibrium because it had exhausted its stakes. For the stakes would be knowledge (or information, if you will), and the reserve of knowledge-language's reserve of possible utterances-is inexhaustible. This sketches the outline of a politics that would respect both the desire for justice and the desire for the unknown.

Discussion

This paper picked up on Bill Tyler's call at the end of the sixth Basil Bernstein held in 2010 in Brisbane, Australia, to explore the possibilities of Bernstein's last paper on the totally pedagogised society (TPS). It undertook this task by firstly reviewing the take up of Bernstein's concept of the TPS in the critical policy sociology literature, arguing that this work presents a dystopian view of education aligning it directly to the instrumental needs of neoliberal economic productivity. The paper suggests that this interpretation of the TPS concept does not do justice to the complexity of the whole Bernstein theoretical corpus, specifically the work on pedagogic discourse, pedagogic device, pedagogic modalities and pedagogic codes. The paper positions the TPS concept within the larger Bernstein research project, with its dual focus on power relations and symbolic control in and through 'the processes and mechanisms of the pedagogic communication of knowledge' (Gordon, 2009: xi). It examines Bernstein's (2000: 111) attention not only to issues of social reproduction in and through education systems, but also to the production/fabrication of social identities and relations of whole populations through pedagogic means in a period of 'reorganising capitalism'. It argues that Bernstein's offerings on the TPS are a sketch, an outline, 'where the plot is not worked out and half the characters are missing' (Bernstein, 2000: 81). The TPS signals an open ended journey in an ongoing exploration of the complex problematique about the relations between symbolic control and modalities of the self. Scholars working with Bernstein's concept of the TPS then need to position this concept within the whole oeuvre and problematique and not simply 'invoke' these concepts, but 'work with them and develop and extend them' (Moore, 2011, xv).

Acknowledgements:

Thanks to Anna Tsatsaroni, Alan Sadovnik and Ben Williams for comments on an earlier version of this paper

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

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

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

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

(4) Reducing the costs to government of education.

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

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

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

^{iv} Bernstein's concept of the TPS has been used extensively in the field of critical policy studies, or sociologies of policy to examine the globalisation of education policies around (1) teacher professionalism (Beck, 2009, Bonal & Rambla, 2003; Robertson, 2012a,b); (2) health and physical education, and citizenship education curriculum (Evans & Davies, 2008; Evans, Davies, Rich, & DePian, 2012; Evans & Rich, 2011; Magalhaes & Soer, 2003; Pykett, 2009, 2010), (3) learning society, knowledge society, and lifelong learning (Ball, 2009, 2010; Gerrard, 2013; Gerwitz, 2008; Pasiás & Roussakis, 2012; Rønning Haugen, 2010); (4) supranational testing regimes (Kanes, Morgan, & Tsatsaroni, 2014; Tyler, 2001; 2010b), and (5) the impact of research on policy (Lingard, 2013, 2005).

^v From a different angle, Kleon (2014) argues that pedagogic agency enhances visibility in a world saturated with information and ideas. How can specific ideas, information be heard in an era where knowledge grows exponentially, and so many ideas are clamouring for attention? Kleon (2014) suggests that pedagogy is the answer – it adds value to new ideas, it connects people to knowledge work. Pedagogic relations are not a means of giving away ideas, but rather a means of connecting others to your knowledge work. The slogan adopted by Kleon (2014: 68) is: 'get rich by out-teaching your competition'. From this perspective, pedagogy becomes the dominant mode of connectivity in a knowledge saturated society.

^{vi} 'Performativity is a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation, or a system of 'terror' in Lyotard's words, that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of control, attrition and change. The performances (of individual subjects or organisations) serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of 'quality', or 'moments' of promotion (there is a felicitous ambiguity around this word) or inspection. They stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organisation within a field of judgement. 'An equation between wealth, efficiency, and truth is thus established' (Lyotard 1984, p. 46). The issue of who controls the field of judgement is crucial. 'Accountability' and 'competition' are the lingua franca of this new discourse of power as Lyotard describes it. A discourse which is the emerging form of legitimation in post-industrial societies for both the production of knowledge and its transmission through education' (Ball, 2000: 1-2).

^{vii} The term device is borrowed from Foucault (1979, 1980) and is used by Bernstein (2000) to refer to the ensemble of rules constituting pedagogic discourse, which in turn becomes the major or dominant instrument of governance. Whole populations are governed not by violent means, but by the power and control relations of the devices of pedagogy, or what Bernstein calls the pedagogic device. Rochex (2011: 86) suggests that 'the effectiveness of the device is limited by two features: 1. Internal: ... although the device is there to control the unthinkable, in the process of controlling the unthinkable it makes the possibility of the unthinkable available. Therefore, internal to the device is its own paradox: it cannot control what it has been set up to control. 2: External: The external reason why the device is not deterministic is because the distribution of power which speaks through the device creates potential sites of challenge and opposition'.

