

Teaching and Globalization

Pasi Sahlberg

Globalization is typically understood as an economic, political and cultural process that is reshaping the role of many nation-states in relation to global markets, agreements, and traditions. Recently it has become frequently analyzed in the context of education. However, there is surprisingly little work done on the pedagogical implications of globalization on teaching and learning other than shifting the emphasis from traditional subjects to information and communication technology and English as a foreign language. This article argues that globalization is having an effect on teaching and learning in three ways: educational development is often based on a global unified agenda, standardized teaching and learning are being used as vehicles to improvement of quality, and emphasis on competition is increasingly evident among individuals and schools. The article concludes that recent development of standardization and competition-based education will become increasingly counter-productive to preparing students for meaningful lives for and beyond knowledge economy. Furthermore, as a response to globalization, educators need to rethink the ways teaching and learning are organized in schools, promote appropriate flexibility at school level, creativity in classrooms and risk-taking among students and teachers as part of their daily work in school.

Education Systems in the Global Context

Globalization has typically been interpreted using economic, political and cultural terms. Depending on the perspective, it has been seen as a transition from a Fordist workplace orientation to internationalized trade and consumption. Globalization is also leading to a diminishing role of nation-states, loss of their sovereignty, and the emergence of global hegemony of transnational media and entertainment corporations. As a consequence, standardization in economies, policies and culture has become a new norm for competitive corporations, ideas, and media. As Burbules and Torres (2000) write, changes in global culture

*Dr Pasi Sahlberg is Senior Education Specialist
in the World Bank, Washington, DC, USA.*

*The views are those of the author alone and do not necessarily
represent those of the World Bank or any of its affiliated institutions.*

Managing Global Transitions 2 (1): 65–83

deeply affect educational policies, practices, and institutions. From recent attempts to analyze and understand the multiple and complex effects of globalization on education it is obvious that there is no single straightforward view of the consequences of the globalization process on teaching and learning in schools and other education institutions (Carnoy 1999; Burbules and Torres 2000; OECD 2001; Stromquist 2002; Hargreaves 2003; World Bank 2003). Although globalization has also created new opportunities to transform education, this article focuses on some counterproductive implications that are becoming evident in recent education reforms.

Globalization has two macro-level paradoxical effects on our daily lives. First, it simultaneously both integrates and segregates. It integrates world cultures through the global communication networks and less restricted movement of individuals. At the same time it creates a tension between those who are benefiting more and those who may be marginalized by the market values and consumer cultures that are typical to many societies, especially in the areas that suffer from poverty or slower development. The challenge for future public education is to give priority to teaching ethics and a sense of global responsibility that go beyond the bounds of the knowledge economy. Second, globalization promotes competition although strategic alliances between competing parties are becoming a condition of success. Economic markets have become more open and flexible because of diminishing barriers of trade and lowering of labor and trade regulations. The mobility of goods, services, money and intellectual capital has increased due to sub-regional and global agreements. Competition to expand markets, promote innovations, and develop highly skilled workforces is shifting the focus of work from quantities to qualities and from mastery of facts to professional flexibility and continuous renewal of personal capacities. Globalization increases competition because productivity and efficiency have become key descriptors of successful economies. Corporations and service organizations are regularly using quality assurance policies and committing themselves to management strategies that are based on assessment of performance of both staff and managers.

As a consequence, similar doctrines have emerged in education. Standards, testing and alternative forms of financing have come to challenge conventional public education in many countries. In the name of accountability and transparency, schools, teachers and students are more often than before measured, tested and asked to perform under the ob-

serving eyes of external inspectors. Even ministers of education today compete to determine whose students can perform the best in international student assessment programs. Indeed, introduction of international test comparisons, such as PISA (Program for International Student Assessment) and TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study), has been one of the strongest pretexts for school reforms in many countries including many of the transition economies (Hargreaves 2003). The emerging perception seems to be that making schools, teachers and students compete will itself improve the quality of education, as it has vitalized corporations in market economies. Various forms of educational standards have been created to help these competitions to become fairer and more comparable.

Education systems are reacting differently to the changes in the world's new economic, political and cultural orders. Globalization has become an influence in nation-states' social reforms as education sectors adjust to the new global environments that are characterized by flexibility, diversity, increased competition and unpredictable change. Understanding the effects of globalization on teaching and learning is essential for any policy maker, reform designer and educational leader. According to Carnoy (1999), the approach which governments take in reforming their education sector and its responses to globalization depends on three key factors:

- the government's objective financial situation,
- its interpretation of that situation,
- its political-ideological position regarding the public sector in education.

