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‘When I write I do it above all to change myself and not to think the same thing as before’ (Foucault ‘Remarks on Marx’ 1991 p. 27)

One of the most recurrent and insistent ‘undercurrents’ of education policy in the 21st century is that articulated by what Bob Jessop (2002) calls ‘the enterprise narrative’. In fact the narrative has three points of address within education. One is directly to the curriculum – in the form of Enterprise Education, and enterprise education now has all of the trappings of a school subject (Journals, teacher training and advanced courses, CPD, a professional association etc.). The second is to the institutions of education as a new form of organisational practice – the creation of entrepreneurial organisations. The third, more generally, is the assertion of enterprise (or social enterprise in various forms) as a new solution to entrenched social problems and as an alternative to public sector provision. Education is just one manifestation of a global re-working of the social, moral and political foundations of public service provision and responses to social disadvantage.
What is particular about the ‘enterprise narrative’ in all forms is that it not only announces a particular form of content for education and form of practice for educational institutions it also aims to construct particular subjectivities – enterprising or entrepreneurial subjects – for teachers and for students: ‘the “economic politics” of Enterprise appears to know no boundaries either in terms of where it might be applied’ (du Gay 2004 p. 40) or to whom.

This paper will draw upon the work of an ESRC funded study of philanthropy and education policy (RES-062-23-1484). The project has two main goals; one is substantive – an attempt to map and understand the recent growth in philanthropic involvements (particularly those coming from business) in education matters; the other is theoretical (and substantive) – to consider ‘new philanthropy’ as one aspect of ‘new governance’, that is the changing form and modalities of the state, the move from government to governance. This research has involved 3 sets of activities; extensive and exhaustive internet searches around particular (corporate) philanthropies, philanthropists and philanthropically funded programmes; interviews with some key ‘new’ philanthropists and foundations interested and involved in education work; and the use of these searches and interviews to construct ‘policy networks’. A ‘method’ I term ‘policy ethnography’ – a mapping of the form and content of policy relations in a particular field.

Here I will map some of the corporate involvement in ‘enterprise education’ and the dissemination of entrepreneurial sensibilities through the activities of their philanthropic foundations and funding. I will outline thereby the construction of a particular ‘discursive formation’. I will also subject some of the specific involvements to analysis. The paper will also show some of the ways that the ‘enterprise narrative’ is invested in education policy using materials from interviews and web searches.

*Enterprise* is deployed in a multitude of ways to introduce new ways of working, new forms of organisation and new kinds of social relationships into education and social policy; ranging from privatisation and contracting out, to
‘social enterprise’ solutions, to micro-finance and charity banking, to making public sector organisation more enterprising, and teaching ‘enterprise education’ in schools, colleges and HE and in schemes for NEETS.

There are a number of complexly inter-related processes involved here. 1. A shift from government to governance. 2. A financialisation of social and education policy. 3. The production of new kinds of citizens and workers, with new sensibilities and values. 4. The assumption of ‘socio-moral duties that were heretofore assigned to civil society organizations, governmental entities and state agencies’ (Shamir 2008) by corporations and philanthropies. Taken together this might be read as the signalling the triumph of ‘the neo-liberal imaginary’ within social policy. These issues will be discussed.

**Transformations and social enterprise**

The landscape of social and education policy has and is being ‘transformed’. A transformation which began in the 1970s, accelerated through Thatcherism in the 1980s and the Conservative governments of the 1990s, which has been pursued with a single-minded vigour under New Labour between 1997-2010, and is to be taken further by the UK’s new Coalition government. A transformation which under New Labour was driven by the tenets and methods outlined in the *UK Government's model of public sector reform* (Cabinet Office 2006). This model is based on four key mechanisms of reform – choice, contestability, workforce reform, and performance management (I discuss each of these in some detail in Ball 2008). It is a transformation that has redistributed power and responsibility within the politics of education, away from local authorities both to parts of the central state and to other new and diverse actors and agencies. It is a transformation based on autonomy and decentralisation on the one hand, and direction and intervention on the other – a process that might be termed ‘fragmented centralisation’ (Monahan 2005). A transformation that is, to a new form of meta-governance (Jessop 2002).
Central to this transformation is a process of substitution – a process which replaces traditional public sector actors with others (businesses, charities, voluntary organisations and social enterprises) and which replaces traditional public sector values and sensibilities (service) with others (entrepreneurship). As Tony Blair put it in his 1998 address to local government: “If you are unwilling or unable to work to the modern agenda, the government will have to look to other partners to take on your role” (www.solarnavigator.net/prime_minister_tony_blair.htm accessed 17th March 2010). Some of these ‘other partners’ are noted below.