^{viii} Agencies might operate in the cultural field, but in fact receive considerable government subsidies. For example, medical doctors in private practice operate in the cultural field, but patients' costs are partially subsidised by governments. Moreover, government funded state schools may outsource of their services to private providers.

^{ix} Bernstein (2001b: 26) identifies the following six specialized agencies of the field of symbolic control:

(1) Regulators: Religious, legal

(2) Repairers: Medicine, psychiatric, social service counselling, child guidance etc.

(3) Reproduces: school system

(4) Diffusers-Recontextualizers-Propagators: State regulated media agencies, state controlled national theatres, opera ballet, music, galleries.

(5) Shapers: Universities and cognate agencies, research centres, research councils, private foundations

(6) Executors: Civil service, central and local governments.

^x Bernstein (2001b) would suggest that Lyotard's (1985) definition of a non-representational theory of knowledge and turn to performativity places too much emphasis on language games and the discursive. He called attention to the social structures and material practices, particularly focusing attention on the agencies and agents producing, disseminating and evaluating the acquisition of new discursive codes.

^{xi} Bill Green (2010) provides a succinct summary of Lyotard's thesis highlighting the significant changes both to knowledge and education currently taking place. 'Education is changing, as is knowledge more generally, to a significant degree energised by what has been described as the digital revolution. This has been widely discussed with references to notions such as globalisation, the New Media Age, openaccess, and the Network Society' (Green, 2010: 56).

References:

- Ball, S. J. (1998). Big Policies/Small World: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy. *Comparative Education*, 34(2), 119-130. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03050069828225>
- Ball, S. J. (2000). Performativities and fabrications in the education economy: Towards the performative society. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 1-23.
- Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 215-228. doi: 10.1080/0268093022000043065
- Ball, S. J. (2005). *Education Policy And Social Class : The Selected Works of Stephen Ball* (1 ed.). Hoboken: Taylor & Francis.
- Ball, S. J. (2009). Lifelong Learning, Subjectivity and the Totally Pedagogised Society. In M. Peters, A., A. C. Besley, M. Olssen, S. Maurer & S. Weber (Eds.), *Governmental Studies in Education* (pp. 201-216). Rotterdam, Boston, Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter. *Signs*, 28(3), 801-831. doi: 10.1086/345321
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway. Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Barad, K. (2012). On Touching—The Inhuman That Therefore I Am *differences*, 23(3), 206-223. doi: doi:10.1215/10407391-1892943
- Bauman, Z. (2004). Zygmunt Bauman: Liquid Sociality. In N. Gane (Ed.), *The Future of Social Theory* (pp. 17-46). London, New York: Continuum.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity* (2nd ed.). Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bernstein, B. (2001a). From Pedagogies to Knowledges. In A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies & H. Daniels (Eds.), *Towards A Sociology of Pedagogy. The Contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research* (pp. 363-368). New York: Peter Lang.
- Bernstein, B. (2001b). Symbolic Control: issues of empirical description of agencies and agents. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 4(1), 21-33.
- Bernstein, B. (2001c). Transcript: Video Conference with Basil Bernstein. In A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies & H. Daniels (Eds.), *Towards a Sociology of Pedagogy. The Contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research* (pp. 369-384). New York: Peter Lang.
- Bernstein, B., & Solomon, J. (1999). 'Pedagogy, identity and the construction of a theory of symbolic control': Basil Bernstein questioned by Joseph Solomon. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(2), 265-279. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01425699995443>
- Castells, M. (1997). *The Power of Identity. The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture*. (1st ed. Vol. 2). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Castells, M. (2000). *End of the Millennium. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. (2nd ed. Vol. 3). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Castells, M. (2009). *Communication Power*. Oxford, GBR: Oxford University Press.