These three factors are normally spelled out in the macro-economic *structural adjustment policies* and related large-scale education reform strategies through which countries adjust not only their economies but also their education systems to the new realities.

The key purpose of structural adjustment policies in the education sector has been a transition towards 'global educational standards'. This is often done by benchmarking the entire systems of less-developed countries to those of economically more advanced ones. Unfortunately, governments often think that there is one correct approach to adjustment of education and that certain 'global education standards' need to be met if the system is to perform in an internationally competitive way. Research on education reforms and experiences on structural adjust-

ment suggest that governments need to realize that there is more than one way of proceeding on the way to improvement. The major condition for sustainable evolution of public education and cultivation of democratically functioning nation-states is the kind of reform that is based on the principle of *development* rather than *creation*. In creation, according to Sarason (2002), new externally designed solutions are being introduced to solve the existing local problems. In development, on the other hand, the key questions are:

- What is the past of the system?
- What kind of institutions do we want the schools to become?
- What capabilities do individuals and the system need to implement the expected reform?

This tension between development and creation is visible in most education system reforms in Europe and Central Asia region today. More specifically, there are three education policy directions within the more general structural adjustment of state economy and public service that are typical of today's large-scale education reforms. Each of these policies is often implemented in the spirit of creation rather than development in developing and transition countries. Moreover, the following policies are often used to promote market-based reforms and hence characterize the essence of globalization of education: *decentralization*, *privatization*, and *increasing efficiency* of education. *Decentralization* is based on an assumption that stronger self-management allows schools to find optimal ways of responding to local needs and becoming more accountable for outcomes. A recent analysis of decentralization in Central and Eastern Europe show how complicated the concept of delegating power can be in practice (World Bank 2000). *Decentralization per se* can neither improve the quality of education nor increase the productivity of schooling. Evidence shows that for example school autonomy alone, as a form of decentralized education management, has produced no significant gains in student achievement (Hannaway and Carnoy 1993). Indeed, the rationale for decentralizing education is not to increase the autonomy of municipalities or schools, but to reduce the central government's responsibility for financing of compulsory education and to aggregate the responsibility of financing of education to local taxpayers and governments. Similarly, the cost-efficiency, competition and impact of private schools have been constant topics of debate among educators. Evidence from the research literature is, however, controversial

(Riddell 1993; Lockheed and Jimenez 1996; Ladd and Fiske 2003). Although cost-effectiveness in private schools may be greater than in public schools, private provision of education through vouchers does not itself improve student learning. For example, data from recent education reforms in Chile show that a large-scale and systematic privatization of public school management has not made a significant contribution to school improvement in general (Carnoy 1997; Mizala et al. 2002; Hsieh and Urquiola 2003). Furthermore, research evidence from New Zealand, Chile and even United States indicate that the common belief that increased competition among schools due to parental choice and related financing structures leads to improved teaching and learning is either unclear, or is simply not true (Belfield and Levin 2002; Ladd and Fiske 2003).

A Tentative Typology of Global Education Reforms

Countries in transition often redesign their policies to align education systems to what they believe to be current international practice. Demand for technological literacy, flexibility of knowledge and skills, and ability to adjust to new labor market needs require teachers to teach new things in new ways. Globalization is hence catalyzing education reforms around the world. However, the thinking behind these reforms varies greatly from one system to another. First and foremost, there is no one common denominator for these reforms, but a closer analysis identifies some typical trends. Looking at the basic values, assumptions, and purposes of various education reforms, four different reform categories can be identified. They constitute a tentative typology of education reforms during the process of globalization that I have designed based on recent thinking on education reforms (see for example Carnoy 1999; Sahlberg 2002; Fullan 2003). Some aspects of types of reforms may overlap and this categorization is not necessarily comprehensive. The four education reform categories are (see Table 1): equity-oriented reforms, restructuring-oriented reforms, financing-oriented reforms, and standardization-oriented reforms.