Social enterprise is increasingly a key component of this substitution both in terms of values and actors\(^1\); ‘a novel image for a mode of activity to be encouraged in locales which had previously operated according to very different logics’ (Rose 2007) p. 20). Social enterprise indeed was a particular realisation of New Labour’s Third way and was a key discursive trope with the intellectual community that informed New Labour thinking (see Ball and Exley 2010). As Walker (2007 p. 56) puts it: ‘Reconciling socialism and capitalism, the third way was about harnessing entrepreneurial drive within a context of social and public purpose. The third sector has become the third way in action’. In 2007 the DTI reported that there were 55,000 social enterprises, with a combined turnover of £27bn, making up 5% of all businesses and accounting for 1% of GDP (Walker 2007 p. 57). And in a variety of ways the Labour governments sought to encourage in practical and discursive ways the development of social enterprise solutions to ‘wicked’ or intractable social problems. For example:

- charity banking (Social Finance, Acumen, Bridges Ventures, Triodos) and enterprise banks (e.g. UNLtd and Future builders).
- Development of commissioning skills and forums – e.g. Innovation exchange.

---

\(^1\) Social entrepreneurs combine the savvy, opportunism, optimism and resourcefulness of business entrepreneurs, but they devote themselves to pursuing social change or ”social profit,” rather than financial profit. (http://davidbornstein.wordpress.com/faq/ accessed 21st May 2010).
- Support for and ‘incubation’ of innovative public service ideas and - e.g. NESTA
- microfinance, social impact bonds -
- new Community Interest Companies (CICs)
- The Compact on Relations between Government and the Voluntary Sector, launched in 1998, is an agreement to improve relations between government and the voluntary sector to mutual advantage.
- The Social Enterprise Unit was initially established within the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), and in 2006 became part of the newly-created Office of the Third Sector, under the wing of the Cabinet Office. The Department for Health also has a Social Enterprise Unit and social enterprise fund.

---


3 A Social Impact Bond is a contract between a public sector body and Social Impact Bond investors, in which the former commits to pay for an improved social outcome. Investor funds are used to pay for a range of interventions to improve the social outcome. By enabling non-government investment to be utilised, Social Impact Bonds will lead to greater spending on preventative services. These interventions can have a direct impact on costly health and social problems.

4 A community interest company (CIC) is a new type of company introduced by the United Kingdom government in 2005 under the Companies (Audit, Investigations and Community Enterprise) Act 2004, designed for social enterprises that want to use their profits and assets for the public good.

5 The Department of Health’s Social Enterprise Unit will be working with social enterprises to identify pathfinders that will lead the way in delivering innovative health and social care services. The learning from these pathfinders will be shared across the health and social care sector so that others can benefit from the pathfinders experience.
However, the infrastructure of social enterprise is not simply made up of local institutions and relations. It is a complex global phenomenon addressed to the solution of major educational problems and forms of social disadvantage in the developing world. This ‘social enterprise’ policy network is also highly integrated with finance capital in terms of philanthropic ‘investment’, ‘investment management’ and the ‘solution providers’. That is to say, finance capital provides donations and intermediate services like charity banking and venture capital, and increasingly these funds are directed towards ‘for-profit’ or ‘social enterprise’ providers. The Clinton Global Initiative exemplifies this.

Imagine a room filled with the most innovative, action-oriented, and socially responsible leaders in the world. The Clinton Global Initiative’s Annual Meeting brings together heads of state, government and business leaders, scholars, and NGO directors. Participants analyze pressing global challenges, discuss the most effective solutions, and build lasting partnerships that enable them to create positive social

**Strengthening Market-Based Solutions**

Traditional approaches to aid are not enough to address the great global challenges of our time. Market-based solutions show incredible promise to solve these daunting problems on a systemic and widespread level. These approaches, however, are still in a nascent stage. Corporations are researching and developing better business practices that meet social and environmental bottom lines while producing profits. Non-profits are pioneering enterprise-based models that offer potential for long-term sustainability. Governments are contributing their resources to encourage and support market-based approaches. At the 2010 Annual Meeting, members will discuss the best strategies for bringing these solutions to scale, so the benefits can be felt by more of the four billion people who subsist on less than $3 a day. (http://www.clintonglobalinitiative.org/ourmeetings/2010/meeting_annual_actionareas.asp?Section=OurMeetings&PageTitle=Actions%20Areas, accessed 25th August 2010).