-
- De Queiroz, J.-M. (2011). The message the voice. In D. Frandji & P. Vitale (Eds.), *Knowledge, Pedagogy and Society. International Perspectives on Basil Bernstein's sociology of education* (pp. 49-61). Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Depaepe, M. (2012). *Between Educationalization and Appropriation. Selected Writings on the History of Modern Educational Systems*. Belgium: Leuven Press.
- Depaepe, M., & Smeyers, P. (2008). Educationalization as an Ongoing Modernization Process. *Educational Theory*, 58(4), 379-389.
- Durkheim, E. (1969). *The Evolution of Educational Thought* (P. Collins, Trans.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Fenwick, T., Mangez, E., & Ozga, J. (2014). Governing Knowledge: Comparison, Knowledge-Based Technologies and Expertise in the Regulation of Education. In T. Fenwick, E. Mangez & J. Ozga (Eds.), *Governing Knowledge. Comparison, Knowledge-Based Technologies and Expertise in the Regulation of Education. World Yearbook of Education 2014* (pp. 3-10). London, New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1979). Governmentality. *Ideology and Consciousness*, 6(Autumn).
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge* (C. Gordon, Marshall, Leo, Mephram, John, Soper, Kate, Trans. C. Gordon Ed.). Brighton, Sussex: The Harvester Press.
- Gewirtz, S. (2008). Give us a Break! A Sceptical Review of Contemporary Discourse of Lifelong Learning. *European Educational Research Journal*, 7(4), 414-424. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/eeerj.2008.7.4.414>
- Gordon, C. (2009). Forward: Pedagogy, Psychagogy, Demagogy. In M. Peters, A., A. C. Besley, M. Olssen, S. Maurer & S. Weber (Eds.), *Governmentality Studies in Education* (pp. xi-xxvi). Rotterdam, Boston, Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Green, B. (2009). Knowledge, the Future, and Education(al) Research: A New-Millennial Challenge. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 37(4), 43-62.
- Hunter, I. (1994). *Rethinking the school. Subjectivity, bureaucracy and criticism*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Kanes, C., Morgan, C., & Tsatsaroni, A. (2014). The PISA mathematics regime: knowledge structures and practices of the self. *Educ Stud Math, iFirst*(18 April). doi: DOI 10.1007/s10649-014-9542-6
- Kleon, A. (2014). *Show Your Work! 10 Ways to Share Your Creativity and Get Discovered*. New York: Workman Publishing Company.
- Lingard, B. (2011). Policy as numbers: ac/counting for educational research. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 38, 355-382.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1985). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Maton, K., & Muller, J. (2007). A Sociology for the Transmission of Knowledges. In F. Christie & J. R. Martin (Eds.), *Language, Knowledge and Pedagogy* (pp. 14). London, New York: Continuum.
- Moore, R. (2013). *Basil Bernstein : The Thinker and the Field*. Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Muller, J. (2004). Introduction: the possibilities of Basil Bernstein. In J. Muller, B. Davies & A. Morais (Eds.), *Reading Bernstein, Researching Bernstein* (pp. 1-14). London: Routledge.
- Muller, J., & Hoadley, U. (2010). Pedagogy and Moral Order. In P. Singh, A. Sadovnik & S. Semel (Eds.), *Toolkits, Translation Devices and Conceptual Accounts: Essays on Basil Bernstein's Sociology of Knowledge* (pp. 161-175). New York: Peter Lang.
- Novoa, A., & Yariv-Mashal, T. (2014). Comparative Research in Education: A Mode of Governance or a Historical Journey? In T. Fenwick, E. Mangez & J. Ozga (Eds.), *Governing Knowledge. Comparison, Knowledge-Based Technologies and Expertise in the Regulation of Education. World Yearbook of Education 2014* (pp. 13-30). London, New York: Routledge.
- Rochex, J.-Y. (2011). The work of Basil Bernstein. A non-"sociologistic" and therefore non-deterministic sociology. In D. Frandji & P. Vitale (Eds.), *Knowledge, Pedagogy and Society*.

-
- International Perspectives on Basil Bernstein's sociology of education* (pp. 77-94). Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Sadovnik, A. (1991). Basil Bernstein's Theory of Pedagogic Practice: A Structuralist Approach. *Sociology of Education*, 64, 48-63.
- Seddon, T. (2008). Remaking Civic Formation: Transforming Politics and the Cosmopolitan School. In B. Lingard, J. Nixon & S. Ranson (Eds.), *Transforming Learning in Schools and Communities* (pp. 152-168). London, New York: Continuum
- Singh, P. (2004). Globalization and Education. *Educational Theory*, 54(1), 103-115.
- Singh, P., & Doherty, C. (2004). Global Cultural Flows and Pedagogic Dilemmas: Teaching in the Global University 'Contact Zone'. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(1), 9-42.
- Tsatsaroni, A., & Evans, J. (2013). Adult numeracy and the totally pedagogised society: PIAAC and other international surveys in the context of global educational policy on lifelong learning. *Educ Stud Math*.
- Tyler, W. (1999). Pedagogic identities and educational reform in the 1990s: the cultural dynamics of national curricula. In F. Christie (Ed.), *Pedagogy and the Shaping of Consciousness* (pp. 262-289). London: Continnum.
- Tyler, W. (2004). Silent, invisible, total: pedagogic discourse and the age of information. In J. Muller, B. Davies & A. Morais (Eds.), *Reading Bernstein, Researching Bernstein* (pp. 15-29). London: Routledge.
- Tyler, W. (2010). *Ten Points of Comment and Feedback on BB6*. Email Communication. July 29th.
- Young, M., & Muller, J. (2010). Three educational scenarios of the future: Lessons from the sociology of knowledge. *European Journal of Education*, 45(1), 11-27.