The main intention of *equity-oriented education reforms* that were typical in the 1960s and 1970s is to promote social equity and increase economic opportunity. In most countries educational attainment determines individuals' social status as well as their capital earnings, which makes the equalizing of access to good education an important factor in closing the gap between the socio-economic groups in society (Carnoy

Table 11: Tentative typology of education reforms

Type of reform	Purposes	Focus of change	Elements
<i>Equity.</i> Reforming to strengthen education's political role in building democratic and social mobility, social equalization, and equal opportunity.	Increase equity of economic and social opportunities by focusing on equal access for all students at least to good basic education.	Shifting public spending from higher to lower levels of education. Expanding the conception of quality of education beyond the knowledge and skills in core subjects. Moving towards integrated curriculum. Emphasizing teacher professionalism.	Extending high-quality basic education to the lowest-income groups, including youth and adults who do not have the basic knowledge and skills. Reaching girls and rural populations, children with special needs, at-risk children, marginalized groups and refugees.
<i>Restructuring.</i> Reforming education as a globally normalized social and political system based on internationally shared core values and assumptions.	Improve education service delivery by adjusting current system's structures to the requirements of global economic standards and socio-political climate.	Decentralizing education management by providing schools with more decision-making authority. Privatizing education management through private schools, vouchers and other solutions.	Realigning the length of compulsory education and secondary education to international norms. Reforming curricula to reflect changes in society (mainly ICT and foreign languages) and establish new agencies for quality assurance and control.
<i>Financing.</i> Reforming education system to adjust to public sector budget cuts and reducing resources available for financing education.	Increase educational cost-effectiveness by reducing public spending on education and improve the efficiency of resource use and the quality of education.	Reforming education through increasing pupil-teacher ratio, optimizing the school network and rationalizing education management.	Decentralization of education management, increasing school choice and privately managed education provision through vouchers and charters. Introducing local level accountability structures to improve cost-effectiveness.
<i>Standardization.</i> Reforming education by setting unified standards for teaching and learning and conducting related external monitoring and testing to justify the achievement of these standards.	Improve the quality of education through setting higher standards and closer standardized monitoring and evaluation of student achievement, and teacher performance.	Reforming education through tightening inspection, performance-related pay, pre-determined performance standards and publicly made test results.	Creating performance standards for students and teachers and indicators that help to assess the achievement of these standards. Closely scripted curricula and regular testing of students often characterize the outcomes of this reform category.

1999). Equity-oriented reforms often emphasize strengthening the political role of education in building democratic justice, social mobility and equal opportunities for all citizens. These reforms typically focus on shifting public spending from higher to lower levels of education, rural/urban balance, gender issues, broadening the conception of educational quality beyond knowledge and skills in core subjects and moving towards a more integrated curriculum and inclusive organization of teaching. Consequently, the popularity of equity-oriented education reforms has decreased recently because of the perceptions that investing in equity may not show an increase in test scores and, hence, may not give sufficient attention to economic growth. Instead, market-based solutions have often been seen as potential alternatives to conventional public education in improving the quality and cost-effectiveness of educational provision. Some fear, among them many teachers, that in this race for higher standards only the fastest and strongest will succeed while the weak either fail or lose their hope when being left behind.

Restructuring-oriented education reforms that emerged in 1980s are based on structural alignments that aim to 'normalize' the current system with international practice. The basic assumption of such reforms is that all education systems that function effectively and produce high quality learning should share the same core values, assumptions and operational principles. The most typical indicators of economically and administratively adjusted education systems are pupil-teacher ratio, class-size, school-size, time allocation per subject, education expenditure per capita and length of compulsory education. Recently, as a consequence of restructuring reforms especially in transition economies, several institutional rearrangements have occurred, such as the emergence of independent assessment and examination centers, privately managed education institutions and accreditation agencies.

Financing-oriented education reforms typically aim at reducing the share of public financing of education by looking for ways of users to pay for their education. As globalization increases competition among nations, national economies have to adjust themselves to the new global economic structural reality. In practice, since education is a significant proportion of public sector spending, reducing public spending inevitably means also shrinking education budgets financed from public funding. This, in turn, leads governments to seek financing outside public budgets or to reduce the unit costs within the education sector, or both of these. Financing-oriented reforms have had three direct implica-

tions for education. First, shifting public funding from higher to lower levels of education. Higher education is typically high-cost, and basic education is relatively low cost in terms of student expenditures. The shift of spending from higher to basic education would therefore enhance opportunities for large numbers of primary students at the expense of subsidizing a relatively elite group of families who could bear the costs of university education privately anyway (Carnoy 1999). Second, this leads to privatization of secondary and higher education. Many governments in the Central and Eastern European regions increase privately financed education in order to overcome the problems of low education financing portfolios in the State budgets. Third, reduction of the cost per student is most often done by increases in class-sizes at all levels of education. According to the economists' estimates, countries that have fewer than 45 students in a class could save significant public resources by increasing class sizes over time (World Bank 1995). In the New Independent States, for example, the pupil-teacher ratio is typically around 10 : 1, whereas the OECD average is 15 : 1.