The enterprise solution is articulated from many disparate but connected points, via authoritative voices, and backed by very large-scale funding. Two specific examples of such activity – Opportunity International and Beyond Profit - which also give some indication of the joining-up of method, money and ideology⁶ as so-called ‘corporate social capitalism’⁷.

---


Opportunity International, a nonprofit microfinance organization founded in 1971 by Al Whittaker and David Bussau, announced at the Clinton Global Initiative’s Fifth Annual Meeting that it will expand its Banking on Education program to five additional countries over the next 24 months. Opportunity will commit USD 10 million to its education finance program, which provides loans for entrepreneurs to open schools in poor areas where it is difficult for children, particularly girls, to access public schools [1, 2]. Opportunity reaches over one million clients globally with products including loans, insurance and technical services. As of December 2008, it had USD 799 million in assets [3]. To view the 2008 Annual Report, see [4] in the bibliography.

Opportunity currently invests in over 200 private schools in five countries, with loans ranging from USD 500 to USD 25,000 for terms of two to five years. The program reached over 8,000 children in 2007, its first year of operation [5]. Opportunity aims to improve educational opportunities for up to 250,000 children by 2012.

In addition to providing loans to entrepreneurs to start and expand schools, Opportunity offers interest-bearing tuition savings accounts and school fee loans for parents who cannot afford their children’s education. School fee payments are flexible and the account assets are guaranteed if the child loses his/her guardians. “The pilot program at Opportunity Uganda currently provides almost 4,800 school fee loans, ranging between $22 and $214 and payable in four-month terms” [1].

In a five-year study comparing “schools for the poor” in India, China, Nigeria, Kenya and Ghana with government schools, Dr. James Tooley, Professor of Education Policy at Newcastle University, observed that schools for the poor were superior to government schools. Not only are they more cost efficient, they “offer flexible payment options, leading to reduced drop out rates in tough financial times. Most microschools are located in close proximity to poor households. This makes parents feel secure about sending their daughters to schools and also helps them save on transportation costs” [5].

Opportunity International operates in 28 countries through 43 microfinance institutions. It raises funds from charitable contributions, government grants and debt and equity from third parties [6].

We’re in Hyderabad this week, reporting from the inaugural Affordable Private School Symposium, organized by Gray Matters Capital. After a long day being steeped in conversations about this new space, the
overwhelming thought is the time is now! There is a sense of being in the right place at the right time. A sensation of being part of a sector that is moving forward.

Let me back up. Affordable Private Schools are social enterprises, providing a reliable source of education for children living in low-income urban areas. Families are considered clients, with the right to demand a quality education. School owners put an emphasis on quality and efficiency, justifying the modest tuition charged that allows them to cover their expenses. (http://beyondprofit.com/index.php?s=tooley, accessed 25th August 2010)

These developments and discourses are replicated in ‘new’ forms of philanthropy, which in particular are funded by and draw upon the methods of finance capital

- ‘venture philanthropy’ - Peter Lampl sees the Sutton Trust “as run a bit like a private equity firm … we look at opportunities that come through the door, we initiate opportunities and we make a decision about where we’re going to put our resources”.
- effectiveness and metrics (new infrastructure NPC etc.), due diligence etc.
- joined-up’ by a specific set of insistent and repetitive ideas and discourses of ‘change’ – e.g. productivity, entrepreneurship, contestability

Again there are new values, methods and forms of organisation here modelled on ‘the firm’ and on the practices of finance capital. Social enterprise is one aspect of what Shamir (2008 p. 6) calls the ‘economization of the social’, within which government becomes a facilitator of a ‘market of authorities’. ‘Government itself becomes a sort of enterprise whose task it is to universalize competition and invent market-shaped systems of action for individuals, groups and institutions’ (Lemke 2001 p. 197).