Standardization-oriented reforms that have appeared since the 1990s are based on the assumption that in the competitive economic and social contexts the quality of education and productivity of labor can best be improved by setting high performance standards for teaching and learning and then measuring whether these standards have been met. Standardization-driven reforms were a catalyst for the introduction of international test comparisons. Students' test scores in TIMSS and PISA have raised public interest in the performance of education systems globally. A consequence is that the complex interconnections between educational achievement and economic success are oversimplified. In competition-intensive global markets, schools have been urged to reach higher standards. This has led to focusing on education reforms that are based on greater standardization and related micro-management of teaching and learning. As Hargreaves (2003) has argued, the most commonly used reform strategy is:

- a closely scripted curriculum with predetermined attainment targets or learning standards,
- aligned testing mechanisms that measure the extent to which these standards have been achieved,
- tightened external inspection to control teachers' and schools' performance,

- performance-related compensation among other reward-sanction structures.

The types of education reforms described in Table 1 rarely occur independently from each other. The internal logic of that typology indicates increased market-orientation of education reform as one moves top-down in Table 1. Therefore, it is normal that two or more of these reforms are implemented simultaneously in large-scale, system-wide efforts to align education to new economic or political situations and thereby improve the quality of education and increase the productivity of labor. Moreover, similar changes may occur within each of these reform categories but for different reasons. For example, changing the curriculum has been almost a fit-for-all cure in education reforms of any type, teacher in-service training is proposed as a means in most reforms, and resource implications of reforms have often impacted on the financial arrangements of education.

Has globalization catalyzed one or some of these education reforms more than others? A Canadian research team presented a synthesis of efforts to reform education systems during the era of globalization. They refer to 'a new official orthodoxy of educational reform' occurring primarily in predominantly Anglo-Saxon countries (Hargeraves et al. 2001). This strategy is rapidly being adopted also in developing parts of the world due to development aid offered by industrialized countries. In many cases, especially in the Europe and Central Asian region, policy, strategies and models of educational reforms created in developed countries are exported to the less-developed transition countries. The new educational orthodoxy is to a large extent a market-based offspring of globalization and, according to Hargreaves et al. (2001), has the following major components:

- *Higher standards* of learning for all students, except for those who have the most severe mental or physical dysfunctions.
- *Deeper learning*, which shifts the focus of teaching away from a presentation-recitation mode of instruction towards teaching for conceptual understanding, problem solving, and shared intelligence that are all essential for successful participation in the knowledge society or knowledge economy.
- *Centralized curricula* that ensure common and consistent coverage of what every student should know and be able to do, often in the form of standards or pre-scripted attainment targets.

- *Literacy and numeracy* as prime targets of reform and which also determine the success or failure of pupils, teachers, schools, and entire education systems.
- *Indicators and attainment targets* of student achievement and curriculum planning that enable teachers and others to be clear whether these standards have been reached or not.
- *Aligned assessments* that are tightly linked to the prescribed curriculum, learning standards, and indicators making sure that teachers focus on high learning achievements for all students.
- *Consequential accountability* where the school performance and especially raising the quality of education, are closely tied to the processes of accreditation, promotion, inspection and ultimately funding and rewarding (or punishing).

This educational reform ideology has been widely accepted, both politically and professionally. In principle these elements of education reform, when implemented successfully, promise significant progress of education, especially in improved quality of education and better opportunities for all students to learn in school. In many cases, as a consequence of this new global education reform movement, the introduction of various educational standards has become common in modern education development. What has followed is an emergence of learning standards for students, teaching standards for teachers, assessment and curriculum standards for educators, with related indicators, criteria and attainment targets. Although some early gains have been recorded, the standardization movement in schools has not-welcomed backwash effects as well that are discussed in the next paragraphs (Fullan 2003).