Networks of flow, new policy relations, new heterarchies
Education and social policy within government, are now thought, influenced and done in many different sites and the education policy community is increasingly diverse and unstable (see (Ball 2008). In general terms this is the move towards a ‘polycentric state’ and ‘a shift in the centre of gravity around which policy cycles move’ (Jessop 1998 p. 32) which ‘enlarge[s] the range of actors involved in shaping and delivering policy’ (Newman 2001 p. 125). This shift is often referred to as a move from government to governance, or to ‘network governance’, or towards the ‘post-bureaucratic state’ or ‘lean government’, which involves the development of ‘relations involving mutuality and interdependence as opposed to hierarchy and independence’ (Peterson 2003 p. 1) and potentially at least an enhancement of ‘the state’s capacity to project its influence and secure its objectives by mobilizing knowledge and power resources from influential non-governmental partners or stakeholders’ (Jessop 2002 p. 199). Clearly, older more direct hierarchy and command methods of government and governing have not been totally displaced by network governance (see Dean 2007) but there are increasing elements of hybridity, intertwining, blurring and instability in the processes of governance - a complex and unstable mix of hierarchy, heterarchy\(^8\) and market. Keast, Mandell and Brown argue that: ‘This situation leads to governance complexity and what is contended to be a “crowded” policy domain in which differing governance arrangements, policy prescriptions, participants and processes bump up against and even compete with each other to cause overlap and confusion…’ (2006 p. 27). There are a variety of related impetuses and a family of loosely inter-related ideas in play here – enterprise, philanthropy, mutualism and privatisation – which are working collectively to transform state education and which empower an new set of actors, with particular interests, in relation to a new set of ‘drivers’ and incentives.

---

\(^8\) Heterarchical relationships replace some bureaucratic and administrative structures and relationships with a system of organization replete with overlap, multiplicity, mixed ascendancy, and/or divergent-but-coexistent patterns of relation. Heterarchies are made up of heterogeneous elements (public and private sectors organizations, charities, non-for-profit, social enterprise and voluntary sector organisations, crown agencies and other Non-Departmental Public Bodies (NDPB)) placed in diverse relations to one another with unstable membership. They are sets of ‘functions’, and are co-functioning, symbiotic elements that are unalike but perhaps also converging.
Enterprise at work – some examples

Business, philanthropy and the enterprise curriculum.

The philanthropic engagements here involve the insertion in various modes and guises of the sensibilities of enterprise into education – an enterprise curriculum in effect. Indeed, enterprise education now has internationally all of the infrastructure and trappings of a school subject – teacher training programmes, advanced courses, professional associations, journals, manuals and texts, the IOE has a Dept of Geography, Enterprise, Mathematics and Science – a recontextualising context in Bernstein’s terms (see Brant, J. and Falk, A. (2007). The enterprise curriculum, in the broadest sense is an attempt to rework students, through the ‘formation of an entrepreneurial identity’ (Holmgren and From 2005 p. 387) and indirectly at least draw them into the ambit of financial capital as workers or customers. Enterprise Education is now a ubiquitous global phenomenon, which is typically linked, in particular in government policy texts, to international competitiveness in the knowledge economy (see entrepreneurship education ‘as one realisation of the neo-liberal
oriented restructuring process, which is sweeping through Europe’ (Holmgren and From, 2005 p. 387).

Creating an Enterprise Culture
Promoting and Strengthening UK enterprise culture must begin with helping young people develop entrepreneurial skills and aspirations. The UK’s second Enterprise Week in November 2005 delivered over 1000 events, encouraging young people to consider entrepreneurship as a career option. (UK government White Paper)

As a category of person and as an ethical personality, du Gay argues the entrepreneur now ‘must be seen as assuming an ontological priority’ (du Gay 1996 p. 181). Enterprise as it is diffused through the social fabric becomes ‘the generalised principle’ (Gordon 1991 p. 42) of the functioning of governmentality. And the enterprise narrative insinuates itself everywhere.

To foster the entrepreneurs of tomorrow, by 2006 every school in the country will offer enterprise education, and every college and university should be twinned with a business champion. (2005 Labour Party Election Manifesto p. 23)

All of this has two underpinnings; First, that ‘the market is the best way to achieve effective organisational arrangements’ it has ‘paradigmatic status’ (du Gay 1991 p. 45); Second, that the ethics of wealth creation’ is a final measure of success and worth (the new heroes of economics and education policy are ‘business champions’, self-made entrepreneurs), this is, a ‘highly individualist form of capitalism’ (Heelas and Morris p. 3).
Again a few examples of corporate philanthropic involvement will have to serve as illustration here.

One example of such activity, which operates on a global scale, with member organisations in 40 countries, is SIFE (Students in Free Enterprise) – its strapline is ‘a Head for Business. A Heart for the world’. SIFE’s mission is ‘a diverse network of university students, academic professionals and industry leaders around the shared mission of creating a better, more sustainable world through the positive power of business’ (http://www.sife.org/AboutSIFE/Pages/AboutSIFE.aspx accessed 8 January 2010). SIFE ‘world headquarters’ is in the US but both HSBC and KPMG are major sponsors. HSBC also sponsors the Young Entrepreneurs Awards and HSBC the Young Enterprise Innovation Awards. Junior Achievement (JA) is a similar organisation with a longer history. It was founded in the US in 1919 by two company presidents. Today JA ‘claims to reach 8.3 millions students per year … in more than 100 countries’ (Sukarieh and Tannock 2009 p. 775) with a curriculum which ranges from pre-school to college level, and covers work readiness, life skills, financial literacy and entrepreneurship and mini-business programmes, using TV and interactive websites.

Kids Speak Out About Entrepreneurship

More than half of kids 13-18 want to start their own business someday. And, to prepare for that, nine out ten of them believe that entrepreneurship should be taught in school. (http://www.ja.org/ accessed 11 January 2010).

Sukareih and Tannock (2009 p.782) argue that the principal goal of JA is ‘to instill a deep and lasting commitment to free market principles in the minds habits, dreams and ambitions of young people everywhere’.

The Enterprise Education Trust, based in the UK, runs among other activities the Network for Teaching Entrepreneurship, which has among its sponsors UBS Warburg, Apax, Garfield Weston, and Deutsche Bank. The Ogden Trust funded and ran for a time The National Schools Business Competition.
Scotland the Hunter Foundation funds the University of Strathclyde Centre for Entrepreneurship and co-funds with the Scottish Government the Schools Enterprise Programme (SEP). Also in Scotland Charles Skene funds the Skene Enterprise Trust, which organises the Skene Young Entrepreneur Award, and funds the Robert Gordon University Centre for Entrepreneurship. Teach First runs a “social entrepreneurship program, to help ambassadors start good social enterprises that will make a real impact in the classroom in addressing educational disadvantage” (Brett Wigdortz).

These sites, programmes and events are conduits for the enterprise discourse. They point up both the role of businesses in developing and supporting curriculum development and curriculum interventions, as well as the complex global flow of ideas and funding through networks established by philanthropic and educational organizations. They also give some indication of the increasingly subtle and complex relations between moral and business interests in the forming of particular kinds of financially ‘responsible’ and entrepreneurially competent citizens and workers through education. Here, as Shamir (2008 p. 8) puts it, business assumes moral authority and agency and mobilises ‘designated actors actively to undertake and perform self-governing tasks’ and perfect their own human capital (Boltanski and Chiapello 2006). Referring to ‘enterprise’ in the specialisms of Academy schools, Woods and colleagues (2007) make the point that what is happening through these various ‘incursions’ into the school curriculum is a form of ‘enclosure’ wherein ‘Areas in the public domain are being carved out for enhanced private influence over the symbolic and cultural power to shape educational purposes and practices’. They go on to argue that the boundaries between public control and private influence are being tested and are becoming increasingly unstable.

There is an increasing number and array of social enterprise and for-profit providers in post 14 education and in post-compulsory education and provision for NEETS and welfare-to-work schemes, in response to what Fuller etal (2010) call ‘the permissive social policy climate’ (p. 38); and charity banks like Social Finance, UnLtd and Futurebuilders, and philanthropies like the Private Equity Foundation are providing support and financial investment for social
enterprises and voluntary organizations to develop their work in this field. While in the process forms of due diligence and effectiveness measures bring to bear upon such providers the requirement that they develop business-like forms and methods. NESTA funds and houses social enterprises, runs a Public services Innovation Lab which ‘is trialing some of the most innovative solutions and bringing them to scale across the country’s public services’ (www.nesta.org.uk/areas_of_work/public_services_lab accessed 15th February 2010) and NESTA recently published The Ownership State by Philip Blond, founder of Red Conservative think tank ResPublica. This argues for a new ‘mutualism’ that is ‘a new power of civil association be granted to all frontline service providers in the public sector. This power would allow the formation, under specific conditions, of new employee and community-owned ‘civil companies' that would deliver the services previously monopolised by the state’ (www.respublica.org.uk/articles/ownership-state accessed 15th February 2010). NESTA is ‘a founder partner in Big Issue Invest's £10 million Social Enterprise Investment Fund to create capital for growing UK-based social enterprises’ (see also Ball and Exley 2010). The Innovation Exchange acts as a broker for social entrepreneurs seeking support for innovative solutions to social problems and looking to take on commissions from local authorities and others. Areas of state activity in relation to education, like the Future Leaders scheme (run by ARK and NCSL), the NCETM (managed by Tribal), and the National Strategies (run by Capita) are being contracted out to or run in partnership with private or charitable providers. What is being established here is a more fully worked up version of what Wolch (1990) called ‘the shadow state’ which is taking on more and more of the roles previous limited to public sector organizations and to the state itself. But I would reiterate Jessop’s (2002) point that many of these changes and interventions are ‘experimental’ rather than definitive.