Globalization as Standardization

A clear impact of globalization is increased competition, not only in economy and trade, but also in other sectors, including education. The fundamental assumption is that boundless business opportunities and the free movement of labor are promoting efficiency and effectiveness in private production as well as among basic public services. Previous education policies have adopted values, principles and management models of market economy, for example, curriculum models in the early 20th century based on scientific management by Frederick W. Taylor. Today again, as a response to the economic, political and cultural globalization process, education systems are seeking governance and operational

models from the business world. As a result, the number of privately managed education institutions has increased, school choice within public education has been made possible, local management and decision making are becoming common due to decentralization, and schools and teachers have been made accountable for teaching and learning. In some instances these neo-liberal and sometimes even market fundamentalist education policies have created what could be described as 'schooling apartheid' in which good schools get better and poor schools get worse or are even abolished due to their failure to perform according to externally set standards. Many good schools have gained their reputation by having a better intake of students and by simple raw student test result data that have been used in comparing schools in the media in the name of accountability.

Focusing on higher economic productivity in national economies is one cause of increased competitiveness in our societies. In the environment where results matter the most, standards are commonly used to determine the quality of these results. Outcomes-based education reform became popular in the 1980s, followed by standards-based education policies in the 1990s first in Anglo-Saxon countries. These reforms shifted the focus of attention from educational inputs, i. e. regulation of teaching, to educational outcomes, i. e. monitoring of learning. As a result, a widely accepted belief among policy-makers and education reformers is that by emphasizing competition among schools and setting clear and high enough performance standards for schools, teachers and students will improve the quality of education, and hence students' learning outcomes. Enforcement of external testing systems to assess how these standards have been achieved has resulted from standards-oriented education reforms. Since the late 1980s, as Hargreaves (2003) writes, 'centrally prescribed curricula, with detailed and pressing performance targets, aligned assessments, and high stake accountability have defined a "new orthodoxy" of educational reform worldwide, providing standardized solutions at low cost for a voting public keen on accountability'. It is easy to see the linkages between what has happened in global economies, politics and societies in general and the mainstream market-based education reform agendas mentioned above.

Efforts to enhance quality, increase productivity and improve cost-effectiveness, have brought standardization in various forms to the world of education. The financing and standardization-oriented education reforms mentioned in Table 1 have dominated education policy discourses

and reform agendas more than have equity- and restructuring-oriented educational development during the last two decades. Schools and teachers have been asked to improve the quality of teaching and learning at a time of increased requirements to spend their time on non-teaching activities in their schools, shrinking education budgets and restricted access to necessary resources. Students' test scores in standardized academic achievement tests have been used as a sole justification for personal success or failure. Student assessment has become a global business in education as schools and local education authorities are forced to spend considerable shares of their education budgets on testing students. What is even more worrying is the shift of teachers' and students' attention from teaching and learning for understanding towards being successful in high stake tests and exams.

Recent research on large-scale standards-driven education reforms seems to suggest that there is a need for a change of course (Fullan 2000). In England and Wales, New Zealand, some provinces of Australia, Japan, Singapore, and even in the United States there are growing concerns about the appropriateness of standardized reform and its real contributions to educate for citizenship and prepare youth for democratic societies and knowledge economies (Oakes et al. 2000; Cuban 2001; Popham 2002; Fullan 2003; Hargreaves 2003). There are indications that over-standardization while resources (both time and money) remain the same are leading to de-professionalization of teachers' work and narrowing curriculum and learning to basic skills in core academic subjects. If that is true, then our standardized schools are not likely to be of much help in developing information societies and helping young people in learning the necessary knowledge, skills and habits of mind that they need in knowledge economies.

Knowledge societies are based on the capacities to share information, build knowledge and create innovations, in other words, to learn. The development of knowledge economies depends on how flexibly the society is able to react to unpredictable changes. Economies that are based on rigid structures and inert minds are not able to succeed and grow. However, many school systems and particularly their secondary schools have become rational, factory-type institutions that impose standardized knowledge on students rather than promote curiosity, creativity and self-actualization. Hargreaves (2003) says that 'the rightful pursuit of higher standards has degenerated into a counter-productive obsession with soulless standardization'. Instead of extending the space for innova-

tive teaching and creative learning in schools, the opportunities for flexibility and risk-taking that are essential in a knowledge economy have been taken away from teachers and students. Education reforms in many countries go under the label 'the way to a knowledge society' but what students, teachers and schools are forced to do often creates new problems rather than solves existing ones.

Education is paramount in helping young people to learn to live together in a secure globalized world. But what kind of education? The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has envisaged six possible scenarios for the future public education in the knowledge society (OECD 2001). Two 'Status Quo' scenarios of these possible futures of public education presume a strengthening of current arrangements that will result in either more entrenched bureaucracy in school systems or a growing emphasis on market and choice-based models as students and their parents become more dissatisfied with public education. Two other scenarios termed 'De-Schooling' scenarios presume that public schooling will simply diminish because of the lack of enough good teachers, and that the proliferation of innovations will create panic and 'meltdown' in education policies. Alternative solutions, such as non-formal education, distance education and e-learning will gradually replace formal public schooling. Only two scenarios labeled as 'Re-Schooling' assume that public education can be saved and improved. One scenario sees schools developing as learning organizations that will focus on learning and development for the knowledge society. The other scenario sees the school as an activity center in its community that networks with other human development entities, promotes the development of social capital and learning for a good life as well as for productivity in the knowledge society.

Teaching and the Knowledge Society

Two decades of education reforms, as Hargreaves (2003) observes, have led to rigid standardization, commercialized teaching, learning for tests and external control that has casualized teachers in many countries rather than empowered them to teach better. How can our schools then become learning organizations and caring communities? One potential way is to re-think teaching and learning by challenging conventional beliefs of what the knowledge society and knowledge economy require from schools. This re-thinking could constitute three dimensions:

- teaching *in* the knowledge society,

- teaching *for* the knowledge society,
- teaching *beyond* the knowledge society.

As teaching *in* the knowledge society (or economy) is self-evident, let us look at the dimensions of teaching *for* and *beyond* it.

Teaching for the knowledge economy is concerned primarily with cognitive learning and is based on three necessary elements. First, schools need to step back to becoming flexible institutions where *carpe diem* is the guiding principle of teaching and learning. Knowledge economies need individuals who can use knowledge, know how to adapt to new situations and be ready to explore the unknown. Second, a creative atmosphere in classroom is a key condition for the emergence of innovations and new ideas during the teaching and learning process. The knowledge economy as a learning system is dependent on innovations. Innovations require creativity and there is no creativity without risk-taking. Across the curriculum, students should learn to develop attitudes and skills that are necessary in social interaction, problem-solving and continuous self-development and learning. Third, individuals should be encouraged to develop collective intelligence and ingenuity. Rarely can only one person master all the knowledge and skills that are required. Successful corporations and communities build on shared knowledge and competences, not only individual mastery.

Teaching beyond the knowledge economy means teaching ethics, dispositions and a sense of global responsibility. It is based on four elements that go beyond the bounds of the knowledge economy. First, schools should help young people to develop values and emotions as part of their character development. Second, teaching in school should focus on learning the principles of democracy. Thirdly, students should be guided to commit themselves to group life and become active members of various communities instead of only learning to cope with short-term teamwork. And fourthly, as Giddens (2000) proposes, teaching should cultivate a cosmopolitan identity that means genuine interest in and understanding of other cultures, humanitarian responsibility of self and others and caring for excluded groups within and beyond one's own society.

Teaching in the era of globalization is a challenge to teachers and to education systems. I argue that public education will play an even more important role in social and economic development in the coming years. Reactions to these challenges have remained so far ineffective. Education vouchers, standardizing teaching and learning, intensifying testing, and

making schools more accountable to the public, have not raised the quality of education as expected. If governments want to narrow the learning gap between the more advanced and those who lag behind, to expand educational opportunities for all people and to improve student learning in general, systemic efforts that are backed up by coherent education policies are required. At the time of globalization this means stronger role of education, more public spending on education as well as more effective use of resources allocated for schooling. The evidence shows that those education systems that have strong public education are likely to be more successful in terms of efficiency and quality (Carnoy 1999; OECD 2002).

Concluding Discussion

The need for new thinking about educational reforms and school improvement is worldwide. The rhythm of change remains fast and unpredictable. Insecurity and uncertainty, that are typical by-products of globalization, create new challenges for schools to prepare pupils for new world realities such as sustainable ecologies or knowledge economies. Schools, when governed and managed well, may provide hope for better security and well being for many more than they do now. As described above, schools have faced the following global phenomena:

Increased standardization of teaching and learning. The new global educational orthodoxy together with competition-based education policies has led to *over-standardization* of teaching and learning (Hargreaves 2003). Standardization-oriented reforms that set unified and predetermined expectations in the form of performance standards underestimate the complexity and dynamics of knowledge economies. Standards are by definition static. Testing and measurement systems that are integral elements of standardized education systems diminish the curriculum and limit teaching to cover the core subjects and specific content areas that are tested (Popham 2002). As experience from highly standardized school systems suggests, teaching becomes technical implementation of predetermined sequences and learning a game of memorizing what was taught until it is externally tested.