Many of these sites and points of public sector innovation are joined-up in another sense in that they are linked together in well-integrated and complex social networks and discourse communities (see Figure 1). These articulate,
advocate, test and trial alternative visions of social and education policy and social services delivery based on a diverse but related set of principles which include mutualism, voluntarism, social enterprise, and for-profit contracting-out. They operate in and across political parties, think tanks, Trusts, the corporate sector, charities and voluntary sector and importantly now at points within the state sector, public services and Higher Education and with links to government departments and agencies. They have in some cases strong international links and they import (e.g. Swedish independent schools, Charter Schools, KIPP) and export policy (e.g. Teach First, Partnerships in Leadership (Ball 2010)). People and ideas move across these sites of articulation, many of the same people speak at different points in different roles. These new actors are in Bob Jessop’s terms the bearers of a new accumulation strategy and he notes their ‘increasing participation ... in shaping education mission statements’ (Jessop, 2002, p. 167).

**Discussion**

A number of dimensions of the effects and processes of the enterprise narrative need further research.

— the increasingly complex, multi-faceted and opaque crossings, blurrings, inter-weavings – hybridities – that constitute and animate this terrain and its governance.

— the hybrid organizations with a variety of different and changing mixes of charitable, social enterprising and business identities and commitments.

— the unclear financial and moral status and standing of these actors and organisations.

— the new complex ‘3rd way careers’ in all of this actors move between sectors state/3rd/business and mix these in composite job portfolios. They are employees, consultant’s, Trustees, with a variety of opportunities/interests/commitments.
— where the social ends and the enterprise begins at organizational and individual levels.
— exploration of the heterarchies of the new state glimpsed and how they are connected by a diverse set of exchanges and relationships – partnership, sponsorship, consultancy, contracting-out, and philanthropy.

Embedded here is a process which Shamir (2008 p. 6) describes as a drive ‘to distribute authority to numerous state and non-state units that assume the economic enterprise form …’. This does begin to constitute a new form of governance, albeit not a single and coherent form, and brings into play new sources of authority and a ‘market of authorities’ (p.10). Within all of this the modalities and contents of education policy and service delivery are changing [what Burch (2009) calls ‘the field effects’ of new forms of participation]; the educational state is more congested; new relationships and forms of relationships are being established in and in relation to policy; the boundaries between state, economy and civil society are being blurred; there are new voices within policy conversations and new conduits through which policy discourses enter policy thinking; there is a new mix within the matrix of governance involving ‘complex relations of reciprocal interdependence’ (Jessop 2002 p. 52) and there is a proliferation of policy heterarchies. What we have as Jessop and others have proposed is a new hybrid form (government + governance) (bureaucracy + markets) (Courpasson and Reed 2004), that is fashioned ‘in the shadow of hierarchy’ (Jessop 1997 and 2002; Scharpf 1994, Whitehead 2003), and realised in and through the modalities of ‘metagovernance’ and the interplay or dialectic of collibration and intervention.

This paper has sought to map and sketch a set of dramatic, wide-ranging and wide spread, multi-facetted changes in the global landscape of education policy. I have sought to indicate the role of enterprise as a key discursive trope which has inter-related political, moral, social and financial dimensions which join-up to produce a compelling narrative. This involves changes in the form and modalities of the state, and in the participants and voices in policy-making, a shift in the distribution of moral responsibilities, the use of quasi-
financial and financial methods and institutions to solve ‘wicked’ social problems, and the articulation of a new active and responsible and enterprising global citizen.

This is a new hegemonic vision which introduces new key ideas and new social logics and new social actors into the heart of the project of state education and displaces the previous incumbents.
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