Public resources for education are not likely to increase. Globalization increases international economic competition, which automatically puts pressure on decreasing public spending in state budgets (OECD 2003). As a consequence, education ministries have been forced to look for more efficient and cost-saving arrangements for delivering mandatory edu-

cational services. Teachers' salaries remain lower than salaries of similarly educated professionals in society. Class-sizes and school-sizes are increasing and financing of teacher professional development is shifting from public authorities to schools and teachers. At the same time, the development of modern teaching and learning tools requires larger budgets than before. Finally, cultural diversity in schools and the widening spectrum of children with various special needs call for intensified human development and appropriate provision of support to these individuals.

Demoralization among teachers and decreasing motivation for schooling among pupils. According to recent studies, teacher burn-out, dissatisfaction with work, lower morale and increasing early retirements have been consequences of tightening central control over teachers' work, expanding competitiveness within and among schools and weakening teacher autonomy (Perie et al. 1997). It may not be fair to blame globalization for all these illnesses in the teaching profession but, as a consequence of the adopted educational reform models – especially 'the new educational orthodoxy' and thus increased competition among schools – *de-professionalization* of teaching has become an increasingly global illness in education systems that will have serious future effects in medium and long term perspectives (Hargreaves 2003; Law 2003).

In order to cope with these impacts of globalization on schools, alternative directions are needed. Often inconsistent education reforms are due to the misinterpretation of the essence of globalization and its impact on education. Some of the proposed educational responses to globalization, such as standardization of teaching and learning, privatization through alternative education provision mechanisms and promotion of open competition between schools, have only recently been more widely questioned. Education policies and reform designers need to pay closer attention to the issues that have been suggested by many of the leading thinkers of educational development (Cuban 2001; Sarason 2002; Hargreaves 2003; Fullan 2003).

There are three different dimensions that schools have to consider when planning their roles in the globalizing world. Schools need to find the most effective ways to teach their pupils *in* the knowledge society. Then they have to design their curricula and pedagogical arrangements to help pupils to learn *for* the knowledge society. Finally, school should help young people to protect themselves from the negative side of globalization, such as marginalization and inequality between rich and poor,

by educating them *beyond* the knowledge society. This entails developing the values and emotions of young people's character, building understanding and commitments to families, communities and group life and cultivating a cosmopolitan identity.

Furthermore, school improvement should make better use of teachers' professional communities. Instead of standardizing teaching by creating more barriers to teachers' genuine creativity, emotional involvement in their students' development and collegial professionalism, teachers should be helped by providing them with time and resources to learn, plan and reflect together about their work in school. Some governments are now shifting the focus of their policies and education reforms from standardization of teaching and learning towards developing professional learning communities of teachers and towards emancipating the professional potential of teachers and principals who are able to find new solutions to maintaining the quality of learning. Promotion of such professional communities is based on four elements (Hargreaves 2003):

- collaborative work and discussion among the teachers and principals in school;
- focus on teaching and learning within that professional collegiality;
- collecting data from classrooms and schools to evaluate the progress and challenges in the educational process;
- rearranging time in schools.

It is obvious that globalization provides new opportunities to solve world-wide problems and at the same time it creates new challenges that needs to recognized. One visible trend within education is homogenization of the content of teaching and standardization of the expected learning in schools. Many governments are currently searching for optimal ways to respond to these challenges. According to the experts the future scenarios are not promising. It seems that public education is still the most powerful means to secure the development of democratic civil societies, productive knowledge economy and sustainable global security. Each of these national and global educational goals can be achieved only when education truly serves the public good and provides learning opportunities for all students. Teaching and learning that are based on the values of democracy, common good and equal opportunities can cultivate these features of our societies. The evidence from large-scale education reforms suggests that improving student learning or expanding opportunities to good education requires systematic efforts and coherent

policies by the public sector. According to these experiences, to do that means not only bigger but also more effective public education spending. To do this successfully, flexibility, creativity and risk-taking will be the key qualities of both institutions and their individuals.

References

- Belfield, C., and H. Levin. 2002. The effects of competition on educational outcomes: A review of the United States evidence. *Review of Educational Research* 27:279–41.
- Burbules, N., and C. A. Torres. 2000. *Globalization and education: Critical perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Carnoy, M. 1997. Is privatization through education vouchers really the answer? A comment to West. *The World Bank Research Observer* 12 (1): 105–16.
- Carnoy, M. 1999. *Globalization and educational reform: What planners need to know?* Paris: Unesco and IIEP.
- Cuban, L. 2001. *Oversold & underused: Computers in classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fullan, M. 2000. The Return of large-scale reform. *Journal of Educational Change* 1 (1): 1–23.
- Fullan, M. 2003. *Change forces with a vengeance*. London: Routledge-Falmer.
- Giddens, A. 2000. *Runaway world: How globalization is shaping our lives*. London: Profile Books.
- Hannaway, J., and M. Carnoy. 1993. *Decentralization and school improvement: Can we fulfill the promise?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hargreaves, A. 2003. *Teaching in the knowledge society: Education in the age of insecurity*. New York: Teachers College.
- Hargreaves, A., L. Earl, S. Moore, and S. Manning. 2001. *Learning to change: Teaching beyond subjects and standards*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hsieh, C., and M. Urquiola. 2003. When schools compete, how do they compete? An assessment of Chile's nationwide voucher program. NBER Working Paper w10008. <http://papers.nber.org/papers/w10008.pdf>.
- Ladd, H., and E. Fiske. 2003. Does competition improve teaching and learning? Evidence from New Zealand. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 22 (1): 97–112.
- Law, W. W. 2003. Globalization as both threat and opportunity for the Hong Kong teaching profession. *Journal of Educational Change* 4:149–79.

- Lockheed, M., and E. Jimenez. 1996. Public and private schools overseas: Contrasts in organization and effectiveness. In *Who chooses? Who loses?* ed. B. Fuller, R. Elmore, and G. Orfield. New York: Teachers College.
- Mizala, A., P. Romaguera, and D. Farren. 2002. The technical efficiency of schools in Chile. *Applied Economics* 34:1533–52.
- Perie, M., D. Baker, and S. Whitener. 1997. Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation. Statistical Analysis Report, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Oakes, J., K. H. Quartz, S. Ryan, and M. Lipton. 2000. *Becoming good American schools: The struggle for civic virtue in education reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- OECD. 2001. *What schools for the future?* Paris: OECD.
- OECD. 2002. PISA 2000. Technical report. Paris: OECD.
- OECD. 2003. *Education at a glance*. Paris: OECD.
- Popham, J. 2002. *The truth about testing: An educator's call for action*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Riddell, A. 1993. The evidence of public/private educational tradeoffs in developing countries. *International Journal of Educational Development* 13 (4): 333–86.
- Sahlberg, P. 2002. Educational reform. In *Encyclopedia of education*. 2nd edition. New York: MacMillan Library Reference.
- Sarason, S. 2002. *Education reform: A self-scrutinizing memoir*. New York: Teachers College.
- Stromquist, N. 2002. *Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of power, technology, and knowledge*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- World Bank 1995. *Strategies for education*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank 2000. *Decentralizing education in transition societies: Case studies from Central and Eastern Europe*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank 2003. *Lifelong learning in the global knowledge economy: Challenges for Developing Countries*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

PDF | Globalization is typically understood as an economic, political and cultural process that is reshaping the role of many nation-states in relation to each other. This article argues that globalization is having an effect on teaching and learning in three ways: educational development is often based on a global unified agenda, standardized teaching and learning are being used as vehicles to improvement of quality, and emphasis on competition is increasingly evident among individuals and schools. Globalization seems to be the issue for the 21st century that the military-industrial complex was to the 1960s. Yet, globalization is a term that is not well-defined, with different meanings for different groups. As the recent protests demonstrate, globalization is a term that is value-laden and controversial. A major ingredient of the word for some is its promise of increasing prosperity and development opportunities for all. ¶ Thanks to globalised education, teaching methods are now more interconnected and widespread. Access to schools has been enhanced and because of that students are increasingly becoming prepared for multinational roles. Such preparation also allows students a more holistic understanding of how the global business scene works and encourages their active participation in it.